

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project: *Towards Ecosystem-Based Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)* (PIMS 4147).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Towards Ecosystem-Based Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)			
GEF Project ID:	57808		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	4147	GEF financing:	6,925,000	6,925,000
Country:	Chile and Peru	IA/EA own:	50,000	50,000
Region:	LAC	Government:	20,562,584	25,000,000
Focal Area:	IW & BD	Other:	4,006,400	4,061,500
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	IWSP1 and BD SP2 + SP4	Total co-financing:	24,624,084	25,330,000
Executing Agency:	UNOPS	Total Project Cost:	31,549,084	32,255,000
Other Partners involved:	TNC, IRD, UCH, WWF, NOAA, CI, Private Sector, GoC & GoP	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		02.09.2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 02.09.2015	Actual: 31.03.2016

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to promote ecosystem based management in the Humboldt Current System (HCS) area, 4-40 degrees south including the proportion corresponding to the two countries EEZs within this area. The Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem stretches from the frontier Ecuador-Peru to that

corresponding to Chile-Argentina, however with the exception of the economic valuation of the goods and services provided by this LME, the project's scope has been focused on the HCS area.

The Project's goal and objective are:

Project Goal: Advance towards a sustainably used and resilient HCLME that can maintain biological integrity and diversity and ecosystem services for current and future generations despite changing climatic and social pressures.

Project Objective: Ecosystem-based management in the HCLME is advanced through a coordinated framework that provides for improved governance and the sustainable use of living marine resources and services.

The project has four specific Outcomes to deliver the Project Objective:

Outcome 1: Planning and policy instruments for EBM of the HCLME – the development of the SAP.

Outcome 2: Institutional capacities strengthened for SAP implementation and for up-scaling the results of pilot interventions to the systems level.

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

Outcome 4: Implementation of pilot MPAs underpins ecosystem conservation and resilience.

The Humboldt Current supports one of the world's most productive Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs), representing approximately 11% of the global fish catch and hosting globally significant biodiversity. High environmental variability in the HCLME has significant impacts on ecosystem productivity and trophic structure. In addition, a range of anthropogenic activities are exerting pressure on this unique ecosystem.

Ecosystem-based management seeks to restore and sustain the health, productivity, resilience, and biological diversity of coastal and marine systems and promote the quality of life for humans who depend on them. Grounded in science, it defines management regimes on the basis of ecological, rather than political, limits that focus on the relevant aspects of ecosystem structure and functioning, and addresses ecological, social, and economic goals. It calls for engaging multiple stakeholders in a collaborative process to define problems and find solutions and uses an adaptive management approach to address uncertainty.

The main Barriers to EBM implementation for the HCLME are structural and political: the government institutions responsible for managing coastal and marine systems are fragmented and tend to be organized along political, rather than ecological, boundaries and the linkages between conservation and economic and sometimes social interests is often not appreciated. As indicated in previous sections implementing EBM for the HCLME will require reforms over the long term to management institutions and development of new political constituencies. In the short term, however, attempts to implement EBM are constrained by gaps in

knowledge and understanding of how to manage coastal and marine systems, difficulties in effectively incorporating scientific understanding into the decision-making process, and incipient recognition of the need to include the stakeholders whose support will be essential to action in the management processes.

Building on International Waters (IW) practice, the project will put in place a governance framework and strengthen foundational capacities for effective long-term ecosystem management, while in the short term, drawing from experience in the biodiversity focal area, provide at a number of selected sites in Chile and Peru protection from the most immediate pressures to ecosystem health and globally significant biodiversity. The project will assist both countries to overcome identified barriers and achieve specific deliverables that include:

- A strengthened regional planning framework with the development and endorsement of a long-term SAP and National Action Plans (NAP), including approved policy instruments for ecosystem-based management established for the HCLME; and
- Improved capacities for up-scaling management models to strengthen marine habitat representativity in the countries' National Protected Area Strategies (NPAS), enhance ecosystem resilience, and catalyse the sustainability of national marine protected areas systems as a basis for establishing a network of marine protected areas along the HCLME in the future.

