

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3410	
GEF Agency project ID		604149	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF – 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Piloting of an Ecosystem-based Approach to Uruguayan Coastal Fisheries	
Country/Countries		Uruguay	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Biodiversity: 2 - Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems; International Waters: 8 – Waterbody-Based Operational Program. GEF's Strategic Priorities: # 2 – Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems; SP # 4 – Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity.	
Executing agencies involved		Direction of National Institute of Fisheries (DINARA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Beneficiaries: CBOs are fisher communities involved in Ecosystem-based Approach to Fisheries (EAF) plans. These are: fishers' community of Punta del Diablo; fishers' community of San Luis (UPAR); and, fishers' community of S.G. de Polanco (aggregate).	
Private sector involvement		Beneficiaries: Industrial Fishery Association (CIPU); Industrial Fishery Association (CAPU). Through consultations: in-kind contributions by the Artisanal Fishers; Fishing Industry [p. 30, PIR, July 2013].	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 21, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 1, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 31, 2013	
Actual date of project completion		NA	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.95	0.95 [p. 1, PIR, July 2013]
Co-financing	IA own	0.029	0.03 [p. 29, PIR, July 2013]
	Government	2.524	2.54 [p. 29, PIR, July 2013]
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.084	0.08 [p. 29, PIR, July 2013]
	Private sector	0.072	0.12 [p. 29, PIR, July 2013]
	NGOs/CSOs	0.055	
Total GEF funding		0.95	0.95
Total Co-financing		2.78	2.78 [p. 1, PIR, July 2013]
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.73 ¹	3.73 [p. 1, PIR, July 2013]
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		1 st Quarter 2014 [p. 2, PIR, July 2013]	
TE submission date		July 2014	
Author of TE		Graciela Pereira and Claudio Baigun	
TER completion date		December 30, 2014	
TER prepared by		Erika Hernandez	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

¹ The addition of this values is less given the round-up. Figures in column 1 are written as they appear in the Project Document (PD).

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	NA	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	ML*	NA	U/A
M&E Design	NA	NA	NA	MU
M&E Implementation	NA	MS	NA	MU
Quality of Implementation	S	MS	NA	S
Quality of Execution	NA	MS	NA	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	NA	NA	NA	MS

*TE assesses a “Moderately Satisfactory” rating to Sustainability, which is interpreted as a Moderately Likely rating based on the TE narrative.

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Terminal Evaluation (TE), the project’s proposed Global Environmental Objective (GEO) is “to reduce impacts on ecosystem ‘health’ and contribute to increases in the conservation of biodiversity through promoting a shift in Uruguay’s management of its coastal fisheries from an approach focused on single-species to one that reflects ecosystem-based fishery management (EAF) principles” [p. iv, TE].

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s Development Objective (DO) is to “contribute to the sustainable development of the country’s fisheries through:

- i. Reorganization and modernization of DINARA’s (Direction of the National Institute of Fisheries) institutional structure;
- ii. Implementation of a robust fisheries management system based on an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) and best available knowledge; and,
- iii. Development of a National Plan for the Development and Management of Artisanal Fisheries in Uruguay (NPDMAF) to include new institutional management arrangements (co-management),” [p. iv, TE].

The PD defines three components through which the development objectives will be achieved:

- (i) Component 1: EAF Strategy, Site Plans and FPAs. This component seeks to promote adoption of a national strategy to bring together elements of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) in Uruguayan fisheries. The document would be adapted to different situations and would serve as a roadmap for the adoption of sustainable fisheries management, particularly focused on expanding the artisanal fisheries sub-sector. In addition, this component seeks to develop and implement community-based EAF plans for 4 representative sites having different ecosystems, fisheries and other characteristics. This would help to generate a database of “lessons-learned” to carry out the national EAF Strategy and to achieve results through co-management. Additionally, this component seeks to create and manage Fishery Protected Areas (FPAs) to conserve fish stocks and foster sustainable fishery [p. 13, TE].
- (ii) Component 2: Policy, Strengthening Institutional Capacity and Public Awareness. This component seeks to use the National Fisheries Modernization Program (NFMP) to develop a new national fisheries law so as to integrate EAF principles as part of the national policy framework. It will also provide support to prepare the new National Plan for the Development and Management of Artisanal Fisheries in Uruguay, which will explore the co-management

