



**INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK**

## **PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT – PCR**

*INFORME DE TERMINACIÓN DE PROYECTO*

### **Bank Memorandum**

**Project Name: Tourism Development Project**

**Project Number: BL-0012**

**Loan Number: 1250/OC-BL**

# Table of Contents

## **1. General Information**

- 1.1. Development Objective
- 1.2. Basic Data
- 1.3. Summary of Ratings
- 1.4. Project Timeline
- 1.5. Reference Documents

## **Bank Memorandum**

- 2.1. Results analysis (outputs, outcomes, and impacts)
  - 2.1.1. Outputs attained
  - 2.1.2. Project outcomes and impacts
- 2.2. Implementation Analysis
  - 2.2.1. Project's performance measurement
  - 2.2.2. Factors affecting project implementation (according to PPMR)
  - 2.2.3. Analysis of factors affecting output delivery and outcome achievement
  - 2.2.4. Analysis of project management lessons learned
- 2.3. Sustainability analysis
  - 2.3.1. Institutional / Organizational Strengthening (IOS)
  - 2.3.2. Project sustainability
- 2.4. Executing Agency Performance
- 2.5. Foundations for the Ex-post Evaluation
- 2.6. Other lessons learned and recommendations

## **Annexes**

- Annex 1A - Source of Financing (Amounts in thousands US\$)
- Annex 1B - Schedule of Investments (Amounts in thousands US\$)
- Annex 1C – Financial Information and Audited Financial Statements

# General Information

## 1.1. Development Objective

The objective of the operation is to increase employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings and government revenues from tourism in a manner that is environmentally and archaeologically sustainable.

## 1.2. Basic Data

Project Name: Tourism Development Project

Project Number: 1250/OC-BL

Loan/TC number: BL-0012

Executing Agency: MINISTRY OF TOURISM

Loan Amount(s) (Original): US\$11,000,000.00

Loan Amount(s) (Current): \$10,627,239.87

Loan Cumulative Cancellations: \$372,760.13

Total Cost of the Project (Current): \$13,627,239.87

Total Cost of the project (Original): \$14,000,000

Author of the Bank Memorandum: Harold Arzu

Loan approval date: June 14, 2000

Mid-term evaluation date: N/A

Exit workshop date: August 12, 2005

### 1.3. Summary of Ratings

#### 1.3.1. Last 10 PPMR Ratings (IP, AS, DO)

	2000	2001	2001	2002	2002	2003	2003	2004	2004	2005
	Dec	Jun.	Dec.	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun
S		S	HS	HS	HS	HS	S	S	S	S
H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
P		P	P	P	HP	HP	HP	HP	HP	HP

IP = Implementation Progress, AS = Assumptions, DO = Development Objectives

### 1.4. Project Timeline

Start up workshop date:

Mid-Term Evaluation date: N/A

Exit workshop date: August 12, 2005

### 1.5. Reference Documents

Country Strategy

Country Portfolio Review Aide Memoire

Administration Mission Aide Memoire

PCR Annex

## Bank Memorandum

### 2.0 BACKGROUND

The Tourism Development Project (TDP) was approved in June 2000 and signed in August 2000. The overall objective of the operation is to increase employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings and government revenues from tourism in a manner that is environmentally and archaeologically sustainable. To reduce the burden of providing counterpart funds for this operation, the government was able to negotiate a parallel US\$3 million loan from the International Cooperation Fund for Development (ICDF) bringing the total financing to US\$14 million.

There is considerable potential for increasing the number of visitors in view of: the relatively small shares of all segments of the markets in which Belize competes; the fact that Belize offers a diversified package of attractions not available in any one of the competing regional destinations; and the excess capacity in the lodging sector.

However, many tourism stakeholders in Belize are concerned with the social and environmental consequences of mass tourism occurring elsewhere in the Caribbean. On the other hand, increasing the number of visitors to Belize is of special interest to policy makers. This is because anticipated increases in foreign exchange, employment and government revenues could

compensate to a significant extent for the expected losses resulting from the scheduled termination of preferential trade agreements for bananas, sugar and citrus. Gradual, planned growth in the tourism sector is compatible with Belize's environmental and social context. Striking a balance between environmental and social concerns and the need to increase foreign exchange earnings highlights the issue of the optimum growth rate for the sector.

In the Blackstone Report, Tourism Strategy Plan, four growth scenarios were analyzed ranging from a no-growth option to a mass tourism option. The study concluded that a "managed growth" scenario where tourist arrivals grew about four percent annually was the preferred option. Under this scenario, during the first five years existing properties achieve viable occupancy rates, while over 10 years impressive growth in GDP, employment and government revenues could be realized without damage to the fragile environmental and cultural foundation upon which tourism is based.

The objective of the TDP is to increase employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings and government revenues from tourism through increases in tourism arrivals both cruise and overnight, increases in archaeological sites visitations and hotel revenues.

It was on the basis of the Blackstone Report that the Tourism Development Project was designed, negotiated and approved. The purpose of the operation was to provide basic infrastructure – the development/establishment of basic facilities and amenities such as lavatories, research building, monument building, visitor's centers, storage, picnic areas, water systems, parking and signage at the Mayan archaeological sites of Caracol (primary), Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai and Altun Ha (secondary sites) and Cerros, El Pilar, Santa Rita, Nim Li Punit and Lubaantun (tertiary sites). Due to the level of activities and development that were anticipated on the tertiary sites, which were minimal and would have exhausted most of its funds on setting up and logistics, leaving even less to do actual work, it was decided by both the Bank and the Government of Belize (GOB) that the resources of the tertiary sites be attributed to the activities of the secondary sites (Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai, and Altun Ha) so as to further enhance and expand these sites that are heavily visited by tourist. The implementation plan also called for the excavation, consolidation and development of the archaeological monuments on these sites. To complement the investment in physical infrastructure and to enhance the accessibility of one of the major sites, the Caracol access road was one of the project's planned outputs.

The executing agency was the Ministry of Tourism which at the time of approval included the Department of Archaeology (DOA). The department was subsequently subsumed under the National Institute of Culture and History (NICH) and renamed Institute of Archaeology (IOA). Part of the project's purpose included the institutional strengthening of the DOA as well as the preparation of an Archaeology Development Plan for Belize. To ensure that the benefits of the tourism investment and development accrued to communities adjacent to the sites, the operation included a community development sub-component focusing on the provision of income generating activities related to tourism ancillary services to local citizens.

The execution of the project was satisfactory and met over 90 percent of the planned outputs. Monuments were consolidated on all five sites and basic infrastructure amenities provided.

These include visitor centers, lavatories, monument buildings, parking facilities, picnic areas, storage, and signage. Due to over expenditure on the consolidation sub-component, the monument building at Caracol and the visitors' center at Altun Ha were not completed. Over enthusiastic investment in monument consolidation resulted in budgetary shortage for the successful completion of these facilities. Nine person years of university training were provided to the IOA and five community development projects were successfully implemented. NICH has taken responsibility for the completion of the two unfinished facilities. The execution however could have benefited from a more balanced representation of stakeholders, tighter budgetary control mechanisms and more effective participation by the executing agency.

All the original development objective indicators for the project were surpassed due mainly to Belize Tourism Board's aggressive marketing and the unanticipated growth in cruise tourism arrivals that coincided with the successful completion of some of the project's outputs. Employment in the tourism sector grew at an annual rate of 6.5% as of 2002. The reported total tourist arrivals to Belize in 2004 was over 1.3 million a 25.5 percent increase compared to 2003, and a 69 percent increase in total arrivals in 2002 compared to 2001 (446,410 visitors/tourist). In 2004 there was a 28.4 percent increase in visits to archaeological sites following a 65.6 percent increase in 2003 and a 63 percent in 2002. Field employment at archaeological sites increased by 20 percent since 2002 and government revenues and foreign exchange earnings increased by more than six and ten percent respectively.

Some of the lesson learned of this operation relate mainly to execution. Project execution could have benefited from the formation of a more multi-sectoral project management team or even a project steering committee that could harness the effective participation of stakeholders in the tourism industry and communities adjacent to the archaeological sites. This would have adopted a more balanced approach to execution rendering the level of importance to visitor infrastructure and community development that the project originally anticipated.

It would have been prudent to conduct rapid assessments or feasibility analyses of critical aspects of the project before execution e.g. the unavailability of water at Caracol and the implication for infrastructure budget for that site.

The new and future challenges to tourism relating to the recent investments in infrastructure will be the maintenance of the Caracol road and the new facilities on the archaeological sites as well as to sustain the investment in tourism promotion and the training of personnel in the various institution that serve the industry including the private sector. A parallel and related MIF project has established within the Belize Tourism Board (BTB) an institutional capacity to deliver tourism training. The project has also enhanced IOA capacity for increased revenue collection. These two factors, along with the fact that tourism continues to be a national priority for economic growth, should contribute significantly to the sustainability of the investment made through this operation.

## 2.1. RESULTS ANALYSIS (OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS)

**2.1.1. Outputs attained** Description of project outputs by components and analysis of factors that influenced project execution.

**2.1.1.1. Output Indicators Analysis** Complete the indicators of the outputs attained in this component using the same output indicators retrieved from the PPMR. Compare the indicators in the Achieved and Planned columns. If there is a significant gap between them, briefly explain the factors responsible for the gap.

### (i) Mayan Archaeological Sites and Caracol access road improvement

**Basic infrastructure** – the development/establishment of basic facilities and amenities such as lavatories, research building, monument building, visitor’s centers, storage, picnic areas, water systems, parking and signage at the sites of Caracol (primary), Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai and Altun Ha (secondary sites) and Cerros, El Pilar, Santa Rita, Nim Li Punit and Lubaantun (tertiary sites).

Early in the life of the project, a decision was taken to focus only on primary and secondary sites based on budget constraints. All planned activities for the sites at Xunantunich, Cahal Pech and Lamanai were satisfactorily completed with visitors’ centers, lavatories, parking and signage, water systems and picnic areas. For the sites at Altun Ha the visitor’s center which is about 90 percent complete remains to be finished and at Caracol, the monument building and the parking area are about 90 percent complete but remain to be finished as well. The reason for not completing the infrastructure listed for the two sites is due to insufficient funds. Overenthusiastic investment in the consolidation of the pyramids at Caracol resulted in less than sufficient funds for the completion of the monument building and park at Caracol and the visitors’ center in Altun Ha. It has been agreed with the National Institute of Culture and History (NICH) that the Institute will take responsibility for the completion of those works still incomplete under the project. Since the expiration of the disbursement period, the visitors’ center at Altun Ha has been completed.

#### ***Consolidation, Excavation and Development -***

This sub-component focused on the consolidation, excavation and development of archaeological structure at each site (Caracol, Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai, and Altun Ha).

All the planned activities for all the sites listed above were satisfactorily completed. In some cases output exceeded expectation such as were the results at Caracol and Xunantunich. In Caracol over 25 percent additional work was done on the pyramids than was originally planned and at Xunantunich an access road was paved and access stairs to the main pyramid to accommodate two sets of visitors simultaneously was constructed.

**Access Road and Final Design** – This sub-component is for the completion of the final design and upgrading of the access road to Caracol, from both the Santa Elena and Georgeville

junctions off the Western Highway. The plan also called for the paving of the road along the villages of Georgeville, Cristo Rey and San Antonio and to widen sections of the road as well as construct appropriate drainage all the length of the road. The final output was to be a first class rural road.

This was satisfactorily completed. All sections of the road were completed as per agreement with the paving of portions along the major villages, the improvement of surface, the widening of some areas, cutting down of hills/elevations, the straightening of sections of the road, the installation of culverts and drains and the erection of road guards in some critical areas. The most critical section of the road is from Caracol site to the junction with the Millenario Road (approximately 16 km). This area was virtually a mud rut trail passable only with four-wheel drive vehicles during the day. Considering the level of investment at Caracol and the long-term implications of an upgraded road, it was decided that it would be more cost efficient and effective to have this section paved. The pavement of the road with line dividers, installation of culverts and drains and the erection of guardrails were completed in September of 2004.

***Archaeology Development Plan/Strategy Plan*** - This sub- component focused on the provision of technical assistance to IOA to prepare an Archeology Development Plan.

The preparation of the Plan was successfully completed, reviewed and approved by the review committee specifically setup to oversee the completion.

## **(ii) Institutional strengthening of the Department of Archaeology and Community Development.**

***Strengthening the DOA/IOA*** – This subcomponent focused on the establishment of a project execution unit in the IOA and the provision of at least eight person years of training to the staff of the Institute.

Three members of staff of the IOA completed formal studies at overseas universities, one in Natural Resources, Recreational/Tourism Studies at Colorado University for two years (Masters Degree), another completed studies for three years in Conservation Management in the UK (Bachelors Degree), another completed studies in Heritage Conservation Studies in the UK for two years (Masters Degree). The fourth member of staff successfully completed her two years studies in Biology/ecology at the University College of Belize (Bachelors Degree). The Project has successfully completed a total of nine years of formal training under the Institutional Strengthening Component. In addition, and in conjunction with the Taiwan Embassy, one field person from the project was selected to do a six-month course in high quality ceramic production. As a result of the institutional strengthening program the IOA has now established a parks and management unit as well as a policy and planning unit.

***Community Development*** – This subcomponent focused on fostering the participation of communities especially those located next to the areas of impact to derive some benefit from the new archeological investments.