The project intervention strategy has a three pronged structure:

1. At one level, the project will advance a strategic long-term planning framework for the identification and prioritization of actions needed to preserve and maintain ecosystem benefits and services of importance for the HCLME. At a systemic level this will be achieved through the formulation of a SAP that includes a plan for a system of Marine Protected Areas of the HCLME (Outcome 1). This will provide an overarching platform for the conceptualization and definition of planning frameworks at national and sub-national levels.
2. However, given that planning processes need to be based upon and informed by measurable on-the-ground experiences, a second thrust of the project will be on a number of in-situ interventions (pilots) that validate differentiated management approaches and targeted responses (Outcome 4). These pilots have been selected using criteria that include global biodiversity values, potential resource generation, stakeholder interest and replication value. They are the Peruvian Guano Islands, Isles and Capes National Reserve (RNSIIPG) and the Bajo O'Higgins and Juan Fernandez Seamounts in Chile. The pilots will deliver direct benefits to biodiversity currently under-represented in the national protected area systems in the short term and provide ground tested lessons for the planning frameworks to be developed through Outcome 1. Complementing these efforts, the sea canyons in both countries will be assessed for their potential as important biodiversity sites and their viability as potential MPAs will be evaluated.
3. The third level of the project will address the interaction between these two axes by developing the skills, instruments and mechanisms both to effectively up-scale the lessons learnt from the pilots in Outcome 4 and to strengthen capacities for implementing the strategic planning frameworks defined in Outcome 1. These include interventions that have already been identified as priority for effective multi-disciplinary management of the HCLME to be delivered through Outcome 3. These interventions will focus on developing coordinated fisheries management collaboration experiences, specific MPA management tools and legislation, and on identifying equivalent national MPA management strategies in order to arrive at shared understanding of management approaches. Outcome 2 will provide the

linkage between the strategic instruments developed under Outcome 1 and the tools for upscaling and advancing the priority interventions under Outcome 3. It will focus on strengthening capacities in key institutions and among stakeholder groups for applying both planning and management instruments and tools. Spatially-based Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation Systems will be developed to underpin the new approaches to management and stewardship of ecosystem goods and services. Additionally, market based mechanisms will generate opportunities for promoting new private sector sustainable management arrangements.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (fill in Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal points, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to both Chile and Peru, including the following project sites: Santiago and Valparaiso in Chile plus Lima and Paracas (pilot site) in Peru. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. José Vicente Troya, Regional Technical Advisor Water and Oceans, LAC, UNDP Panama via Skype
2. Jorge Alvarez and Ignacia Holmes, UNDP COs Lima and Santiago
3. Focal point entities: IFOP in Chile and IMARPE in Peru;
4. The Ministries of the Environment in both countries and GEF focal points;
5. The Fisheries Ministries or equivalent in both countries (Fisheries Undersecretariat = SUBPESCA in Chile and PRODUCE in Peru);
6. The authorities responsible for Marine Protected Areas, Marine Parks or Natural Protected Areas (Ministry of the Environment and SUBPESCA in Chile and SERNANP in Peru);

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

7. The Nature Conservancy (Peru);
8. WWF (Chile and Peru);
9. Oceana (Peru);
10. Conservation International (Peru) and Erich Pacheco from CI USA via Skype;
11. Pablo Echevarria, Grupo Consorcio, San Andrés, Paracas, Peru
12. Luis Efraín Clemente Sanguinetti: Universidad Villareal, Lima, Peru
13. Artisanal Fisher representatives: Chile and Peru
14. Steve Martins, Regional Government, Ica, Peru
15. Nancy Daves, NOAA, via Skype

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of these Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (US\$)		Government (US\$)		Partner Agency (US\$)		Total (US\$)	Total (US\$)
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	50,000	50,000					50,000	50,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support 			Chile 11,539,084 Peru 12,345,000	Chile 12,500,000 Peru 12,500,000			23,884,084	25,000,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other 					TNC 690,000	TNC 150,000 NOAA 95,000 WWF 20,000 Conservation Int. 40,000 Consortio S.A. 25,000	690,000	330,000
Totals	50,000	50,000	24,624,084	25,000,000	690,000	330,000	24,574,084	25,380,000

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with both the UNDP Regional office in Panama and the CO in Peru. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be over a time period of 10 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	18 December 2015
Evaluation Mission	10 days	20 January 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	29 January 2016
Final Report	2 days	26 February 2016

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: 30.12.2015	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: 20.01.2016	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: 29.01.2016	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: latest 26.02.2016	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have a conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in water resources management, international development, environmental sciences, monitoring and evaluation, or other relevant fields;
- A first level university degree in combination of 9 years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree.
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience;
- Language requirements: be bilingual Spanish–English;

- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; and
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas: Large Marine Ecosystems (LME) and the TDA-SAP process.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline Value	Targets at end of project	Sources of verification	Assumptions																										
<p>GOAL: A sustainably used and resilient HCLE that can maintain biological integrity and diversity and ecosystem services for current and future generations despite changing climatic and social pressures</p>																															
<p>OBJECTIVE: Ecosystem-based management in the HCLME is advanced through a coordinated framework that provides for improved governance and the sustainable use of living marine resources and services</p>	<p>1. Agreement on and understanding of the ecosystem-level issues of the HCLME as they relate to management of living marine resources (LMR) and biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>Concerns relative to management of HCLME LMR limited to main shared commercial fishery stocks and impacts of environmental volatility</p>	<p>Countries agree on the scope and priority of ecosystem level issues & develop interventions to address them in the SAP including management of shared fisheries from an EBM perspective</p>	<p>Approved SAP NAP with detailed budgets</p>	<p>Both countries continue to show the same commitment to advancing EBM as the start of project</p>																										
	<p>2. Increase in the % of fisheries management decisions that are based on integrated information on multi-specific criteria and multi-disciplinary parameters, including natural and ENSO-related variability</p>	<p>Both Chile and Peru use single stock criteria for fisheries management, responses to ENSO are not precautionary but reactive <i>Note: A management decision matrix will be defined in year 1 of project for monitoring this indicator</i></p>	<p>The shared anchovy fishery is managed using multi-specific criteria & multi-disciplinary parameters At least 50% of the decisions in management matrix include multi-specific criteria and multi-disciplinary parameters</p>	<p>Coordinated management plans for the two countries</p>		<p>Prioritization of development objectives does not limit the effectiveness of efforts for ecosystem protection</p>																									
	<p>3. Increased area of priority coastal, coastal-marine and marine habitats in Peru & Chile that are under some form of legal protection that contributes to biodiversity conservation.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Country & Habitat</th> <th>Area ha.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Peru</td> <td>Coastal</td> <td>216,409</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marine</td> <td>118,591</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Chile</td> <td>Seamounts MPA*</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seamounts VME**</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Marine Protected Area **Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME)</p>	Country & Habitat		Area ha.	Peru	Coastal	216,409	Marine	118,591	Chile	Seamounts MPA*	0	Seamounts VME**	0	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Country & Habitat</th> <th>Area (ha.)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Peru</td> <td>Coastal</td> <td>395,867</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marine</td> <td>130,491</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Chile</td> <td>Seamounts MPA*</td> <td>8,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seamounts VME**</td> <td>507,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Estimated by 1.5 m round seamount apex **Under increased protection through VME protocol and fishing regulations; area estimated as per MPA x # of seamounts</p>	Country & Habitat		Area (ha.)	Peru	Coastal	395,867	Marine	130,491	Chile	Seamounts MPA*	8,300	Seamounts VME**	507,000	<p>SERNANP legal documents NPAPS – MPA implementation strategies for each country</p>	<p>Private sector continues to be supportive of certification processes</p>
	Country & Habitat		Area ha.																												
Peru	Coastal	216,409																													
	Marine	118,591																													
Chile	Seamounts MPA*	0																													
	Seamounts VME**	0																													
Country & Habitat		Area (ha.)																													
Peru	Coastal	395,867																													
	Marine	130,491																													
Chile	Seamounts MPA*	8,300																													
	Seamounts VME**	507,000																													
<p>4. Increase in the number of certifiable fisheries</p>	<p>The necessary conditions for certifying a fishery are not yet in place</p>	<p>At least one fishery has the necessary elements for certification</p>	<p>Project reports Certification application</p>																												

