



*Intermediate Evaluation of the Project
“Environmental protection and maritime
transport pollution control in the Gulf of
Honduras” (RS-X1009), GRT/FM-9179-RS*

Final Report



*Evaluator: Ing. Mauricio Castro Salazar
Nov. 6th, 2010*



Todos...
**Rescatemos el
Futuro**

El Golfo de Honduras es vía de Progreso, Trabajo, Comunicación y VIDA.
¡Aprovéchalo Responsablemente!
Proyecto Golfo de Honduras

Edificio TRAINMAR, Planta baja a un costado. Empresa Nacional Portuaria, Puerto Cortés-Honduras Teléfonos(504)465-2343
Tel./Fax(504)665-3822 , email: pro_golfo@yahoo.com, proyecto.golfo@gmail.com

Table of contents

1. Background	3
2. Methodology.....	4
3. The Evaluation.....	5
3.1. ToR: Comprehensive comparison, of the foreseen and executed activities, the advances and obtained objectives, the compliance level of the Project's objectives and goals based on the logical framework that is in force.	5
3.2 ToR: Compliance status of the contractual conditions	9
3.3. ToR: Determination of the possible effects and impacts at a medium and long term, based on the advance and compliance of programmed vs executed activities, the quality of the executed actions and methodology associated with its development and combined actions, added or generated for different components	10
3.4. ToR: Detection of the deviations in regards to the design and proposals of adjustments required in the technical, financial, economical and institutional framework for the Project's execution.....	12
3.5. ToR: Definition of the weaknesses and strengths of the processes associated to the Program's execution	14
3.6. ToR: Investments sustainability assessment and effectiveness in execution, so as positive value added. Efficiency assessment of resource use in general. Assessment of the level of participation from stakeholders, and commitments taken by partners and local collaborators.	15
3.7. ToR: Main lessons learned for the execution of pending project activities.....	16
3.8. ToR: Identification of recommendations to improve effectiveness in project's execution, the relation between results attained and resources used-invested.	17
3.9 Assess alliances and joint investments that could have been established with other institutions, organizations and/or projects for the achievement of value added outputs.....	17
3.10 ToR: Assessment of GEF's 5 evaluation criteria.....	18
4. Conclusions	19
5. Recommendations.....	21
Annexes	24

1. Background

1.1. For over 50 years Central America, as a region, has tried to work in an integrated way. Several efforts have been carried out to achieve it, and the results show little advances. In 1994 an effort was done to find themes and working areas of common interest and those with the opportunity to carry out joint actions- without many political complications- and all countries signed an agreement to work in a joint manner in environmental themes that promote sustainable development, and therefore the Central American Alliance for Sustainable Development (ALIDES) was reached.

1.2. ALIDES facilitates joint work and allows implementing some of the conventions based on Rio 92 that the Central American Region- as a whole- had agreed; among others, the *CONVENTION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE BIODIVERSITY AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIORITY WILDERNESS AREAS IN CENTRAL AMERICA*. This Convention, specifically article 18 defines the priority areas that must be protected because in them there is 75% of representation of the Central American biodiversity. Among those priority areas is the Gulf of Honduras.

“Article 18. Within this Convention, priority will be given to develop and strengthen the frontier protected areas in the following land and coast areas known as: the Maya Biosphere Reserve- Fraternity Biosphere Reserve or Trifinio Plan -; Gulf of Honduras- Gulf of Fonseca; Coco River Reserve or Solidaridad - Cayos Miskitos-; International System of Protected Areas for Peace, SIAPAZ - Bahia Salinas Reserve-; La Amistad Biosphere Reserve- Sixaola Reserve,- Darien Region”.

1.3. In 1997, in Tulum Mexico the Chiefs of States of Mexico, Guatemala, Belize and Honduras met and agreed to work jointly to preserve the Gulf of Honduras’ ecosystems, particularly its coral reefs.

1.4. In 2001, through the environmental organism of the Central American Integration System, the Central American Commission for Environment and Development starts the implementation of the GEF Project “Mesoamerican Reef System”. Since that moment, it is discussed that the conservation of the Gulf of Honduras requires the participation of other regional organisms and of sectors that traditionally are not involved in conservation. The Central American Commission for Maritime Transportation (COCATRAM) and the port authorities of the ports located in the Gulf are the logic complement, and without a doubt the most important actors to conserve their ecosystems.

1.5. In 2005 the Grant Agreement GRT/FM-9197-RS is signed by the Central American Commission for Maritime Transportation (COCATRAM) and the Inter American Development Bank (IADB), and financed by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), to execute the Environmental Protection and Maritime Transportation Pollution Control in the Gulf of Honduras, from now on known as the GOH Project, for a total of US\$ 11.85 million, including co-financing.

1.6. “Up to August 23rd the GOH Project has disbursed a total of two million four hundred fifty two thousand six hundred seventy six United States dollars with seventeen cents (US\$ 2,452,676.17) that represent 49.11% of the funds. According to Clause 3.06 a) the grant will have an intermediate evaluation of the project which will be carried out two years from the first disbursement”.

1.7. Since the first disbursement of the Project was carried in February 2006 the intermediate evaluation must have been carried out in February 2008. Nevertheless due to delays in the start of the project, it can be considered that the initial date was at the beginning of 2007, thus the intermediate evaluation must have been carried out in the second trimester of 2009. Nevertheless, due to the political events that took place in Honduras on June 28th, 2009, IADB, and thus the project, entered a “stand by period” that ended on March 17th, 2010.

1.8. The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) requires that the projects managed/ implemented by the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) have an intermediate evaluation of the project to determine the progress level of the program's objectives and expected results, as well as difficulties in the implementation, sustainability, learned lessons and to get recommendations that would influence the decisions on actions to be carried out in the project's second part and that would allow compliance of the objectives that were agreed with GEF.

1.9. To comply with this requirement this Intermediate Evaluation is carried out. The objective is to review and assess achievements during the Project execution related to its objectives, logical framework and action plan in order to propose necessary adjustments and changes for the resting project period to improve performance and better goals achievement. At the beginning of August 2010 the independent consultant Mauricio Castro Salazar was hired to carry out the evaluation. Terms of reference (ToR) are included in Annex 1.

2. Methodology

2.1. The evaluation was carried out between August 2nd and September 3rd, 2010, including an extensive agenda of consultations, meetings and interviews in the three countries. At all time of the evaluation, the assessment of the global objectives to be reached stood out- spirit of GEF funding- and of the regional objectives- that are the project's global objective- in order to ensure the “regionally coordinated” goals and results. The consultant had access to numerous documents (see the list in ANNEX 2), and had the opportunity to interview key actors of the Project's execution process (ANNEX 3). Additionally, when necessary the consultant requested additional information to the actors, and examined the outputs generated by the Project.

2.2. The consultant thanks the personnel of the Inter-American Development Bank, the Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU), COCATRAM, organizations and actors participating in the project, their disposition to meet with him, answer questions and

discuss comments and to provide him information that supports the results, conclusions and recommendations that are included in this report.

2.3. The consultant had the opportunity, before starting the evaluation with key actors of the project's implementation, to review in detail the scope of the terms of reference with IADB and with RPCU with the purpose of carrying out a most efficient evaluation in the short available time. The report is presented in such way that the evaluation results are shown- added and analyzed according to the terms of reference- followed by conclusions, and finally recommendations.

2.4. The recommendations seek to respect the spirit of the initial documents that originated the project- the consultant considers that after more than 7 years they are still as valid. Additionally, he recognizes the Project's strengths and weaknesses and makes recommendations for the ongoing Project's second part, in the case that it is approved to continue. As possible, the recommendations try to be consistent with the opinions of the numerous persons that were interviewed.

2.5. It seems to be common that the available time for intermediate evaluations consultancy is too short to obtain a broader vision of the Project. The consultant considers that he was able to capture the essence of the ideas that inspired the Project and its design, what was developed by the Project and the opinion of the participating actors. He recognizes that with more time he would have been able to obtain a better appreciation of the numerous aspects and complexities of the project. The evaluator hopes that his analyses and recommendations are taken with the constructive spirit that they were made: recognizing the Project's achievements and helping to attain- at least in broad features- the objectives agreed when it was approved.

3. The Evaluation

As requested by IADB in the terms of reference (ToR) the following results are submitted. Text in italic letters is as requested in the ToR.

3.1. ToR: Comprehensive comparison, of the foreseen and executed activities, the advances and obtained objectives, the compliance level of the Project's objectives and goals based on the logical framework that is in force.

3.1.1. The Project was approved by GEF 3 on March 24th, 2005 and officially initiated on August 11th, 2005, thus contractually speaking its termination date is August 10th, 2010. Thus, at the date of the evaluation it was expected for the resources to be 100% committed and the results 100% reached, and it would have 6 additional months for the official closing.

3.1.2. RPCU has indicated through diverse means that there are differences between the "real starting" and the hiring date of the first coordinator, the hiring date of the

specialists and the generation of the first outputs and it has insisted that the effective work time is 44 months; therefore there are still 16 months for its termination. In other words, RPCU claims that at this time the Project is in its 75%.

3.1.3. Based on the premise that the Project is in its 75%, it is supposed that the results, as well as the disbursed budget must be around 75%. Based on the programmed activities and the execution of the Logical Framework it shows that the result obtained up to this date of the Project’s total advance is approximately 50%. In other words the project has a difference between what it was initially programmed and reality at this date of approximately 25%.

Chart 1: Disbursements established in the Project’s Document

Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
GEF IADB	690	1.120	1.150	1.150	690	4.800
Governments	360	480	600	600	360	2.400
Total	1.050	1.600	1.750	1.750	1.050	7.200
Percentage	15%	20%	25%	25%	15%	100%

This same chart, modified with some values and information obtained from the evaluation, adjusted to the time passed indicated by RPCU of 44 months and updated to July 31st, 2010, must be read as follows:

Chart 2: Expected Disbursements

Source	Year 1 12 months	Year 2 24 months	Year 3 36 months	Year 4* 44 months Up to Jul 31, 10
GEF-IADB	690	920	1,150	767
Expected disbursements GEF accumulated funds	690	1,610	2,760	3,527
Expected accumulated percentage	15	35	60	75%

*8 months of the year 4 (US\$1,150 programmed) equivalent to US\$ 767 thousand.

3.1.5. According to the data from IADB’s monitoring controls on the Project (using Loan Management System, LMS), up to August 20th, 2010, US \$2.452 million have been disbursed, in other words 51% of the total budget. In summary, it can be stated that the Project has a difference with what it was programmed in the disbursement chart of approximately 25%.

3.1.6. During the evaluation it was evidenced that the physical advance- compliance of goals and objectives- maintains a close relationship with the budget execution. The physical advance is close to 50% in the same way as the budget execution of 50%, thus the Project maintains a difference of 25% with expected budget execution.

3.1.7. It was evidenced during the evaluation that reported physical advances of the goals described in POA are consistent. If a goal is reported to a determined percentage of advance it is possible to know how such percentage is composed, this is results of the annual planning in which clear parameters are established, which facilitate the weight of the physical advance.

3.1.8. It was also evidenced in the evaluation that the advance percentages are directly related to the budget execution percentages. If a goal shows a physical advance, let's say 35%, and it is compared with its budget advance, this is also close to 35%. This shows that the planning and programming exercises that were carried out show good results.

3.1.9. The Projects maintains a difference between what it was expected and reality of 25%. RPCU argues and justifies that the differences have been out of its control and has indicated that they are due to many factors, among others: the "stand-by" due to the Honduran political situation, delays in the response times of the "non objections" and the changes of the involved officers.

3.1.10. The Project's Indicative Budget included in the Project Document and in the Grant Agreement is of US\$ 7.200.000; and it is established that the GEF-IADB funds for the Project's Administration (RPCU and Regional Steering Committee) were budgeted in US\$ 950.000. It is foreseen that if a project has an advance close to 50% or it is expected up to the date according to the time that has passed in 75%, the "Administration subcategory" must be in the same ranges as the physical advance. In other words, if the physical advance is of 50%, the administrative expenses will be proportional, near to US\$ 475,000 (50% of the subcategory of expenses). If the Project has a behavior as the one expected, in other words to have a 75% of the physical advance, the Administration subcategory must have the same behavior and the total spent should have been approximately US\$ 715,000 (75% of the foreseen administrative expenses). According to RPCU's budget controls, this "subcategory" presents expenses for US\$ 1,110,992.00, which represents 23% of GEF total funding.

3.1.11. The foregoing, without reviewing if it was budgeted too much or too little, or if it is a design error of the Project, what is true is that the Project does not have remaining budget funds in the "Administration subcategory" (RPCU and Management Committee). It is clear that expenses not related to RPCU were charged to this "subcategory".

3.1.12. This mistaken charge causes incompliance with the *Financial Guidelines for Selected Operational Components*, specifically with "Guideline #2" that says "The GEF project management budget as a percentage of the GEF grant should not exceed 10

percent.” In other words, what has been budgeted for administration costs cannot exceed 10% of GEF’s grant.

3.1.13. This situation also brings us to determine that the original Indicative Budget that is included in the Project’s Document does not comply with this requirement; it was budgeted close to 20%, in other words it doubles what GEF permits. Nevertheless, that budget was approved by GEF 3 in 2004.

3.1.14. Determining that there are mistaken expense charges in the “Administration subcategory”, RPCU’s personnel asks about the opportune function of the Project’s Administrative Agency, IADB, that has given its “no objection” to the expenses charged to this subcategory. However, IADB’s “no objection” does not substitute RPCU’s responsibility for the wrong charges or to promptly and carefully follow up budget’s execution.

3.1.15. The physical advance- as it was said- having passed 75% of the Project’s term is at 50%. Up to July 30th, 2010 there are no funds in the “Administration subcategory” to complete the other 50% and reach 100% of the Project’s awaited goal.

3.1.16. It is clear- and it can be verified that some of the Management Committee’s minutes and in the feeling of the local actors that participate in the Project and also in RPCU- that the concepts “global”, “regional”, “international waters”, “transboundary” and “incremental costs” have not been fully discussed, thus they have not completely been interiorized. The Project’s regional focus, after visiting the sites where the Project works and interviewing many actors, is still valid.

3.1.17. This situation seriously affects the compliance of the Project’s Global Objective: “...the implementation of a regionally coordinated Strategic Action Plan that will result in regional, and by extension global, environmental benefits through protection of international waters, their resources and sustainable use of resources ...” (What has been underlined is not of the original). This is also reflected with clarity in the Project’s Strategy, number 1.26 of the Project’s Document: “The project is essentially regional and transboundary in nature. It will enable the coastal states responsible for managing the Gulf of Honduras and its basin to build new and improve on existing regional cooperative frameworks, ensure adherence to international conventions, as well as strengthen national laws, regulations, and management regimes to prevent and reduce existing and potential degradation from pollution which, by its nature, crosses national boundaries and threatens a globally significant ecosystem..”

3.1.18. The importance of understanding and interiorizing the concepts “international waters” and “transboundary” is vital, since the justification to obtain the funds was based in demonstrating that the Project had a total coherence with what is established in GEF Operational Program 10 “to develop and implement International Waters projects that demonstrate ways of overcoming barriers to the use of best practices for limiting releases of contaminants causing priority concerns in the International Waters

focal area, and to involve the private sector in utilizing technological advances for resolving these transboundary priority concerns". (What is underlined is not of the original, the text was taken from the Project's Document).