A total of eleven proposals for sub-project activities under the Community Development sub-component were submitted to the Bank for its approval. After revision, the Bank found five to be acceptable and gave its no objection. These have all been completed and include establishment of a large vendors complex with fourteen vendor's stalls at the entrance to Xunantunich, one at Cahal Pech, three at Lamanai, assistance in the construction of an art and craft center for the women's group at Indian Church and training to various communities in the production of arts and crafts by making replicas of original artifacts for sale to tourist.

These five projects were accepted based on their potential to enhance economic opportunities for enterprising community members in the areas of tour guiding, production of replicas of Mayan artifacts, the provision of economic infrastructure for small businesses near archaeological sites. The six proposals not accepted targeted physical infrastructure projects outside of the project area that would clearly have no economic impact on communities near the sites. These included piers and airstrips not associated with the project area.

**2.1.1.2. Identification of achieved outputs** Bearing in mind the output indicators in the different project components, describe briefly the key outputs achieved by this project

Five major archaeological sites were consolidated, developed and preserved;

Visitors' centers, lavatories, parking lots, picnic grounds, research centers and monument buildings were erected on sites;

The Caracol access road was upgraded to a first class rural road;

The IOA received institutional strengthening through nine person years of university training;

An Archeological Plan was prepared and the communities on the periphery of the sites received assistance and participated in income-generating activities through five sub-project.

**2.1.2. Project outcomes and impacts** Description of the project results in relation with its Development Objective (DO or purpose in the project logical framework)

## **2.1.2 Objectives**

### **Project Objective**

To increase employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings and government revenues from tourism in a manner which is environmentally and economically sustainable.

**2.1.2.1. Outcome Indicators Analysis** Complete the indicators of achievement in the development objective (outcome) using the same outcome indicators retrieved from the PPMR (key performance indicators). Compare the Achieved and Planned outcome indicators. If there is a significant gap between them, briefly explain the factors responsible for the gap.

Employment in the tourism sector grew at an annual rate of 6.5% since 2002. This is 1.5 percent higher than was targeted. This can be attributed to increases in tourist arrival as well as to increased training in the sector resulting from the parallel MIF (Eco-tourism Training Project).

Field staff at archaeological sites increased by more than 20% since 2002. The target was 20 percent. On some sites it has more than doubled as a result of the exponential increase in cruise tourism over the same period.

Foreign Exchange from tourism expenditure grew at an annual average rate of a least 6% since 2002. Tourism foreign exchange earnings have increased by an annual average of more than ten percent since 2002. This again may be attributed to increases in cruise arrivals and visitations to the sites.

While government revenues may not have increased substantially as a result of cruise ship fees, they increased substantially through an increase of seven percent in occupancy taxes much more than the four percent increase anticipated by the project.

There has been a 100 percent increase from park entrance fee for secondary sites (Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai and Altun Ha) and 50 percent increase on fees to primary site (Caracol). This far exceeds the target of 10 percent.

The annual growth of tourists and cruise ship passengers over the life of the project has increased by about 80 percent and the annual growth of visitors to the archeological sites has more than doubled over the same period. This far exceeds the targets of 10 and 20 percent respectively.

There has been an annual increase of at least 15 percent in numbers of entrepreneurs participating in micro-enterprise activities in tourism sector over 2000 –2004.

**2.1.2.2. Identification of intermediate outcomes and initial impacts** Considering the achieved project outputs, to the extent possible, identify intermediate outcomes and initial impacts achieved by this project so far.

### **Intermediate Outcome**

There has been an increase in entrepreneurs particularly in the vicinity of Altun Ha, Lamanai and Xunantunich even before the full impact of the project is felt. There has been an increase in economic activity on the Caracol road as well as increase in occupancy in hotels along the route. The IOA has disseminated a wealth of information to tour guides, students, teachers, researcher and the general public as a result of this operation.

**2.1.2.3. Identification of future outcomes and impacts** Considering the achieved outputs, identify expected future outcomes and impacts and describe how these outputs are critical towards the achievement of outcomes and impacts.

## **Future Outcomes**

No changes in the transportation conditions are anticipated in the future resulting from project activities already undertaken. The Government will need to provide resources to maintain existing levels of service.

## **Future Impacts**

Potential future impacts of this operation are continued increases in site visitation, foreign exchange earnings, employment and growth in entrepreneurship. As a result of the dual impact of cruise tourism growth and the initial investment and thus publicity of the site, there may be a need to develop similar site in the south and north of the country and to expand the recently developed sites to increase carrying capacity.

The increase in research type tourism through the uncovering of new and interesting information on the Mayas is a likely future impact.

There is also the possibility of investment in airports to enhance the accessibility of sites such as Caracol to cruise tourists.

**2.1.2.4. Analysis of assumptions (from outputs to outcomes)** Identify the necessary conditions towards the achievement of the project outcome and explain why they are necessary

Government needs to continue identifying tourism as a national priority and the BTB needs to continue focusing on promoting Belize as an overnight destination. Archaeological sites need to be continuously maintained and preserved and tourism training for providers of tourism ancillary services such as tour guiding, artisans etc needs to be sustained. Political stability will also be critical for sustained progress.

**2.1.2.5. Pilot question No. 1 (Optional) Distribution of the project benefits within the target population**

Given that the investment in archaeological sites was concentrated in the north and west of the country and they remain the sites that are accessible to cruise tourist may indicate some inequity. Tourism activity in the southern part of the country particularly Toledo lags behind the rest of the country.

**2.1.2.6. Pilot question No. 2 – (Optional) Adverse effects of the project**

There is no identifiable adverse effect of the project. However, there is always the possible threat of stress on the existing sites due to increased visitation and limited carrying capacity. As a part of the project preparation process, an Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) was conducted recommending the establishment of archaeological site carrying capacity and a zoning strategy. This was a response to environmental concerns, resource condition and character and the need for mitigation and stabilization. A comprehensive EIA for the Caracol Road Upgrading was also conducted. It outlined recommendations relating to: land use patterns, cultural resources, noise levels, and risk, health and safety issues.

#### **2.1.2.7. Pilot question No. 3 – (Optional) Contribution to the achievement of national / sectoral targets**

##### **Country Strategy**

This operation came as a result of the Blackstone Report that outlined the development of the archaeological sites in Belize and their potential for economic growth and development. Tourism is one of the pillars of GOB's strategy for economic growth, foreign exchange earnings, and increased employment opportunities.

#### **2.1.2.8. Pilot question No. 4 – (Optional) Project changes in response to changes in the context / environment**

While there may have been no major changes in policy, there was a significant change in the environment. The exponential growth in cruise tourism was not anticipated by the project so much so that all indicators associated with site visitation, field staff employment and growth in cruise arrival were dramatically surpassed. Additionally, the fiscal difficulties faced by government towards the end of the project caused some delays in the attainment of some outputs as the size and capacity of the executing agency was significantly compromised.

#### **2.1.2.9. Recalculation of the Internal Rate of Return (IRR)** If the project included ex-ante a calculation of the project's expected rate of return, what was the expected rate of return and what is the observed rate of return?

The EIRR for the IDB/ICDF-funded sections was 15.9% (13.3 to 18.6% in the sensitivity analysis. The calculation of the EIRR was based solely on vehicle operating cost savings. It did not include benefits arising from access to social services, socio-economic integration, tourism development and increased agricultural production.

#### **2.1.2.10. Recalculation of other cost analysis indicators** If the project included ex-ante any other economic evaluation estimates (cost-effectiveness, efficiency-efficiency and/or cost-benefit analysis), what was the expected indicator and what is the observed indicator?

N/A

#### **2.1.2.11. Rating of project effectiveness in terms of the development objective (DO)** Bearing in mind the analysis in sections 2.1.1. and 2.1.2., rate the attainment of the project development effectiveness in terms of the development objective.

☒ Very Effective (VE) ☐ Effective (E) ☐ Marginally Effective (ME) ☐ Ineffective (I)

(Explain your rating)

All the development indicators set for this operation were either met or surpassed. Earnings from tourism have increased, employment both nationally and directly at the sites is increasing and government revenue from the industry is growing according to expectations.

## 2.2. IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS

### 2.2.1. Project's performance measurement

**2.2.1.1. Elements for monitoring and evaluation** In a scale from 1 to 4 assess the quality of the following elements required for project monitoring and evaluation:

1. Problem analysis	Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
2. Intervention Strategy in response to the problem (rationale)	Low ← [ ] [2] [ ] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
3. Identification of expected outcomes and impacts	Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
4. Identification of expected outputs	Low ← [ ] [ ] [ ] [4] → High [ ] N/A
5. Indicators of expected outcomes	Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
6. Indicators of expected outputs	Low ← [ ] [ ] [ ] [4] → High [ ] N/A
7. Baseline for expected outcomes	Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
8. Baseline for expected outputs	Low ← [ ] [ ] [ ] [4] → High [ ] N/A
9. Assumptions from outputs to outcomes	Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
10. Assignment of responsibilities for data collection	Low ← [ ] [2] [ ] [ ] → High [ ] N/A
11. Project implementation plan	Low ← [ ] [ ] [ ] [4] → High [ ] N/A
12. Procurement plan	Low ← [ ] [2] [ ] [ ] → High [ ] N/A

**2.2.1.2. Critical factors analysis in the project design** Considering the elements assessed above, describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a major influence (negatively or positively) in the project performance measurement.

#### Positive factors

The archaeological consolidation and development component proceeded extremely well due to the knowledge, experience and enthusiasm of the PEU that was staffed mainly by archaeologists

as well as the level of autonomy that was given the unit. Appropriate interventions by the Bank and the Ministry of tourism helped to steer the project execution in the right direction at times.

The existence of a realistic project implementation plan and the availability of baseline for expected outcome assisted significantly in measuring performance.

### **Negative factors**

The absence of a mechanism such as a project steering committee resulted in overemphasis on the archeological component of the operation at the expense of the tourism element and infrastructure. An engineer was not a part of the PEU and thus the delays and relative unimportance attached to the Caracol road section and infrastructure sub-projects by the PEU.

BTB was never a significant participant in this project yet the data necessary to assess the outcome had to be sourced from the Board. The Ministry's and the Bank at times oversight of the project was a bit too lax. This resulted in overspending on consolidation of pyramids.

**2.2.1.3. Lessons learned for the project design (adopted measures).** Describe in a concise way what measures were adopted to improve the project design in those aspects related with performance measurement.

Ministry of Tourism and IOA were not in the position to collect and analyze critical data to determine the performance of the project and the involvement of BTB in the project was non-existent or minimal. Regular meetings between the Bank and the executing unit resulted in improved mechanism to incorporate performance data in the progress report. Additionally, joint periodic revision of the project's performance data ensured that they remain realistic throughout the execution period.

Cross pre-conditions involving activities that are mutually exclusive and independent should be avoided.

**2.2.1.4. Lessons learned for the project design (alternative measures).** Based on your experience in this project, describe in a concise way what alternative measures do you recommend to improve project performance measurement in the design of future operations.

Title: Availability of resources for data collection

Conclusion: The timely collection and use of data to measure performance will be improved if resources are provided as a separate cost item in the budget, to be met from the financing.

Explanation: No resources were provided for the collection of performance data at the outcome level. Many executing agencies are not yet fully sensitized to the need to put additional resources from their own budgets for data collection. Especially where counterpart resources are limited, they are unable to give the necessary priority to data collection and analysis. In this case, it would have been important to give BTB a pivotal role in project execution oversight and the provision of data. Ensure that a project steering committee comprised of key stakeholders is part of the management structure of the operation.

**2.2.1.5. Available information during project implementation** In a scale from 1 to 4 rate the level and quality of compliance of the following tasks that should be undertaken by the Executing Agency to obtain the necessary information for project performance measurement:

1. Establishment of processes and mechanisms for data gathering and data analysis (sources of data, responsibilities, periodicity and characteristics of the information) Low ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ → High ☐ N/A
2. Data gathering for the outcomes base line Low ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ → High ☐ N/A
3. Data gathering for the outputs base line Low ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ → High ☐ N/A
4. Data gathering, data analysis and reporting of information on available resources (inputs) and undertaking activities Low ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ → High ☐ N/A
5. Data gathering, data analysis and reporting of information on project outputs and their contribution to the achievement of expected outcomes Low ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ → High ☐ N/A
6. Data gathering, data analysis and reporting of information on project outcomes and impacts and their contribution to sectoral and national goals Low ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ → High ☐ N/A

**2.2.1.6. Critical factors analysis for performance measurement during implementation** Considering the elements assessed above, describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a major influence (negatively or positively) in the project performance measurement during its implementation.

There was overemphasis by the PEU on the output and less attention given the outcome and such was the preoccupation with the archaeological pyramids at the expense of tourism infrastructure on the sites.

The presence of a project implementation plan helped to ensure that there is constant revision of the relationship between activities and outputs under the operation.

For the output level, the normal reporting requirements of the loan, as well as the supervision contract, include provisions for periodic progress measurement and reporting.

**2.2.1.7. Lessons learned during project implementation (adopted measures)** Describe in a concise way what measures were adopted to obtain the required information (in the expected quantity and quality) for the project performance measurement.

During meetings between the PEU and the Bank, decisions were always taken to increase and enhance the quality of performance indicators in the progress reports. Retrofitting of the PPMR was conducted jointly with the PEU so as to agree on the requisite data and the source.

**2.2.1.8. Lessons learned for the implementation (alternative measures).** Based on your experience in this project, describe in a concise way what alternative measures do you recommend to improve project performance measurement in the implementation of future operations.

Institutions and stakeholders directly involved should be made aware of the goals of the Project and a project steering committee comprising entities such as the BTB, the IOA, MOW and the Ministry of Finance should be formed precisely for execution oversight.

