

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3749	
GEF Agency project ID		4147	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Towards ecosystem management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem	
Country/Countries		Chile, Peru	
Region		Latin America	
Focal area		International Waters, Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		IW-SP1, BD-SP2 & BD-SP4	
Executing agencies involved		Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP, Chile), Instituto del Mar del Perú (IMARPE, Peru)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As co-financier: TNC (The Nature Conservancy)	
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 22, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 1, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 2015	
Actual date of project completion		March 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.075	0.075
	Co-financing	0.155	0.155
GEF Project Grant		6.925	6.00514
Co-financing	IA own	0.05	0.05
	Government	20.562584	39.043877
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.0775	NA
	Private sector	2.584	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	1.35	1.165
Total GEF funding		7	6.08014
Total Co-financing		24.779084	40.413877
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		31.779084	46.494017
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2016	
Author of TE		Fernando Amestoy	
TER completion date		February 10, 2017	
TER prepared by		Mathias Einberger	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	NR	ML
M&E Design		MS	NR	MS
M&E Implementation		S/HS	NR	S
Quality of Implementation		S	NR	S
Quality of Execution		S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME) is one of the world's most productive, with an estimated primary productivity similar to the four other major up-welling areas in the world, and an unmatched fisheries productivity representing approximately 18-20% of the global fish catch. Furthermore, the Humboldt Current System features globally significant biodiversity, has been designated a WWF Global 200 Ecoregion, and harbors massive forage fish stock feeding sea birds and marine mammal populations. The heterogeneity in the physical features of its marine environment has resulted in high levels of endemism, with the regions of the HCLME housing a plethora of endemic species with similar or even higher shares than those of the famous the Galapagos Islands in Ecuador or the Juan Fernandez Islands off of Chile. (CEO-End p. 6)

By using a three pronged intervention strategy, the project will 1) advance a strategic long-term planning framework for the identification and prioritization of actions needed to preserve and maintain the HCLME, 2) make sure that planning processes are informed by measurable on-the-ground experiences through a number of in-situ pilot interventions, and 3) address the interaction between these two dimensions by developing the skills, instruments and mechanisms to effectively scale the lessons learnt from the pilots and to strengthen capacities for implementing the strategic planning framework. (CEO-End p. 10)

The project was thus designed to contribute to the protection of a globally significant ecosystem providing global environmental benefits, while being fully in line with International Waters Strategic Program 1, providing for the "development of ministerial-agreed collective programs of action on fish stocks and habitat conservation for LMEs that should benefit from use of MPAs through funding from the biodiversity focal area". Biodiversity resources were allocated to set up and operationalize MPAs for the conservation of currently unprotected off-and near-shore marine and coastal habitats; thereby increasing the representation of effectively managed marine PAs in Chile and Peru in line with Biodiversity Strategic Program 2. (CEO-End p. 16)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's stated objective was: "Ecosystem-based management (EBM) in the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME) is advanced through a coordinated framework that provides for improved governance and the sustainable use of living marine resources and services." The framework laid out in the project documents specified 4 distinct components/outcomes, designed to work along the above-specified three-pronged intervention strategy.

Component 1: Planning and policy instruments for ecosystem-based management (EBM) of the HCLME are agreed and in place at regional and national levels

Component 2: Capacities strengthened for SAP implementation and for up- scaling the results of pilot interventions to the systems level

Component 3: Implementation of priority MPA & fisheries management tools provides knowledge of options for enhanced protection of HCLME and SAP implementation

Component 4: Implementation of pilot MPAs that underpin ecosystem conservation and resilience

While component 1 would advance a strategic long-term planning framework for the identification and prioritization of actions needed to preserve and maintain the HCLME, the pilot measures under component 4 would make sure that planning processes are informed by measurable on-the-ground experiences. Components 2 and 3 would finally address the interaction between the other parts of the project by developing the skills, instruments and mechanisms to effectively scale the lessons learnt from the pilots and to strengthen capacities for implementing the strategic planning framework. (CEO-End pp. 1, 10)

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

No significant changes were noted by the TE.