of fisheries and will support the country's legal framework. Field activities will be conducted in order to provide the needed technical basis to carry out draft regulations. As part of its activities, the component seeks to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Direction of the National Institute of Fisheries (DINARA) and other institutional stakeholders to increase understanding of EAF principles and their promotion. Hence, it will provide technical assistance, development of training materials, training courses and field-visits to supported pilot sites. Increased awareness of the Medium-Size Project (MSP) will be supported among institutional stakeholders, decision-makers and the citizenry on the relevance of Uruguay's artisanal fisheries, their problems, constraints and solutions. Support will be provided in the form of equipment, technical assistance, preparation of education and public awareness materials and workshops [p. 13-14, TE].

- (iii) Component 3: Management, M&E and Information Dissemination. This component has three subcomponents. The first sub-component, management, will be integrated into the National Fishery Modernization Program's management structure. M&E indicators are to be developed during the project's planning, which will be later integrated into the program's M&E system. The project will attempt to disseminate project results so as to share "lessons learned" with project beneficiaries, individuals and institutions involved. Support will be provided for technical issues, webpage development and the printing of newsletters and other materials [p. 14-15, TE].

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

According to the Terminal Evaluation, the project did not undergo changes in its Global Environmental Objectives, nor in its Development Objectives. However, some of its implemented activities did change due to delayed budget disbursements [p. 16, TE]. The only adopted changes were in regards to its timetable and its operative tools to implement activities [p. 17, TE]. The TE mentions that although the Logical Framework Matrix should have been changed to reflect changes in activities, it was not modified [p. 33, TE].

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for relevance. This TER finds that the project is relevant to both the GEF and to the Government of Uruguay, assigning a *satisfactory* rating for relevance. As stated in the project document, the project's goals are in accordance with Uruguay's goal to preserve its fishery resources by improving its legal framework. The government has recently adopted the new Fishery Act 19,175 that attempts to ensure the conservation, regulation, sustainable development and responsible exploitation of

hydrobiological resources and of their ecosystems. The project is also connected to other government activities like the National Fisheries Modernization Program that attempts to restructure and modernized the National Direction of Aquatic Resources (DINARA). More importantly, the project's activities will help to address the current inefficient fishery management and surveillance regulations [p. viii, TE]. Furthermore, the project's objectives are consistent with two of GEF's Operational Programs. First, it is consistent with GEF's *Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems; International Waters* Operational Program (2) because it seeks to reduce the loss of biodiversity, particularly pertaining to the protection of endangered fish, marine mammals and coastal birds such the South American sea lion. Second, it's also consistent with the *Waterbody-Based* Operational Program 8 as it aims to protect coastal waters that are home to fish reproduction, nursery and food supply. This project will contribute to the protection of endangered species as well as to ensure that their ecosystems incorporate livable environments.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
-------------------	---

The TE rates “achievement of objectives” as *satisfactory* and “accomplishment of outputs and activities” as *highly satisfactory*. The TE uses a five-point rating scale, different to the GEF in that it does not grant an ‘unsatisfactory’ rating. However, this TER gives a *moderately satisfactory* rating for effectiveness, due to moderate shortcoming in the achievement of expected outcomes. While most project components were achieved, the creation of the National Strategy bringing together elements of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) in Uruguayan fisheries was not achieved. The TE states that this depended, to a large extent, on factors external to the project. TE states that DINARA (National Aquatic Resource Authority) was insufficiently committed to the writing of the National Strategy, which was still under development at the time of the TE's writing. The TE states that project objectives were very ambitious due to the limited amount of time, the presence of weak governance mechanisms, the socio-economic context and DINARA's structural constraints [p. 10, TE].