3.1.19. The non immersion of these concepts also threatens the noncompliance of the incremental costs and it must be remembered that "The financing of the incremental costs is the guiding principle of GEF's operations that finances the incremental or additional costs that seek to transform a project with national/ local benefits in another that also has benefits for the world environment". (Extracted from the Summary of the document GEF/ME/C.30/2).

3.1.20. Comparing Project Documents available in GEF's and COCATRAM's web pages, the one used by RPCU and the official Project Document, some difference were found. Such differences do not seem to affect project's execution, however, they might complicate project's political management to COCATRAM, particularly with institutional back up and counterparts, since eventually those COCATRAM's country members might object that the entity dedicates resources to a project where only some countries are benefited. In Component 1 there is a key difference. In the Project Document found in COCATRAM's webpage it is read in Component: "To develop regional capacities for maritime and land-based pollution Control in Central America".

And in the official Project Document it is read in Component 1: "Building the regional capacity for maritime and land-based pollution prevention and control".

Indicating Central America in the name of Component 1 might create a misunderstanding to other stakeholders that more countries are participating other than the three located in the Gulf of Honduras.

3.1.21. Project Document was also compared with the Logical Framework adjusted in 2007/2008 (Annex 3). Even though differences are not substantial, there are some differences regarding goals and indicators.

3.2 ToR: Compliance status of the contractual conditions

3.2.1. The Project's Document establishes that GEF will provide 67% of the contribution and COCATRAM and the participating countries 33%. That is established in CLAUSE 1.03: "Additional Resources. The amount of the resources that the Beneficiary is obligated to timely provide for the complete and non interrupted execution of the Project, in addition to this Contribution's resources, is estimated in the equivalent of two million four hundred thousand dollars (US\$2.400.000). This estimation does not imply a limitation or reduction of the Beneficiary's obligation according to what is established in Article 6.04 of the General Norms. This amount can include contributions from Belize, Guatemala and

Honduras, from now on the “Participating Countries”. Additional resources can be given in specie.”

3.2.2. US\$ 2,4 million have been disbursed up to July 31st, 2010. This implies that appropriately justified counterpart should be at least US \$1,18 million. Up to Dec. 31st, 2009, a counterpart of US\$ 1,06 million have been approved (US\$1,061,572.00).

3.2.3. It is important to indicate that a requisite for disbursement is that “pari passu” relation should be 67-33 at all time. From documentation review it can be noted that this relation has not been followed, and therefore the contractual clause regarding counterpart has not been complied. Also, there is not periodical follow up to counterpart compliance on behalf of RPCU.

3.2.4. Clause 6.01.(b) of the norms annexed to the contract indicate: “Every important modification of the plans, specifications, investment calendar, budget, bylaws and other documents that the Bank approves, as well as every substantial change in the contract or contracts of goods or services that are paid with the resources destined to the Project’s execution or the modifications of the investment categories require the Bank’s written consent.”

3.2.5. Of the reviewed documentation, it has been verified that there are budget modifications that have not received the Bank’s “no objection”.

3.2.6. In the compliance control of contractual clauses that IADB follows with the Operation Management System (OPMAS), it is reflected that clause 6.04 b) says “from the following calendar year from the Project’s initiation and during its execution period, the Beneficiary shall demonstrate the Bank, during the first sixty (60) days of each calendar days, that it will timely have the necessary resources to carry out the local contribution to the Project during that year.” This requirement was not complied for years 2007 nor 2008.

3.3. ToR: Determination of the possible effects and impacts at a medium and long term, based on the advance and compliance of programmed vs executed activities, the quality of the executed actions and methodology associated with its development and combined actions, added or generated for different components

3.3.1. The actions executed up to the intermediate evaluation’s date have been carried out following the available and globally accepted methodologies, and have been used by competent professionals, having participated as individual contractors or as part of the firms that have been hired.

3.3.2. The supervision of the contractors has been adequate, which guarantees that the quality of the works that have been carried out and currently are carried out according to the quality standards.

3.3.4. The Project has known how to use the available information that comes from SAM, as well as from other projects or activities that have been developed in the zone by organizations such as TNC, WWF, NOAA and others.

3.3.5. The development of outputs and compliance of objectives have required that the activities and actions that have been carried out in the different components are combined optimizing their benefits.

3.3.6. Regarding effects and impacts at a medium and long term, it results as previously mentioned: the Project has a delay of approximately 25% and does not have the budget resources to pay the administrative expenses that are required for the obtainment of the awaited results. From all the reviewed documentation- that include the reports of the hired consultancy services, minutes from meetings, bi-annual reports and others - from the interviews and from the analyses that were carried out- executed activities, quality, methodological focus- it is inferred that in the current conditions all activities included in the Project's Document cannot be complied with in the remaining time, and therefore adjustments are needed for the resting project period.

3.3.7. In a medium term the noncompliance of all that was programmed and awaited that the Project's product of the described situation would cause a delay in the strengthening of the units or departments of environmental management of the ports, the impossibility of having a base line that permits the determination of advances or delays in the degradation of the Gulf of Honduras and the effort of having in a network a great amount of actors that have been identified and hired would be loss.

3.3.8. The current situation of the Project could provoke in a long term that the effects and impacts in the sensible sites- for their ecological value (mangrove swamps, reefs and others), social value (housing and production zones) and economic value (fishing and tourism activities) - continue under risk and danger conditions similar to the ones at the beginning of the Project.

3.3.9. Product of the advance that the Project has up to July 31, 2010 two of the most awaited outputs by the Project that combine and boost the activities between the Project's components: the Strategic Action Program for the control and pollution prevention of the Gulf of Honduras and the nautical letter of the Gulf of Honduras hydrographically updated with the due signs of the sensible zones have not been finished and require more detailing and discussion. The non obtainment of these outputs would provoke that the Project's global objective will not be complied with.

3.4. ToR: Detection of the deviations in regards to the design and proposals of adjustments required in the technical, financial, economical and institutional framework for the Project's execution

3.4.1. The Logical Framework proposed in the Project's Document was adjusted and "not objected " by the Bank in 2008, and under it the Project is being executed, deviations between what was approved and what is being carried out can be seen in Annex 5.

In general, up to this date there are many indicators that have not been measured or that they have not been given sufficient attention.

3.4.2. The main deviations in regards to the design and technical aspects -already indicated- are fundamentally related to the conceptual and application aspects of the GEF funds: "regionality", "cross border", "international waters" and "incremental costs". The Project is not being executed following these concepts: three hydrographic equipments were acquired, three consultants were hired after supporting the environmental management units of the ports, the budget of the demonstrative project is divided into 3, a map that shows regional outputs from consultancies and others are not available nor visible.

3.4.3. Since its design the Project included the importance of the public-private alliances and it is only until last year that the private company sectors that operate in the Gulf of Honduras have been incorporated in the Project's development.

3.4.4. The relationship between the technical aspects linked to navigation, the port operation and pollution included in component 3 and 4 were designed thinking in the legal and institutional changes. This relationship has not been developed until this date.

3.4.5 One of the strategies designed and incorporated in the Project's Document is the use of demonstrative projects: "... These will be confirmed at the beginning of the Project's execution phase, after it, a regional agreement will be established on the main demonstrative projects, their execution, supervision and report submission.

Up to the date of this midterm evaluation, no demonstrative project has been carried out nor has the theoretical or guiding framework in which they would be carried out.

3.4.6. From the financial point of view- understood as the management of incomes and expenditures- the Project has presented a weakness that is hoped to be amended with the incorporation of a specialist that was integrated in the first trimester of 2010. The weakness is shown in two concrete examples: in recent liquidations that the Project has done: there are expenses in 2006 and there is a weakness in the management of the rotation funds (authorized for US \$ 250 thousand) that have caused in some occasions that the Bank has not accepted its settlement of accounts or that the Project runs out of funds to operate, as it happened during the "stand-by".

3.4.7. In the economical- understood as the final annual result- the Project has shown a weakness that is reflected on one side- already mentioned- on expense charges that did not correspond to the administrative subcategory and on the other side in the lack of timely execution of the budget programmed during all the execution years of the Project that has been low, as for example in 2009 it was inferior to 60%, due in part to the bad planning of the financial resources.

3.4.8. The Project's design defined that COCATRAM would be the Project's executing agency and the Central American Commission for Environmental and Development would be the co-executing agency. In the opinion of most of actors interviewed CCAD's participation has been "scarce", specifically that in the few activities that it has participated, it has delegated it into a junior officer. The generalized comment of COCATRAM's leadership is that it has moved from "not doing it" to "doing it" and it is recognized that they have supported the improvement in RPCU's administrative systems and that they participated in the different meetings that the Project organizes.

3.4.9. From an institutional point of view, only the Management Committee (MC) and the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) were evaluated. The Management Committee, according to the Operative Bylaws, has the following functions: approve the Annual Operative Plan, approve the changes to the Operative Bylaws, channel the political participation of the national authorities, governors and majors when necessary for the better execution of the Project, enforce compliance of each country and enforce commitments established in the convention between COCATRAM and the Governments of the Republic of Honduras, Guatemala and Belize.

After reviewing the MC's minutes, it is observed that besides participating in the previously mentioned functions at a political level -macro-, is also involved at micro level issues, such as: request for the organization of workshops, instructions for the preparation of technical information, approval of the terms of reference, review of consultancy' reports, selection of the workshops' venues and others.

3.4.10. The Project's Management Committee has a particular composition: of the 6 members that are part of it, two participate in COCATRAM, 3 in CCAD and one does not participate in COCATRAM. This composition does not facilitate COCATRAM's duties as the executing agency, since there are moments, such as the "stand-by" in which it was required for COCATRAM to give temporary funds to guarantee the Project's continuity and there wasn't an agreement in COCATRAM's Board of Directors, probably because not all of COCATRAM's members feel that they are Project's owners.

3.4.11. The Project's Operative Bylaws define the Regional Steering Committee's responsibilities, which are: participate with its contributions in the development of the Annual Operative Plan (POA) and its budget, as well as to transmit the observations that

are considered necessary for the Project’s correct execution by its corresponding organization.

- Participate in meetings summoned by RPCU that are necessary for the advance and disclosure of POA’s activities and of the Project in general.
- Establish the specialized committees included in the Project (Technical Committee and Public Participation Committee, among others) to support the Project’s management, using the experience and knowledge of its members.

Some of the actors that participated in Regional Steering Committee have the opinion that it is very expensive to unite this instance and that the contributions are too little, thus the relationship cost/ efficiency is very bad.

3.5. *ToR: Definition of the weaknesses and strengths of the processes associated to the Program’s execution*

From the interviews that were carried out with the Project’s key actors and with RPCU’s team we submit a summary of strengthens and weaknesses:

Strengths
Quality of technical work.
Quantity and quality of available information.
Alliances with high value scientific organizations.
Interest of port authorities in environmental themes.
Technical capacity of the RPCU team in environmental and coastal marine issues and participation schemes.
Interest of the private sector that operate in the Gulf of Honduras in improving their environmental management.
Interest of the sector linked to COCATRAM in the improvement of navigation routes and control of the maritime transportation to reduce the contamination risks.
Management of planning tools for the elaboration of POAs and Physical Advance Reports of the Project.

Weaknesses
Micro-management.
Lack of opening towards regionality
Low participation of CCAD.
Response times in the approvals of the terms of reference and of the no objections in hiring, POAs and others.
RPCU’s capacity in project management.

Late participation of the private section in the Project's execution.
Lack of real commitment of the countries in the provision of funds as counterpart and in the non existence of coercive contractual mechanisms to carry out the compromises acquired in this subject matter.
The lack of knowledge in general, of RPCU and other relevant actors, of the concepts that GEF manages in the use of its funds: incremental costs, % of the administrative expenses and others; as well as IADB's and GEF's norms and procedures.
Limited consultants that are citizens of the Gulf of Honduras.
The lack of planning and follow up of several of the Project's indicators according to the logical framework that is in force.
Weak regional focused results up to date.

3.6. ToR: Investments sustainability assessment and effectiveness in execution, so as positive value added. Efficiency assessment of resource use in general. Assessment of the level of participation from stakeholders, and commitments taken by partners and local collaborators.

3.6.1. Regarding investments sustainability and resource use efficiency, the general opinion of key stakeholders consulted is that port authorities of the 5 involved ports will take appropriate budget provisions to follow up project investments.

3.6.2. They acknowledge that project's execution has created or supported the strengthening of environmental management port units and that once these units are fully operational, they will receive budget for adequate operation.

3.6.3. In some cases, stakeholders acknowledge that once project funds are over, several activities will be executed nationally without major hassle: monitoring water quality, bathymetry, maintenance of local stakeholders networking, revision and update navigation routes among others. Even some coordination meetings among environmental management units from some participating ports might be probable to happen, with expenses covered by national budgets.

3.6.4. It is generally envisaged that COCATRAM's role will be very important for the sustainability of project actions executed so far. In general stakeholders do not expect that COCATRAM would create an Environmental Management Unit, but rather that takes the responsibility to maintain network established so far and to effectively delegate the coordination of environmental management units to one of its staff.

3.6.5. From the point of view of consulted stakeholders, it is unlikely that fees, taxes of other type of charges are established to keep project activities ongoing. They consider that funding shall be provided from environmental ministries and port authorities.

3.6.6. Very few of consulted stakeholders know or have participated in all project components. In general, appropriation of project's global objectives is scarce. However, it is clear that personnel related to the environmental management units of ports do have the wider knowledge.

3.6.7. In general , key stakeholders consider that their “connectivity” to national approach will not be ceased when the project ends, and probably neither the “regional approach”, but this latter will be more difficult to maintain.

3.6.8. As mentioned above, it is a general agreement that the involvement of the private sector is recent and that it must be increased and strengthened, since they have proved enthusiasm and interest when invited to project related activities.

3.7. ToR: Main lessons learned for the execution of pending project activities.

3.7.1. Lessons learned were asked during the interviews that the evaluator conducted with several key stakeholders. Main answers and observations are summarized as follows:

1. Project design must consider enforcement measures to oblige countries to comply with their initial commitments.

2. Time must be invested at the beginning of the project to master concepts related to fund origin, including key concepts that will have to be applied during project execution, such as: incremental costs, regionality, international waters, transboundary, among others.

3. Participants roles must be clear since the beginning: What are the competences of the executing agency?, what are the competences of the administrative agency? What are the competences of the Management Committee?

4. Administrator, executing agency and RPCU shall invest time defining communication mechanisms, defining approval time, and understanding some relevant concepts, i.e. “no objection”, and procedures of the Administrative Agency, such as: budget control, Rotative Fund settlement of accounts, among other; and also donor procedures.

5. There is a need to have more regional information material that helps to break barriers from stakeholders to jointly guarantee existence and health of ecosystems.

6. To establish training budget to invest in personnel from participating organizations, as to promote continuation of project’s activities and actions, and to reduce “learning curve”.

7. It is important to take into account personnel stability of executing and co-executing agencies, in order to assess whether they have financial and human resources capabilities to achieve project results.

8. It is necessary that actors know not only details of their component, but also a general idea of global project objectives.