There should be a more balanced representation by discipline within the PEU and should have included a tourism expert and an engineer since much of the work relating to tourist visitors centers and the Caracol access road required engineering design and supervision. The outcome indicators were related to tourism and not necessarily to archaeology.

### **2.2.2. Factors affecting project implementation (according to PPMR)**

#### **2.2.3. Analysis of factors affecting output delivery and outcome achievement**

**2.2.3.1. Identification of negative factors to produce outputs** Describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a negative influence on the implementation of project components and the delivery of products (outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness, and explain why.

(i) The poor budgetary control mechanism within the PEU and the lack of sufficient execution oversight provided by the executing agency resulted in over expenditure on the archaeological component of the project at the expense of visitors' centers and community development sub-projects.

(ii) Macro-economic and fiscal difficulties in the latter part of project execution forced GOB to defer and slowdown the execution of some of the planned activities under the operation namely visitors' centers and parking areas. This also had the effect of reducing the size and capacity of the PEU to effectively meet some of the contractual obligations under the operation.

(iii) The long learning curve experience with regards to transactions with the ICDF co-financing resulted in some delays in the execution of the Caracol road access sub-project. This eventually had the effect of extending the disbursement deadline for the operation.

**2.2.3.2. Identification of positive factors to produce outputs** Describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a positive influence on the implementation of project components and the delivery of products (outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness, and explain why.

(i) The presence of a reliable supply of dedicated workers for the excavation and consolidation of the archaeological monuments resulted in the timely completion of this sub-component of the project.

(ii) The ability of the PEU to respond to changes in the tourism environment and circumstances by making the necessary modification to works on the infrastructure component e.g. the water system and access stairs at Xunantunich.



(iii) The resourcefulness of the engineer from MOW in the face of budget constraints resulted in the efficient execution of the Caracol road access that allowed savings to incorporate additional

**2.2.3.3. Identification of negative factors for the achievement of outcomes** Describe what were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a negative influence on the achievement of project outcomes, and explain why.

(i) Visitors' centers in Caracol and Altun Ha were not completed though well advanced. To embrace the full potential of increased cruise visitors it is important that these be completed.

(ii) While some sub-projects aimed at enhancing community participation and development were implemented the numbers did not reflect what was originally planned in the project. Over expenditure on pyramids resulted in less than sufficient resources for community development activities.

**2.2.3.4. Identification of positive factors for the achievement of outcomes** Describe what were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a positive influence on the achievement of project outcomes, and explain why.

(i) BTB's aggressive marketing and the relatively stable sociopolitical environment of the country contributed to increased tourist arrivals.

(ii) The complementary investment in tourism training under the parallel MIF operation enhanced the marketability of potential employees in the tourism sector.

## **2.2.4. Analysis of project management and lessons learned**

**2.2.4.1. Project Management Analysis** Identify and analyze the effectiveness of adopted measures to address the problems and capitalize on the opportunities related with the critical factor analysis and explain how they were put into practice.

(i) In order to ameliorate the impact of limited local resources and the problems relating to the implementation of the remaining sub-projects under basic infrastructure, Ministry of Tourism contracted the services of an engineer for the final two years of execution. This improved the quality and timeliness of the infrastructure outputs.

(ii) In response to the difficulties associated with disbursement requests from ICDF financing, the Bank and the executing agency requested a meeting with ICDF representatives. The resulting visit by the ICDF specialist improved the execution process for the Caracol access road.

(iii) The original proposals submitted by the PEU for the community development activities were not all consistent with the objectives of this sub-component. Subsequent discussions resulted in more appropriate submissions.

**2.2.4.2. Lessons learned on project management** Based on your experience with this project, and considering the effectiveness of adopted measures mentioned in the project management analysis, describe in a concise way what alternative measures you recommend to address the problems that may arise during the implementation of similar project.

Ensure that a multi-sectoral approach to management and coordination of the project is adopted by establishing a project steering committee and/or a wider representation on the PEU. The executing agency should play the major role in decision-making regarding the execution of the project instead of giving the PEU excessive leverage.

The Bank's project team should provide continuous execution oversight throughout the life of the project ensuring that the necessary technical support is available to the COF sector specialist particularly in instances where decisions with potentially major impacts on outputs are proposed.

### Rating project implementation (IP)

**2.2.4.3. Rating project implementation** Rate the project implementation considering the above management analysis and the obtained project outputs in the expected quantity and quality, and reasonable timeframe, and reasonable costs.

☐ Very Satisfactory (VS) ☒ Satisfactory (S) ☐ Unsatisfactory (U) ☐ Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

(Explain your rating)

Most outputs and all outcomes have been substantially achieved.

## 2.3. SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

### SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

#### 2.3.1. Institutional / Organizational Strengthening (IOS)

**2.3.1.1. Areas strengthened or improved by the project** Identify those institutional/ organizational areas strengthened or improved by the project, directly or indirectly, and indicate the level of influence (national, regional, local).

Institutional / Organizational Area				Level		
	Yes	No	N/A	National	Regional	Local
1. Legal and regulatory framework	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Procedures, manuals, operational guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Capacity						

3.1. Top management capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2. Middle management capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3. Information Systems capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4. Performance measurement (M&E capacity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.5. Client-oriented service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Functional and organizational structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Budgeting / Financial management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Intra- / Inter-sectoral coordination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Intra - / Inter-organizational coordination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Staffing / Human resources development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Procurement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Self-evaluation, auditing & accountability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2.3.1.2. IOS achieved by the project in the country** Describe the project's most significant contributions (maximum 3) to the institutional / organizational strengthening in the country.

(i) The nine person years of training provided to the IOA have increased the capacity of the institution to conduct other projects of this kind and to provide new and interesting information to the public, tour guides and operators, teachers students and researchers both at home and abroad.

(ii) It has also enabled the IOA to become more sustainable and to contribute to the autonomy of NICH through the increase in revenues from site visits.

(iii) It has strengthened artisans and entrepreneurs adjacent to the sites by providing training in the making of replicas of Mayan artifacts and other income-generating activities.

**2.3.1.3. IOS achieved by the project in the Executing Agency** Describe the project's most significant contributions (maximum 3) to the institutional / organizational strengthening in the Executing Agency. Compare the current situation with the situation before the project.

(i) The Executing Agency at the inception of the project included as a department the IOA. This department received nine person years of training and thus has increased its capacity to conduct other projects of this kind and to provide new and interesting information to the public, tour guides and operators, teachers, students and researchers both at home and abroad. The very activity of excavation and consolidation of pyramids provided new and interesting information as well skill development to the institute. Before this project, excavation of sites was conducted

mainly by experts from abroad and the dissemination of information was done by foreign researchers.

(ii) The preparation and existence now of an Archeology Development Plan for Belize.

**2.3.1.4. Rating the project's contribution to the Institutional / Organizational** Rate the extent in which the project contributed to the institutional / organizational strengthening in the Borrowing Country and the Executing Agency.

☐ Very Relevant (VR)                      ☒ Relevant (R)                      ☐ Partially Relevant (PR)                      ☐ Irrelevant (I)

As has been explained above, this operation included a component specifically for institutional and organizational strengthening of the IOA.

## 2.3.2. Project sustainability

**2.3.2.1. Scope of project sustainability** Through consultation with the Executing Agency, define what actions, services and/or outputs should be sustained, and for how long, to ensure the sustainability of the expected project's outcomes and future impacts.

(i) The physical infrastructure on the archaeological sites should be maintained in a serviceable condition, since this is critical to the continued availability of satisfactory tourism services. These include the archaeological monuments, visitor centers, bathroom facilities, parking lots and signage.

(ii) It is important that all access roads be maintained particularly those leading to Xunantunich and Caracol

**2.3.2.2. Basis for sustainability analysis** In a 1 to 4 scale estimate the probability of the existence during the first year after project completion (and the termination of IDB financing) of the following institutional and organizational settings, arrangements or resources in the country, needed to sustain the products, actions, services, outputs, outcomes and future impacts initiated by the project and described in 2.3.2.1.

Institutional / Organizational arrangements and resources	Probability
1. Executing Agency top management's support	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2. Policy, legal and regulatory framework	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3. Preparedness and organizational capacity	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4. Inter-organizational coordination	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
5. Availability of financial resources	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6. Key personnel	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
7. Financial resources for infrastructure maintenance	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

8. Project beneficiaries' support

Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A

9. National government support

Low ← [ ] [ ] [3] [ ] → High [ ] N/A

### **2.3.2.3. Root-cause analysis of factors affecting negatively the project sustainability**

Considering the estimates described in the previous question and the factors, which may affect the project sustainability, identify concrete reasons why the future impacts, immediate outcomes, products, actions and/or services described in 2.3.2.1. may not be sustainable, and explain why.

The allocation of resources for infrastructure maintenance has not been a priority, especially given the fiscal constraints at the national level. If the requisite financial and human resources are not made available to IOA and MOW in a timely fashion then the sustainability of the impacts of products and services provided for under this operation may be compromised.

### **2.3.2.4. Root-cause analysis of factors contributing positively to the project sustainability**

Considering the previous analysis, and the factors, which may affect the project sustainability, identify concrete reasons why the future impacts, immediate outcomes, products, actions and/or services described in 2.3.2.1 may be sustainable.

The IOA that is now a part of NICH has ownership and responsibility for the assets relating to the monuments and basic infrastructure invested on the sites. IOA has almost doubled its revenue contribution to NICH through increased site entrance fees and collections. It may be able to allocate portions of this revenue increase to maintenance of sites. Additionally, tourism continues to be a national priority for economic growth and thus the prudence for continued preservation of investment made in the national heritage.

The MOW is responsible for maintenance of all national roads and highways. Since this road also serves some other tourism and farming destinations along the route there is strong justification for continued maintenance.

**2.3.2.5. Lessons learned on sustainability (adopted measures)** Based on your experience with this project, and considering the previous analysis, describe in a concise way what measures adopted in the project design and/or implementation were effective towards project sustainability, and explain how they were put into practice.

The raise in fees collected for entrance to archaeological parks and the autonomy provided to IOA to manage and administer the funds collected and to use such for the benefit of the Institute (NICH) was a measure incorporated in the project design.

MOW insisted on paving as much of the (difficult to maintain) area of the Caracol road as was financially possible. This decision was taken during implementation.

With regard to environmental sustainability, the executing agency adopted measures at Xunantunich and Altun Ha to control the flow of visitors to and from sites. In the case of Xunantunich, an exit stairway was constructed on the main pyramid on the opposite side of the entrance stairs thus allowing constant movement and preventing overcrowding. At Altun Ha, the

access road was widened simultaneously with the implementation of visitor control process limiting the number of visitors on site at any given time.

**2.3.2.6. Lessons learned on sustainability (alternative measures)** Based on your experience with this project, and considering the previous analysis, describe in a concise way what alternative measures you recommend during project design and/or implementation to improve the sustainability of future projects.

Ensure that structural designs for buildings and other civil works incorporate low cost maintenance features and that annual maintenance reports by MOW and IOA be prepared and submitted to the Bank up to at least five years after project execution.

**2.3.2.7. Sustainability action plan** Considering the previous analysis, describe the significant actions that the Borrower and/or the IDB should undertake during the next year to ensure sustainability of future impacts, outcomes, products, actions and/ or services identified in 2.3.2.1.

The Bank should closely monitor the national budget and the NICH's budget to ascertain the level of commitment made by GOB and the Institute for the maintenance of archaeological, basic infrastructure and access road physical assets and the continued training of the Institute's personnel.

**2.3.2.8. Rating project sustainability (S)** Considering the previous analysis and the probability of implementing the Sustainability Action Plan, rate the probability for the sustainability of this project during the next three (3) years:

☐ Very Probable (VP)                      ☒ Probable (P)                      ☐ Low Probability (LP)                      ☐ Improbable (I)

While heritage tourism continues to be a national priority, the physical assets will be maintained in a suitable condition only if resources are provided by the Ministry of Finance for the road and by NICH for archaeological sites. Recent trends in budgetary allocations suggest a low probability that resources will be provided to sustain an acceptable level of service for secondary and feeder roads. If this occurs, as unpaved surfaces, it will result in their deterioration to an unsuitable condition within approximately three years.

## 2.4. Executing Agency Performance

**2.4.1. Executing Agency performance in key areas** Assess the Executing Agency Performance (including co-executors and the Project Executing /Coordinating Unit) in the following areas:

1. Participation and quality of its contributions during project design	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2. Organization for project execution (Executing/Coordinating Unit's staff, infrastructure, coordination, communication, etc.)	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3. Coordination and integration of the project Executing/Coordinating Unit with the Executing Agency	Low ← <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

4. Establishing a monitoring and results framework (baseline data, systems, procedures, data analysis and reporting, etc.)	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
5. Executing/Coordinating Unit's management and decision-making capacity	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6. Timeliness in the fulfillment of the IDB's policies, procedures and contractual clauses	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
7. Financial management (securing counterpart resources, disbursements, quality and timeliness of AFS, etc.)	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
8. Timeliness and efficiency for procurement of goods, works and consulting services	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
9. Executing Agency top-level management's leadership, ownership and support to project execution	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
10. Concrete actions to secure project sustainability	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

#### 2.4.2. Lessons learned on organization and management of the PCU (adopted measures)

Based on your experience with this project, identify what adopted measures regarding the structure, organization and processes of the Coordination/Executing Unit, as well as the personnel profiles, were effective and analyze how they were put into practice.

In order to ameliorate the impact of limited resources and the problems relating to the implementation of the remaining sub-projects under basic infrastructure, the Ministry of Tourism contracted the services of an engineer for the final two years of execution. This improved the quality and timeliness of the infrastructure outputs. Also of significant benefit was the decision of MOW to dedicate a full-time engineer to the Caracol road.