The following bullets describe the level of completion for each project component:

- (i) Component 1: EAF Strategy, Site Plans and FPAs. (Rating by TE: Moderately Unsatisfactory. Rating by TER: Moderately Satisfactory.) Under this component, DINARA developed a national strategy that would enable the sustainable co-management of fisheries. The TE states that DINARA's lack of commitment interfered with the attainment of some of the outputs [see p. 16, TE]. Although this strategy was designed, its document is still under development. The principles pertaining the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) Plan were developed in four sites by stakeholder groups. However, only one site had a formally established plan where specific social, economic and environmental indicators were identified, as called for in the PD. Three local fishery councils were to be created by DINARA. This indicator was met and exceeded by the creation of an additional council [p. 7, Annex 12, TE]. Although two sites (Barra del Chuy and La Coronilla) adopted the Declaration of Terminal User Rights for Fisheries (TURFs) for local communities, their corresponding decrees were not implemented. Finally, the project established two or more Fishery Protected Areas (the TE is not clear about the number of FPAs) but no legal decrees were produced [p. 22, Annex 12, TE].
- (ii) Component 2: Policy, Strengthening Institutional Capacity and Public Awareness. (Rating by TE: Moderately Satisfactory. Rating by TER: Satisfactory.) A national Fishery Law was adopted and the Law incorporated most of the EAF principles but it did not include TURFs or FPAs, as called for in the PD. To strengthen DINARA's capacities, 3 manuals and

technical reports were to be provided. By the time the Terminal Evaluation was carried out, only 2 manuals were produced and these had not yet been finalized [p. 9, Annex 12, TE].

- (iii) Component 3: Management, M&E and Information Dissemination. (Rating by TE: Highly Satisfactory. Rating by TER: Satisfactory.)A Project Management Unit (PMU) coordinated the GEF supported activities, which were documented. They were included in the National Fisheries Modernization Program (NFMP) activities, reports were completed in a timely and efficient manner, and annual meetings were held [p. 10, Annex 12, TE]. In addition, a knowledge management system was established, and consisted of setting up a webpage [p. 36, Annex 12, TE].

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
----------------	---

The TE does not provide a rating for project efficiency. This TER rates project efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative. The Terminal Evaluation states that the project was efficient, given that it adequately used the available human resources that were interested in participating [p.39 TE]. Nevertheless, DINARA was not involved in the project as originally desired. Regarding cost-efficiency, TE states that the project attained a “very high capacity building in stakeholders” [p. 19, TE]. However, M&E capacity building was inadequate given that there were no monitoring collection tools developed, as called for in the PD, except for the provisioning of reports. A good investment in the long-term investment was that the relationship between environmental and social institutions improved [p. 19, TE].

The project underwent delays. First, according to the TE, there was a delay at the beginning of the project, causing the postponement of activities related to the Fishery Act and the reallocation of funds to different project components [p. 16-17, TE]. In January 2013, an extension of one year was approved under the tier “Budget Revision E.” The project received no additional funding and the log frame was not modified despite its “conceptual weaknesses,” but the project’s timetable and some of the operative tools were [p. 11, 17, TE]. The project also underwent delays related to financial delivery at the beginning and the end phases. There were output delivery delays related to the project’s complexity. This is because there was no available staff qualified in project management. There were also differences in opinion between the technical coordinator and the scientific director, over what criteria to use to guide the project, which affected the project’s efficiency [p. 29, TE].

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <i>Unable to Assess</i>
--------------------	--

The TE rates the project’s sustainability as *moderately satisfactory*, which is interpreted as equivalent to a rating of Moderately Likely on the GEF sustainability scale based on the TE narrative. This TER however finds that there are too many unknowns, particularly concerning institutional and environmental risks to sustainability that are identified in the TE, to support the TE’s rating. This TER assess a rating of *unable to assess*. As TE states, sustainability of project outcomes “demands a restructure in DINAR which is still pending...” (TE, pg 31). In addition, there are a number of environmental risks to sustainability that while mentioned are not assessed in detail. At the same time, there seems to be political support at the national level (*likely*), although it is unknown whether local communities support the project. Financial sustainability also seems *moderately unlikely*.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