9. It is important to establish a periodical cross control (could be annually) between logical framework, the operational plan and results achieved, in order to ensure that 100% are planned and followed up.

10. There are two official languages in the Gulf of Honduras, Spanish and English. Therefore all project's outputs shall be produced in both languages as to ensure that all 5 ports receive 100% of project's benefits.

11. It is necessary to guarantee that all specialists involved in the execution of a project have knowledge and abilities in project management.

3.8. ToR: Identification of recommendations to improve effectiveness in project's execution, the relation between results attained and resources used-invested.

3.8.1. Recommendations are detailed in Clause 5 about recommendations. Main recommendations are oriented to: compliance of GEF's budget rule of 10% for administrative costs, priorities for product deliverance, COCATRAM's follow up to local stakeholders and strengthening of port's Environmental Management Units.

3.8.2. Recommendations about governmental counterpart are indicated; so as to relevant GEF's concepts, such as: incremental costs, regionality, transboundary and international waters.

3.8.3. Some recommendations regarding the Strategic Plan of Action are also included.

3.9 Assess alliances and joint investments that could have been established with other institutions, organizations and/or projects for the achievement of value added outputs.

3.9.1. The Project has established alliances with similar projects (FREPLATA) and other specialized organizations in the marine-cost issues. Other institutions that have cooperated are: TNC, WWF, Marfund, Healthy Reef, Zamorano, MACHC, HELCOM y UNU.

3.9.2. The relationship with MACHC is highly appreciated, particularly hydrographic services and training centers of participating ports.

3.9.3. Counterpart given by MACHC has not been approved yet, since there is not enough supporting documentation yet validated by an auditor. This counterpart has been estimated by them in approx. US\$400.000.

3.9.4. Coordination established with SAM project, with TNC, Healthy Reef and WWF was crucial to have valuable information for the Assessment of Transboundary Diagnose. All information provided by these organizations has been very much appreciated by RPCU.

3.9.5. SAM has supported and given input in the Regional Steering Committee, through valuable baseline information related to their project.

3.9.6. Healthy Reef supported through information to characterize the coastal line and to describe reef features; and their indicators proposal to measure health of existent reef in Gulf of Honduras.

3.9.7. TNC provided information related with coastal forest, main nutrient sources in food chains, interface between coastal and maritime communities and biodiversity. Also, TNC gave information regarding ecosystems characterization, and about nesting, breeding and feeding sites of species.

3.9.8. WWF provide information from its Bioaccumulation studies that showed presence of Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Carbon (elements known to have a degradation effect on reefs); as well as fungicides, insecticides and herbicides.

3.10 ToR: Assessment of GEF's 5 evaluation criteria

An assessment of the 5 criteria that GEF uses in its evaluations was performed after the execution of close to 40 interviews to local stakeholders, including governmental officers, civil society leaders, entrepreneurs, and others, and reviewing all relevant documentation.

- a. Relevance: it is possible to state that Project objectives have been considered in the national priorities of the 3 participating countries and the Executing Agency. Equally, it was possible to verify that both ministries of environment and transportation, and port companies have included in its relevant subjects the degradation reduction of the Gulf of Honduras. The main weakness is that the approach has been more national than regional and the Project's objective is that the degradation reduction of the Gulf of Honduras is tackled regionally, so as the rest of Project goals.
- b. Efficacy: the Project has not shown the expected efficacy. Already 75% of the time schedule has gone and the respective expected results have not been achieved. For instance, the ADT and PAE have not been socialized nor regionally adopted. The project has consultancy reports that need to be socialized, internalized and converted into Project's achievements, once the recommendations included on them have been executed.
- c. Efficiency: the Project has not had the expected efficiency. Up to the date of this assessment, the project shows a 50% of execution, both in terms of budget and physical advance; however, when comparing to elapsed time, which is 75%, the relation progress-time shows deficit and so it is reflected in the low budget execution showed every year and where many expected outputs are not ready yet.
- d. Results: eventhough the Project has not yet achieved its objectives, it is clear and recognized that the creation and strengthening of the Port Environmental Units is a direct result, and so is the set up of navigation aids and the introduction of environmental issues in COCATRAM and port companies.
- e. Sustainability: Project's matters and results have been step by step incorporated in work agendas and policies of the countries involved in the Project. On one hand ministry's officers and port companies have included within their work programs aspects related to navigation risks, elaboration of hydrographic charts, water quality monitoring, and other. Civil society and private enterprises have also

included within their operational budgets and policies aspects related with the Project.

4. Conclusions

As per the results of the evaluation, the evaluator concludes the following:

4.1. According to contractual agreements, closing date of the project is August 11th, 2010, since there is no official extension approved at this date. Also, the project's effective time has been approx. 75%.

4.2. Projects execution, in terms of physical advance, budget execution and disbursements made, is approx. 50%, which implies that there are still expected outputs not yet attained. If the time elapsed is compared with this, there is a delay of approx 25% in project's accomplishment and contribution disbursed.

4.3. Several indicators as defined in the Project's Logical Framework have not been measured, particularly those related to regional and demonstrative focuses, and to achievements in pollution reduction from different sources in the Gulf of Honduras.

4.4. It is not clear the concept of "incremental costs" in project's execution. Also, participants are not fully aware that the project is primarily focused towards regional and global objectives, and also that the project must be executed in line with the guiding principles of GEF's International Waters Program, and with particular interest in transboundary issues.

4.5. There are differences between GEF's approved Project Document with COCATRAM's, with RPCU's and with IADB's. These differences appear not to have consequences in the project's execution.

4.6. There are no remaining funds in the budget line for administrative costs, it has more expenses than budgeted, and already exceeds GEF 4's norm of 10% of total GEF's budget (\$475.000), however, the project was approved in GEF 3. The project started with a deviation regarding this norm, since the budget line approved for administrative costs is close to 20% (US\$950.000) from GEF's budget. Up to date, expenditure in administrative costs is approx 23% (US\$1,11 million) from GEF's budget and project objectives are not achieved yet.

4.7. Contractual conditions in general have been complied. However, there are 2 relevant issues that have not been complied:

4.7.1. There are budget modifications made between budget lines that did not have IADB's "no objection"; and

4.7.2. Counterpart contribution has not been kept throughout the project at the ratio of 67% GEF and 33% participating countries and COCATRAM.

4.8. Up to date there is no advance regarding one of the expected outputs from the project related to improving the legal, policy and institutional framework to contribute to

the project's global objective regarding pollution prevention and navigation safety in Gulf of Honduras.

4.9. The Project Document establishes demonstrative projects as one of the first activities to be implemented. However, there is no work done regarding demonstrative projects.

4.10. RPCU has a strong technical management (particularly regarding environmental pollution, marine-coast management and participation), which is acknowledged by stakeholders and the Evaluator. It is also acknowledged that there is a technical weakness regarding port and maritime transportation. Also RPCU has a weakness in project management. This is reflected in a poor budget management - which is expected to improve after some recent changes -, in the weak management of the Rotatory Fund and in the project's low budget execution during its time frame, including weak planning and acquisitions and lack of use of relevant tools. RPCU does not manage the "incremental costs" concept which is GEF's key principle and has given low attention to the concepts of "global", "regional", "transboundary" and "international waters".

4.11 The project was conceived with COCATRAM as the executing agency and CCAD as co-executing agency. COCATRAM's involvement and leadership has been increasing, however, CCAD's involvement has limited to participating in the project's Management Committee. Nevertheless, the project's environmental vision and focus is closer to CCAD than COCATRAM and this is reflected in the Strategic Plan of Action.

4.12. It is envisaged that the Management Committee provides general guiding lines to the project, ergo "macro". However, its involvement has been more at the day to day level, namely "micro". The Regional Steering Committee has operated as a supporting group from the Management Committee and not as stated in the Project Document.

4.13. Once all expected project's outputs are delivered, costs for updating, follow up and maintenance of acquired assets will be majorly covered by the involved Ports. In all cases, port organizations showed strong interest and disposition to include in their own budgets costs for pollution monitoring, hydrographic campaigns and local networks.

4.14. It is unlikely that one of the three participating countries will take the responsibility to coordinate regional actions, but rather to participate in these with costs charged to local authorities. COCATRAM and CCAD's involvement is particularly relevant.

4.15. Regional projects require quite a lot of accompaniment from participating agencies, particularly to assess in acquirement processes, compliance with norms, response time, and full understanding of principles and concepts in which the donation is based, and to guarantee fulfillment of commitments taken from signatory countries. In 5 years calendar of the project, IADB has had 4 different international specialists.

4.16. Among several lessons learned that were mentioned above, the main seems to be that when a regional project is implemented, the participating countries must interiorize that their involvement is to achieve a regional goal and not national, and that 3 national projects does not add up to a regional project. This is a key challenge.

4.17. Alliances with other projects and organizations operating in Gulf of Honduras have been an important asset for the project. Valuable inputs have included information, methodologies, know-how, and contacting other relevant stakeholders for the Gulf's health.

4.18. Private sector involvement is recent and they still feel that both benefits and their participation are marginal.

4.19. Language is a barrier for the smooth project execution. Consultants' outputs are not exploited 100% because of language barriers.

4.20. All background and justifications given to access GEF's funds for this project are still valid. The assessment of relevance, efficacy, efficiency, results and sustainability –even when some of these criteria state a delay in the Project- allows to conclude that the Project shall continue and needs to extend its execution period. The interest to reduce degradation of the Gulf of Honduras has increased in co-relation with the interest of port authorities in the environmental issues and with the interest of environmental authorities in marine issues. Stopping this project would have long and medium term negative consequences. On one hand, in medium term, those related to non satisfaction of expectations raised by the project, such as a network, a baseline for monitoring water quality, declaration of a Special Area under MARPOL convention, the Strategic Action Plan, and demonstrative projects; and on the other hand, in the long term, not reducing the degradation of the Gulf of Honduras.

5. Recommendations

The Evaluator recommends the following:

5.1. To continue with project's execution, since initial background and justifications given to GEF to apply for funding are still valid and the interest and concerns in environmental issues have grown both in port organizations as in private sector, local government and civil society in general.

5.2. To extend execution time 16 months more, due Dec. 11th, 2011, with a timeframe of 6 months for the last disbursement, due June 11th, 2012. This implies to carefully plan the achievement of outputs and outcomes, finalizing of consultancies and the financial and technical closing of the Project.

5.3. Extending the execution time implies several changes to the projects course. The project's North, according to GEF funding, is to achieve global objectives, then regional and finally national. Putting into practice the concept of incremental costs must be a priority. It is advisable to strengthen among local stakeholders concepts related with regionality, globality, transboundary, international waters and incremental costs.

5.4. It is urgent to have a budget according with approved lines, so the project will be able to arrive to a good completion. RPCU must submit as soon as possible a proposal for expense reclassification and to apply to respective components the fees the specialist and

to leave only costs related to Project Coordinator, financial specialist, accountant assistant, and project's assistance, so as its related expenses. The objective is to maintain the subcategory of administrative costs in US\$950.000 as approved by GEF.

The budget proposal must be close linked with objectives, goals, indicators and schedule. In annex 5 a proposal is shown.

5.5. Request for IADB's "no objection" to do corresponding cost reversion, while IADB will have to check whether that requires GEF's approval.

5.6. To make necessary budget modifications and submit for IADB's "no objection".

5.7. In order to improve efficiency of funds, the following is suggested:

5.7.1. Directive Committee:

a) To maintain the same number of members, asking COCATRAM and CCAD to cover the expenses of their members (CCAD to environmental authorities and COCATRAM to port authorities).

b) To take functions as described in Project Document: political and orientative.

5.7.2. Regional Steering Committee:

a) To keep it if and only if each country takes over their respective costs for participation of their representatives and limit their functions to those described in the Project Document or call for meeting only in very concrete and especial occasions with expenses to the project.

b) To establish virtual mechanisms for meetings and discussion that facilitates good coordination and communications without travelling costs. There are simple and low cost mechanisms, such as a Facebook page, that allows exchange of information and feedback.

5.7.3. RPCU

a) To keep RPCU as it is. Do not hire more personnel. The Coordinator will have to include among his responsibilities, the promotion of the Strategic Action Plan and other outputs together with the COCATRAM's Executive Director and CCAD's Executive Secretary, for instance, legal and political settlements that guarantee outcomes and achievements of the Project.

b) To take measures so all outputs are produced in both languages, and also easy to understand to all stakeholders (especially to those that are not from environmental area).

c) To change method of payment presently used to output-based payment. It is proposed to design a payment schedule for the coming months directly related to financial and physical advance of the project. This method of payment is suggested for the Coordinator, Financial Specialist and Accountant Assistance, including percentage tracks, that could be bimonthly.

d) The method of payment suggested to other specialists, is in 4 tracks of 25% each, linked to project outputs.

e) To hire two short term consultants to support the improvement of project's management in terms of acquisitions and planning (including budget progress, physical advance, indicators control among other).

5.8. To continue the improvement of the budget and rotator fund's management. COCATRAM shall continue increasing the project's control and to guarantee that all IADB's contractual clauses are complied.

5.9. To strengthen projects accompanying from IADB and seek that one same specialist will remain for the rest of the project period.

5.10. To indicate –by IADB- which is the official Project Document, in English and Spanish, that shall be the same in all web pages (project's and COCATRAM's).

5.11. To keep up with the commitments that gave origin to the project: 67% GEF and 33% counterpart. COCATRAM shall see that this commitment is complied and to request for CCAD's support to comply with contractual agreements. Directive Committee shall include as part of its agenda counterpart's follow up and respective decisions taken.

5.12. COCATRAM shall start preparing its participating members in this project to take over their responsibilities in assigning budget for the operation of Environmental Management Units and to follow up on project results, to give proper maintenance to assets acquired, and to keep the network active. In general, it is necessary to plan all actions that need to be followed up by key actors to guarantee project's sustainability. Such planning will have to be linked to the commitment from respective actors.

5.13. It is convenient that COCATRAM and CCAD explore whether their mandates allows them to give continuity to project's expected results, particularly those related to country coordination. The model of the Central American Agency for Aeronautical Safety could serve as reference.

5.14. It is urgent to develop demonstrative projects, (two of them should be the regional plan for spillage response and the electronic nautical chart), under the project's premise: respond to incremental costs and to seek compliance with the global objective of the project. In Annex 6 there is a preliminary proposal.

5.15. To continue Alliances that has been established during the project's execution and to look for new alliances and synergy opportunities, that will support and guarantee project's results sustainability and maximization.

5.16 To strengthen private sector's participation, particularly the port operators and administrators, and to promote regional focus and protection of Gulf of Honduras as ecosystem will also be an attractive for them.

Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Consultancy: “Intermediate Evaluation of the Project “Environmental protection and maritime transport pollution control in the Gulf of Honduras” (RS-X1009), GRT/FM-9179-RS ”

Annex 2: List of actors met or interviewed.

Annex 3: Comparison between the Project Document and the Logical Framework adjusted in 2007.

Annex 4. Comparison between the Logical Framework adjusted in 2007 and outputs attained by 2010.

Annex 5: Proposed necessary adjustments to achieve Project goals and proposed budget distribution.