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline Value	Targets at end of project	Sources of verification	Assumptions
				reports	
	5. % increased awareness in identified target groups, of the benefits of applying EBM	% awareness of a defined number of target groups to be determined in the first 6months of the project	30% increase from the baseline value for each target group	Evaluation surveys at project start & end using agreed on EBM definition	
Outcome 1: Planning and policy instruments for ecosystem-based management (EBM) of the HCLME are agreed and in place at regional and national levels	1. A Strategic Action Plan (SAP) developed based on up-dated ecosystem information and with an EBM approach is approved by both countries at the highest levels	There is currently no common planning process or definition of priority actions Limited understanding of EBM	Complete SAP is endorsed at the highest levels by both countries	SAP & legal documents	Changes in the administration in both countries does not affect the continuity of the SAP and NAP processes
	2. National Action Plans (NAPs) developed within the SAP framework and approved in each country	There are no national plans to prioritize actions for HCLM management. Existing plans are sector based	NAPs approved at the highest level in each country	NAP & legal documents	
	3. % of the priority actions identified in plans that have secure financing: (a) regional level in SAP (b)national level in the NAP	(a) 0 (b) Peru =0 Chile =0	(a)40% (b) Peru =60% Chile =60	SAPs; NAPs & Public budget documents	
	4. Existence of short, medium and long-term targets for marine & coastal habitat conservation	National protected area system strategies do not have specific targets for coastal marine conservation	NPAS identify priority to reduce habitat representativity gaps and have specific targets & implementation strategies	Adjusted NPAS	
	5. Number of sectors represented and level of officials that participate in the national inter-sectoral committees	<i>To be measured in yr 1 as NIC do not yet exist</i>	The numbers of sectors represented and levels when NIC are first formed, are maintained and strengthened throughout the project	Minutes (actas) of the NIC meetings	
Outcome 2:	1. % of effective information exchanges in protocols defined within the	Currently, each government manages independent Geographical Information	70% of protocols for information exchange are functioning at least at		The will to share information between public

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline Value	Targets at end of project	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Institutional capacities strengthened for SAP implementation and for up-scaling pilot interventions to the system level	framework of the Ecosystem Information System (EIS)	Systems (GIS) with limited information exchange.	minimal levels		institutions in public and private sectors at national and regional levels continues
	2. % of staff profiles and procedures that are aligned with EBM in key institutions (i.e., CONAMA, MINAM, SUBPESCA, Vice-Minist. de Pesquería)	<10% of staff in IFOP, IMARPE have profiles aligned with needs for EBM <i>Staff profiles & procedures for EBM will be determined in yr 1 once standards have been set based on agreed EBM definition</i>	>20% of staff in IFOP, IMARPE have profiles aligned with needs for EBM >70% of the research projects for resource management follow ecosystemic criteria <i>Targets for other institutions to be determined in year 1</i>	Capacity needs evaluations carried out on year 1 and 5 project Research plans	
	3. Key institutions (MINAM CONAMA, SUBPESCA), have the capacities and internal processes to prioritize the creation of new MPAs and to manage them effectively.	Baseline to be established with institutional capacity scorecard values applied to relevant institutions on each country	30% above baseline values	Institutional capacity scorecard for MPA adapted from UNDP capacity scorecard	
	4. Procedures defined and adopted to promote good fisheries practices and improve market competitiveness within the framework of the HCLME	There are no procedures for promoting good fisheries practices in relation to market competitiveness in either country	At least two mechanisms are adopted that promote good practices and improve market competitiveness within the framework of the HCLME	Project reports; legal documents and evaluations reports on impact of mechanisms	
	5. Improved understanding of the benefits of ecosystem goods and services of artisanal fisher representatives that participate in fisheries fora (as a proxy indicator of potential compliance with regulatory frameworks)	Baseline level of understanding of ecosystem benefits in will be measured in at project start	Increase of 30% above baseline values	Awareness evaluation survey applied at beginning and end of project	
Outcome 3:	1. Advances in adopting EBM for the shared	Current agreement between IFOP and IMARPE only includes	Coordinated management agreement includes the use of multi-specific	Legal documents – IMARPE and	The current commitment to