4. GEF IEO 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 rates the project as relevant and the TER follows its assessment, rating relevance as Satisfactory.

The project was designed fully in line with International Waters Strategic Program 1 and Biodiversity Strategic Program 2, providing for the “development of ministerial-agreed collective programs of action on fish stocks and habitat conservation for LMEs that should benefit from use of MPAs through funding from the biodiversity focal area” and allocating biodiversity resources to set up and operationalize MPAs for the conservation of currently unprotected off-and near-shore marine and coastal habitats, thereby increasing the representation of effectively managed marine PAs in Chile and Peru. Additionally, the project contributed to Biodiversity Strategic Program 4, by incorporating biodiversity conservation considerations into fishery policy and regulation, advancing multi-species monitoring and marketplace governance mechanisms. (CEO-End p. 16)

The TE also states that the project was relevant to the governments of Peru and Chile, because it aligned well with policies in both countries to promote the management of their natural fishing resources and the preservation of their ecosystems and biodiversity. Accordingly, in its design and implementation the project adequately considered national realities in terms of the existing institutional and policy frameworks. During the evaluation, the TE verified the commitment of both countries to the goal of applying an ecosystem approach to the management of their natural resources. The TE also positively notes the project's role in generating synergies between and greater involvement of the environmental and fishing authorities, in the pursuit of these objectives. (TE p. 19)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates the project's effectiveness as Satisfactory. This TER revises that rating to Moderately Satisfactory, in light of both the evidence presented by the TE and the less benign MTR assessment. The TE's assessment of project effectiveness appears to remain incomplete, with several key components not being discussed in the relevant sections of the TE. For example, no mention was found of output 2.1 "Spatially-based Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation System developed" and for other elements, such as "Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for achieving EBM, including a plan for a system of Marine Protected Areas of the HCLME, is formulated & endorsed at highest levels" only limited and incomplete information was provided. Furthermore, the TE's financial section provides evidence of sub-execution of components 2 and 4, since utilization of GEF funding was well below expected levels there. Therefore, activities such as a planned baseline survey for the seamounts in the pilot area in Chile could not be carried out, because the initial design underestimated the operational cost of monitoring deep waters. (TE p. 31) Overall, in light of both the evidence presented by the TE and the less benign MTR assessment, the TER therefore adopts a more conservative rating of Moderately Satisfactory.

In its assessment of the project's effectiveness, the TE evaluates achievement of four objectives, which however only partially overlap with the original project components specified in the Request for CEO Endorsement.

First, the TE notes that the project was effective in the development of institutional capacities for ecosystem-based management (EBM), through various training activities that strengthened fisheries and environmental agencies in management mechanisms, incorporating the concept of economic valuation of environmental goods and services, NGOs both at the organizational level, and also through training courses and cross-border exchanges.

Second, in terms of generating a coordinated framework to improve governance and promote the sustainable use of living marine resources and ecosystem services, the TE notes that while the project was effective in promoting coordination between actors on the national level, it was not so successful on the bi-national level due to border disputes between the two countries. It was able to generate successful articulation dynamics among all participating institutions, particularly among artisanal fishermen, governmental organizations and NGOs, and served to expand the room for coordination among policymakers, implementers and institutions responsible for M&E.

Third, the TE also assesses progress on raising awareness of governmental, academic, business and civil society organizations of the EBM approach and their involvement in it. Accordingly, the project was effective in sensitizing local communities and society as a whole about environmental problems and the need to adapt an ecosystem-based management approach. More than 5,000 people, from different sectors and public agencies, as well as from the productive sector, were trained under the project. Almost 1,000 people from local communities, trade unions, environmental organizations, technical cadres, and government authorities participated in meetings aimed to promote the management of protected areas.