Annex 6: Demonstrative projects

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE CONSULTANCY: Intermediate Evaluation of the Project “Environmental protection and maritime transport pollution control in the Gulf of Honduras” (RS-X1009), GRT/FM-9179-RS

CONTRATACIÓN DE CONSULTOR(A) INDIVIDUAL INTERNACIONAL

1. Antecedentes

El 8 de agosto del 2005 se refrenda la firma del Convenio de Financiamiento no Reembolsable GRT/FM-9179-RS, entre la Comisión Centroamericana de Transporte Marítimo (COCATRAM) y el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, para ejecutar el Proyecto Protección Ambiental y Control de la Contaminación originada por el Transporte Marítimo en el Golfo de Honduras, en adelante denominado Proyecto GOH, por un total de US\$ 7.2 millones.

El objetivo global del Proyecto consiste en apoyar la implementación de un Plan de Acción Estratégico, de manera que se traduzca en beneficios para la región, al contribuir a estabilizar la calidad de agua en el Golfo de Honduras y prevenir la degradación de ecosistemas marinos y costeros vulnerables del Sistema Arrecifal Mesoamericano que se encuentran amenazados por la contaminación y constituyen la barrera arrecifal más grande de este hemisferio. Esto se hará mediante la protección de las aguas internacionales y de sus recursos, así como mediante la promoción de su uso sostenible de conformidad con los objetivos del Programa Operacional 10 del GEF.

El objetivo de desarrollo del Proyecto es contribuir a revertir la degradación de los ecosistemas marinos y costeros dentro del Golfo de Honduras. Esto se pretende lograr mejorando la prevención y control de la contaminación relacionada con el transporte marítimo en los principales puertos y rutas de navegación, aumentando su seguridad para evitar el encallamiento de buques y los derrames, y reduciendo aquellas fuentes terrestres de contaminación que drenan en el Golfo.

Los objetivos específicos del Proyecto son:

- a) Crear y consolidar una red regional para controlar la contaminación de origen marítimo y terrestre dentro del Golfo de Honduras, lo cual incluye la formulación de esquemas institucionales y económicos que garanticen la sostenibilidad del Programa de Acción;
- b) Desarrollar una capacidad de largo plazo para recolectar, organizar, analizar y difundir información ambiental marina como complemento del Sistema de Información Ambiental (SINAM) del Sistema Arrecifal Mesoamericano (SAM);
- c) Mejorar la seguridad de navegación en puertos claves y adoptar enfoques innovadores con el fin de reducir la contaminación ambiental marina asociada con descargas operacionales y accidentales en el mar, y
- d) Realizar la gestión ambiental en la red sub-regional de cinco puertos localizados en el Golfo de Honduras, mediante la preparación y ejecución de inversiones y programas de acción, lo cual incluye la demostración de actividades piloto y la participación del sector privado.

El Proyecto GOH a la fecha ha desembolsado un total de dos millones cuatrocientos cuarenta dos mil seiscientos setenta y seis dólares americanos con diecisiete centavos (US\$ 2,442,676.17) que representan el 49.11% de los fondos. De acuerdo con la Cláusula 3.06 a) del Convenio de financiamiento no reembolsable se deberá de llevar a cabo una evaluación intermedia del proyecto, a los dos años a partir del primer desembolso del financiamiento.

Considerando que el primer desembolso del proyecto fue realizado en febrero del 2006 la evaluación intermedia debió de realizarse en febrero del 2008. Sin embargo, debido a atrasos en el arranque del proyecto se puede tomar como fecha de arranque a inicios del 2007 por lo cual la evaluación intermedia estaba programada para el segundo trimestre del 2009. Sin embargo, a raíz de los acontecimientos políticos sucedidos en Honduras el 28 de junio del 2009 el Banco y por lo tanto el proyecto entraron en un estado de pausa que concluyo completamente hasta el 17 de marzo del 2010.

Es de considerar que aunque la evaluación intermedia del proyecto está desfasada en el tiempo de ejecución está en un momento propicio de la dinámica del proyecto para la incorporación de sus recomendaciones. En la actualidad se están cerrando las consultorías que contienen los diagnósticos y planes propuestos para la implementación por lo cual cabe una revisión de los alcances y actividades contemplados por el proyecto para la obtención de sus objetivos y aún se cuenta con aproximadamente el 50% de sus recursos financieros.

El Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial (GEF por sus siglas en ingles) requiere que los proyectos administrados /implementados por el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID) lleven a cabo una evaluación intermedia del proyecto para determinar el grado de progreso hacia los objetivos del programa y de los resultados esperados, así como de las dificultades en la implementación, sostenibilidad y lecciones aprendidas.

2. Objetivo General de la Consultoría

Realizar una revisión y evaluación critica de los logros alcanzados durante la implementación del Proyecto en relación a sus objetivos y el marco lógico del proyecto y el plan de trabajo con miras a proponer los ajustes y cambios necesarios durante el periodo de ejecución restante para poder mejorar el desempeño del proyecto y alcanzar las metas propuestas.

2.1 Objetivos Específicos

- 2.1.1 Realizar un diagnóstico que muestre la situación actual de la ejecución del Proyecto, con referencia a la ejecución de actividades y al cumplimiento de sus objetivos, así como los resultados esperados a la fecha de evaluación intermedia, en específico los temas destacados en la Cláusula 5.01 del Anexo A del Convenio N° GRT/FM-9179-RS.
- 2.1.2 Evaluar el grado de avance y cumplimiento obtenido a la fecha en la ejecución del Proyecto, identificando cualitativa y cuantitativamente los alcances logrados en los marcos técnico, administrativo, financiero e institucional, así como las lecciones aprendidas.
- 2.1.3 Evaluar la sostenibilidad del Proyecto y sus componentes en términos institucionales y financieros así como el grado de apropiación de sus usuarios/beneficiarios.
- 2.1.4 Proponer medidas, modificaciones, mecanismos y otras acciones necesarias para alcanzar eficientemente las metas previstas, incluyendo ajustes en los indicadores de seguimiento de cada componente y medidas para mejorar la supervisión.
- 2.1.5 Recomendar la tipología y esquema de ejecución que deberá emplearse para el financiamiento de los Proyectos Demostrativos.
- 2.1.6 Proponer la estructura de la URCP para la segunda fase del proyecto, en función de los requerimientos de socialización y negociación del PAE.

3.0 Metodología de la Consultoría

En el desarrollo de la Consultoría, se deberán realizar las siguientes actividades, sin perjuicio de aquellas otras que puedan ser propuestas para realizar el trabajo:

3.1 Análisis de documentos

El Consultor deberá considerar en el desarrollo de su trabajo, al menos, los siguientes documentos:

- 3.1.1 El Convenio de Financiamiento No Reembolsable de Inversiones del Fondo del Medio Ambiente Mundial N° GRT/FM-9179-RS.
- 3.1.2 La Política de Seguimiento y Evaluación del FMAM.
- 3.1.3 Los Informes Individuales de Implementación del Proyecto (PIR- por sus siglas en ingles) con sus respectivas "Tracking Tools" presentados a la secretaria del FMAM en el 2006, 2007, 2008 y 2009
- 3.1.4 Los documentos de preparación del proyecto presentados al FMAM
- 3.1.5 Documento del Proyecto RS-X1009
- 3.1.6 El Reglamento Operativo del Proyecto
- 3.1.7 Planificación Plurianual Operativa del Proyecto
- 3.1.8 Las actas de las siete (7) reuniones del Comité Regional de Gestión del Proyecto
- 3.1.9 Las actas de las seis (6) reuniones del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- 3.1.10 Las ayudas memoria de las Misiones de Administración realizadas en diciembre 2006 y junio 2008 por parte del Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo
- 3.1.11 Los Estados Financieros del Proyecto para los años 2006, 2007, 2008 y 2009.
- 3.1.12 Los Planes Operativos Anuales del Proyecto para el 2007, 2008, 2009 y 2010.
- 3.1.13 Los Informes Semestrales de Ejecución
- 3.1.14 Los informes finales de las Consultorías de ADT/PAE, Riesgos de Navegación, Estrategia de Comunicación del Proyecto, Red de Actores Clave y cualquier otro que esté concluido al hacerse la evaluación intermedia.
- 3.1.15 Documentos generados a través de otras cooperaciones técnicas o estudios relacionados, que han sido utilizados en el desarrollo del Proyecto.

3.2 Diseño y aplicación de entrevistas y consultas

El Consultor deberá elaborar y llevar a cabo un programa de entrevistas con personas relevantes vinculadas directa o indirectamente con el Proyecto para obtener opiniones y percepciones de los siguientes actores sobre el desempeño del Programa:

- 3.2.1 Personal del Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo responsable de la supervisión técnica y fiduciaria del Proyecto.
- 3.2.2 Director Ejecutivo y personal de la COCATRAM.
- 3.2.3 Personal de la Unidad Regional de Coordinación del Proyecto.
- 3.2.4 Puntos Focales de ambiente y transporte marítimo que conforman el Comité Regional de Gestión del Proyecto. Se puede incorporar los miembros del Comité Directivo del Proyecto según su disponibilidad.
- 3.2.5 Las autoridades portuarias de los 5 puertos involucrados sobre la ejecución de acciones vinculadas con su fortalecimiento a través del Proyecto.
- 3.2.6 Red de Actores de la sociedad civil y organizaciones no-gubernamentales vinculadas con el Proyecto.
- 3.2.7 Otros programas y entidades de cooperación relacionados con el Golfo de Honduras, tales como, NOAA, Proyecto MAREA, SAM, TNC y WWF.

Además, dentro de lo posible, el consultor deberá llevar a cabo entrevistas o consultas telefónicas con las firmas consultoras y los consultores individuales encargados de la ejecución de los estudios, actividades y obras específicas del Programa.

3.3 Análisis y presentación de la información recopilada

El Consultor deberá presentar la información de manera que se pueda visualizar con claridad los resultados y permitir:

- 3.3.1 Comparación, en forma integrada, de las actividades programadas y ejecutadas, los avances y alcances obtenidos, y el grado de cumplimiento de objetivos y metas del Proyecto, con base en la Matriz de Marco Lógico vigente.
- 3.3.2 Estado de cumplimiento de las condiciones contractuales.
- 3.3.3 Determinación de los posibles efectos e impactos a mediano y largo plazo, con base en el avance y cumplimiento de las actividades programadas y ejecutadas, la calidad de las acciones ejecutadas y metodologías asociadas con su desarrollo, y de acciones combinadas, agregadas-generadas para los diferentes componentes.
- 3.3.4 Detección de las desviaciones respecto al diseño y propuestas de ajustes requeridos en el marco técnico, financiero, económico e institucional para la ejecución del Proyecto.
- 3.3.5 Definición de las debilidades y fortalezas de los procesos asociados a la ejecución del Programa.
- 3.3.6 Análisis de la sostenibilidad de las inversiones y la efectividad en el desarrollo, así como valores agregados positivos.- Análisis sobre la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos en general.- Análisis del nivel de participación y apropiación de los diversos actores interesados, así como de los compromisos adquiridos por los socios y colaboradores locales.
- 3.3.7 Determinación de las lecciones aprendidas clave para la ejecución de las actividades pendientes del Proyecto.
- 3.3.8 Identificación de recomendaciones y ajustes para mejorar la efectividad en la ejecución del Proyecto, la relación entre los resultados alcanzados y los recursos utilizados-invertidos.
- 3.3.9 Evaluar las posibles alianzas e inversiones conjuntas que se hubieran realizado con otras instituciones, organizaciones y/o proyectos para el alcance de productos con valor agregado.

Para el desarrollo de las actividades, el Consultor deberá proponer una metodología de trabajo que permita asegurar el cumplimiento de los objetivos de estos Términos de Referencia. Para estos fines, se pueden proponer instrumentos y mecanismos de evaluación utilizados en programas de aguas internacionales, preferiblemente financiados por el FMAM, de acuerdo a la experiencia disponible.

El Consultor desempeñará su trabajo bajo la supervisión directa del Especialista Sectorial a cargo de la operación e iniciará su trabajo con una reunión con el equipo del BID encargado de la supervisión técnica y fiduciaria de la operación para terminar de definir la metodología y calendario de trabajo.

El Consultor deberá viajar a Honduras, Guatemala y Belice con el propósito de realizar las entrevistas correspondientes, tanto con el equipo del Proyecto Golfo de Honduras así como con sus beneficiarios y los consultores.

El Consultor también deberá visitar los sitios y/u obras que el Proyecto ha apoyado con sus recursos.

También deberá realizar un Taller de Divulgación de los resultados, donde se exponga, se discuta y se reciba la retroalimentación requerida por parte del Organismo Ejecutor y del Banco para

elaborar el documento final de evaluación y Ayuda Memoria del Taller realizado. Este Taller se realizaría en dos niveles, una jornada ejecutiva con el nivel directivo y otra jornada con el nivel operativo.

4. Productos

El Consultor deberá entregar los productos que se detallan a continuación:

4.1 Plan de Trabajo

4.2 Informe Borrador de la Evaluación Intermedia a los 30 (treinta) días después de iniciada la Consultoría que deberá contener, pero no limitarse a:

- 4.2.1 Grado de cumplimiento de las actividades del Proyecto y sus sub componentes.
- 4.2.2 Debilidades y fortalezas de los procesos asociados con la ejecución del proyecto.
- 4.2.3 Limitaciones y logros en la ejecución del Proyecto.
- 4.2.4 Impactos logrados con la ejecución del Proyecto.
- 4.2.5 Evaluación de los indicadores utilizados en la matriz de marco lógico.
- 4.2.6 Lecciones aprendidas para la ejecución.
- 4.2.7 Propuesta de ajustes necesarios para lograr el cumplimiento de las metas del Proyecto, incluyendo el diseño de indicadores de cumplimiento y de éxito, y recomendaciones para la URCP.
- 4.2.8 Recomendaciones para el diseño y ejecución de los proyectos demostrativos contemplados en los componentes 3 y 4, que aseguren la contrapartida proyectada de los actores involucrados.
- 4.2.9 Marco Lógico actualizado del proyecto, incluyendo el establecimiento de los parámetros cuantitativos que no fueron definidos en el marco lógico al inicio del proyecto
- 4.2.10 Propuesta de distribución presupuestaria del proyecto acorde a las recomendaciones del ítem 5.2.8 y el marco lógico actualizado.
- 4.2.11 Propuesta de conformación de la URCP para la ejecución de la segunda fase del Proyecto en función de los requerimientos para la socialización y negociación del PAE, incorporando los perfiles de los consultores, en caso de ser diferentes.
- 4.2.12 Presentación en PowerPoint de los resultados de la evaluación, orientada a los involucrados con la ejecución del Proyecto, detallando las conclusiones y recomendaciones principales de la Consultoría

4.3 Informe Final de la Evaluación Intermedia del Proyecto, dentro de los 15 días después de la misión o taller de revisión, que incorpore las recomendaciones realizadas y que deberá tener:

- 4.3.1 Informe Final, incorporando todas las observaciones y comentarios realizados.
- 4.3.2 Presentación en PowerPoint ajustada a los resultados del taller de discusión.
- 4.3.3 Borrador del Project Implementation Report (PIR) y Tracking Tools a ser presentada al FMAM para el 2010, en inglés, y que refleje los resultados de la evaluación de medio término.