- Financial resources. (**Moderately unlikely**). Financial resources for future operations could also be secured through the Fishery and Aquaculture Facility (as per Act 19,175) but would be granted through a limited duration [p.31, TE]. Although contributions from local governments in infrastructure are expected, they probably will not be enough as resources. The provisioning of continued technical assistance to DINARA was not considered.
- Sociopolitical. (**Likely**) The Terminal Evaluation states that there were favorable conditions to include civil society in the project if political priorities are not changed in 2015 [p. 32, TE]. The ruling party during the project's implementation, the Socialist Party of Uruguay, will be again in power in 2015. The party got reelected on November 30, 2014, so it is highly possible that it will support the project. However, no information regarding support by communities and other stakeholders is provided.
- Institutional framework and governance. (**Unable to Assess**) The recently adopted legal framework helps to ensure the project's institutional sustainability. However, there is not enough information to rate this subsection. The Fishery Act that was adopted, leading to the establishment of a Fishery Consulting Committee and Regional Artisanal Fishery Councils. A long-lasting impact could be achieved if DINARA's restructuring modifies its previous attitude towards being ready to commit. This is because it is the main institution responsible for the project's continuity. The process would need to develop censuses, improved capacities to carry out *in situ* fishery sampling, among others [p. 31, TE]. Up until the date of the TE's submission, DINARA was undergoing restructuring. If this is capable to change DINARA's commitment to the project, then its sustainability could be possible.
- Environmental. (**Unable to assess**). The TE discusses environmental risks to project sustainability in a general way, but not sufficient to provide a rating here.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The Terminal Evaluation does not report on actual co-financing or the effect of co-financing on project outcomes or sustainability.

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

The project experienced delays. First, according to the Terminal Evaluation, there was a delay at the beginning of the project, causing the postponement of activities related to the Fishery Act and the reallocation of funds to different project components [p. 16-17, TE]. In January 2013, an extension of one year was approved under the tier "Budget Revision E," allowing to compensate for the delay in the delivery of outcomes. The project received no additional funding and the log frame did not suffer any change despite its "conceptual weaknesses," except for its timetable and some of its operative tools [p. 11, 17, TE]. The project also underwent delays related to financial delivery at the beginning and the end phases. There were output delivery delays related to the project's complexity. First, there was no available staff

qualified in project management. There were also discrepancies between the technical coordinator and the scientific director, which affected the project's efficiency [p. 29, TE]. These delays did not appear to negatively affect sustainability.

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

Country ownership had an important influence in the project, which vastly affected the outcomes. To start, DINARA (Direction of the National Institute of Fisheries) was the main institution responsible in implementing the project. The Terminal Evaluation states that DINARA's lack of commitment interfered with some of the project's outputs. Although their specific effect is not addressed by the TE, it is possible to observe that the first component was affected. For this component, DINARA was responsible for adopting the EAF (Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries) Strategy through the generation of a living document. This outcome was not produced as the document was still in a developing phase, up until the TE's submission. This TER is unable to assess if this outcome will positively or negatively affect the project's sustainability given that its content is yet unknown. In addition, Component 3 was also affected. Under this section, DINARA managed to create more than 2 FPAs (Fishery Protected Areas; their number is unknown) but their corresponding decrees are yet inexistent [p. 8, Annex 12, TE].

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE did not rate the M&E design. This TER rates M&E Design at entry as *moderately unsatisfactory*, based on the PD and assessment presented in the TE narrative. The M&E plan presented in a Logical Framework Matrix was not finalized – PD states that “subsequent to its approval, (the Logical Framework) will be integrated into the program's existing M&E activities to ensure monitoring consistency...” (PD, pg 22)... Baseline data is not included in the PD (for example, on the quality of DINARA, or targeted fisheries). PD states that an FAO inception missions will “identify the required baseline information needed to support the M&E program.” (TE, pg 22).