Fourth, in terms of the incorporation of project experience into national and regional public policies, the TE merely notes that environmental agencies and fishery management said that they are already doing this, but provides no further information. (TE pp. 19-20)

In light of the extensive results framework laid out in the project documents, the TE provides rather limited evidence and justification for its effectiveness rating. It does however provide a separate discussion about the "achievement of products, results and objectives":

Under component 1, the project developed planning and policy instruments for ecosystem-based management of the HCLME. The analysis identified a number of problems and challenges in Peru and Chile, which formed the basis for an inter-institutional consultation process, including broad community participation, to define a strategic action program with 5 main goals. It aimed at i) the recovery and maintenance of optimum population levels of the main exploited species, ii) improved environmental quality through integrated management of the coastal zone, iii) recover and maintain the biodiversity of these ecosystems, iv) diversify productive activities and create new opportunities for the fishing sector, and v) finally contribute to the population's food security.

Under component 2, the project contributed to an increased interest of the Peruvian population in the state of Humboldt Current, taking all stakeholders into account and encouraging local participation in the care and protection of the sea. Institutional and community capacities were strengthened in the marine-coastal areas of the pilot sites and institutional capacities to implement the strategic action

program were strengthened through training workshops on the modeling of complex ecosystems, quantitative ecology, coastal planning and management, fisheries strengthening, and environmental information systems. The project also promoted inter-institutional coordination to make decision-makers aware of the Humboldt Current situation and the need to ensure its sustainability through ecosystem-based management.

The elaboration of the Master Plan for the Reserva Nacional Sistema de Islas, Islotes y Puntas Guaneras Perú (RNSIIPG) under component 3 supported the articulation of 20 sub-management committees located along 1,700 km of the coastal strip, including public, regional, private institutions, NGOs and social fishermen crafts organizations. These sub committees constituted the members of the management committee. They were trained through regional workshops on Climate Change, supervision, fisheries management and control, management and conservation of natural resources, management of areas under an ecosystem approach, and the state of resources in the different areas. More than 322 people participated in the courses offered, however only during 2014. As for the coordinated management of the bi-national anchovy stock, the project financed bi-national activities for the standardization of hydro-acoustic techniques, and for studying anchovy populations and ecological and biological aspects of anchovies. Technical staff from both IMARPE and IFOP participated in these activities with the goal of making the evaluations comparable by unifying methodological criteria and coordinating activities.

In relation to outcome 4 and implementation of the pilot MPAs, studies were funded in the area of the Juan Fernández Archipelago on fisheries, shark tagging, birds, and environmental education. A general assessment of the area in terms of biodiversity, marine endemism, and habitat diversity was presented and a proposal for making it a multiple use area for fishing and tourism was generated. For the management tools to be developed, the project financed several studies, including biodiversity, oceanography, baseline establishment, cataloging, and evaluation. Research campaigns were also funded for studies on biotic and abiotic variables and impact assessments for penguin, sea lion, and other local wildlife populations. IMARPE staff was trained in the use of Ocean Data View software to develop baselines for the area with oceanographic data. Furthermore, successful MPA implementation strategies were developed in both countries. While Chile significantly increased the extension of MPAs, Peru did not increase the extent but significantly improved management and control of its MPAs. Lastly, the lobster fishery in Juan Fernández was certified and important advances were made in the certification of the anchovy fishery in Peru by the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). (TE pp. 34-37)

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the project's efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER revises that rating to Satisfactory, as the shortcomings noted in the TE appear to be largely outside the control of the project and can be attributed to the general institutional context in Latin America.