#### 2.4.3. Lessons learned on organization and management of the PCU (alternative measures)

Considering the above assessment, if in a future project you would have the opportunity to re-design the structure, organization and processes of the Coordination/ Executing Unit, as well as the personnel profiles, describe the alternative measures you would propose to improve their performance.

Project execution could have benefited from the formation of a more multi-sectoral project management team or even a project steering committee that could harness the effective participation of stakeholders in the tourism industry and communities adjacent to the archaeological sites. This would have adopted a more balanced approach to execution rendering the level of importance to visitor infrastructure and community development that the project originally anticipated.

**2.4.4. Rating the Executing Agency performance (EAP)** Based on the above performance assessment made in this section, on the achieved project results, as well as on the Executing Agency's efficiency during project implementation, rate the Executing Agency performance:

☐ Very Satisfactory (VS)      ☐ Satisfactory (S)      ☒ Unsatisfactory (U)      ☐ Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

(Explain your rating)

➔ It is necessary and important to make the distinction here. The executing agency was the Ministry of Tourism and the executing unit comprised archaeologists who had closer relations with the DOA and later IOA. The role of the executing agency in the first three years of the project was limited to signing disbursement request and intervening only when there was a perceived discrepancy in activities and/or budgetary allocations. The continuous oversight that should have been shared between the agency and the Bank was inadequate to prevent over expenditure on some activities and under spending on others.

## 2.5. Foundations for the Ex-post Evaluation

**2.5.1. Provisions for ex-post evaluation** Establish if this operation requires an ex-post evaluation according to the Loan Agreement. If applicable, provide the following information about the provisions taken (see agreements among the IDB, Borrower and Executing Agency in the Project Completion Workshop Aide Memoire):

- |                                                                              |                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Does the Loan Agreement require an ex-post evaluation for this operation? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                                                                          |
| 2. What will be its schedule?                                                | Start up date: 1/9/2005<br>Submission date: 18/10/2005                                                                                       |
| 3. Who are the responsible parties for carrying out the evaluation?          | <input type="checkbox"/> IDB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Borrower                                                                    |
| 4. What is the estimate of the costs involved?                               | <b>USD\$10,000.00</b>                                                                                                                        |
| 5. How the cost involved will be financed?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> IDB loan's funds<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Borrower financing<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other source |

If financing comes from other source, please specify:

➔ A final evaluation has been conducted and was financed from the proceeds of the loan as provision was made for it in the financing budget.

**2.5.2 Analysis of the ex post evaluation capacity** Review the capacity of the Executing Agency, as well as its infrastructure and information systems to collect, review and report information on the achievement of future outcomes and impacts, and the main negative and positive factors that may affect this evaluation.

N/A

## 2.6. Other lessons learned and recommendations

### 2.6.1. Additional lessons learned and recommendations



In addition to the lessons learned and recommendations recorded in previous sections of this report, this section offers users the opportunity to state the lessons learned and recommendation that may be helpful in the design and/or implementation of new projects

- (i) The project management has determined that meeting the pre-conditions for first disbursement prior to the signing of the loan agreement avoids execution delays.
- (ii) Earlier and more intense coordination with the co-financiers (ICDF) should have been initiated through a pre-determined process and a focal point to minimize the delay in the flow of funds particularly to the access road component
- (iii) Conduct rapid assessment or feasibility analyses of critical aspects of the project before execution e.g. the unavailability of water at Caracol and the implication for infrastructure budget for that site.
- (iv) All efforts should be made to keep the PEU in operation and intact until the completion of all activities under the project.
- (v) A civil engineer should have been an integral part of the PEU from project inception to completion given the degree of civil works requirement of the infrastructure and access road component of the project.
- (vi) In circumstances where new policies (such as the unprecedented growth in cruise visitors) threaten to create adverse impacts on the sustainability of the project's expected outputs, immediate steps should be taken by the Bank and the executing agency to introduce wherever necessary and realistic measures to mitigate against such impacts.

## **Annexes**

**VISITORS TO MAYA SITES**  
**1992 - 2005**

**Table 3.1**

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
<b>ALTUN HA</b>	6,930	9,196	9,860	10,626	12,763	18,200	17,626	19,826	23,279	26,599	58,175	96,861	112,113	94,274
<b>CAHAL PECH</b>	6,243	6,437	8,920	10,377	10,202	10,978	10,944	7,259	8,004	6,002	13,089	15,492	18,558	17,860
<b>LAMANA'</b>	3,464	6,968	7,936	10,336	10,687	13,193	19,720	17,740	21,499	18,274	19,524	25,085	30,455	32,843
<b>XUNANTUNICH</b>	7,361	8,781	12,613	14,291	17,745	22,866	23,818	27,614	28,911	31,697	40,311	44,874	51,173	51,039
<b>CARACOL</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,609	5,916	3,972	4,579	4,705	4,769	6,151	8,652	12,117	16,769
<b>SANTA RITA</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	887	1,476	1,705	1,712	1,206	934	closed	closed	closed	closed
<b>NIM LI PUNIT</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,486	1,301	1,089	1,552	1,917	2,451	2,755	2,231	3,469	3,258	3,253
<b>LUBAANTUN</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,663	1,246	1,889	2,271	2,491	2,447	2,952	2,014	3,570	3,690	3,608
<b>CERROS</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	468	362	274	672	502	494	1,993	2,091
<b>EL PILAR</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	453	1,593	3,014	5,101	1,309	1,005	1,254	566
<b>BARTON CREEK</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,760	9,371	7,149
<b>TUNICHIL</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,941	7,066	6,062
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23,998</b>	<b>31,382</b>	<b>39,329</b>	<b>48,779</b>	<b>60,440</b>	<b>75,607</b>	<b>82,529</b>	<b>85,093</b>	<b>95,790</b>	<b>99,755</b>	<b>143,306</b>	<b>203,203</b>	<b>251,048</b>	<b>235,514</b>

# **PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT – PCR**

## **Executing Agency Memorandum**

**Submitted to the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)**

**(Date of submission)**

**The ability of this report to reflect project results at completion, foster sustainability of projects benefits and capitalize on lessons learned depends on the participation of the Borrowing Institution, the Executing Agencies, and the project beneficiaries in the preparation of this report.**

**Therefore, your contribution as author of the Executing Agency Memorandum will be of great value to the extent that project implementation knowledge and experience, the analysis of information on results and the views of beneficiaries can be transmitted objectively and independently.**

#### **Instructions to complete the Memorandum**

To complete this memorandum, please bear in mind the following recommendations:

- ❑ Do not forget to complete the cover page and the box regarding basic data by providing the necessary information.
- ❑ It is very important that you review the PCR Guidelines that will be provided to you by the Bank's Country Office, in particular, the technical annex on "Practical guidelines to prepare the PCR". This annex includes guidance, tips and practical examples to assist you in completing the required information. Remember that the questions for the Bank and for the Executing Agency, as well as the appropriate numbering are the same, except for the first digit (for the Bank they start with number 2, i.e. 2.1.1.1., while for the executing Agency they start with number 3, i.e. 3.1.1.1.)
- ❑ Answer the questions in a concise manner. The desired length for each response is 10 lines maximum. Please do not exceed 15 lines per response. Should you need to attach important relevant information documenting project results, please use Annex 5, "Documental Annex". This optional material can be sent to the Bank's Country Office as a separate document (see PCR guidelines for a description of this annex).
- ❑ **Note:** This template takes a few minutes to save your information due to the buttons available to mark responses.

### Project Basic Data

Project Name: Tourism Development Project (T.D.P)

Project Number: 1250 /OC-BL

Loan Number /TC:

Executing Agency: Tourism Development Project, Ministry of Tourism

Name of the Author of the Executing Agency Memorandum: Dr. ALLAN MOORE

Position in the Executing Agency: Project Director

Position in the Executing Agency:

## 3. EXECUTING AGENCY MEMORANDUM

### 3.1 RESULTS ANALYSIS (OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES AND FUTURE IMPACTS)

**3.1.1 Outputs attained.** Description of project outputs by components and analysis of factors that influenced project execution.

- A) Site and access improvement
  - 1) Archaeology sites
    - a) Basic infrastructure
    - b) Consolidation/excavation and development
    - c) Site information
  - 2) Archaeology Development Plan
  - 3) Access road and final design
- B) Institutional Strengthening
  - 1) Community Development
  - 2) Strengthening of the DOA (now IOA)

Factors influenced the project execution a) logistics of working in extremely remote areas, b) timeliness in getting disbursements especially from the ICDF funds and efforts in fulfilling preconditions for first draw down after commencement of project, c) deviation due to natural disasters (hurricanes), d) changes in IDB's personnel – sector specialist, financial specialist, and country rep., e) oversight of key activities that needed to be put in place for the operational function and success of the project, f) changes in GOB's executive arm, g) the inability to maintain a full complement of the PEU staff to the completion of the project, h) the limitation of funds due to the fact that the budget was prepared two years prior to implementation of project, no inflationary adjustments, increased in cost of supplies and materials, exponential growth/cost, and expansion in excavation/consolidation on sites for visitors to see more and I) the fulfillment of precondition of one activity was contingent on all others, (infrastructure activities at all other sites could not commence until the siting plans for Cracol was prepared), j) the Bank's understanding, assistance and flexibility in responding to dynamics and changes of the Project ( without affecting the final goals and objectives) .

**3.1.1.1. Output Indicators Analysis.** Complete the indicators of the outputs attained in this component using the same output indicators retrieved from the PPMR. Compare the indicators in the Achieved and Planned columns. If there is a significant gap between them, briefly explain the factors responsible for the gap.

PLANNED	ACHIEVED
Component 1. Archaeology – site development and access improvement	Component 1
(i) Basic infrastructure – the development/establishment of basic facilities and amenities such as lavatories, research building, monument building, visitor’s centers, storage, picnic areas, water systems, parking and signage at the sites of Caracol (primary), Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai and Altun Ha (secondary sites) and Cerros, El Pilar, Santa Rita, Nim Li Punit and Lubaantun (tertiary sites)	<p>(i) All activities proposed under the basic infrastructure of the Loan Agreement (and much more activities and upgrades of some original activities proposed) for the site of Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, and Lamanai were completed far and beyond what was expected. (Additional activities not mentioned in the plans were the setting up of complete water systems for the lavatories and other use and the connection electrical power of for Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai and Altun Ha, additional bathroom, gift shops, picnic area/pavilions, ticket booths, interconnecting walk ways, paving of access road (rather than merely upgrading) and many other. For more detail see Final Report.</p> <p>(ii) At Caracol 95% of the activities proposed are completed. Activities to be completed are the dressing (tiling) of the floor of monument building and the completion of the parking area – compact and surfacing. (In the interim the original parking areas at Caracol has been improved and is in use at the moment. This area is at the moment quite adequate for the volume of traffics to that site. Despite several encouraging but unsuccessful attempts to source (drill for) water at Caracol as part of the infrastructure component, a cistern (water storage/catchment) was constructed and a water and storage reservoir was erected. Water is presently being pumped from the cistern to the reservoir and gravity fed to service the bathroom and other area.</p> <p>(iii) At Altun Ha an approximate 98% of the infrastructure activities are completed. The only remaining activity is the completion of the visitor’s center, which is about 90% completed.</p> <p>(iv) Although the Project had initially planned (in consultation with the Bank), not to carryout any works on the tertiary level sites because the activities scheduled were minimal and would have not been cost effective, the Project was forced to engage in major rehabilitation (cleaning up and repairs to damaged archaeological structures, bathrooms and visitor’s center buildings) at the site of Lubaantun and Nim Li Punit after three major tropical storms. The Project likewise assisted in upgrading the small visitor’s center at the site of Cerros and establishment of information panels and showcases for the center. It</p>

<p>(ii) Consolidation, Excavation and Development - This sub-component basically itemizes structure at each site (Caracol, Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai, and Altun Ha) that are to be excavated, consolidated and developed as per loan agreement.</p>	<p>also engaged, even after the decision not to involve tertiary sites, in the clearing of vegetation from the dock to the site and along the coastline (See Semestral Report No.7). Directional and information wooden signs were also erected at the site to inform and direct tourist to the site. Similarly, wooden signs were erected to inform and direct visitors at all sites impacted by the Project. The IOA is presently preparing a comprehensive signage program for all sites presently opened to the public. These should be in place by October of 2005.</p> <p>All activities under this component is completed and fulfilled. In addition there were many more activities/areas that were cleared, excavated and consolidated including numerous structures, masks and freize. These were done to further enhance the attraction for visitors to the sites. It should be noted that the original plans (under the Leventhal study done in 1998) was to have development activities impacting on three different levels of sites – the primary, the secondary and the tertiary. Based on the level of activities and development that were anticipated on the tertiary sites, which were minimal and would have exhausted most of its funds on setting up and logistics, leaving even less to do actual work, it was decided by both the Bank and the GOB that the resources of the tertiary sites be but to the activities of the secondary sites (Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai, and Altun Ha) so as to further enhance and expand these sites that are heavily visited by tourist. Although Caracol is designated as the primary site, statistics shows that the secondary sites mentioned above carry the bulk of visitors to archaeological sites (apart from some cave sites such as Barton Creek, Nohochen Cave (Jaguar Paw) and Actun Tunichilmiknal which got some assistance from the TDP).</p> <p>(ii) All sites being impacted by the Project were cleared of thick vegetations to expose hidden structures affording the visitors to appreciate the architecture of the buildings in much more detail. Signs were erected to identify structures and provide information and directions to other parts of the site and to trails. Trails were established to guide visitors to other areas of interest on the site offering them more to see, while disbursing groups from congestions. The trails offer an alternative to archaeology as special interest group/s can enjoy the serenity, the ecology, flora and fauna of the jungle.</p> <p>Of interest to note is that the total number of visitors to archaeological sites alone has increased dramatically to over 350% from 95,790 in 2000 when the project started to 345,744 in 2004 when the Project was culminating.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------