5. Presentación de Informes

Todos los documentos deberán ser presentados en el idioma español e inglés. El informe final deberá ser enviado en formato PDF en un solo archivo con sus anexos. Si lo anterior no es posible, se podrán utilizar formatos de MS Office.

6. Perfil del Consultor

6.1 Requisitos Profesionales

La consultoría requiere un(a) consultor(a) “senior”, profesional de las ciencias relacionadas con manejo de recursos naturales, medio ambiente, gestión portuaria, u otros profesionales con especialidad en las áreas de esta consultoría (ingeniero ambiental, ingeniería de puertos, administración de proyectos, o economía) con especialidad y/o maestría, y/o doctorado afín a la consultoría.

6.2 Experiencia requerida

- 7.2.1 Experiencia profesional general de al menos 10 años en el área de administración y/o ejecución de proyectos.
- 7.2.2 Experiencia específica en la administración y/o ejecución de al menos 2 proyectos similares a la consultoría. Experiencia relacionada con manejo de recursos marino-costeros será una ventaja importante.
- 7.2.3 Experiencia en evaluación de al menos 2 proyectos/programas ambientales financiados con fondos GEF y/o otros fondos externos.
- 7.2.4 Experiencia en evaluación de al menos 2 proyectos/ programas ambientales financiados con fondos nacionales.
- 7.2.5 Experiencia en redacción y edición de documentos, relacionados con el trabajo a realizar.
- 7.2.6 Experiencia en la Región centroamericana.
- 7.2.7 Dominio de los idiomas español e inglés, escrito, lectura y hablado.

7. Plazo de la Consultoría

La Consultoría será ejecutada en dos (2) meses, incluyendo una visita de campo en el área del proyecto y la participación en un taller de discusión del borrador y finalizará no más tarde del 1 de septiembre del 2010.

8. Forma Pago

La forma de pago será la siguiente:

20% a la firma del contrato y entrega del cronograma y plan de trabajo.

40% con el informe de avance y presentación de resultados.

40% a la presentación del informe final aprobado y a satisfacción del Banco

La contratación se realizará mediante un contrato de servicios profesionales entre el BID y el consultor (a), por suma alzada, por lo cual debe incorporar todos los costos necesarios para cumplir con los términos de referencia, incluyendo gastos de transporte, viáticos y seguros. La moneda de contratación será en dólares.

Annex 2:

List of actors met or interviewed reuniones

Mr. Juan Poveda, BID Specialist
Ms. Emelie Weitnauer, BID Consultant
Ms. Nalda Morales, BID Budget Officer
Mr. Alejandro Aguiluz, BID Operational Officer
Mr. Edas Muñoz, Project Gulf of Honduras Coordinator RPCU
Mr. Demetrio Martínez, network specialist RPCU
Mr. Roberto Rivas, specialist ambiental RPCU
Ms. Norma Reyes, assistant RPCU
Mr. Maynor Pinto, General Manager National Port Company of Honduras (ENPH)
Mr. Bruno Fontana, Intendent Puerto Cortés ENPH
Mr. Carlos Portilla, Hydrography Chief ENPH
Ms. Lucy del Cid, Departament of Hygene, industrial and Environmental Safety Puerto Cortés
Ms. Magdalena Gutiérrez Castillo, Training Chief ENPH
Mr. Jonathan Laínez, State Sub Secretary for Environment, Honduras
Mr. Constantino López, Financial Director National Port Company of Guatemala (EMPORNAC)
Mr. Rigoberto Aguirre, Sub-Director Maritime Operations EMPORNAC
Ms. María del Rosario Miranda, Chief of Environmental Departament EMPORNAC
Ms. Mircy Aguirre, Public Relations EMPORNAC
Mr. Maynor Rivas, Hydrography Chief Puerto Santo Tomás de Castilla
Mr. Sergio Girón, Training Center Chief EMPORNAC
Ms. Yamara Morataya, Training Center EMPORNAC
Mr. Donald Guerra, Port Services Manager Manabique
Mr. Melvin Leal, Manager Unopetrol
Mr. Jiovanny Sosa, Superintendent of Operations COBIGUA
Mr. Julio Palacios, Industrial Safety Supervisor COBIGUA
Mr. Mauricio Gómez, Human Resources COBIGUA
Mr. Stuardo Dangel, Advisor, Ministry of Communications of Guatemala
Mr. Claudio Rodríguez, Project's Liasson, Ministry of Communications of Guatemala
Mr. Rolando Rousselin, Executive Sub-Director National Port Commission of Guatemala
Mr. Sergio Porres, Chief of Maritime Dept. , National Defense Ministry of Guatemala
Mr. Carlos Moino, General Secretary Ministry of Environmenta and Natural Resources of Guatemala
Mr. Estuardo Villatoro, Viceminister of Communications of Guatemala
Mr. Luis Furlán, Director of TRIGOH
Mr. Otto Noack, Executive Director COCATRAM

Mr. Roberto Rodríguez, Secretary ai. of CCAD
Mr. Noel Jacobs, former Coordinator of Project SAM
Ms. Ana Carolina Sikaffy, former member of RPCU
Mr. Said Flores, Director Port of Big Creek
Mr. Gustavo Carrillo, Chief Port of Big Creek
Mr. Raineldo Guerrero, Chief Port of Belize
Mr. John Flowers, Ports Commisioner Belize Port Authority
Mr. Lloyd Jones, Former Ports Commisioner Belize Port Authority
Mr. Gilbert Swaso, Former Maritime Operations Belize Port Authority
Mr. Martin Alegria, Chief Environment Department of Belize
Mr. Juan Rancharan, former representative at CRG for Belize
Mr. Ismael Fabro, Former Chief Environment Department of Belize.

ANNEX 3: Comparison between the Project Document and the Logical Framework adjusted in 2007

ANNEX 3: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (version approved in 2005 vs. 2008 version)
Environmental Protection and Maritime Transport Pollution Control in the Gulf of Honduras

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	Comparison with Logical Framework 2008
Goal of Program: Contribute to the stabilization of water quality in the Gulf of Honduras and prevent the degradation of vulnerable coastal and marine ecosystems threatened by pollution	• Levels of contaminants (nutrients, sediment, BOD, toxics) stabilized by 2010 relative to 2005 • Rate of decline in the quality of selected coral reef sites, mangroves and seagrass beds (sites to be determined by TDA) halved by 2010 relative to 2005	targets not included in 2008 LF (in red)
Objective of Program: Enhance the control and prevention of maritime transport-related pollution in the major ports and navigation lanes in the Gulf of Honduras, improve the navigational safety to avoid groundings and spills, and reduce land-based sources of pollution draining into the Gulf.	• Sustainable regional institutional mechanism for environmental protection and pollution prevention of the Gulf of Honduras is formally established by Year 4 • Contaminant loads from port and other land-based activities reduced by 25% by 2010 relative to 2005 • Operational discharges from shipping in the Gulf reduced by 25% by 2010 relative to 2005 • Incidence of maritime accidental spills reduced by 50% by 2010 relative to 2005	Objective: Reduction of land-based sources of pollution are not explicit in 2008 LF Indicators: same indicators, however targets not specified additional indicators were included in 2008 LF regarding direct effects

COMPONENT 1: BUILDING THE REGIONAL NETWORK FOR MARITIME AND LAND-BASED POLLUTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Sub-component 1.a Build and reinforce regional network for pollution control and prevention	• Regional arrangements for project execution and monitoring established by Year 1, including the Regional Steering Committee and Project Management Committee • Number of stakeholder organizations from all 3 countries involved in project implementation increases by 25% by Year 5 • Informed media coverage of pollution issues in the Gulf increases relative to 2005 baseline • Enhanced knowledge and capacity for environmental protection and maritime transport pollution control through the training of at least 100 people by Year 5 through training courses and exchange programs	ok
Sub-component 1.b Financial sustainability mechanism	• Formal agreements are reached between public and private sectors on the sustainable financing for maritime pollution monitoring, control and prevention by Year 5 • Public and private economic benefits of maritime pollution prevention quantified by Year 3 • Enhanced experience in sustainable financing of maritime pollution monitoring, control and prevention through the application of 2 demonstration projects by Year 4, of at least one should be considered for replication by Year 5	ok
Sub-component 1.c Monitoring and modeling strategic framework	Baseline of land based and marine sources of pollution and water quality within the Gulf established by Year 2 in collaboration with MBRS program	ok

COMPONENT 2: BUILDING THE INFORMATION BASE FOR THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAM		
Sub-component 2.a Environmental Information System	and maritime related data (including economic data) transferred to EIS by Year 2. • Coastal communities in all three countries are aware of pollution issues through the publication of a state of the Gulf report by Year 2	ok
Sub-component 2.b Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis	• Enhanced knowledge on the relative importance and transboundary impact of land-based and marine-based sources of pollution by Year 2 and TDA endorsed by the 3 countries by Year 2 • Enhanced knowledge of the adequacy of national and regional legal and institutional frameworks for environmental management of the maritime transport industry and land based activities by Year 1 • Policy and economic barriers to marine pollution prevention confirmed by Year 1	ok
Sub-component 2.c Strategic Action Program (SAP) for port and navigational pollution reduction	• Countries, funding agencies and regional organizations endorse the SAP by Year 3 • By Year 5 formal partnerships established with other funding agencies and private sector for the implementation of the SAP • At least 2 new regional agreements related to marine pollution and control entered into effect and applied by Year 4 and by Year 5 the application for the designation of the Gulf of Honduras as a Special Area under MARPOL has been submitted to IMO, • At least 2 regulatory instruments for marine pollution and control harmonized by Year 3 • Slope stabilization and erosion control measures in critical watersheds in place by Year 5	Endorsement of SAP is not clear in indicators of LF 2008 Not included: Slope stabilization and erosion control measures in critical watersheds in place

COMPONENT 3: ENHANCING NAVIGATIONAL SAFETY IN SHIPPING LANES		
Sub-component 3.a Navigational safety in shipping routes	• Navigational safety risks identified by Year 1 • Enhanced regional communication capacity for navigational safety and surveillance established by Year 3 • Provision of 100% of the essential equipment installed by Year 5 (eg, signaling equipment)	ok
Sub-component 3.b Institutional, legal, policy, regulatory and enforcement framework for navigational safety	• Improved institutional, legal, policy, regulatory and enforcement framework for navigational safety through the formulation of at least 10 reform projects by Year 3 • Ratification and regulations in effect by Year 5 of international conventions for the protection of the marine environment • Ballast water exchange zone (limit) established for the Gulf of Honduras by Year 2	Indicators not included (in red): • Ratification and regulations in effect by Year 5 of international conventions for the protection of the marine environment • Ballast water exchange zone (limit) established for the Gulf of Honduras by Year 2
Sub-component 3.c Capacity building for regional hydrographic and oceanographic data processing, inspection, pilotage and other operations at sea related to navigational safety and spills	• Enhanced regional capacity for hydrographic and oceanographic data processing, inspection, pilotage and other operations at sea related to navigational safety and spills through the training of at least 100 people by Year 3	ok
Sub-component 3.d Regional/transboundary oil and chemical spill prevention and contingency plan	• Regional/transboundary oil and chemical spill prevention and contingency plan prepared by Year 2 • At least 3 regional emergency spill response exercises carried out by Year 3 • Gaps and collaboration options in existing equipment and facilities assessed by Year 2 and provision of 100% of the essential equipment provided by Year 5	ok
Sub-component 3.e Demonstration projects for navigation safety	• Enhanced experience in navigation safety and marine environmental protection through the application of 2 demonstration projects by Year 4	ok

COMPONENT 4: IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND HAZARD REDUCTION MEASURES IN THE REGIONAL NETWORK OF FIVE PORTS WITHIN THE GULF OF HONDURAS		
Sub-component 4.a Risk assessments of port operations	• Environmental risks of port operations assessed by Year 2 with Action Plans established by Year 3	ok
Sub-component 4.b Harmonization of regional guidelines, standards and policies for port environmental management and security	• Regional harmonization of guidelines, standards and policies for port environmental management and security by Year 3. • By Year 4 partnerships established with other funding agencies (incl. private sector) for the financing and implementation of port improvements in environmental management and safety, including investments in waste receiving and recycling facilities • Enhanced collaboration between ports and potential funders through establishment of regional port users' forum.	indicators not included: • By Year 4 partnerships established with other funding agencies (incl. private sector) for the financing and implementation of port improvements in environmental management and safety, including investments in waste receiving and recycling facilities • Enhanced collaboration between ports and potential funders through establishment of regional port users' forum. (Although forum are considered, however not explicitly including potential funders)
Sub-component 4.c Demonstration projects for port environmental management	• Enhanced experience in port environmental management and safety through the application of demonstration projects in 3 ports by Year 4 (eg. environmentally sound dredge spoil disposal, portspecific hydrographic surveys etc)	Although demonstration projects are included in LF 2008, not explicitly to enhance experience in port environmental management and safety, but only for pollution prevention. However, a new indicator was included regarding the Environmental Mananagement Units

Annex 4. Comparison between the Logical Framework adjusted in 2007 and outputs attained by 2010.