The TE notes that the project was implemented in line with national and international standards and efficiently achieved the expected results, considering the number of institutions and actors involved. It

further notes that results were for the most part achieved with the expected resources. The TE takes particular note here of the work carried out with artisanal fishermen and civil society in raising awareness about EBM and forming committees for the management of MPA resources – highly demanding activities in terms of coordination and time management that were nevertheless successfully fulfilled. The overall utilization of GEF funds was moderately below expectations, at just over US\$6 million according to the last available information provided by the TE. Non-utilization appears to be largely a result of the non-execution of some project activities in components 2 and 4. While information on materialized co-financing provided by the TE is incomplete and inconsistent, high commitment of the participating countries to the project objectives seems to have been reflected by their contributions, which evidently exceeded the initial expectations by as much as 44%. (TE pp. 10, 26)

In another section, the TE takes note of some challenges with the institutional arrangements in both countries, which caused some tensions between fishery and environmental agencies and consequently delays in the start-up phase of the project (described in more detail under section 5.2 below). The resulting project extension impacted project efficiency through increased administrative costs. Yet the TE describes these institutional challenges as a common problem in Latin American countries, for which the project is only partly to blame. (TE p. 34)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rates project sustainability as Moderately Likely, discussing mostly institutional and financial, but also some socio-economic and political aspects of sustainability. The TER agrees with this assessment.

Regarding institutional sustainability, the TE notes evidence of early incorporation of several project results into the policies and activities of Chilean and Peruvian government agencies. Environmental agencies have incorporated important inputs from the project and lessons learned from the articulation processes, especially those with environmental NGOs, artisanal fishermen, and civil society, in the management of protected areas.

In terms of financial sustainability, many of these activities are already incorporated in the institutions' budgets and require adjustments in their work plans that are considered feasible in the short and medium term, while other project activities to be incorporated may require additional funds. In some areas, tourism promotion activities have generated an important inflow of funds that could make their management financially sustainable in the medium and long term. In the short term however, significant investments are still required to improve tourism services and promote multiple-use and ecosystem-based approaches for these areas. Additionally, the increase in the area of MPAs generated as a result of the project implies a need to strengthen the capacities of the agencies responsible for monitoring them. Competitive funds to promote the development of scientific and technological activities in both countries could be an opportunity to deepen the needed ecosystem research, in order to improve the management of fishery resources.

In terms of socio-economic sustainability, the TE notes that the project was widely accepted by both the productive and environmental sectors, with both fishermen and NGOs having become aware of EBM and having increased their involvement with multiple-use co-management approaches. However, the TE also identifies moderate risks emerging from upcoming government changes, in the short term in Peru and in the medium term in Chile, which will require effort from strategic actors to keep the project objectives on the political agenda.

For environmental sustainability, the TE provides no explicit discussion.

Overall, rather than the availability of funds, the TE views as the greatest challenges the prioritization of issues identified by the strategic action program in the political agendas of Chile and Peru, as well as the maintenance of networks and mechanisms for inter-institutional coordination among key actors that were developed during the project.

According to the TE, the exit strategy of the project includes its transfer to the governments of Chile and Peru and its corresponding institutionalization, in order to guarantee the SAP's continuity and commitment to the project's long-term objectives, despite some adjustments the governments may choose to undertake. (TE pp. 26, 38)

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 TE states total materialized project co-financing at roughly US\$39.52 million, but based on the TE's reporting of materialized co-financing by contributor, the project received about US\$40.26 million in co-financing, which is regardless more than 60% higher than confirmed co-financing at CEO endorsement. According to the TE, government co-financing materialized at US\$15.894073 million from Chile and US\$23.149804 million from Peru, both contributions being substantially larger than initially expected. From the co-financing table provided in the TE it further appears that UNDP co-financing materialized fully at the initially programmed US\$50,000, while The Nature Conservancy (TNC) provided its promised US\$690,000 and other NGOs contributed an additional US\$475,000. Due to inconsistencies in the TE's reporting of total co-financing and co-financing by contributor, it is difficult to assess actual co-financing by contributor source and related impacts on project outcomes. (TE p. 10)

Although the TE provides some good information about materialization of GEF funding by project component, indicating there was sub-materialization of funds for components 2 and 4 while components 1 and 3 were executed on budget, no similar information is provided for co-financing. It is therefore difficult to assess the effect of the larger than anticipated materialization of co-financing on project outcomes. (TE pp. 30-33)

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 TE takes note of some challenges with the institutional arrangements in both countries, which caused some tension and initial delays in the start-up phase of the project, impacting project efficiency through increased administrative costs due to the resulting extension of the project deadline.