	<p>tendering procedures for contracts for the civil works and the production of progress and final reports.</p> <p>The road was divided into three sections and contracting firms were hired; one for each of the sections.</p> <p>All sections of the road was completed as per agreement with the paving of portions along the major villages, the improvement of surface, the widening of some areas, cutting down of hills/elevations, the straightening of portions of the road, the installation of culverts and drains and the erection of road guards in some critical areas. The most critical portion of the road was the portion from Caracol site to the junction with the Millenario Road (an approximate 16 km). This area was virtually a mud rut trail that was passable only with four-wheel drive vehicles during the dry. Considering the level of investment at Caracol and the long-term implications of an upgraded road, it was decided that it would be more cost efficient and effective to have this section paved. The pavement of the road with line dividers, installation of culverts and drains and the erection of guardrails were completed in September of 2004. (see MOW's interim and final report for more detail)</p> <p>Coordination – Monthly meetings were held among the road contractors, the Ministry of Works, members of the Department of Archaeology, and members of the Tourism Development Project. The WSP consultant chaired these meetings. When it was necessary members from the Forestry and the Environment Departments were invited to join the meetings.</p>
<b>Component 2 Institutional Strengthening</b>	<b>Component 2</b>
<p>Community Development – This subcomponent was to ensure that communities, especially those located next to the areas of impacts derives some benefit from the development. It is to provide opportunities for community empowerment and sustainability to harness potential resource as a result of the development by the Project.</p>	<p>Originally, approval was granted for eleven sub-project activities under the Community Development sub-component. After revision by the Bank, five were accepted. These have all been completed and includes erection of a large vendors complex with fourteen vendor's stalls at the entrance to Xunantunich, one at Cahal Pech, three at Lamanai, assistance in the construction of an art and craft center for the women's group at Indian Church and training to various communities in the production of arts and crafts by making replicas of original artifacts for sale to tourist. The Project also concentrated in providing lecture series to provide tour guides with new and update information and to train locals interested in becoming tour guides especially those that are next to sites that were being impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Apart from those mentioned above the Project assisted in the upgrading of the Cerros Visitor's Center and the provision information panels and showcases. It also refurbished and upgraded the Sarteneja airstrip.</p> <p>Other project activities done outside the resources of the Loan includes the repairs to the dock at Caye Caulker, the construction of an asphalted parking area at Altun Ha and the upgrading and asphaltting of the</p>

Strengthening the DOA/IOA – This sub- component was to provide training to members of staff of the DOA so that they are equipped to adequately handle the improvement and development of the Project upon completion.	<p>dirt road from the old Northern Highway junction through the village of Rockstone Pond and to the site of Altun Ha.</p> <p>Three member of staff of the IOA have completed formal studies at overseas universities, one in Natural Resources, Recreational/Tourism Studies at Colorado University for two years (Master's Degree), another has completed studies for three years in Conservation Management in the UK (Batchelor's Degree), another has completed studies in Heritage Conservation Studies in the UK for two years (Master's Degree). The fourth member of staff has successfully completed her two years studies in Biology/ecology at the University College of Belize (Bachelors Degree). The Project has successfully completed a total of nine years of formal training under the Institutional Strengthening Component. In addition, and in conjunction with the Taiwan Embassy one field person from the project was selected to do a six month course in high quality ceramic production. Not only did he successfully completed the course but his report reflected excellency.</p> <p>As a result of the Institutional Strengthening program the IOA has now expanded into a parks and management unit and a policy and planning unit.</p>
Component n	Component n
(Insert here the output indicators of the PPMR)	(Using the same indicators, insert here the achievements for this component)

**3.1.1.2. Identification of achieved outputs.** Bearing in mind the output indicators in the different project components, describe briefly the key outputs achieved by this project

- 1 The archaeological sites have been excavated, consolidated and developed – result, more visitors to the parks, the hiring of more wardens and park personnel at the parks.
- 2 Most of the infrastructure and amenities has been completed – in some case some has been added – result, more tourist friendly. The access roads to these sites have improved tremendously.
- 3 The institutional strengthening has provided better and more qualified staff – result, the establishment of two new units in Parks and Policy.
- 4 Out put achieved but were never planned – consolidation of exposed features such as masks, stucco freize etc. sewer and septic systems for bathrooms, water systems, running of power etc. (see final report for details)

n

**3.1.2. Project outcomes and impacts.** Description of the project results in relation with its Development Objective (DO or purpose in the project logical framework)

More public/Private sector involvement in tourism related sector

The objective of the Project was to increase employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings and government revenue from tourism in a manner that is environmentally and archaeologically sustainable. The Project also aimed at increasing tourism arrivals to benefit the public and private sector organizations and communities involved in tourism. Today, one out of every four Belizeans is employed directly or indirectly in tourism or its sub-sector industry. Our projected number of tourist to Belize has surpassed the anticipated threshold in year one and has continued to climb to almost four time the amount of visitors in 2002 having an obvious impact on the foreign exchange earnings and revenue earnings for Belize. With the upward surge in tourism and the demand for services came more participation and benefit in public and private sector organizations, Community have been more involved and have been trained and assisted to play a more proactive role in the tourism sub-sector.

**3.1.2.1. Outcome Indicators Analysis.** Complete the indicators of achievement in the development objective (outcome) using the same outcome indicators retrieved from the PPMR (key performance indicators). Compare the Achieved and Planned outcome indicators. If there is a significant gap between them, briefly explain the factors responsible for the gap.

PLANNED	ACHIEVED
To increase employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings and government revenue from tourism in a manner that is environmentally and archaeologically sustainable.	<p>1.) Employment in the tourism sector grew at an annual rate of 6.5% beginning 2002.</p> <p>2.) The reported total amount of arrivals to Belize in 2004 is 1, 349,417 a 25.5% increase as compared to 2003, and a 69% increase in total arrivals in 2002 as compared to 2001 (446,410 visitors/tourist). This phenomenal growth was primarily due to the burst in the cruise ship sector.</p> <p>3.) In 2004 there was a 28.4% increase in visits to archaeological sites, following a 65.6% increase in 2003 and a 63.0% increase in 2002.</p> <p>4.) Field staff at archaeological sites increased by 20% since 2000.</p> <p>5.) Foreign Exchange from tourism expenditure grows at an annual average rate of a least 6% since 2002.</p> <p>6.) Government Revenues increased due to:</p> <p>9 % increase in occupancy tax from 7% in 2003 and 2004;</p> <p>40% increase from cruise ship fee; and</p> <p>100% increase from park entrance fee for secondary sites (Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, Lamanai and Altun Ha) and 50% increase on fees to Primary site (Caracol)</p> <p>7.) Tourism accounts for approximately 16% of the country's GDP.</p>
To increase tourism arrival to benefit the public and private sector organizations and communities involved in tourism.	<p>1.) The annual growth rate of tourist and cruise ship passengers visiting Belize is at least 83%, and the annual growth of visitors to Maya sites is at least 52% over 2000 - 2004.</p> <p>2.) An annual increase of about growth rate about 60% of cruise visitors visit Maya Sites over 2000 –2004</p> <p>3.) An annual increase of at least 15% in numbers of entrepreneurs about participating in micro-enterprise activities in tourism sector over 2000 -2004</p>

Factor responsible for the difference (if any):



**3.1.2.2. Identification of intermediate outcomes and initial impacts.** Considering the achieved project outputs, to the extent possible, identify intermediate outcomes and initial impacts achieved by this project so far.

➔Intermediate outcome and initial impact:

The integration of the Project Execution Unit with the Institute of Archaeology to plan and execute development activities of the project. This has resulted in a smoother operation of how the development of these sites should progress.

Development of sites and site facilities and the reorganization of entrance to better serve and manage the flow of visitors entering the site, on the site and collection of entrance fees. Continuous improvement on Access road to sites has shown encouraging signs and has indeed attracted more people to the site (eg. Xunantunich).

Members of staff of the Institute of Archaeology received overseas training under the institutional strengthening component which allowed for greater administration and management capability of the IOA. Increase trainings to tour guides and operators and dissemination in information and provide opportunities for small entrepreneur.

BTB continuous aggressive marketing campaign – Over all results of the intermediate outcome are more developed sites, increase in information and research, and increase in employments and visitation to sites and foreign exchange.

**3.1.2.3. Identification of future outcomes and impacts.** Considering the achieved outputs, identify expected future outcomes and impacts and describe how these outputs are critical towards the achievement of outcomes and impacts

➔Future outcome as a result of outputs are increase in visitation, research, student investments, increase in employments opportunities, increase in transportation, airstrip, hotels, restaurants and general expansion in services. These would all ultimately have critical impact on the goals of the Project in creating employment opportunities, increase public/private sector participation, increase in visitation and increase in foreign exchange earnings from tourism.

**3.1.2.4. Analysis of assumptions (from outputs to outcomes).** Identify the necessary conditions towards the achievement of the project outcome and explain why they are necessary.

➔For this to occur we must assume that:

The Institute of Archaeology remains as an intact entity/Institution/Department with jurisdiction over the administration, management and development of the sites.

Maintain the present level of trained staff with plans to factor in future training and Improve the numbers and level of staff on field staff.

Ensure the atmosphere for tourist visitation to the country and sites remain favorable and that private sectors and communities juxtaposing archaeological sites impacted by the Project continues to have involvement opportunities as a result of the increase in tourism.

BTB must continue with its aggressive marketing and promotional efforts.

Ensure maintenance and upgrading of access roads to the sites.

IOA to ensure the continued level of maintenance to the development made by the Project (and to further improve such) at sites impacted by the Project.

**3.1.2.5. Pilot question No. 1 – (Under construction). This question is optional for operations with a PCR due date prior to February 1, 2005. Before this date, answers to this question will only be required for those operations selected in a pilot group for completing the full version of the PCR.** Have you observed inequalities in the access of the target population to project benefits based on gender, location, ethnicity, rural/urban sector, income group or other reason? If so, what are the reasons behind them?

➔No, there were no intended inequalities in the access of the target population where gender, location, ethnicity etc were concerned because the Project initiated its activities with an opened mind. In addition most of these sites are in remote or in rural communities where most, if not all, the population are homogeneous. The Project further encouraged the participation women in almost all fields of employment and provided training for several women's group for them to take opportunity of the development and tourism. Apart from training in arts and crafts the Project provided gift shops for the sale of their products. Furthermore most of the archaeologists on the PEU has professional training in Anthropology which gives training in understanding people, communities and societies especially when dealing with issues of rural vis-à-vis urban, gender, ethnicity, customs and traditions etc.

**3.1.2.6. Pilot question No. 2 – (Under construction). This question is optional for operations with a PCR due date prior to February 1, 2005. Before this date, answers to this question will only be required for those operations selected in a pilot group for completing the full version of the PCR.** Were any unintended adverse effects produced by this project to the population or to the environment? If so, what measures have been taken?

➔No, there were no adverse effects produced by the Project to the population or the environment as we worked closely with other departments to insure that these were addressed and regulations were adhered to. We worked very closely with departments such as, Archaeology, the Forestry Department, the Department of the Environment, and several other Government and private sector agencies and with local populations. Because populations in these communities are generally homogeneous there are very little conflicts, if any. Furthermore the project encouraged "women empowerment" by affording trainings and workshops in arts and craft production and marketing (gift shop sales) to several women's group. In addition the Project proper employed both genders in its work force from supervisory level to manual work. (In total the Project hired approximately 20 to 25 females to work in non-traditional field – a break through when considering that excavation and fieldworks were traditionally for males).

**3.1.2.7. Pilot question No. 3 – (Under construction). This question is optional for operations with a PCR due date prior to February 1, 2005. Before this date, answers to this question will only be required for those operations selected in a pilot group for completing the full version of the PCR.** The results of the project have most likely contributed to the attainment either of the established goals of the Borrowing Country's sectoral or national strategies or to the indicators of the Bank's Country Strategy. If this has been the case, specify which objective or result indicator the project has contributed towards and explain how and to what extent it does.

➔The result of the project has established the goals of the borrowing county's national strategy in tourism as it has set out to accomplish what was initiated since 1994 under the Black Stone Report. The Black Stone Report was an evaluation and strategy study for the development of tourism and its sub-sectors. Under this report allowance was given for the investment in and development of one of Belize's premier site, Caracol to showcase Belize's Archaeological Tourism and to compete with other Mundo Maya countries that have major archaeological sites for tourism. Today Belize has surpassed that initial idea and has developed several

archaeological sites for tourism including the premier and hallmark site of Belize Caracol. Not only were the sites being developed under this Project but it included the development of auxiliaries or other entities such as the infrastructure/amenities, the institutional strengthening, community development and access improvement to these sites so that the visitor physically see the investment and development. All these complimenting and adding value to a more sustainable “site development” plans that is well accepted and appreciated by both Belizeans and foreigners. Furthermore as a result of innovative consolidation practice in the field, Belize has now introduced (and mastered) the practice of replicating major finds (such as masks and other stucco) through fiberglass replica for exhibit while covering back and preserving the originals.