Comparación entre lo previsto en el Marco Lógico (versión ajustada 2007) con relación a lo logrado a junio 2010

RESUMEN NARRATIVO	INDICADORES VERIFICABLES	resultados reportados a junio 2010
FIN:		
Contribuir a disminuir la degradación de los ecosistemas marinos costeros dentro	1. En X % se reducen los niveles contaminantes (tales como nutrientes, sedimentos, DBO y tóxicos, entre otros)	no se reporta
	2. En X % se reduce la tasa de degradación de la calidad de los pastos marinos, arrecifes coralinos y manglares, entre otros.	no se reporta
PROPÓSITO:		
La prevención y control de la contaminación y la seguridad de transporte marítimo en el Golfo de Honduras mejorada.	1. Al menos 3 mecanismos institucionales sostenibles de carácter regional para la prevención y control de la contaminación se han creado al 3er trimestre 2010	A la fecha se ha logrado solo 1. (se menciona el mecanismo GOLFONET como implementado)
	2. En X% se reduce las cargas contaminantes de las fuentes puntuales provenientes de actividades portuarias al final del Proyecto.	no se reporta
	3. En X % se reduce las cargas contaminantes provenientes de actividades de origen terrestre enfocadas en los principales afluentes que drenan hacia las áreas de influencia de las ciudades de los cinco puertos al final del Proyecto.	no se reporta
	4. En X % se reduce las descargas contaminantes provenientes del transporte marítimo al final del Proyecto.	no se reporta
	5. En X % se reduce los derrames marítimos accidentales de materiales peligrosos al final del Proyecto	no se reporta
	EFFECTOS DIRECTOS	
	6. X % se incrementan en número de grupos de interés en los países intervenidos al final del Proyecto	no se incluye
	7. Al menos 1 propuesta por cada grupo de interés es presentada al Comité Regional de Gestión anualmente	a la fecha se ha logrado solo 1. (se menciona TRIGOH)
	8. Ochenta (80) % capacitados aprueban la evaluación de destrezas al 4to trimestre 2009.	se reporta como logrado
	9. Al menos una (1) mejor práctica o política es adoptada por los puertos al 4to trimestre 2009.	se reporta como logrado
	10. Cien (100) % actualizado el portal de internet actualizado al 4to trimestre 2008.	se reporta como logrado
	11. Al menos 1 boletín trimestral es publicado durante la vida del Proyecto.	se reporta como logrado
	12. Al menos cinco (5) alianzas (una en cada puerto) es suscrita al 2do trimestre 2009.	se reporta cumplimiento parcial
	13. Al menos un (1) plan de prevención y control de la contaminación es adoptado y aprobado al 4to trimestre 2009.	no se ha logrado, en proceso
	14. Tres (3) planes operativos son aprobados al 4to trimestre 2009.	se reporta como logrado
	15. Al menos tres (3) medidas para mejorar la seguridad de la navegación se han adoptado al 1er trimestre 2010.	se reporta como logrado
	16. Al menos tres (3) medidas de prevención y control del impacto ambiental, identificadas de mayor riesgo son incorporadas en el plan operativo de los Puertos al final del Proyecto.	se reporta cumplimiento parcial

RESUMEN NARRATIVO	INDICADORES VERIFICABLES	resultados reportados a junio 2010
COMPONENTES:		
1. Capacidad regional para prevenir y controlar la contaminación de origen marítimo y terrestre desarrollada	1.1. Cien (100) % creada y funcionando la Red Regional de prevención y control de la contaminación al 4to trimestre 2008. Proceso de contratación al 50 % al 4to trimestre del 2007.*	se reporta que se ha logrado el 85%
	1.2. Cien (100) % implementada la estrategia regional de comunicaciones e información al final del Proyecto.	se reporta que se ha logrado el 40%
	1.3. Tres (3) mediciones de parámetros ambientales (una cada año) al 4to trimestre 2009 (en los temas de: (i) calidad de aguas y; (ii) hábitat marinos costeros)	no se ha logrado, en proceso, solo se ha hecho una medición
	1.4. Al menos seis (6) talleres de capacitación regional derivados de las evaluaciones de necesidades al 3er trimestre 2009.	se reporta que se han logrado 2 talleres
	1.5. Al menos tres (3) intercambios con otros proyectos de aguas internacionales son realizados al 4to trimestre 2009.	se reporta logro parcial
	1.6. Cien (100) % elaborado el estudio de sostenibilidad financiera de las actividades de protección ambiental y beneficios económicos de la prevención de la contaminación marina al 3er trimestre 2009	no se incluye
	1.7. Cien (100) % elaborado el estudio de condiciones de competitividad y efectos de designación del Golfo bajo MARPOL al 4to trimestre 2009	no se incluye
	1.8. Al menos un (1) proyecto en la región se le asiste técnicamente para que apliquen los instrumentos e incentivos generados en el estudio para cuantificar los beneficios económicos de la prevención de la contaminación marina al final del Proyecto.	no se incluye
2. Plan de Acción Estratégico desarrollada	2.1. Cien (100) % establecida la línea de referencia de fuentes terrestres de contaminación y calidad del agua en colaboración con el SAM al 4to trimestre 2008.*	se reporta como logrado, sin embargo no se ha divulgado
	2.2. Cien (100) % desarrollado e implementado el módulo de manejo de información para el Golfo de Honduras que intercambie información técnica y científica con otros proyectos como el SAM y el Sistema de Información Ambiental de CCAD, al 1er trimestre 2009.*	se reporta cumplimiento parcial (40%)
	2.3. Cien (100) % actualizado y ampliado el ADT/PAE al 4to trimestre 2008.*	no se incluye
	2.4. Cien (100) % PAE elaborado y difundido al 4to trimestre 2008	no se incluye
	2.5. Al menos dos (2) nuevos acuerdos regionales relacionados con la prevención y control de la contaminación marina son propuestos al 2do trimestre 2009	no se ha logrado
	2.6. Propuesta técnica de solicitud a los gobiernos para gestionar ante la OMI para la designación del Golfo de Honduras como área especial bajo MARPOL, elaborada al 2do trimestre 2010	no se ha logrado
3. Seguridad de navegación en las rutas marítimas mejorada	3.1. Cien (100) % identificados los riesgos de navegación al 4to trimestre 2008.	se reporta como logrado
	3.2. Cien (100) % adquiridos los equipos esenciales, priorizados en los estudios de diagnósticos de navegación (según disponibilidad de recursos) al 1er trimestre 2009.	se reporta como logrado
	3.3. Sistema de comunicación entre las autoridades marítimas de la región para atender contingencias establecido al 1er trimestre 2009.	no se ha logrado
	3.4. Al menos diez (10) propuestas de reformas al marco legal para seguridad de navegación y prevención y control de la contaminación del Golfo de Honduras al 2do. Trimestre 2010	no se ha logrado
	3.5. Elaborado y propuesto el plan regional de prevención y contingencias para derrame de petróleo y sustancias químicas al 1er trimestre 2009.	no se ha logrado
	3.6. Cien (100) personas capacitadas en temas relacionados con seguridad de navegación y derrames al 1er trimestre 2009.	no se ha logrado

RESUMEN NARRATIVO	INDICADORES VERIFICABLES	resultados reportados a junio 2010
COMPONENTES:		
4. Gestión ambiental y medidas de reducción de riesgos en la red regional de cinco puertos localizados en el Golfo de Honduras mejorada	4.1. Al menos tres (3) proyectos demostrativos de tecnologías innovadoras para prevenir contaminación son diseñados al 4to trimestre 2008	no se ha logrado
	4.2. Cuatro (4) evaluaciones de riesgos ambientales derivados de las operaciones portuarias son desarrolladas al 2do trimestre 2007.	se reporta como logrado
	4.3. Una (1) propuesta de armonización regional sobre las directrices, estándares, políticas de gestión ambiental y seguridad portuaria al 2do trimestre 2009	no se ha logrado
	4.4. Tres (3) foros de usuarios de los puertos establecido, por lo menos una vez al año durante la vigencia del Proyecto.	no se ha logrado
	En 2009 se incluye un nuevo indicador: <i>3 Unidades de gestión de ambiental portuarias (UGAPs) conformadas</i>	no se ha logrado
5. Gestión	5.1. Al menos siete (7) reuniones del Comité Directivo / Comité Regional de Gestión (2 al año) durante la vigencia del Proyecto.	se reporta como logrado
	5.2. Dos (2) evaluaciones del Proyecto (una intermedia al 1er trimestre 2008 y la otra al final).*	la evaluación intermedia fue ejecutada en agosto y setiembre 2010.
	5.3. Cuatro (4) auditorías financieras (una al año) durante la vida del Proyecto.	se reporta como logrado

Annex 5: Proposed necessary adjustments to achieve Project goals and proposed budget distribution.

Based on the fact that the project will be granted with an extension, the following is a proposal that includes a budget analysis, a budget reclassification, a budget modification request, and an accounting reversal.

At the same time that a budget management is proposed, a priority analysis of activities and goals is done, based on the assessments and as discussed with RPCU and other relevant actors. Finally, a list of indicators and a time schedule is proposed.

The evaluator recommends:

1. To analyse spent budget up to date and to propose expenditure reclassification, in order to leave in sub-category 01.001 only expenses related to the Project Coordinator, Financial Specialist, Accounting Assistant and Administrative Assistant. This group would be the core of RPCU and would be the responsible to close the project. It would be hired for 22 months, until June 11th, 2012.
2. Reclassify paid honoraries (US\$399.000) to Environmental, Maritime and Facilitator consultants since the beginning of the project until August 2010, into the respective components. This would be the technical consultants group and would be hired for 16 months until Dec. 11th, 2011.

The above mentioned budget move would reduce sub-category 01.001 in approximately US\$410.000.

This shall include:

- IADB's no-objection
 - an accounting reversal.
3. Description of the terms of reference:
 - 3.1. Terms of reference: Project Director
 - 3.1.1. Objective and general approach of the position

Qualified professional, with experience in the field of the Project, among other; maritime, marine, environmental and coastal zone planning issues. Shall demonstrate expertise in project management with international financial institutions.

He/she will be responsible for an adequate project's execution and compliance of project's objectives and goals, as well as the correct technical and administrative management, under the supervision of the Executive Director of COCATRAM, and in conformance as established in the following documents:

- Project document, approved by GEF
- IADB-COCATRAM Agreement
- IADB and GEF norms and regulations
- CCAD-COCATRAM Memorandum
- Transparency norms
- Logical Framework analysis
- Annual Operative Plans

3.1.2. Responsibilities

The Director shall be responsible to COCATRAM of the compliance of these terms of reference.

3.1.3. Scope and seat of the job

It is based at the Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU), in Puerto Cortes, Honduras, at the facilities of the National Port Company. The Unit will be the central administrative and technical base for the daily execution of the project.

3.1.4. Activities

- To elaborate operative annual plans (OAP) 2011 and 2012
- Compliance with OAP 2011 and 2012
- Prepare and submit all necessary documentation that will assure project's extension.
- Promote Strategic Plan (PAE)
- Legal and political institutional arrangements
- Execution of Pilot and Demonstrative projects
- Budget execution according to programs
- Submit financial statements
- Submit audits
- Prepare biannual reports, action plans, reports to PIR and GEF and to participate and facilitate on the final evaluation.
- Submit final reports

- Timely and quality execution of all assignments to consultants and RPCU members.
- All functions related to leadership and good project management.

3.1.5. The Project Director shall hire the consultancy services of three short term advisors: a maritime consultant that supports in specific cases and subjects related to the translation of “environmental” into “maritime” language, a consultant that will assist him/her on acquisitions, and other consultant that provides support in planning tools and abilities that help RPCU to improve the project management.

3.1.6. Fees

The fees will be paid according to the project’s advance and shall be defined in accordance with COCATRAM’s rules and conditions and with IADB’s no objection.

B- Terms of reference of the Facilitator

- 3.2. The Facilitator would basically have under his/her responsibility everything related to guarantee the project’s sustainability and at least comply with the following terms of reference:

3.2.1 Objective and general approach of the position

The facilitator shall be responsible for seeking consensus and assuring sustainability of project’s objectives, in coordination with the Project’s Director. He/she shall use best-available tools and methodologies to dinamise and achieve a balanced participation of all project’s members in his/her interventions. He/she will be responsible for planning and facilitating project’s meetings and public workshops, as well as training of Unit’s staff and project’s members on negotiation and facilitation techniques. Shall be responsible for project’s dissemination by means of specialized tools for opening and keeping communication among target groups, public and press.

3.2.2 Responsibilities

The facilitator will be under the supervision of the project’s Director and shall be responsible to execute at least the activities described below.

3.2.3 Scope and seat of the job

Based at the Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU), in Puerto Cortes, Honduras, at the facilities of the National Port Company. The Unit will be the central administrative and technical base for the daily execution of the project.

3.2.4 Activities:

- To assure operational local actors network.

- To implement the communication's strategy
- To systematize experiences
- To design and execute a regional training plan
- Co-execute demonstrative projects of component 3.
- To support organization and execution of workshops and fora
- To promote participative exchanges with other GEF projects on International Waters.
- To assure monitoring system continuity
- To guarantee sustainability transferring achievements and outcomes to local actors.

3.2.5 Fees

The fees will be paid according to the project's advance and shall be defined in accordance with COCATRAM's rules and conditions and with IADB's no objection.

C- Terms of reference of the Environmental Specialist

3.3. The Environmental Specialist shall at least comply with the following terms of reference

3.3.1. Objective and general approach of the position

He/she shall be a professional in the field of marine sciences, marine biology, sanitary engineering, ecology, or related, with a vast experience in environmental issues, including marine resources, coastal zones and ecosystems. Shall be responsible to guarantee that goals and objectives are met as planned in the Project's Document and Logical Framework with regards to the Transboundary Diagnose Analysis, Strategic Environmental Plan, strengthening of the Port Environmental Management Units, and the declaration of Especially Sensitive Maritime Zone.

3.3.2. Responsibilities

The environmental specialist will be under the supervision of the Project's Director and shall be responsible to execute at least the activities described below.

3.3.3. Scope and seat of the job

Based at the Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU), in Puerto Cortes, Honduras, at the facilities of the National Port Company. The Unit will be the central administrative and technical base for the daily execution of the project.

3.3.4. Activities:

- To finalize ADT/PAE
- To strengthen Port Environmental Management Units
- To prepare Gulf of Honduras for its declaration as ESMZ
- To socialize the report about navigation risks
- To set in place the monitoring system
- To support execution of demonstrative projects in component 4
- To set in place the communication system

3.3.5. Fees

The fees will be paid according to the project's advance and shall be defined in accordance with COCATRAM's rules and conditions and with IADB's no objection.

4. The priorities for the next 16 months should be:

4.1. To strengthen the concepts of regionality, globality and transboundary waters:

To strengthen the concept that the 3 countries share one same ecosystem. Even if a country makes significant national efforts, but if the other two countries do not, the gulf's ecosystem will continue to degrade. It is about doing regional efforts. Protecting ecosystems in the Gulf of Honduras is to protect a global asset. To strengthen the local actor's network. Additionally, this network will lastly ensure in the long term that goals for degradation reduction and country coordination and to achieve the global project's objective.

4.2. In component 1:

To establish mechanisms to guarantee sustainability of results and outcomes, in particular of:

- a. Monitoring system and standard compliance (which implies elaboration of protocols and procedures for communication between ports and consolidating information)
- b. Network of actors
- c. To conduct the necessary studies to guarantee that the declaration of ESMZ will not affect port's competitiveness.

- d. Training of local actors (responsibility of the Facilitator)
 - e. Implementation of communication strategy (responsibility of the Facilitator)
 - f. To strengthen experience exchanges from local actors with other GEF's projects on International Waters. See calendar in <http://www.iwlearn.net/calendar>. (responsibility of the Facilitator)
 - g. Develop, implement, maintain and assure sustainability of the information module. (responsibility of the Facilitator)
 - h. Development of a financial-economical assessment to guarantee project's results sustainability by means of tariffs, fees, taxes or other mechanisms. (responsibility of the Facilitator)
- 4.3. In component 2:
- a. The information module of Gulf of Honduras (design and equipment), that will be managed by COCATRAM, and that besides environmental issues shall include aspects related to navigation and with hydrographic information and nautical charts. This shall include a plan for operational, updating and information capture for the module. The information related with nautical charts shall be necessarily linked with the electronic charts.
 - b. Design and implementation of a strategy for socialization of the Transboundary Diagnose (ADT).
 - c. Negotiation and approval of the Strategic Plan (PAE)
 - d. To ensure that the regional structure proposed to handle marine and environmental issues in the Gulf of Honduras is considered in SAMII.
 - e. To organize the donors conference to promote PAE.
- 4.4. In component 4:
- a. Legal and political aspects that guarantee navigation safety and pollution reduction from ships and ports.
 - b. A clear definition, with the respective specifications and acquisition plan for the equipments that shall be purchased: buoys, lights, barriers, skimmers, and other.
 - c. To establish a communication system between ports, which implies quality improvement of transmissions, communication protocols, maintenance plans and sustainability of the system.
 - d. To execute regional exercises for spillages care (which would be executed as a demonstrative project), regional plans and its implementation (that would be

another demonstrative project and it is linked to incise e) of the above-mentioned component 2)

- e. To systemize two pilot experiences: elaboration of the nautical chart and elaboration of the regional spillage prevention and care plan. Both experiences shall be presented as projects.