There were tensions between fishery and environmental agencies due to different degrees of their organizational maturity. Fishery institutes were conceived in the late 1950s and early 60s, designed to carry out all scientific activities relevant for their mandate (oceanography, fisheries biology, marine ecology, etc.). Environmental agencies were created only in the last decade and while they were given the legal mandate to carry out many of the activities that previously belonged to fishery bodies, they were not equipped with the necessary infrastructure. This situation makes smooth coordination between the two parties essential, so that the research and information products generated in the fisheries institutions are made available to the environmental agencies that now possess the legal authority to act on them. The required process of adaptation and systemic maturation in this regard is however still a work in progress in most Latin American countries, while the corresponding regulatory framework is also rather new and is still in the process of being adjusted. Nevertheless, the TE notes that over the course of the project's implementation, coordination has improved and the relationship has become more fluid. (TE p. 34)

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 of the project appears to have been high, as evident from the above expected level of materialized country co-financing mentioned above in section 5.1. However, it is difficult to pin down the corresponding effect on project outcomes, since the TE does not provide a concise breakdown of co-financing by either sources or use. (TE pp. 30-33)

In terms of sustainability, the TE notes evidence of early incorporation of several project results into the policies and activities of Chilean and Peruvian government agencies. However, it also views the prioritization of issues identified by the strategic action program in the political agendas of Chile and Peru, as well as the maintenance of networks and mechanisms for inter-institutional coordination among key actors that were developed during the project, as its greatest challenges. (TE p. 38)

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 Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The TE's discussion of M&E focuses mostly on M&E implementation but neglects M&E design at entry. In its summary table it rates M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory.

However, the TE's analysis of the logical and results framework concludes that while the project documents specified clear objectives and well-defined products realistic at the time they were proposed, the selected indicators were often not specific, difficult to measure, not easily accessible, or poorly defined. The TE also found inconsistencies in the proposed means of verification. In many cases these were unclearly specified or based on baseline studies that were to be carried out in the first months of the project but never materialized. Overall, the TE identified design weaknesses in the project results framework that made it difficult to measure its success in achieving some of the proposed results. (TE pp. 20-22)

Other than these identified weaknesses in the results framework and its indicators, the project documents specified standard M&E procedures, including an inception workshop and report, annual project and project implementation reports, a project steering committee, mid-term and final evaluation, and a terminal report. The project design also included the M&E budget. (CEO-End pp. 4-6)

Overall, the TER therefore rates M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE's discussion of M&E focuses mostly on M&E implementation, rating it as Satisfactory, though in its summary table it rates M&E implementation as Highly Satisfactory. The TER rates M&E implementation as Satisfactory.

The TE notes that the project had numerous M&E instruments for during implementation, but mainly the reports presented to the board of directors by the regional coordination unit on a quarterly and annual basis, the implementation reports by UNDP, the midterm evaluation and a financial audit.

According to the TE, thorough monitoring of the activities laid out in the annual work plans, including indicators for planned, ongoing and finalized activities, was carried out. Its evaluation of the relevant documents confirmed the objectivity of the information submitted in each reporting period, as well as the recognition of partial failures to reach goals and corresponding reports to the national committees and the steering committee, including the activities that needed urgent attention. The PIRs included further supplementary information by also monitoring the indicators of the project results framework and its risk matrix.

The TE notes that all M&E instruments used showed an adequate level of synthesis and relevance, providing the information needed to take the necessary corrective measures, if the management committee considered it appropriate. However, minutes of its annual meetings also show that operational issues took more time of its agenda than strategic ones and that there was no discussion of the MTR and whether any corrective or preventive action was necessary. (TE p. 28)

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: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The project implementing agency was UNDP. The TE provides no designated section discussing the performance of the implementing agency in detail. Based on the limited relevant information found in the TE, the TER rates quality of project implementation as Satisfactory.