As per the SMART acronym (*specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely*), the project's indicators were *specific, measurable* and *timely* for the most part, although they were not always *achievable* or *realistic*. As TE states, “*the logical framework matrix contained certain indicators that were vague or ambiguous, difficult to measure (not "SMART") in some cases or not adequate. Thus, for instance, the DO that depends on the "Reorganization and modernization of DINARA's institutional structure" is not relevant since its achievement is not exclusively dependent upon the project but rather on a political-institutional decision. In turn, Outcome 1.1 requiring "EAF principles validated and included in policies and national policy frameworks" is conditioned to the sanction of legal provisions and decrees which are also outside the project capacity. The project, in the best scenario, may support or promote a better institutional organization for fisheries management or else encourage consideration of conceptual inputs to strengthen the legal context but it should never be responsible for their accomplishment or implementation.*” (TE, pg 10). Moreover, despite the fact that EAF (Ecosystem-based Approach to Fisheries) principles were included in national policy frameworks, the passage of the Fishery

Act depended upon external actors (like political parties in congress) were outside the project's control, and thus should not have been among the project's targets. Another of its indicators was designed to assess the reduction of biodiversity loss of 8 species [p. 4, Annex 12, TE]. However, it is unlikely that any changes in biodiversity loss would be expected to occur over the short lifetime of the project, and it is also difficult to attribute causality to the project's activities.

Lastly, PD does lay out tasks and responsibilities for M&E activities (PD, pg 22), and a budget line is provided for evaluations. Overall, the M&E plan is insufficiently developed at entry, and M&E Design is assessed as moderately unsatisfactory.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <i>Moderately Unsatisfactory</i>
-----------------------------------	---

The Terminal Evaluation rated M&E Implementation as *moderately satisfactory*, noting that several M&E products were unfinished or pending at the time of the evaluation [p. 27, TE]. However, this TER assesses a rating of *Moderately Unsatisfactory* to M&E Implementation, finding that weaknesses in the M&E design noted above, particularly the absence of an explicit M&E plan, were not addressed during implementation and these weaknesses negatively impacted the project. TE states that “*M&E mechanisms were essentially based on reports required from the project whereas it would have been desirable to explicitly develop a plan following GEF guidelines to ensure timely and proper project performance. Failure to implement an explicit M&E plan prevented delays in activities and outputs from being rapidly adjusted during the initial project stages.*” (TE, pg 29). At the same time, TE states that as part of the monitoring PIRs and PPRs were provided, and that these “...were adequately used to monitor progress” (TE, pg 29). TE also notes that monitoring was strengthened by several committee meetings and 4 FAO missions aimed at monitoring project development.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: <i>Satisfactory</i>
--	------------------------------------

The TE did not rate Quality of Project Implementation. The TER grants a rating of *Satisfactory* for quality of the project implementation. According to the TE, FAO closely supervised the project. It also provided technical assistance through its Fisheries and Aquaculture Department and carried out field missions. For instance, along with the GEF and DINARA, FAO provided a workshop on “Sharing experiences on collection of information and use for an ecosystem-friendly fishery management” in San Gregorio de Polanco (July 27-28, 2013). Field visits to pilot sites were reported by FAO's Technical Officer to San Gregorio de Polanco (May-June, 2011) and to Barra del Chuy (August 2011) [p. 2, Annex 7, TE]. Nevertheless, information regarding other workshops offered by FAO is not provided. FAO's Representation Office in Uruguay held the project's budget and ensured its timely execution. As a Budget Holder, FAO-Uruguay was responsible for facilitating project coordinating activities as well as the recruitment of consultants. There were delays in the delivery of funds but these were related to outputs that were still under completion, particularly related to the Fishery Act [p.17, TE]. Moreover, the TE

correctly mentions that the law should not be considered as part of the project [p. 8, Annex 12, TE]. Clearly, its adoption does not depend on the project but on external actors such as legislators.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution

Rating: ***Moderately Satisfactory***

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project execution. This TER assesses a rating of *moderately satisfactory* given that the TE states that DINARA's Director was fully committed to the project and was able to satisfactorily execute most of the expected activities.. However, TE finds that DINARA's staff was not supportive of the project. The assistant coordinator of the project stopped working by mid-2013, which affected the availability of some committed outputs [p. 16, TE]. Despite this, most activities were carried out and outputs were completed. For instance, DINARA created the Regional Fishery Councils (RFCs) that promoted the EAF (Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries) principles at project pilot sites and introduced the co-management feature. Technical assistance was provided by DINARA's technicians, although the type of assistance was not found in the TE. DINARA staff also undertook the role of developing Letters of Agreement [p. 15, TE]. Project Execution also should be faulted in-part for failing to improve upon weaknesses in the project's M&E system. Finally, TE states that the project was efficient in technical aspects of the project's work, but less so in terms of improving the efficiency of administrative and project management tasks. (TE, pg 29).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No changes in environmental stress or status are noted in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project. The Terminal Evaluation points out that it will have an impact on resource conservation and management strategies in marine and coastal areas but such impact was not assessed.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