4.5. Component 4

- a. To execute 3 demonstrative projects that will favor pollution reduction
- b. To do all legal and institutional arrangements to assure that environmental threats resulting from port operations are reduced.
- c. To elaborate harmonized regional environmental guidelines, that include policies and standards for an adequate environmental management in ports and navigation safety standards.

PROPUESTA DE PRESUPUESTO Y PROGRAMACION DE ACTIVIDADES

	COMPONENTE	PRESUPUESTO FONDOS BID	PROPUESTA DE MODIFICACION	PRESUPUESTO MODIFICADO	EJECUCIÓN 2005 A AGOSTO 2010	PROPUESTA TRANSFERENCIAS DE COSTOS	SALDO DISPONIBLE PARA COMPROMISOS
Componente 1:							
	Desarrollo de la Capacidad Regional Para Prevenir la Contaminación de Origen Marítimo y Terrestre en la Región del Golfo de Honduras						
01.001	Administración (UCP y Comité Directivo Regional)	950.000	-	950.000	1.112.944	(406.715)	243.771
01.002	Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo	150.000	62.000	212.000	174.649	-	37.351
01.003	Consultorías y Estudios	600.000	(216.000)	384.000	69.111	62.410	252.479
01.004	Cursos y Capacitación Practica	160.000	(6.000)	154.000	-	-	154.000
01.005	Coordinación e Intercambios con Otros Proyectos AI	185.000	(155.000)	30.000	-	-	30.000
01.006	Publicaciones	80.000	-	80.000	2.392	-	77.608
01.007	Equipamiento	100.000	(11.000)	89.000	56.345	-	32.655
01.008	Estudios Pilotos	150.000	(128.000)	22.000	-	-	22.000
	TOTAL COMPONENTE 01	2.375.000	(454.000)	1.921.000	1.415.440	(344.305)	849.865
Componente 2:							
	Desarrollo de una Base de Informacion para el Plan de Accion Estrategico						
02.001	Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo	145.000	(90.000)	55.000	12.493	-	42.507
02.002	Consultarías y Estudios	480.000	276.000	756.000	299.804	174.180	282.016
02.003	Cursos y Capacitación Practica	77.000	50.000	127.000	-	-	127.000
02.004	Publicaciones	38.000	-	38.000	3.209	-	34.792
02.005	Equipamiento	87.100	93.000	180.100	-	-	180.100
	TOTAL COMPONENTE 2	827.100	329.000	1.156.100	315.505	174.180	666.415
Componente 3:							
	Mejorar la Seguridad de la Navegación en las Rutas Maritimas						
03.001	Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo	110.000	(78.000)	32.000	4.199	-	27.801
03.002	Consultarías y Estudios	290.000	233.000	523.000	254.268	170.125	98.607
03.003	Cursos y Capacitación Practica	50.000	24.000	74.000	49.312	-	24.688
03.004	Publicaciones	-	10.000	10.000	-	-	10.000
03.005	Equipamiento	222.900	-	222.900	230.286	-	(7.386)
03.006	Proyectos Demostrativos	300.000	-	300.000	-	-	300.000
	TOTAL COMPONENTE 3	972.900	189.000	1.161.900	538.065	170.125	453.710
Componente 4:							
	Mejorar la Gestión Ambiental en la Red Regional de Cinco Puertos Localizados en el Golfo de Honduras						
04.001	Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo	80.000	-	80.000	-	-	80.000
04.002	Consultarías y Estudios	100.000	(64.000)	36.000	3.289	-	32.711
04.003	Cursos y Capacitación Practica	30.000	-	30.000	-	-	30.000
04.004	Publicaciones	-	-	-	-	-	-
04.005	Proyectos Demostrativos	120.000	-	120.000	-	-	120.000
	TOTAL COMPONENTE 4	330.000	(64.000)	266.000	3.289	-	262.711
Otros Costos							

Products and related consultancies

	tercer cuatrimestre 2010	2011	2012
componente 1			
Desarrollo de la Capacidad Regional Para Prevenir la Contaminación de Origen Marítimo y Terrestre en la Región del Golfo de Honduras			
Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo			
Realizar reuniones del Comité Directivo		Mar.-Oct.	
Crear y dejar funcionando la red regional de prevención y control de la contaminación marítima	Set.-Dic.		
Consultorías y Estudios			
Implementación de la estrategia regional de comunicaciones en el Golfo de Honduras	Diciembre	Todo el año	Ene-May
Consultoría: analizar si con la declaratoria de ZMES se pierde competitividad en los puertos del Golfo.		Feb-Jul	
Sistematizar experiencias y lecciones aprendidas		Jun-Dic.	Ene-May
Consultoría: Diseño del Plan Regional de Capacitación para Grupos de Interés en Areas Prioritarias del Golfo de Honduras	Set.-Dic		
Realizar monitoreo de parámetros ambientales		Jun-Ago	
Consultoría: Especialista en Adquisiciones	Nov.-Dic.	Ene.-Jul	
Consultoría: Especialista en Planificación (control, revisiones periódicas, etc.)	Nov.-Dic.	Ene-Jul	Dic.-Ene
Consultoría: estudio para garantizar que vía tarifas, impuestos, tasas u otro mecanismo la sostenibilidad de los resultados del proyecto.		Ene-Jul	
Primer Taller del plan de regional de capacitación para grupos de interés en las áreas priorizadas en el Golfo de Honduras	Set.-Dic.		
Supervisión, Asistencia Técnica, atención a conferencias y seminarios	Nov.	Ene.-Dic.	
Consultoría: Ejecutar el plan de capacitación regional para grupos de interés en las áreas priorizadas.	Oct-Dic.	Ene-Dic.	
Coordinación e Intercambios con Otros Proyectos AI			
Realizar intercambios con otros proyectos de Aguas Internacionales		Noviembre	
Equipamiento			
Equipar UGAPs	Set-Nov.		
Componente 2:			
Desarrollo de una Base de Informacion para el Plan de Accion Estrategico			
Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo			
Conferencia de donantes para la implementación del Plan de Acción Estratégico		Oct.-Nov.	

Un taller regional de información sobre el estado de la salud del Golfo de Honduras.		Mar--Jun.	
Consultorías y Estudios			
Desarrollar consultoría Análisis Diagnóstico Transfronterizo / Plan de Acción Estratégico	Octubre		
Consultoría: Diseño e implementación del Modulo de Información para el Golfo de Honduras	Octubre	Enero	
Consultoría: Elaborar propuesta técnica para designar Golfo de Honduras como ZMES.	Diciembre	Agosto	
Consultoría: Traductor a énfasis en aspectos Marítimos Portuarios del PAE		Ene.-Abr.	
Cursos y Capacitación Práctica			
Socializar y ratificar el Plan de Acción Estratégico		Feb.-Set.	
Reuniones para la elaboración de acuerdos regionales relacionados con la validación y ratificación del PAE		Jun.-Jul.	
Supervisión, Asistencia Técnica, atención a conferencias y seminarios	Oct.-Nov.	Ene.-Nov.	
Consultoría: Ejecutar el plan de capacitación regional para grupos de interés en las áreas priorizadas.	Oct-Dic.	Ene-Dic.	
Publicaciones			
Edición, diagramación y Reproducción de documentos síntesis de ADA, PAE y Riesgos a la Navegación	Octubre		
Equipamiento			
Adquisición de equipo para módulo regional de información del Golfo de Honduras	Nov.-Dic.		
componente 3:			
Mejorar la Seguridad de la Navegación en las Rutas Marítimas			
Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo			
Reuniones de socialización informe riesgos a la navegación		Ene.-Set.	
Consultorías y Estudios			
Consultoría: Diagnóstico y diseño del sistema de comunicación relacionada con la seguridad de navegación entre los puertos del Golfo de Honduras y código PBIP.	Oct.-Dic.		
Consultoría: Armonización de directrices, estándares y políticas regionales para la gestión ambiental y seguridad portuaria		Ene-Set.	
Consultoría para proyecto demostrativo: Gestión de los planes nacionales y regional de contingencias contra derrames de hidrocarburos y sustancias peligrosas (énfasis en puertos)		Feb.-May	
Consultoría: Diseño de Proyectos demostrativos en función del plan de implementación hidrográfica y la generación de cartas electrónicas náuticas	Noviembre	Abril	
Cursos y Capacitación Práctica			
Supervisión, Asistencia Técnica, atención a conferencias y seminarios	Noviembre	Noviembre	
Desarrollo actividades de capacitación en temas hidrográficos	Octubre	Marzo	
Publicaciones			
Documentos técnicos Mejoras en la Seguridad de la Navegación (Mapas, Cartas Náuticas, etc)		Ene.-Ago.	

Equipamiento			
Adquirir equipos contra derrames		Ene-Jun.	
Proyectos Demostrativos			
Implementar 2 proyectos demostrativos		Mar.-Nov.	
componente 4:			
Mejorar la Gestión Ambiental en la Red Regional de Cinco Puertos Localizados en el Golfo de Honduras			
Talleres y Grupos de Trabajo			
Realizar 1 foros de usuarios de los puertos	Oct.-Dic.		
Realizar 4 foros de usuarios de los puertos (continuación).		Abr.-Dic.	
Consultorías y Estudios			
Consultoría: Asistencia técnica para conformar o fortalecer la unidad de gestión ambiental portuaria (UGAP) de Belize	Oct.-Dic.		
Consultoría: Asistencia Técnica para conformar o fortalecer la unidad de gestión ambiental portuaria (UGAP) Guatemala	Oct.-Dic.		
Consultoría: Asistencia Técnica para conformar o fortalecer la unidad de gestión ambiental portuaria (UGAP) Honduras	Ago.-Dic.		
Consultoría: Elaboración de Guías Ambientales Regionales para la mejora de la gestión ambiental de los puertos y sus usuarios.		Abr.-Dic.	
Cursos y Capacitación Práctica			
Consultoría: Ejecutar el plan de capacitación regional para grupos de interés en las áreas priorizadas.	Octubre	Setiembre	
Publicaciones			
Proyectos Demostrativos			
Implementar 3 proyectos demostrativos (incluye consultoría de diseño)		Mar.-Nov.	
Revisión y Evaluación Anual Independiente			
			Enero
Auditorias			
Auditoria	Oct.-Dic.	Feb.-Abr.	Ene.-Jul.

Marco Lógico ajustado según la Evaluación Intermedia

RESUMEN NARRATIVO	INDICADORES VERIFICABLES
FIN:	
Contribuir a disminuir la degradación de los ecosistemas marinos costeros dentro del Golfo de Honduras	1. En 2012 se mantiene los mismos los niveles de contaminantes (tales como nutrientes, sedimentos, DBO y tóxicos, entre otros) comparado con 2005 2. En 2012 se reduce a la mitad la tasa de degradación de la calidad de los pastos marinos, arrecifes coralinos y manglares, entre otros en comparación con la del 2005.
PROPÓSITO:	
La prevención y control de la contaminación y la seguridad. de transporte marítimo en el Golfo de Honduras mejorada	1. Al menos 3 mecanismos institucionales sostenibles de carácter regional para la prevención y control de la contaminación se han creado al 3er trimestre 2010
	2. En 25% se reduce las cargas contaminantes de las fuentes puntuales provenientes de actividades portuarias al final del Proyecto (valor al 2012 comparado con valor base de 2005).
	3. En 25% se reduce las cargas contaminantes provenientes de actividades de origen terrestre enfocadas en los principales afluentes que drenan hacia las áreas de influencia de las ciudades de los cinco puertos al final del Proyecto. (valor al 2012 comparado con valor base de 2005).
	4. En 25% se reduce las descargas contaminantes provenientes del transporte marítimo al final del Proyecto. (valor al 2012 comparado con valor base de 2005).
	5. En 50 % se reduce los derrames marítimos accidentales de materiales peligrosos al final del Proyecto (valor al 2012 comparado con valor base de 2005).
	EFFECTOS DIRECTOS
	6. 50% se incrementan en número de grupos de interés en los países intervenidos al final del Proyecto
	7. Al menos 1 propuesta por cada grupo de interés es presentada al Comité Regional de Gestión anualmente
	8. Ochenta (80) % capacitados aprueban la evaluación de destrezas al 4to trimestre 2009.
	9. Al menos una (1) mejor práctica o política es adoptada por los puertos al 4to trimestre 2009.
	10. Cien (100) % actualizado el portal de internet actualizado al 4to trimestre 2008.
	11. Al menos 1 boletín trimestral es publicado durante la vida del Proyecto.
	12. Al menos cinco (5) alianzas (una en cada puerto) es suscrita al 2do trimestre 2009.
	13. Al menos un (1) plan de prevención y control de la contaminación es adoptado y aprobado al 4to trimestre 2009.
	14. Tres (3) planes operativos son aprobados al 4to trimestre 2009.
	15. Al menos tres (3) medidas para mejorar la seguridad de la navegación se han adoptado al 1er trimestre 2010.
	16. Al menos tres (3) medidas de prevención y control del impacto ambiental, identificadas de mayor riesgo son incorporadas en el plan operativo de los Puertos al final del Proyecto.