According to the TE, UNDP and UNOPS divided their scope and responsibilities, with UNOPS being responsible for administrative management and UNDP for implementation M&E, which created the perception of causing additional operational costs not foreseen in the project document. UNDP also collaborated with the political-strategic subsystem of the project, provided its network of experts and international programs related to the project theme, and supported the regional coordination unit through UNDP-USA and UNDP-PANAMA. The regional coordination unit recognized the value of UNDP's technical support and its mediation of some conflict situations, highlighting the contributions in reconciling positions with the GEF focal point in Chile. Finally, UNDP participated in the project steering committee in line with the provisions of the project document and periodically monitored the project under the results framework and in terms of the risk analysis through the PIRs.

UNOPS provided its IT and financial-accounting systems as well as support staff at its headquarters and at the local level, implementing the procurement procedures, contracting, and supporting the administrative execution of the project. (TE pp. 22-23)

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	----------------------

The executing agencies were IFOP (Chile) and IMARPE (Peru), with UNOPS providing support and facilitating project management. The TE provides no designated section discussing the performance of the executing agencies in detail. Based on the limited relevant information found in the TE, the TER rates quality of project execution as Satisfactory.

The TE notes that at the design stage, there were non-written agreements between the participating countries that were subsequently not reflected in the implementation of the project, creating some tensions between the executing agencies, the implementing agency and the regional coordination unit. This was due to the fact that as the regional coordination unit was located in Peru it was therefore expected that the regional coordinator would be Chilean, which however did not result from the

international call to fill the vacancy. At the same time, the selected Chilean expert for the position of assistant coordinator resigned and the vacancy was filled with a Peruvian technician, deepening the regional asymmetry. The TE however found that this initially tense situation was overcome over the course of the implementation and did eventually not affect the achievement of the project results. (TE p. 22)

A more serious concern with the project's execution were the previously noted tensions between fishery and environmental agencies, stemming from their different degrees of organizational maturity and technical capacity, coinciding with competing jurisdictional ambitions. While coordination between them has grown more and more fluid over the course of the project's implementation, the resulting tensions and initial delays appear to have somewhat negatively impacted the project through increased administrative costs by necessitating an extension of the deadline. However, the TE describes these institutional challenges as a common problem in Latin American countries, for which the project is only partly to blame. (TE p. 34)

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.

While the TE does not note any environmental change resulting directly from the project, it views it in a position well suited to achieve verifiable reductions of ecosystem pressures on the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem in the medium term, mostly due to the positive impacts on institutional capacities noted below. (TE p. 27)

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.

The TE does not note any socioeconomic changes occurring as a result of the project and no other information is available.

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

The TE considers the project as having had an important impact in terms of institutional strengthening, by increasing the awareness of relevant actors about ecosystem-based management (EBM) and by catalyzing the incorporation of its criteria in collaborative work programs. Training workshops on management issues, ecosystem management, technologies, and other relevant components for EBM, as well as the development and strengthening of environmental information systems, were important tools in this regard. The experiences of the pilot areas have served as a proof of concept, with their lessons learned identified and their best practices disseminated to be replicated in other areas, involving resource users in sustainable, ecosystem-based management. Almost 5,000 people have been mobilized in workshops and courses, both for training purposes and to support the consolidation of protected area management committees in terms of governance. (TE p. 27)

b) Governance

The project developed planning and policy instruments for ecosystem-based management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem under component 1. Furthermore, in terms of generating a coordinated framework to improve governance and promote the sustainable use of living marine resources and ecosystem services, the project was effective in promoting coordination between actors on the national level. Due to border disputes between Chile and Peru during the project, it was however not as successful on the bi-national level, but was particularly successful in generating articulation dynamics among artisanal fishermen, government organizations and NGOs. (TE pp. 34-37)

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.

The TE does not note any unintended impacts and no other information is available.

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.