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline Value	Targets at end of project	Sources of verification	Assumptions																																																															
Implementation of priority MPA & fisheries management tools provides knowledge of options for enhanced protection of HCLME and SAP implementation	anchovy stock as measured by the increase in agreed on and coordinated program of activities	information exchange on stock evaluations and reproductive parameters for main pelagic commercial stocks	criteria and multi-disciplinary parameters for the establishment of each country's TAC for the shared stock	IFOP procedures	international cooperation maintains at least the same level as project start																																																															
	2. Adoption of coordinated management measures for the shared stock, such as closures, quotas and exclusion areas	Each country uses independent criteria for managing their part of the shared stock	Countries use the same criteria for establishing TACs, fishing seasons and exclusion areas	Project reports and legal documents																																																																
	3. Increase in hectares of the coastal-marine interface under improved management - measured by RNSIIPG Master Plan and the tools for monitoring and management effectiveness measurement	RNSIIPG has not yet been established. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Pilot site</th> <th colspan="5">METT Score by Cat.</th> <th rowspan="2">Total METT Score</th> <th rowspan="2">% of total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Context</th> <th>Planning</th> <th>Inputs</th> <th>Processes</th> <th>Outputs</th> <th>Outcomes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RNSIIPG</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>7</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>22</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Max score</td> <td>3</td> <td>24</td> <td>21</td> <td>39</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>99</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Capes and islands of the guano systems are currently managed from an extractive perspective only targeting guano birds as conservation priorities worthy of protection.	Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total	Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes	RNSIIPG	2	6	5	7	0	2	22	22%	Max score	3	24	21	39	3	9	99		<i>RNSIIPG established with a fully developed Management Plan</i> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Pilot site</th> <th colspan="5">METT Score by Cat.</th> <th rowspan="2">Total METT Score</th> <th rowspan="2">% of total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Context</th> <th>Planning</th> <th>Inputs</th> <th>Processes</th> <th>Outputs</th> <th>Outcomes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RNSIIPG</td> <td>3</td> <td>16</td> <td>13</td> <td>24</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> <td>63</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Max score</td> <td>3</td> <td>24</td> <td>21</td> <td>39</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>99</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <i>The GEF METT has been used to establish initial baseline and target values but a more specific M&E tool for marine areas will be developed in the FSP and will also be used to measure management effectiveness gains</i>	Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total	Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes	RNSIIPG	3	16	13	24	1	6	63	64%	Max score	3	24	21	39	3	9	99		RNSIIPG Management Effectiveness monitoring system
	Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total																																																												
Context		Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes																																																														
RNSIIPG	2	6	5	7	0	2	22	22%																																																												
Max score	3	24	21	39	3	9	99																																																													
Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total																																																													
	Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs			Outcomes																																																												
RNSIIPG	3	16	13	24	1	6	63	64%																																																												
Max score	3	24	21	39	3	9	99																																																													
4. Identification of equivalency in conservation management options (PAs) for coastal and marine environments in both countries	Peru has no specific protected area categories for marine areas, but uses terrestrial categories, that follow a gradient from direct to indirect resource use – with no fully intangible protected areas. Chile has three categories for marine areas (Marine Reserves, Marine Parks and MUMPAS). These management schemes and categories are not equivalent for both countries	SNAP and SINANPE MPA conservation categories defined, equated and based on a common concept for both countries	SNAP & SINANPE documentation (Plan Director)																																																																	