COMPONENTES:	
1. Capacidad regional para prevenir y controlar la contaminación de origen marítimo y terrestre desarrollada	1.1. Cien (100) % creada y funcionando la Red Regional de prevención y control de la contaminación al 4to trimestre 2008. Proceso de contratación al 50 % al 4to trimestre del 2010.
	1.2. Cien (100) % implementada la estrategia regional de comunicaciones e información al final del Proyecto.
	1.3 Al menos un reporte anual consolidado (incluyendo todos los puertos participantes) con los resultados de mediciones y la aplicación de protocolos de monitoreo en los temas de (i) calidad de aguas y; (ii) hábitat marinos costeros. La información debe estar por puerto, por país y consolidada.
	1.4. Al menos seis (6) talleres de capacitación regional derivados de las evaluaciones de necesidades al 3er trimestre 2011.
	1.5. Al menos tres (3) intercambios con otros proyectos de aguas internacionales son realizados al 4to trimestre 2011.
	1.6. Cien (100) % elaborado el estudio de sostenibilidad financiera de las actividades de protección ambiental y beneficios económicos de la prevención de la contaminación marina al 3er trimestre 2011
	1.7. Cien (100) % elaborado el estudio de condiciones de competitividad y efectos de designación del Golfo bajo MARPOL al 4to trimestre 2011
	1.8. Al menos un (1) proyecto en la región se le asiste técnicamente para que apliquen los instrumentos e incentivos generados en el estudio para cuantificar los beneficios económicos de la prevención de la contaminación marina al final del Proyecto.
	1.9. Protocolos regionales definidos y en aplicación en todos los puertos para el monitoreo y seguimiento de la contaminación de origen marítimo y terrestre en el área de influencia del proyecto.
2. Plan de Acción Estratégico desarrollada	2.1. Cien (100) % establecida la línea de referencia de fuentes terrestres de contaminación y calidad del agua en colaboración con el SAM al 4to trimestre 2010.
	2.2. Cien (100) % desarrollado e implementado el módulo de manejo de información para el Golfo de Honduras que intercambie información técnica y científica con otros proyectos como el SAM y el Sistema de Información Ambiental de CCAD, al 1er trimestre 2011.
	2.3. Cien (100) % actualizado y ampliado el ADT/PAE al 2do trimestre 2011.
	2.4. Cien (100) % PAE elaborado y difundido al 2do trimestre 2011
	2.5. Al menos dos (2) nuevos acuerdos regionales relacionados con la prevención y control de la contaminación marina son propuestos al 2do trimestre 2011
	2.6. Propuesta técnica de solicitud a los gobiernos para gestionar ante la OMI para la designación del Golfo de Honduras como área especial bajo MARPOL, elaborada al 2do trimestre 2011

COMPONENTES:	
3. Seguridad de navegación en las rutas marítimas mejorada	3.1. Cien (100) % identificados los riesgos de navegación al 4to trimestre 2008.
	3.2. Cien (100) % adquiridos los equipos esenciales, priorizados en los estudios de diagnósticos de navegación (según disponibilidad de recursos) al 1er trimestre 2009.
	3.3. Sistema de comunicación entre las autoridades marítimas de la región para atender contingencias establecido al 4to trimestre 2010.
	3.4. Al menos diez (10) propuestas de reformas al marco legal para seguridad de navegación y prevención y control de la contaminación del Golfo de Honduras al 3er. Trimestre 2011
	3.5. Elaborado y propuesto el plan regional de prevención y contingencias para derrame de petróleos y sustancias químicas al 2do trimestre 2011.
	3.6. Cien (100) personas capacitadas en temas relacionados con seguridad de navegación y derrames al 2do trimestre 2011.
	3.7. Al menos dos (2) ejercicios de respuesta de emergencia de derrames realizados al 2do trimestre 2011
	3.8. Al menos dos (2) actividades piloto de demostración relacionada con la mejora de la seguridad de navegación y la protección del medio ambiente marino son desarrolladas al 4to trimestre 2011.
	3.9 Limite de zona para agua de lastre definida en el Golfo de Honduras antes de finalizar el proyecto. (**indicador original de LFA 2005)
4. Gestión ambiental y medidas de reducción de riesgos en la red regional de cinco puertos localizados en el Golfo de Honduras mejorada	4.1. Al menos tres (3) proyectos demostrativos de tecnologías innovadoras para prevenir contaminación son diseñados al 4to trimestre 2011
	4.2. Cuatro (4) evaluaciones de riesgos ambientales derivados de las operaciones portuarias son desarrolladas al 2do trimestre 2007.
	4.3. Una (1) propuesta de armonización regional (Elaboracion de Guías Regionales) sobre las directrices, estándares, políticas de gestión ambiental y seguridad portuaria al 2do trimestre 2011
	4.4. Tres (3) foros de usuarios de los puertos establecido, por lo menos una vez al año durante la vigencia del Proyecto.
	En 2009 se incluye un nuevo indicador: <i>3 Unidades de gestión de ambiental portuarias (UGAPs) conformadas</i>
5. Gestión	5.1. Al menos siete (7) reuniones del Comité Directivo / Comité Regional de Gestión (2 al año) durante la vigencia del Proyecto.
	5.2. Dos (2) evaluaciones del Proyecto (una intermedia al 1er trimestre 2008 y la otra al final).*
	5.3. Cuatro (4) auditorías financieras (una al año) durante la vida del Proyecto.

Anexo 6: Tipología y esquema de ejecución que deberá emplearse para el financiamiento de los Proyectos Demostrativos

1- Generalidades

El Documento de Proyecto dice que el proyecto "... está firmemente orientado hacia la demostración como mecanismo idóneo para promover y facilitar cambios concretos en el desempeño nacional en materia de prevención y control de la contaminación."

En la segunda fase de la ejecución del Proyecto es una actividad que debe estar presente, máxime que se pensaba se ejecutaría en una etapa temprana de la primera fase. El DP da una pauta de la forma en que se deberán seleccionar los proyectos, y específicamente señala: "...las demostraciones a realizar serán seleccionadas durante un proceso participativo y competitivo..."

El Documento de Proyecto también indica criterios de selección y propone la consideración de los siguientes: "...potencial de emulación, probabilidad de ejecución exitosa, distribución de costos y posibilidades de contribuir al logro de las metas del Proyecto."

También señala que se financiarán "... dos actividades piloto de demostración relacionadas con la mejora de la seguridad de navegación y la protección del medio ambiente marino y también indica "...que para complementar lo anterior se llevarán a cabo proyectos de demostración relacionados con mejoras ambientales en tres de los cinco puertos seleccionados..."

El Documento de Proyecto da una pauta muy importante para la selección de los proyectos "...en lo posible se realicen a través de alianzas público-privadas..."

2- Tipos de proyectos

El Documento de Proyecto es claro, los proyectos versarán en dos grandes áreas:

- 1-Mejora en la seguridad de la navegación y protección del medio ambiente marino
- 2-Mejoras ambientales.

Con el fin de facilitar la presentación de proyectos se proponen los siguientes temas:

- 1-Cartas náuticas electrónicas (elaboración, utilización, etc.)
- 2-Rastreo de buques
- 3-Manejo de desechos químicos (petróleo, basuras y aguas aceitosas) en tierra y barcos
- 4-Control de derrames y elaboración de planes
- 5-Manejo de residuos sólidos en tierra y barcos
- 6-Instalación de una red de medición de datos oceanográficos y meteorológicos.
- 7-Centros de reciclado de residuos plásticos u otros materiales (trituradores, separadores)
- 8-Reactores o plantas de tratamiento para manejo de aguas servidas

- 9-Equipos eficientes en el uso de combustibles fósiles o que usen electricidad o combustibles alternativos
- 10-Estaciones de monitoreo automatizadas para el control de la contaminación
- 11-Radares para el control de embarcaciones
- 12-Señales para la navegación
- 13-Sistemas de comunicación barco-tierra
- 14-Controles satelitales
- 15-Puestos de control y observación
- 16- Fortalecimiento de la capacidad regional de las comunicaciones relacionadas con la seguridad de la navegación
- 17-Monitoreo, vigilancia y control de buques pesqueros o dedicados a otras actividades comerciales
- 18-Asistencia prestada en las áreas de radio VHF/HF
- 19- Sistemas Automatizados de Identificación (SAI)
- 20-Nuevos software o hardware que faciliten el control de la contaminación o la mejora de la seguridad en la navegación.

3- Convocatoria

El proyecto Golfo de Honduras convocará por medio de las redes de actores locales y por medios de comunicación locales (radio local, televisión local, periódico local) a presentar proyectos por un máximo de US\$40 mil, cuya contrapartida deberá ser igual o superior .

Podrán participar organizaciones públicas o privadas relacionadas con la actividad portuaria o marítima, con al menos 3 años de estar legalmente establecidas, de cualquiera de los tres países participantes y se requiere que en cada proyecto participen al menos dos países (binacionales).

Los proyectos deberán contar con un ejecutor en uno de los países y un co-ejecutor en cualquiera de los otros dos países. Si el proyecto incluye 3 países (trinacionales) el aporte de la contribución podrá ser de hasta US\$ 75 mil, y la contrapartida deberá ser igual o superior.

Todos los proyectos que se presenten, bi o trinacionales, deberán mostrar que tienen un objetivo de carácter regional.

4- Criterios de elegibilidad

4.1- Organizaciones participantes

Las organizaciones deberán estar legalmente registradas en cualquiera de los tres países y deben pertenecer al menos en sus 2/3 a ciudadanos de cualquiera de los tres países.

Organizaciones internacionales pueden participar colocando sus propios fondos como parte de la contrapartida.

Una organización solo puede participar en un proyecto.

4.2- Propuestas elegibles

Solo se recibirán propuestas que usen el formato que se adjunta. Toda la documentación podrá ser presentada en inglés o en español y será evaluada por el punto focal en cada país participante y luego agregada y consolidada en la Unidad Coordinadora del Proyecto.

Solamente podrán participar proyectos que estén dentro de los temas seleccionados:

- 1-Cartas náuticas electrónicas (elaboración, utilización, etc.)
- 2-Rastreo de buques
- 3-Manejo de desechos químicos (petróleo, basuras y aguas aceitosas) en tierra y barcos
- 4-Control de derrames y elaboración de planes
- 5-Manejo de residuos sólidos en tierra y barcos
- 6-Instalación de una red de medición de datos oceanográficos y meteorológicos.
- 7-Centros de reciclado de residuos plásticos u otros materiales (trituradores, separadores)
- 8-Reactores o plantas de tratamiento para manejo de aguas servidas
- 9-Equipos eficientes en el uso de combustibles fósiles o que usen electricidad o combustibles alternativos
- 10-Estaciones de monitoreo automatizadas para el control de la contaminación
- 11-Radares para el control de embarcaciones
- 12-Señales para la navegación
- 13-Sistemas de comunicación barco-tierra
- 14-Controles satelitales
- 15-Puestos de control y observación
- 16- Fortalecimiento de la capacidad regional de las comunicaciones relacionadas con la seguridad de la navegación
- 17-Monitoreo, vigilancia y control de buques pesqueros o dedicados a otras actividades comerciales
- 18-Asistencia prestada en las áreas de radio VHF/HF
- 19- Sistemas Automatizados de Identificación (SAI)
- 20-Nuevos software o hardware que faciliten el control de la contaminación o la mejora de la seguridad en la navegación.

Los propuestas que se presenten deben cumplir estos criterios:

- potencial de emulación
- probabilidad de ejecución exitosa
- distribución de costos y posibilidades de contribuir al logro de las metas del Proyecto
- Equidad entre las organizaciones participantes
- Participación entre sector público, sociedad civil, academia y sector privado
- Introducción de elementos innovadores en el contexto local

- Las organizaciones líderes participantes deberán mostrar capacidad administrativa demostrada

5. Presupuesto

5.1. Formato para el presupuesto

La propuesta de proyecto debe presentarse en US\$. Debe incluirse el presupuesto que la organización proponente dispondrá para el proyecto. Si se trata de un proyecto que incluyen dos países el límite máximo será de US\$40.000, y si incluye los 3 países será de US\$75.000. Los fondos serán transferidos a la organización determinada como líder en la propuesta.

5.2. Costos Elegibles

- Debe presentarse ítem por ítem en dólares de los Estados Unidos.
- Servicios profesionales deberán detallarse en horas o tarifas diarias, y deben estar dentro de los valores de Mercado.
- Costos de viaje necesitan ser debidamente justificados e informes de viaje deberán ser incluidos en los informes de avance.
- Consultorías no deben exceder el 25% del total del aporte que otorgue el PGOH. Servicios personales sumados a gastos de consultoría no deben exceder el 40% del total de los fondos otorgados por el PGOH.
- El presupuesto deberá incluir un ítem para evaluación de un auditor externo, y debe ser el 5% del total de la contribución.
- El presupuesto debe incluir un ítem de costos administrativos y no deben exceder el 7.5% del total de los costos operacionales (sin incluir auditoría e imprevistos)
- Fondos de contrapartida deberán presupuestarse en una columna separada, siguiendo los mismos ítems de la contribución del PGOH.
- Imprevistos no deben exceder el 5% del total de la contribución, excluyendo auditoría y costos administrativos.
- Vehículos y terrenos no pueden ser adquiridos con fondos provenientes del PGOH.
- Servicios como agua, electricidad, teléfono, papelería, artículos de oficina, renta, costos por el manejo financiero, contabilidad y otros relacionados con buenas prácticas de administración se deben incluir en los costos administrativos.

6. Procedimiento para someter una propuesta:

Las propuestas deben presentar en el formato que se adjunta. Solo aplicaciones completas serán consideradas.

Las propuestas se enviarán al punto focal de cada país y tendrán como fecha límite el.....a las 17 horas.

En Belice a:

En Guatemala a:

En Honduras a:

Golfo de Honduras

Guía para presentar proyectos demostrativos

I – Título del Proyecto

II – Definición del problema y Justificación

Describe brevemente el problema y cuantifíquelo (defina la línea base) y explique por qué es importante la propuesta y como calza en los temas propuestos en la convocatoria

III – Objetivos y resultados esperados

Objetivo general	Se debe entender como el logro que el proyecto busca. Es una propuesta de solución, total o parcial, del problema propuesto, y se espera que solucionará implementando el proyecto.		
Actividades	Productos esperados	Indicadores	
Acciones, fase o componenets que deben ser ejecutados para solucionar el problema planteado. Los resultados y presupuesto deben ser definidos sobre estas. Deben ser formulados en forma breve y precisa y deben ser consistentes con el objetivo general.	Los productos esperados son efectos directos de las actividades.	Indicadores son resultados o cambios esperados de los productos esperados. Los indicadores propuestos deben ser verificables y cantidad, calidad y tiempo.	

La propuesta debe incluir un cronograma con el plan de ejecución de actividades. Se debe recordar que el proyecto debe ser planeado para que esté completamente terminado el.....(incluyendo el reporte financiero y técnico).

IV – Sostenibilidad

Se deberá indicar como el proyecto continuará operando una vez que acabe el financiamiento.

V – Impacto

La descripción del impacto que se generará debe ayudar a cumplir los objetivos y metas que busca satisfacer el Proyecto Golfo de Honduras PGOH

VI – Presupuesto

- Debe presentarse item por item en dólares de los Estados Unidos.
- Servicios profesionales deberán detallarse en horas o tarifas diarias, y deben estar dentro de los valores de Mercado.
- Costos de viaje necesitan ser debidamente justificados e informes de viaje deberán ser incluidos en los informes de avance.
- Consultorías no deben exceder el 25% del total del aporte que otorgue el PGOH. Servicios personales sumados a gastos de consultoría no deben exceder el 40% del total de los fondos otorgados por el PGOH.
- El presupuesto deberá incluir un item para evaluación de un auditor externo, y debe ser el 5% del total de la contribución.
- El presupuesto debe incluir un ítem de costos administrativos y no deben exceder el 7.5% del total de los costos operacionales (sin incluir auditoría e imprevistos)
- Fondos de contrapartida deberán presupuestarse en una columna separada, siguiendo los mismos items de la contribución del PGOH.
- Imprevistos no deben exceder el 5% del total de la contribución, excluyendo auditoria y costos administrativos.
- Vehículos y terrenos no pueden ser adquiridos con fondos provenientes del PGOH.

- Servicios como agua, electricidad, teléfono, papelería, artículos de oficina, renta, costos por el manejo financiero, contabilidad y otros relacionados con buenas prácticas de administración se deben incluir en los costos administrativos.

Presupuesto

<i>Item</i>	<i>Ingresos PGOH (US \$)</i>	<i>Ingresos Contrapartida (US \$)</i>	<i>Total (US \$)</i>
<i>1. Servicios personales</i>			
<i>2. Servicios no personales</i>			
<i>3. Materiales</i>			
<i>4. Maquinaria y equipo</i>			
<i>5. Construcciones y mejoras</i>			
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>\$</i>
<i>Costos Administrativos</i>			
<i>Imprevistos</i>			
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>\$</i>
<i>Auditoría Externa</i>			
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>\$</i>

Presupuesto por actividad y su cronograma

<i>Actividad</i>	<i>Presupuesto</i>	<i>Detalles</i>
<i>Actividad 1</i>	<i>\$</i>	
<i>Actividad 2</i>	<i>\$</i>	
<i>Actividad 3</i>	<i>\$</i>	
<i>...</i>		