According to the TE, the project aided the artisanal fishery sector in improving its understanding of fishery management issues as socio-ecological systems and about post-harvest practices. Allegedly, this would help the sector to increase their economic benefits [p. 32, TE] but no socio-economic changes were documented.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

No impacts deriving from improvement of capacities were reported by the Terminal Evaluation (TE). The TE states that the project influenced institutions’ educational curricula to improve their interventions in sites and raised the awareness of young people to conserve coastal, marine and freshwater resources [p. 33, TE]. However, no quantitative or qualitative evidence is provided. DINARA also seems to have offered technical assistance to the local community but the specific communities are not mentioned [p. 14, TE]. FAO-Uruguay also provided technical assistance in order to “ensure the quality of outputs and outcomes,” through its Fisheries and Aquaculture Department [p. 21, TE]. To strengthen DINARA’s capacities, 3 training workshops were provided under component 2.

b) Governance

A better system of governance was created through the adoption of the Fishery Act (19,175) [p. 33, TE] but it has not yet been implemented by DINARA. As part of the Act, the National Strategy, based on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAF), is not yet implemented given that its document is still under edition [p. 16, TE]. During the implementation, DINARA was regarded as an institution that lacked commitment. DINARA’s restructuring may, or may not, modify its incentives and, thus, could become more involved in the conservation of fisheries. However, it is unable to determine such possibility. Co-management in the form of operating Ecosystem-based Fishery Management Functional Units (EFMFU) was also set as the principal tool that implemented new inclusive governance processes. New governance frameworks included civil society members, through the creation of the Regional Fishery Councils (RFCs) [p. 34, TE]. RFCs were composed by representatives from DINARA, local governments, national coastguard, pilot site coordinator and local fishers association [p.14, TE].

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

Some unintended impacts could be related to their effect on fisheries operating before the introduction of EAF principles. It is possible that an EAF approach could result in the generation of fishery products that are more expensive, thus diminishing fishers’ well-being.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual

factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

At the time of the TE's submission, there were no initiatives that were replicated by other governments in the region. However, there were demands for creating fishery councils at two new sites in Uruguay. The TE considers that this is a very promising model that could be replicated in the region [p. 33, TE].

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

According to the TE, the lessons learned were that:

- Implementing (Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries) EAF projects requires weighing their possibilities and scope before the writing of the project document. An appropriate analysis of the social, economic, environmental and institutional scenarios should be carried out to obtain specific outputs and outcomes;
- Success in this type of project may be better ensured if during its design log frame components that depend on political and administrative externalities, are avoided. "SMART" indicators should be selected;
- A basic requirement to ensure effective achievement in EAF projects is to properly balance available resources with expected outcomes and the government's capacity;
- Implementing projects under an EAF should ensure establishing adequate alliances and synergies with other institutions that may have impact on fisheries;
- EAF projects must be flexible and adjustable so that they may be approached from social, economic, institutional and environmental perspectives;
- Establishing the EAF concept that has co-management as its central philosophy, demands that both the government and the users agree and become engaged with this approach; strengthening their interaction through participatory mechanisms that reflect transparency, credibility and mutual trust among stakeholders;
- It is essential to have an appropriate technical and scientific baseline, strong institutional support and demonstrated decision of governmental institutions to take the lead over these processes and to promote empowerment of local organizations;
- Success of EAF projects must be ensured on the basis of widening the fishery management vision and provided that adequate conditions and human resources are available and may be further developed.
- It is necessary to have strategies in place to reduce potential conflicts that may originate in competences and differences in salaries between the recipient institution regular staff and project-hired staff by generating equal opportunities;
- In the near future, project outputs and outcomes should be properly disseminated as well as the scope of the new Fishery Act by means of a workshop inviting representatives from the different pilot sites in order to show project achievements and disseminate future actions. This would grant larger visibility to project outcomes and outputs through production of *ad hoc* documents;
- Strengthening EAF requires a larger regional vision that may allow the understanding of how fishing affects shared resources and, particularly, resources with high temporal and spatial variability in the use of different habitats throughout their life cycle. A closer interaction should be encouraged among countries of the region with the purpose of communicating and discussing criteria for, benefits of and barriers to the application of ecosystem-based management, [p. 37-38, TE].