**3.1.2.8. Pilot question No. 4 – (Under construction). This question is optional for operations with a PCR due date prior to February 1, 2005. Before this date, answers to this question will only be required for those operations selected in a pilot group for completing the full version of the PCR.** Where there any significant changes in the project context and in sectoral/national policies and/or development strategies? If so, explain how the project was adapted to respond to these changes.

→ Changes that were sectoral and national in context were those changes in the Government executive level (at Cabinet level) and their fiscal adjustment which froze funds passing through the system. This caused delay and uncertainties with decision making. Fiscal adjustments between Government and Bank also cause delay in Project activities. The fact that the Project Executive Unit was trimmed down in the third year of the Project has created a void in the Unit and as a result has caused deficiency in the control and management of field operations and has affected the decisions of the PEU’s decision and ability to produce deliverables (in the main reports) on time.

**3.1.2.9. Recalculation of the Internal Rate of Return (IRR).** If the project included ex-ante a calculation of the project's expected rate of return, what was the expected rate of return and what is the observed rate of return?

→ N/A

**3.1.2.10. Recalculation of other cost analysis indicators.** If the project included ex-ante any other economic evaluation estimates (cost-effectiveness, efficiency-efficiency and/or cost-benefit analysis), what was the expected indicator and what is the observed indicator?

→ N/A

**3.1.2.11. Rating of project effectiveness in terms of the development objective (DO).** Bearing in mind the analysis in sections 2.1.1. and 2.1.2., rate the project effectiveness in terms of attainment of the development objective.

x



Effective (E)



Marginally Effective (ME)



Ineffective (I)

Explain your rating

→ Despite some ups and downs in the project execution, as is expected in any project, the TDP has ultimately attained its major objectives and goals as are set out in the Agreement.

## 3.2. IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS

### 3.2.1. Project's performance measurement

**3.2.1.1. Elements for monitoring and evaluation.** In a scale from 1 a 4 assess the quality of the following elements required for project monitoring and evaluation:

1. Problem analysis	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2. Intervention Strategy in response to the problem (rationale)	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3. Identification of expected outcomes and impacts	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4. Identification of expected outputs	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
5. Indicators of expected outcomes	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6. Indicators of expected outputs	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
7. Baseline for expected outcomes	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
8. Baseline for expected outputs	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
9. Assumptions from outputs to outcomes	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
10. Assignment of responsibilities for data collection	Low < x <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
11. Project implementation plan	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
12. Procurement plan	Low < <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

**3.2.1.2. Critical factors analysis in the project design.** Considering the elements assessed above, describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a major influence (negatively or positively) in the project performance measurement

→ Project implementation plan

Baseline for expected outcome

Assignment of responsibility for data collection

**3.2.1.3. Lessons learned for the project design (adopted measures).** Describe in a concise way what measures were adopted to improve the project design in those aspects related with performance measurement

→ Because of the dynamics of the tourism the Project had to be susceptible and flexible respond to rapid and frequent changes in the industry. Cognizant of this the Bank and the Project Execution Unit met frequently to

to discuss changes, amendments, additions and alterations to the project design especially for the infrastructure component where physical designs had to be constantly altered to meet the ever growing numbers of tourist to the site and its facilities. Apart from having to adjust to the exponential growth and cost, the Project had to make some adjustments to the initial implementation plan to cut some activities (the tertiary sites) from the archaeology component that would have not been cost effective and by adding activities that were deemed necessary and crucial for the success of the project objective (water systems, electricity, septic systems etc.).

**3.2.1.4. Lessons learned for the project design (alternative measures).** Based on your experience in this project, describe in a concise way what alternative measures you recommend to improve project performance measurement in the design of future operations

➔ Recommendation for future Project:

Project study should be more cautious so as not to omit or have over sighted crucial elements/activities needed for the successful completion of the Project.

Efforts should be made to implement project immediately after study and costing have been finalized. When time (years) are spent between study and implementation the budget no longer show a true reflection on the cost because of cost of living, inflation, and a general increase in prices. (In the TDP Project the final study and budget was prepared in 1998 with implementation in August of 2000 and no cost adjustments made).

Preconditions prior to first disbursements must also satisfied/met before implementation (if possible) as much time is taken from “actual work” in meeting preconditions.

Preconditions of one activity should not have bearing or affect other activities. In other words other activities in the same component should not be contingent on the fulfillment of one activity as in the case of the siting plans for Caracol. Infrastructure works on all other sites could not commence until the preconditions for the siting plans for Caracol were completed, even though they were independent of each other. – This resulted in extreme delay in the commencement of the infrastructure component of the Project.

Commitment should be made to retain full complement of staff for the duration and completion of the Project unless it is deemed otherwise due to illness, disciplinary action or such related circumstances.

Unlike other Projects, archaeological related projects are different in that it operates in extreme conditions in remote and sometime inaccessible areas of the country. Because of the logistics involved, consideration for flexibility is crucial and must be allowed for the Project to implement its activities and accomplish its goals.

**3.2.1.5. Available information during project implementation.** In a scale from 1 to 4 rate the level and quality of compliance of the following tasks that should be undertaken by the Executing Agency to obtain the necessary information for project performance measurement:

- |                                                                                                                                                                           |     |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |      |                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|
| 1. Establishment of processes and mechanisms for data gathering and data analysis (sources of data, responsibilities, periodicity and characteristics of the information) | Low | ← | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | High | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 2. Data gathering for the outcomes base line                                                                                                                              | Low | ← | <input type="checkbox"/> | x                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | High | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 3. Data gathering for the outputs base line                                                                                                                               | Low | ← | <input type="checkbox"/> | x                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | High | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 4. Data gathering, data analysis and reporting of information on available resources (inputs) and undertaking activities                                                  | Low | ← | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | High | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 5. Data gathering, data analysis and reporting of information on project outputs and their contribution to the achievement of expected outcomes                           | Low | ← | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | High | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |



**3.2.1.6. Critical factors analysis for performance measurement during implementation.** Considering the elements assessed above, describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) that had a major influence (negatively or positively) in the project performance measurement during its implementation

→ No formal attempts were made or no entities were made responsible for the collection and analyzing of data for the Project. Data achieved for the project were from institutions like the BTB, the IOA, the Belize Central Bank and others that are normally responsible for the collection and analysis of these data for their institution and national use.

**3.2.1.7. Lessons learned during project implementation (adopted measures).** Describe in a concise way what measures were adopted to obtain the required information (in the expected quantity and quality) for the project performance measurement

→ Information for Project performance measure were gathered from the sources mentioned above – the BTB, IOA, Central Bank and others (BTIA, Min of Finance, Central Statistics)

**3.2.1.8. Lessons learned for the implementation (alternative measures).** Based on your experience in this project, describe in a concise way what alternative measures you recommend to improve project performance measurement in the implementation of future operations

→ Institutions and stake holders directly involved should be made aware of the goals of the Project and a committee should be formed precisely for the collection of data (which would also serve as a bench marker) which can be used to measure the success of the Project as it moves towards its final objectives and goals.

Entities such as the BTB, the IOA, and the Ministry of Finance should be abreast of the importance of these information to the Project and Belize at large and should there make extra efforts in collecting these data or in future the Project should hire its own data collection personnel/ unit so that data would be readily accessible to the Project (and others) for assessment.

## **2.2.2. Factors affecting project implementation (according to PPMR)**

(As useful information to answer section 3.2.3. it is advisable to review the factors affecting project implementation recorded in the PPMR. The Bank's Country Office should be able to provide this information).

## **3.2.3. Analysis of critical factors affecting project success**

### **Critical factors affecting output delivery**

**3.2.3.1. Identification of negative factors to produce outputs.** Describe which were the main factors (maximum 3) which affected negatively the implementation of project components and the delivery of products (outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness, and explain why

→ 1) The timeliness and bureaucracy of receiving disbursement payments especially from the ICDF portion of the Loan.

2) The lack of forecasting and planning for the unprecedented growth in tourism arrival to Belize. Plans had to

be constantly modified to accommodate the continuous growth.

3) The tendency of the Ministry to try an engage in activities that were out side of the realm of the components or Agreement and cost overrun.

**3.2.3.2. Identification of positive factors to produce outputs.** Describe which were the main factors (maximum 3), which contributed positively to the implementation of project components and the delivery of products (outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness, and explain why

➔The constant consultation and assistance with and from the Bank and the Ministry of Tourism.

The flexibility and understanding of the Bank to initiate or adapt changes recommended and justified for the timely implementation and success of the Project.

The ability to work with a very hard working, dedicated and understanding office and field staff who in many case worked long hours under extreme camping conditions.

### **Critical factors for achieving project outcomes**

**3.2.3.3. Identification of negative factors for the achievement of outcomes.** Describe which were, the main factors (maximum 3), which affected negatively the achievement of project outcomes and explain why

➔Late start in addressing the infrastructure component which came partly as a result of having to do (at late notice), siting plans for Caracol.

The monitoring of the financial aspects could have been tighter controlled.

The fragmentation of the PEU

These would have afforded the project more time and funds to complete the approximate 2% activities remained to fully complete all activities of the Agreement.

**3.2.3.4. Identification of positive factors for the achievement of outcomes.** Describe which were the main factors (maximum 3), which contributed positively to the achievement of project outcomes and explain why

➔The enabling environment and attitude of the Bank and the ministry to support and assist the Project in carrying out it activities.

BTB aggressive Marketing and the relatively sociopolitical stability of the country.

Major increase in tourism arrivals.

### **3.2.4. Analysis of project management and lessons learned**

**3.2.4.1. Project Management Analysis.** Identify and analyze the effectiveness of adopted measures to address the problems and capitalize on the opportunities related with the critical factor analysis and explain how they were put into practice

➔A major adaptive measure was to sensitize people on what we were doing as there are always skeptics especially in archaeology and the archaeological finds. To this end we made our works opened to the public especially those working in the sub-sectors of the tourism industry and offer lectures and trainings to make it inclusive.

The Project also capitalize on the fact that there are experts in consolidation in the neighboring country of Guatemala who worked at the site of Tikal and who were later employed with the Project affording many Belizeans the chance to learn consolidation. Belizeans who had mastered the techniques are not responsible for the maintenance and further consolidation of structures and other architectural features.

**3.2.4.2. Lessons learned on project management.** Based on your experience with this project, and considering the effectiveness of adopted measures mentioned in the project management analysis describe in a concise way what alternative measures you recommend to address the problems that may arise during the implementation of similar future projects

➔For archaeological related projects it need a fair bit of flexibility as there are many unpredictabilities and logistics involved.

### Rating project implementation (IP)

**3.2.4.3. Rating project implementation.** Rate the project implementation considering the above management analysis and the obtained project outputs in the expected quantity and quality, reasonable timeframe, and reasonable costs

☒ Very Satisfactory (VS)                      x                      ☐ Unsatisfactory (U)                      ☐ Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

Explain your rating

➔Had it not been for the latter period of the Project (one year prior to completion) the Project could have been rated as highly satisfactory but in the end with the dismantling of the PEU management the Project faced some difficulties in completing its activities.

## 3.3. SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

### 3.3.1. Institutional / Organizational Strengthening (IOS)

**3.3.1.1. Areas strengthened or improved by the project.** Identify those institutional / organizational areas strengthened or improved by the project, directly or indirectly, and indicate the level of influence (national, regional, local).

Institutional / Organizational Area				Level		
	Yes	No	N/A	National	Regional	Local
1. Legal and regulatory framework	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Procedures, manuals, operational guidelines	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Capacity						
3.1. Top management capacity	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2. Middle management capacity	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x
3.3. Information Systems capacity	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4. Performance measurement (M&E capacity)	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	x	x
3.5. Client-oriented service	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Functional and organizational structure	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x
5. Planning	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x
6. Budgeting / Financial management	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Intra- / Inter-sectoral coordination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Intra - / Inter-organizational coordination	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Staffing / Human resources development	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Procurement	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Self-evaluation, auditing & accountability	x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3.3.1.2. IOS achieved by the project in the country.** Describe the project's most significant contributions (maximum 3) to the institutional / organizational strengthening in the country.

➔ Providing 3 highly trained (with formal degrees) staff for the management and administration of the Institute of Archaeology. The formulation of two new units within the IOA, parks management and policy units as a result. (Institutional Strengthening)

Providing one trained personnel who now directs the Museum of Belize.

The Project has created the atmosphere for the IOA to collect revenue from entrance fees for the sustainability and management and those sites developed by the Project. The IOA has also “inherited” all fix assets of the Project along with developed archaeological sites ready for the booming tourism activity.

Archaeological Strategy Plan which will guide and assist the activities of IOA for the 10 to 20 years

**3.3.1.3. IOS achieved by the project in the Executing Agency.** Describe the project's most significant contributions (maximum 3) to the institutional / organizational strengthening in the Executing Agency. Compare the current situation with the situation before the project.

➔ The Project has provided training that increased the level of administration and management of the Institute of Archaeology so that they can address the cultural resource management of Belize in a more proficient and professional way.

The Project has never had a strategy study that guides its activities for the short, medium to long term. The Executing Unit has insured that a strategy study was conducted and completed for the IOA.

### 3.3.1.4. Rating the project's contributions to IOS

x

☒ Relevant (R)

☐ Partially Relevant (PR)

☐ Irrelevant (I)

Explain your rating

→ The IOA has never seen or expressed such large level of development and improvement in archaeology/archaeological tourism during its pre-project period. It has also experienced a higher level of institutional strengthening for members of its senior staff. The IOA today is respected and is looked upon in the international circles as being one of the best organized and proactive in the region.

### 3.3.2. Project Sustainability

**3.3.2.1. Scope of project sustainability.** Through consultation with the Executing Agency, define what actions, services and/or outputs should be sustained, and for how long, to ensure the sustainability of the expected project's outcomes and future impacts.