The TE takes note of the early incorporation of several project results into the policies and activities of Chilean and Peruvian government agencies. In particular, the Instituto del Mar del Perú and the Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (Chile) have been deepening the ecosystem management approach in their management of fishing resources. Environmental agencies are managing important inputs generated under the project framework for the management of protected areas and have already incorporated lessons learned from the articulation processes. Many of these activities are already incorporated in the institutions' budgets and require adjustments in lines of work that are considered feasible in the short and medium term. Other project activities to be institutionalized may require additional budget funds. (TE p. 26)

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, future initiatives should give more attention to project governance and to how it responds to the sectoral policies (e.g. productive, environmental, social, territorial) in which it is framed.

The TE views good inter-institutional relationships not only as key to the formulation of the strategic action program in this case, but also as a key factor for the achievement of the objectives of any project involved with ecosystem-based management (EBM) in general. It is therefore essential to develop mechanisms to facilitate negotiation and conflict resolution. In this regard, the TE highlights the role of institutions responsible for sectoral policies, such as environmental ministries in this project.

Reaching consensus on complex projects involving many actors with different social and environmental backgrounds and agendas is an expensive process. It requires a great effort and management skills from the coordination unit, the cost of which should be considered as an added value in achieving project results rather than as administrative costs. The TE views this as a critical factor to be considered in selecting the staff of these units.

The TE further calls for the development of specific communication plans in order to prioritize and include project themes in the political agenda. They should generate concise information products with clear proposals and recommendations for solving the main problems associated with EBM and sustainability criteria-based management.

In all areas of major contributions of the project, such as in social technology, with the pilot projects and their introduction of best EBM practices, and with the contributions in the management of protected areas, the TE views the project as having promoted the synergic relationship of the academic, governmental, and business sector. It allowed for the identification of best practices, the development of a specific project methodology to involve the productive sector, and the generation of useful information products for the development of environmental public policy and management. (TE p. 45)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Result 1

- Maintain commitment to environmental issues and preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem in the agendas of both governments.
- Analyze the desirability and feasibility of a supranational management body for the coordinated management of shared fish stocks in transboundary areas and the addressing of related environmental concerns.
- Extend implementation of the project until December 2016, with the aim of transferring its results to policy makers in the participating countries.
- Develop an agenda for the implementation of at least some of the priority activities identified in the strategic action program (SAP).
- It is recommended to catalyze the above recommendations by submitting a Project Implementation Form for one of the SAP items to the GEF.
- Promote and present the results of the project to entities potentially interested in financing the promoted policies.

Result 2

- Maintain the "Amigos del Mar" network as an instrument for communication and social awareness of ecosystem-based management. Review the communication policy of the project in Chile to achieve similar results.

Result 3:

- Evaluate the actions of the inter-sectoral committee to ensure the sustainability of the management mechanisms developed in the pilots and evaluate their transfer to other areas.
- Transfer activities and capacities of the project to the Servicio Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas por el Estado (Peru) and the Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura (Chile) to promote the creation of committees and subcommittees for the management of protected areas.
- Include joint activities to increase knowledge on shared resources and the impacts of climate change on fisheries and extreme weather in the annual work plans of IMARPE and IFOP.

Other recommendations:

- Evaluate the possible role of UNDP in consolidating the sustainability of governance structures for cross-border resource management by providing management capacities, international standards, and mediation between the parties.
- Ensure that other projects preparing for submission to the GEF adopt an adequate selection of indicators and means of verification in their results frameworks. Ensure that results can be assessed accurately ex-post by safeguarding the provision of the studies necessary for the establishment of clear baselines.

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 IEO 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?	The report contains an assessment of most relevant outcomes and some important impacts of the project, as well as the achievement of its objectives, but the relevant information appears incomplete and disconnected.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is at times internally inconsistent and the evidence presented unconvincing and not very well substantiated.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses sustainability but does not discuss all relevant aspects of sustainability.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are largely supported by the evidence but could be more comprehensive.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides conflicting and inconsistent information about actual project costs and co-financing.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report only explicitly assesses M&E implementation in its evaluation of project M&E systems.	MU
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).