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Some of the recommendations that the Terminal Evaluation gives to FAO and the Government of Uruguay are to:

- 1) “Strengthen synergies especially between DINARA and other organizations such as DINAMA, PNN, Local Governments, NGOs;
- 2) Promote creation by DINARA of regional delegations for a better implementation, surveillance and monitoring of management plans, a higher visibility of the State institutional presence and also to encourage a closer relationship with the fishing communities;
- 3) Involve all stakeholders at all levels and strengthen and promote synergies and collaboration mechanisms between them so as to ensure the accomplishment of co-management as the basic strategy to move forward towards full ecosystem-based fisheries management in Uruguay. This implies strengthening the operation of fishery councils and trying to meet the expectations of the different stakeholders involved in them; inserting recreational fisheries particularly in coastal areas as a key element in fisheries management considering they fish for resources shared with artisanal fisheries, there are territorial conflicts and they are subject to different control and legal measures; promoting inclusion of the industrial fishery sector with the purpose of extending the basis and scope of ecosystem management to large-scale fisheries; and, incorporating productive sectors with activities that directly impact on the quality of the aquatic environment;
- 4) Design in the short term a strategy based on identifying economic instruments and mechanisms and required human resources (...) so that DINARA may ensure an adequate sustainability of project outcomes;
- 5) Promote concepts of good fishing practices and encourage their application in those communities where there are signs of excessive fishing intensity or even overfishing, unauthorized catch (...), lack of knowledge of specific regulations (...) or use of non-selective or unauthorized fishing techniques;
- 6) Promote training in fishery product processing techniques, value added and marketing strategies with the purpose of generating feasible alternative technologies thus promoting a more rational resource use, a reduction in fishing intensity and an increase in economic benefits for the artisanal sector;
- 7) Actively promote the concept and benefits of allocating TURFs in certain areas as an effective means of eliminating overfishing, controlling fishing intensity, increasing economic benefits, protecting critical habitats, reducing conflicts and improving user awareness of the benefits of having jurisdiction and decision-making capacity over the resources they exploit;
- 8) Improve biological and fishery knowledge of those aspects that were not adequately covered by the project but which are required to adjust management plans and make progress towards consolidation of EAF. In particular, it is recommended that the use of fishers’ ecological knowledge be promoted and valued in order to increase information at the local level; and,
- 9) Ensure involvement and participation of women as primary stakeholders in coastal areas and enhance visibility of their role and relevance. In order to achieve this, it is important that participation of women in fishery councils be encouraged, especially by DINARA,” [p. 35-37, TE].

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<i>The Terminal Evaluation adequately addresses the project's outcomes. It appropriately examines impacts on governance but its impact assessment is poor for environmental, socioeconomic and capacity changes. The TE offers an accurate assessment of objectives in Annex 12.</i>	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	<i>The report is internally consistent. Most evidence is provided, except for the kind of workshops that DINARA and FAO provided. Ratings were not always well substantiated.</i>	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<i>The project's financial and sociopolitical sustainability were addressed. It was not possible to assess the environmental and institutional & governance sustainability given that they depend on the restructuring of DINARA and on exogenous events.</i>	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<i>Lessons learned were supported by the evidence given in the report, such as the dissemination of the Fishery Act through workshops.</i>	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<i>The report does not include actual project costs, except for the way GEF funding was disbursed.</i>	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<i>The report contained a good quality of information. However, one important weakness was that, despite having recognized a weak monitoring system, it did not suggest a better system. Although there was a mid-term evaluation in the form of PIRs and PPRs, their results were not provided.</i>	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

The main sources of information were the Project Document (PD), the Terminal Evaluation (TE), Annexes in the TE and the Project Implementation Review (PIR).