→ Since the Project has made major physical developments in excavation, consolidation and infrastructure these will have to be maintained if the sites are to contribute to the overall goal and objectives of the project in attracting visitors, creating employment and earn foreign exchange for Belize. The institutional strengthening component will also have to be updated and continuous.

**3.3.2.2. Basis for sustainability analysis.** In a 1 to 4 scale estimate the probability of the existence during the first year after project completion (and the termination of Bank financing) of the following institutional and organizational settings, arrangements or resources in the country, needed to sustain the products, actions, services, outputs, outcomes and future impacts initiated by the project and described in 3.3.2.1.

Institutional / Organizational arrangements and resources	Probability
1. Executing Agency top management's support	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2. Policy, legal and regulatory framework	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3. Preparedness and organizational capacity	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4. Inter-organizational coordination	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
5. Availability of financial resources	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6. Key personnel	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
7. Financial resources for infrastructure maintenance	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x <input type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
8. Project beneficiaries' support	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
9. National government support	Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

**3.3.2.3. Root-cause analysis of factors affecting negatively the project sustainability.** Considering the estimates described in the previous question and the factors, which may affect the

project sustainability, identify concrete reasons why the future impacts, immediate outcomes, products, actions and/or services described in 3.3.2.1. may not be sustainable, and explain why.

→The estimates would not be sustainable if the tourism industry fails, bringing less people to Belize therefore having less foreign income to continue sustaining the development efforts that the Project has implemented. This is vital as it would have a snow ball effects on entire industry and economy of Belize.

**3.3.2.4. Root-cause analysis of factors contributing positively to the project sustainability.** Considering the previous analysis, and the factors, which may affect the project sustainability, identify concrete reasons why the future impacts, immediate outcomes, products, actions and/or services described in 3.3.2.1. may be sustainable, and explain why.

→For a continued positive sustainability Belize must ensure that the tourism industry continues to strive so the foreign exchange continues to be earned for the maintenance and further development of the sites. This then means that the climate for tourism and tourism investments will have to be continuously favorable and that the Belize Tourism Board continues to be aggressive in its marketing, regulations and development of the industry.

During the pre-project period, the then Department of Archaeology received an annual budget, irrespective of its contribution to the national coffers, from which to maintain and operate its affairs. As a result of the Project and which was agreed upon in the Loan Agreement, the IOA (through NICH) collects and manages the finances received from entrance fees and use such fees for the upkeep, maintenance and further development of the archaeological Parks. Note also that entrance fee to archaeological parks has increased almost by 100%. The pre-project budget of the IOA was approximately \$600,000.00. Today the approximate fiscal budget for the IOA is over a million dollars.

**3.3.2.5. Lessons learned on sustainability (adopted measures).** Based on your experience with this project, and considering the previous analysis, describe in a concise way what measures adopted in the project design and/or implementation were effective towards project sustainability, and explain how they were put into practice.

→The raise in fees collected for entrance to archaeological parks.

The ability for the Institute of Archaeology to manage and administrate its own funds collected and to use such for the benefit of the Institute.

**3.3.2.6. Lessons learned on sustainability (alternative measures).** Based on your experience with this project, and considering the previous analysis, describe in a concise way what alternative measures you recommend during project design and/or implementation to improve the sustainability of future projects

→That further efforts be made to review the site entrance fee with a view to increase and to insist that the IOA has complete and autonomous control over the funds it collect from entrance fees rather than dividing such among other entities of NICH.

**3.3.2.7. Sustainability action plan.** Considering the previous analysis, describe the significant actions that the Borrowing Country and/or the Bank should undertake during the next year to ensure sustainability of future impacts, outcomes, products, actions and/ or services identified in 3.3.2.1.

→Continued enabling atmosphere for the tourism industry.

Continued aggressive marketing strategy and promotional efforts.

Continued public/private and tourism industry stakeholder collaboration and cooperation.

**3.3.2.8. Rating project sustainability.** Considering the previous analysis and the probability of implementing the Sustainability Action Plan, rate the probability for the sustainability of this project during the next three (3) years:

x

☒ Probable (P)

☐ Low Probability (LP)

☐ Improbable (I)

Explain your rating

➔The tourism industry is very strong and indications are that visitation to Belize continues to rise.

## 3.4. BANK PERFORMANCE

**3.4.1. Bank Performance in critical areas.** Evaluate the Bank's performance in the following areas:

- |                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Extent to which the Bank facilitated the project design in a participatory manner with the Borrower and Executing Agency                          | Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            |
| 2. Technical assistance and training as well as consistent follow-up provided so that the Executing Agency follow the Bank's policies and procedures | Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            |
| 3. Technical assistance and training provided to the Executing Agency to improve project management                                                  | Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 4. Benefits of the Bank's supervision and assistance to improve project management                                                                   | Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            |
| 5. Timeliness in the Bank's response to the needs of the Executing Agency during project implementation                                              | Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 6. Bank flexibility to respond to emergencies during project implementation                                                                          | Low ← <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> x → High <input type="checkbox"/> N/A            |

**3.4.2. Lessons Learned for the organization and operation of the PEU (measures adopted).** Based on the project experience, identify the measures adopted in terms of structure, organization and processes of the Project Coordination/Executing Unit, as well as its interaction with the Bank, and the lessons learned. How were those measures put into practice?

➔In hindsight the PEU should have had a stronger finance unit. Perhaps our finance officer was overwhelmed as that officer as well as other officers was not confined to just their individual choirs – we were all taken up with whatever needed to be done. This seemed like a good and workable approach, and I still think it is however; perhaps the finance areas could have been aided and strengthened. Consideration should also be given that the Finance officer came from a private sector background and had to be dealing with a highbred of both the Bank's and the GOB's financial system.

Because the Project involved the construction and erections of many buildings and structures, the PEU should have employed an architect engineer from the start of the Project so that he/she would have had input in the planning of the infrastructure facilities.

**3.4.3. Lessons Learned for the organization and operation of the PEU (alternative measures).** Based on the project experience during its implementation, what do you suggest that the Bank do in future operations in order to support the improvement of the structure, organization and processes of the Project Coordination/Executing Unit and its interaction with the Bank in future operations?

➔ Ensure that the PEU is composed of a full cross-section of professionals so that all aspects of components and activities are adequately addressed.

Confine activities of the Project Executing Unit to implementation and execution.

Ensure that the PEU maintain its full compliment of staff in the Unit for the complete duration of the Project. If possible to try and maintain the existing staff throughout the life of the Project for the sake of continuity and institutional memory – the latter is extremely crucial especially during the final stage of the Project. New members of staff will not be able to assist with institutional memory.

**3.4.4. Ratings of Bank Performance.** Based on 3.4.1., rate the Bank's performance in monitoring the project, taking into account the experience of the Borrower and your experience as Executing Agency during project design and implementation.

☒ Very Satisfactory (VS)                      x                      ☐ Unsatisfactory (U)                      ☐ Very Unsatisfactory (VI)

Explain your rating

➔ At the start of the project and for almost the four year life cycle of the project both the Bank and the Tourism Development Project developed a very cordial and understanding relationship and modus operandi. In the end however, and just when the project needed such relationship in preparing and wrapping up its activities almost all staff members at the Bank were changed, for one reason or the other. This scenario was like starting a new as the rapport and relationship had to be built with not much time on hand to do that.

## 3.5. FOUNDATIONS FOR THE EX-POST EVALUATION

**3.5.1. Provisions for ex-post evaluation.** Establish if this operation requires an ex-post evaluation according to the Loan Agreement. If applicable, provide the following information about the provisions taken (see agreements among the Bank, Borrower and Executing Agency in the Project Completion Workshop Aide Memoire):

Does the Loan Agreement require an ex-post evaluation for this operation?

☒ No  
x

What will be its schedule?

Start up date: 12 DD 8 MM 05 YY  
Submission date: DD MM YY

Who are the responsible parties for carrying out the evaluation?

x ☐ Borrower

What is the estimate of the costs involved?

USD\$ [ 8,000.00 ]

How the cost involved will be financed?

☐ IDB Resources                      x  
☐ Other Source

If financing comes from other source, please specify:

**3.5.2. Analysis of the ex post evaluation capacity.** Review the capacity of the Executing Agency, as



well as its infrastructure and information systems to collect, review and report information on the achievement of future outcomes and impacts, and the main negative and positive factors that may affect this evaluation.

➔ Prior to the implementation of, or during the initial stage of the project, the PEU should have been informed that data collection and statistics would have been a crucial component in the evaluation of the project. Entities could have been formed or existing ones could have been charged with this task so that data could have been pooled in one archive for easy access when needed. Other units such as BTB, IOA and others however collect data, as part of their normal activity. Since this was not done in no formal or organized way by the Project, it is fare enough to say that the capacity of the Executing Agency to collect data, review and report information was weak and unsustainable. Data used by the Project are from the source mentioned above.

### **3.6. OTHER LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In addition to the lessons learned and recommendations recorded in previous sections of this report, this section offers users the opportunity to state the lessons learned and recommendation that may be helpful in the design and/or implementation of new projects.

➔

## Annexes 1A - IB

### Annex 1A - Source of Financing (Amounts in millions of US Dollars)

Investment Category	Original				Actual				IDB
	IDB	Borrower	Other Sources	Total	IDB	Borrower	Other Sources	Total	
	(1)	ICDF (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<b>1. S &amp; AI</b>	7,408	2,400		9,808					
<b>2. IS</b>	400			400					
<b>3. PEU</b>	900	160		1,060					
<b>4. F C</b>	1,700	155		1,855					
<b>5. E&amp;A</b>	100	30		130					
<b>6. C</b>	499	255		747					
<b>TOTAL</b>	11,000	3,000		14,000					

Source of information:

From LMS: Columns (1) and (5)

To be completed by the author of the Executing Agency Memorandum: Columns (2) (3) (6) (7) (10) (11)

Legend: S & AI (Site and Access Improvement), IS (Institutional Strengthening), PEU (Project Execution Unit),

FC (Financial Cost), E&A (Evaluation and Audit), C (Contingency)

NB: Since there are no Financial Officer presently on hand with the Project, but we have asked the previous one to come in as soon as he returns from India, at which time information/figures for the actual will be provided and forwarded.

### Annex 1B - Schedule of Investments (Amounts in millions of US Dollars)

Years	Original	Actual	Gap

	<b>IDB</b> (1)	<b>Borrower</b> (2)	<b>Other</b> (3)	<b>Total</b> (4)	<b>IDB</b> (5)	<b>Borrower</b> (6)	<b>Other</b> (7)	<b>Total</b> (8)	<b>(8)-(4)</b> (9)
<b>1</b>									
<b>2</b>									
<b>3</b>									
<b>4</b>									
<b>5</b>									
<b>6</b>									
<b>7</b>									
<b>N</b>									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

Source of information:

To be completed by the author of the Executing Agency Memorandum: Columns (2), (3), (6), (7)

Central Bank of Belize

Total stay-over tourist expenditure (Foreign exchange from tourism expenditure) \$BZ mn

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
<b>Total stay-over tourist expenditure</b>	<b>\$217.80</b>	<b>\$193.80</b>	<b>\$173.40</b>	<b>\$182.10</b>	<b>\$191.20</b>
<b>Cruise expenditure</b>	<b>\$4.5</b>	<b>\$3.7</b>	<b>\$24.2</b>	<b>\$43.4</b>	<b>\$65.0</b>

**VISITORS TO MAYA SITES  
1992 - 2005**

**Table 3.1**

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
<b>ALTUN HA</b>	6,930	9,196	9,860	10,626	12,763	18,200	17,626	19,826	23,279	26,599	58,175	96,861	112,113	94,274
<b>CAHAL PECH</b>	6,243	6,437	8,920	10,377	10,202	10,978	10,944	7,259	8,004	6,002	13,089	15,492	18,558	17,860
<b>LAMANAI</b>	3,464	6,968	7,936	10,336	10,687	13,193	19,720	17,740	21,499	18,274	19,524	25,085	30,455	32,843
<b>XUNANTUNICH</b>	7,361	8,781	12,613	14,291	17,745	22,866	23,818	27,614	28,911	31,697	40,311	44,874	51,173	51,039
<b>CARACOL</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,609	5,916	3,972	4,579	4,705	4,769	6,151	8,652	12,117	16,769

## **PROJECT COMPLETION MEETING**

### **Tourism Development Project (1250/OC-BL) IDB Conference Room, August 12, 2005**

#### **Attendees**

Project Executing Unit:	Dr. Allan Moore, Project Director Dr. Jaime Awe, Project Archaeologist
Executing Agency, Ministry of Tourism	Deon Pascascio, Chief Executive Officer
Ministry of Works	Lennox Bradley, Road Engineer
Inter-American Development Bank	Harold Arzu, Multi-Sectoral Specialist Luis Acosta, Financial Specialist

#### **Objectives:**

The objectives of the meeting were to review the accomplishments under the projects, assess the activities that were still pending and potential action to ensure completion; to outline a plan of action to resolve pending financial issues; review other contractual obligations under the loan agreement; and to outline the lessons learnt and assess the new challenges for the sustainability of the investment made in the tourism sector.

#### **Discussions**

There was general agreement that the project results were satisfactory and that it achieved over ninety percent of outputs originally planned. There was also consensus that with better execution perhaps more could have been achieved.

#### ***Component One***

Included in this component were archaeological site access and improvement comprising of the provision of basic infrastructure such as visitors centers, lavatories, parking areas, picnic areas and site information. It also focused on the design and construction of the access road to Caracol, and the preparation of an Archaeology Development Plan.