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline Value	Targets at end of project	Sources of verification	Assumptions																																																																																																		
	5. Number of best management practices developed in the project pilot sites that are up-scaled to other protected areas	0	a) Peru: > 3 other sites in the RNSIIPG with management committees and plans b) Chile: at least one other canyon or seamount in the process of adoption the management options	a) Management plans of the pilot sites b) Project reports																																																																																																			
Outcome 4: Implementation of pilot MPAs that underpin ecosystem conservation and resilience	1. Increase in management effectiveness of the pilot MPAs measured a) in Peru with Management Plans b) with the Declaration of the area in Chile c) Management effectiveness tracking tool (METT) METT Poor= < 25%; Fair=26–50%;, Good= 51–76%;; Excellent= 77–100%	(a) 3 pilot areas in Peru do not have management plans; in Chile only specific fisheries (orange roughly) are currently managed in sea mounts (b) METT values <u>Peru</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Pilot site</th> <th colspan="5">METT Score by Cat.</th> <th rowspan="2">Total METT Score</th> <th rowspan="2">% of total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Context</th> <th>Planning</th> <th>Inputs</th> <th>Processes</th> <th>Outputs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Lobos de Tierra</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>7</td> <td>0</td> <td>7</td> <td>26</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pta. San Juan</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> <td>10</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>7</td> <td>40</td> <td>42%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Islas Ballestas</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>8</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> <td>28</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Max score</td> <td>3</td> <td>24</td> <td>21</td> <td>36</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Chile</u> Seamount 1& 2 METT 5/63 = 8% Poor	Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total	Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Lobos de Tierra	2	6	4	7	0	7	26	27%	Pta. San Juan	2	6	10	15	0	7	40	42%	Islas Ballestas	2	6	4	8	1	7	28	29%	Max score	3	24	21	36	3	9	96		(a) All 3 pilots in Peru with approved management plans; Ecosystem-based management strategy for 2 sea mounts agreed on by relevant stakeholders (b) METT values <u>Peru</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Pilot site</th> <th colspan="5">METT Score by Cat.</th> <th rowspan="2">Total METT Score</th> <th rowspan="2">% of total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Context</th> <th>Planning</th> <th>Inputs</th> <th>Processes</th> <th>Outputs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Lobos de Tierra</td> <td>3</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>29</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> <td>69</td> <td>72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pta. San Juan</td> <td>3</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>29</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> <td>69</td> <td>72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Islas Ballestas</td> <td>3</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>29</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> <td>69</td> <td>72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Max score</td> <td>3</td> <td>24</td> <td>21</td> <td>36</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Chile</u> Seamount 1&2 METT >30% (Fair or more)	Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total	Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Lobos de Tierra	3	14	14	29	2	7	69	72%	Pta. San Juan	3	14	14	29	2	7	69	72%	Islas Ballestas	3	14	14	29	2	7	69	72%	Max score	3	24	21	36	3	9	96		GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) applied at mid-term and end	Options pre-identified for financial sustainability of MPA prove to be effective
	Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total																																																																																															
		Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs																																																																																																	
Lobos de Tierra	2	6	4	7	0	7	26	27%																																																																																															
Pta. San Juan	2	6	10	15	0	7	40	42%																																																																																															
Islas Ballestas	2	6	4	8	1	7	28	29%																																																																																															
Max score	3	24	21	36	3	9	96																																																																																																
Pilot site	METT Score by Cat.					Total METT Score	% of total																																																																																																
	Context	Planning	Inputs	Processes	Outputs																																																																																																		
Lobos de Tierra	3	14	14	29	2	7	69	72%																																																																																															
Pta. San Juan	3	14	14	29	2	7	69	72%																																																																																															
Islas Ballestas	3	14	14	29	2	7	69	72%																																																																																															
Max score	3	24	21	36	3	9	96																																																																																																
	2. Reduction in the incidence of illegal extractive activities in restricted areas established in the management plans of RNSIIPG pilot sites	No. of reports of illegal extractive activities will be measured once zoning of pilots is complete	Reduction of 50% for RNSIIPG	Reports presented to local Peru port authorities (Capitania de Puerto – DICAPI) at each location																																																																																																			
	3. % management costs of the pilot areas protected that have secure financing a) RNSIIPG pilots b) Seamounts	As neither the RNSIIPG nor the Seamount MPA has been established there are currently no specific management costs.	a) 100% of the RNSIIPG pilots management costs covered of which at least 50% is from resources other than GoP b) Seamount have identified sources	Pilot area management plan financial section and budget																																																																																																			

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline Value	Targets at end of project	Sources of verification	Assumptions
			for 100% management costs	reports	
	4. Ecosystem-based management strategy for sea canyons agreed on by the relevant stakeholders	No specific plans for sea canyons exist	Approved management strategy for sea canyons of the HCLME	Project reports	
	5. Populations of flagship species at pilots <i>Species will be selected in yr 1</i>	Population levels (distribution and abundance) as estimated in yr 1 for selected flagship and/or indicator species in pilots	Populations maintain at least the same levels as at the beginning of the project or are increasing	Flagship species population censuses at project start & end	

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. *Project Document signed 02.09.2010 (English and Spanish versions)*
 2. *Exchange of letters UNDP and Peru-MFA dated 28.02.2012 and 07.03.2012 plus ProDoc, Part 5 Legal Context, paragraph 302*
 3. *Inception Report and Mid Term Review documentation*
 4. *Steering Committee minutes and presentations*
 5. *Approved Annual Operational plans 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015*
 6. *Progress reports including financial data 2011 to 2015*
 7. *Letters from the project focal points in Chile and Peru requesting an extension of the project*
 8. *TDA-SAP documentation and the SAP implementation draft PIF*
 9. *PIR 2013, 2014 and 2015*
-

10. Project product database

11. GEF tracking tools

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to the GEF IW strategic priorities and how does support the GEF IW focal area? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the HCLME participating countries? What is the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to the GEF IW strategic priorities and how does support the GEF IW focal area? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its end-term targets of expected outcomes? Answer the question for all the outcomes. 	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

<p>Have the project logical framework and work plans (and any changes made to them) been used as management tools during implementation?</p> <p>Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <p>Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Is project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</p> <p>Does the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Fernando Amestoy

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Montevideo, Uruguay on 21-12-2015



Signature: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁶)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

<p>Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by</p> <p>UNDP Country Office</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>UNDP GEF RTA</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p>	
---	--