Except for the completion of the visitor center at Altun Ha and the monument building at Caracol, all planned activities in this component were successfully completed. More work than originally planned was done on the excavation and consolidation of monuments particularly at the Caracol site. Additional works were also done at Xunantunich including the upgrading of a one-mile access road and the construction of a double access stairway to the main pyramid to accommodate an unanticipated flow of visitors to the site. These unplanned activities were carried out at the expense of the visitor center and lavatories at Altun Ha and the monument

building at Caracol. The project was also unable to find a sustainable source of water for Caracol despite intense efforts at drilling. The lavatories are currently served by water captured from the rain and/or ferried in during the dry season.

The Caracol Access Road was successfully completed despite initial difficulties and other challenges near to completion. Ministry of Works (MOW) was able to put additional resources from its own budget and the Ministry of Finance in collaboration with the hydroelectric project did the same resulting in more than planned investment on the road. Difficulties in accessing the ICDF counterpart funds early in the project resulted in some delays. Fiscal problems for the government during the latter part of the project also created challenges for the MOW and the contractors.

### ***Component Two***

This component focused on the provision of institutional strengthening to the Department of Archaeology (DOA) and community development activities to engage local entrepreneurs and artisans adjacent to and on the periphery of the archaeological sites. At least nine person years of university training was delivered to the DOA now renamed the Institute of Archaeology (IOA) under the National Institute of Culture and History (NICH). The area of training ranged from Natural Resources and Recreational/Tourism to Heritage Conservation and Conservation Management. It was agreed that this training has definitely upgraded the operational capacity of the IOA and has developed local capacity for project management in the area of conservation and heritage tourism, a field previously dominated by foreign researchers and experts..

The result of the community development initiatives was less than satisfactory. Of the initial target of ten sub-projects in this area only five were executed. The Bank recorded its disappointment in the level of priority given to this sub-component by the PEU. The PEU in return informed the meeting that while community development initiatives might not proceed as planned, the PEU throughout the project execution period interspersed general activities with unplanned community development work such as training of artisans and provision of new information and materials to local tour guides.

### ***Project Execution***

The Bank indicated that while overall execution was generally satisfactory, the PEU focused its attention and in some cases the resources of the operation disproportionately on the excavation and consolidation of the archaeological monuments at the expense of basic infrastructure such as visitor centers, lavatories and community development activities. The Bank felt that this was somewhat a reflection of the professional composition of the PEU (two archaeologists and an accountant). The tourism aspects of the project appeared to have been overwhelmed by the archaeological aspects.

There was consensus that perhaps a multi-sectoral approach to management and coordination of the project should have been adopted by establishing a project steering committee and/or a wider stakeholder representation on the PEU. The executing agency should have played the major role in decision-making regarding the execution of the project instead of giving the PEU excessive

leverage and relative autonomy. The Ministry of Tourism recorded its disappointment at the type of close relationship that developed between the Bank and the PEU which the Ministry felt undermined its ability to effectively control decision-making.

The MOW felt that a smoother relationship between his Ministry and the PEU would have been preferable. Decisions regarding the disbursement of resources to facilitate the road design consultants were not always efficient. The Bank indicated that it appeared that given the significance of the civil works component of the operation, an engineer should have been an integral part of the PEU. There was general agreement on this observation.

The Bank felt that the project management failed to apply the necessary budgetary controls critical for effective financial management. The fact that many of the activities were conducted in-house by the PEU meant that there was a higher than normal use of the revolving fund and therefore less direct control by the Bank.

The Ministry of Tourism due to fiscal constraints and over expenditure on component one of the project, decided to reduce the staff of the PEU before some activities were completed. This created difficulties for both the Bank and the PEU to meet certain contractual obligations particularly those associated with disbursements and financial reporting.

### ***Pending Issues***

The meeting discussed pending issues to be resolved prior to project completion. It was agreed that bank guarantees would be accepted upon the payment of retention to contractors as defects liability periods for at least two contracts went beyond the disbursement deadline. As a result of delays in honouring payment requests by contractors interest had accrued. The Bank clarified that interest payment would not be met from the project financing and that Government needed to settle the matter with contractors.

The Bank reminded the PEU that the final Semestral Report and the Borrower's Project Completion Report were due. The PEU indicated that they would be submitted before the project disbursement period. The Bank and the PEU also agreed that the ex-post evaluation of the project was proceeding as planned.

Regarding the unfinished visitor center at Altun Ha, Jaime Awe, Director of IOA indicated that NICH is committed to the completion of the center and that just recently they had completed the lavatories. The case was the same for the monument building and parking area at Caracol.

Regarding water at Caracol, the PEU indicated that a more comprehensive search for a solution will need to be done and that it would be outside the scope of this project.

MOW indicated that maintenance of the Caracol road was part responsibility of the Ministry of Tourism and that under the Agreement, part of the revenues from park entrance would be allocated for this. The IOA concurred. The IOA also accepted responsibility for the maintenance of the infrastructure on site as well as the monuments.

### ***Lessons Learnt***

Some of the lesson learnt on this operation relate mainly to execution. Project execution could have benefited from the formation of a more multi-sectoral project management team or even a project steering committee that could harness the effective participation of stakeholders in the tourism industry and communities adjacent to the archaeological sites. This would have adopted a more balanced approach to execution rendering the level of importance to visitor infrastructure and community development that the project originally anticipated. A civil engineer should have been an integral part of the PEU from project inception to completion given the degree of civil works requirement of the infrastructure and access road component of the project.

The project management also determined that meeting the pre-conditions for first disbursement prior to the signing of the loan agreement avoided execution delays. The project director emphasized that earlier and more intense coordination with the co-financiers (ICDF) should have been initiated through a pre-determined process and a focal point to minimize the delay in the flow of funds particularly to the access road component

It was generally agreed that rapid assessments or feasibility analyses of critical aspects of the project should have been conducted before execution e.g. the unavailability of water at Caracol and the implication for infrastructure budget for that site.

All efforts should be made to keep the PEU in operation and intact until the completion of all activities under the project.



Non-Resident Visitors to Archaeological Reserves - 2006							
Site/Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	
Xunantunich	2794	2991	3532	2772	2088	2015	
Caracol	1294	1394	1673	1007	518	560	
El Pilar	100	102	85	44	32	20	
Cahal Pech	1188	1077	1225	888	890	849	
Caves Branch	2009	2130	3220	2736	1833	1849	1
Altun Ha	1173	1485	1518	1143	723	1063	1
Lamanai	2401	2529	3007	1900	1713	1916	1
Cerro	94	87	81	21	34	8	
Lubaantun	506	406	605	390	240	286	
Nimi Li Punit	296	325	472	300	164	199	
Barton Creek	409	706	914	574	511	464	
Tunichil Muknal	567	617	864	812	654	444	
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>12831</b>	<b>13849</b>	<b>17196</b>	<b>12587</b>	<b>9400</b>	<b>9673</b>	<b>6</b>
% Change	15.72233795	16.9697341	21.07094719	15.42335498	11.5182	11.8527	7.4
Resident Visitors to Archaeological Reserves - 2006							
Site/Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	
Xunantunich	226	154	99	318	138	166	
Caracol	47	114	80	81	28	17	
El Pilar	9	2	1	0	0	26	
Cahal Pech	57	46	59	77	31	102	
Caves Branch	28	4	0	66	23	3	
Altun Ha	85	100	121	149	141	87	
Lamanai	63	60	41	73	44	67	
Cerro	19	40	34	50	43	0	
Lubaantun	27	17	40	11	13	14	
Nimi Li Punit	19	22	29	33	11	10	
Barton Creek	39	0	0	1	0	0	
Tunichil Muknal	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>492</b>	
	16.11140031	14.54971369	13.11816762	22.3581468	12.28527	12.8058	8.7
Government Visitors to Archaeological Reserves - 2006							
Site/Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	
Xunantunich	23	0	0	29	17	10	
Caracol	4	0	20	26	36	60	
El Pilar	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cahal Pech	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caves Branch	0	0	0	47	16	24	
Altun Ha	16	113	206	5	7	33	
Lamanai	8	0	17	18	58	0	
Cerro	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Lubaantun	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Nimi Li Punit	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Barton Creek	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Barton Creek	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tunichil Muknal	0	0	0	0	11	7
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>145</b>
	<b>School Visitors to Archaeological Reserves - 2006</b>					
<b>Site/Month</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>
Xunantunich	2	293	0	215	1102	760
Caracol	13	100	238	31	300	76
El Pilar	0	0	46	0	0	0
Cahal Pech	0	136	877	365	507	629
Caves Branch	0	0	0	86	0	26
Altun Ha	0	16	328	317	1381	724
Lamanai	1	262	326	548	445	545
Cerros	0	0	0	0	62	0
Lubaantun	0	0	0	98	117	225
Nimi Li Punit	0	0	79	320	323	474
Barton Creek	0	0	0	0	0	13
Tunichil Muknal	0	0	0	0	3	11
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>1894</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>4240</b>	<b>3483</b>
	<b>Sunday Belizeans Visitors to Archaeological Reserves - 2006</b>					
<b>Site/Month</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>
Xunantunich	424	261	0	582	326	145
Caracol	131	97	109	485	88	3
El Pilar	5	0	0	0	0	0
Cahal Pech	107	37	920	156	141	23
Caves Branch	103	0	105	183	162	77
Altun Ha	170	175	93	242	142	100
Lamanai	202	139	220	655	152	61
Cerros	124	193	123	994	127	20
Lubaantun	31	24	11	6	0	0
Nimi Li Punit	4	25	29	57	20	10
Barton Creek	51	0	26	14	0	0
Tunichil Muknal	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>1352</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>1636</b>	<b>3374</b>	<b>1158</b>	<b>439</b>
	<b>Paid Visitors to Archaeological Reserves - 2006</b>					
<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Resident</b>	<b>Non Resident</b>	<b>Cruise Ship Visitors</b>	<b>Total Paid Visitors</b>		
Xunantunich	1101	16192	6109	23402		
Caracol	381	7002		7383		
El Pilar	39	444		483		
Cahal Pech	489	7012	2403	9904		
Caves Branch	128	14891	46491	61510		
Altun Ha	853	8117	33923	42893		

Altun Ha	633	8117	33923	42833			
Lamanai	368	14724	4811	19903			
Cerros	186	325		511			
Lubaantun	125	2585		2710			
Nimi Li Punit	132	1852		1984			
Barton Creek	40	3962		4002			
Tunichil Muknal	0	4504		4504			
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>3842</b>	<b>81610</b>	<b>93737</b>	<b>179189</b>			
<b>Un-Paid to Archaeological Park - 2006</b>							
<b>Site Name</b>	<b>School Visitors</b>	<b>Bze Sundays</b>	<b>GOB Visitors</b>	<b>Total UnPaid Visitors</b>			
Xunantunich	2372	1738	79	4189			
Caracol	771	936	146	1853			
El Pilar	46	5	0	51			
Cahal Pech	2524	1501	0	4025			
Caves Branch	139	636	89	864			
Altun Ha	2854	1043	386	4283			
Lamanai	2136	1471	101	3708			
Cerros	62	1581	2	1645			
Lubaantun	440	80	11	531			
Nimi Li Punit	1196	155	0	1351			
Barton Creek	13	91	0	104			
Tunichil Muknal	0	0	18	0			
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>12553</b>	<b>9237</b>	<b>832</b>	<b>22622</b>			
<b>Cruise Ship Visitors to Archaeological Reserve - 2006</b>							
<b>Site/Month</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>	
Xunantunich	1503	715	1645	1052	129	706	
Cahal Pech	545	573	521	411	58	136	
Caves Branch	6308	6129	12349	8707	3467	5676	3
Altun Ha	7179	7252	7951	5184	1853	2556	1
Lamanai	908	1255	1464	904	186	62	
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>16443</b>	<b>15924</b>	<b>23930</b>	<b>16258</b>	<b>5693</b>	<b>9136</b>	<b>6</b>
	17.54163244	16.98795566	25.52887334	17.34427174	6.073376	9.74642	6.7

<b>s - 2006</b>							
<b>Jun</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	16192
560	556	0	0	0	0	0	7002
20	61	0	0	0	0	0	444
849	895	0	0	0	0	0	7012
1849	1114	0	0	0	0	0	14891
1063	1012	0	0	0	0	0	8117
1916	1258	0	0	0	0	0	14724
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
286	152	0	0	0	0	0	2585
199	96	0	0	0	0	0	1852
464	384	0	0	0	0	0	3962
444	546	0	0	0	0	0	4504
<b>9673</b>	<b>6074</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	81610
1.8527	7.4427	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>2006</b>							
<b>Jun</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	
166	0	0	0	0	0	0	1101
17	14	0	0	0	0	0	381
26	1	0	0	0	0	0	39
102	117	0	0	0	0	0	489
3	4	0	0	0	0	0	128
87	170	0	0	0	0	0	853
67	20	0	0	0	0	0	368
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
14	3	0	0	0	0	0	125
10	8	0	0	0	0	0	132
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>492</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	3842
2.8058	8.7715	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>reserves - 2006</b>							
<b>Jun</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
60	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	2	0	0	0	0	0	89
33	6	0	0	0	0	0	386
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



- 2006							
Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
706	359	0	0	0	0	0	6109
136	159	0	0	0	0	0	2403
5676	3855	0	0	0	0	0	46491
2556	1948	0	0	0	0	0	33923
62	32	0	0	0	0	0	4811
9136	6353	0	0	0	0	0	93737
0.74642	6.7775	0	0	0	0	0	