

Towards Ecosystem-Based Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)

Chile - Peru

Terms of Reference

Mid-Term Review

August 2013

Countries:	Chile and Peru
ATLAS Award ID:	00060454 (UNOPS)
PIMS Number:	4147
GEF Focal Area:	IW & BD
GEF Strategic Objective:	GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMME IW/SP1 and BD/SP2 and indirectly SP4
GEF Budget (USD):	6,925,000
Co-Financing Budget (USD):	24,624,084
Project Document Signature dates:	Chile 15.07.2010; Peru 26.08.2010; UNOPS 02.09.2010
Date of first disbursement:	March 2011
Original Planned Closing Date:	March 2015
Executing Agency:	UNOPS
Date of Project Closure	Suggested closing date March 2016

1 INTRODUCTION

UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) to promote accountability for resource use;
- iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subjective to a mid-term and a final independent evaluation. According to the Project Document¹ of the project **Towards Ecosystem-Based Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)**, PIMS 4147, a mid-term review is foreseen in August 2013.

The current Terms of Reference of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the Project **Towards Ecosystem-Based Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME)**, outline what is expected from the Review Team and briefly reflect key aspects of the project and its background. For any description on methodology, procedures and content of the review report reference is made to the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm> (Annex 1)

Brief project description

The Humboldt Current supports one of the world's most productive Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs), representing approximately 18-20% 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.

¹ Page 66 of the ProDoc states that “An independent Mid-Term Evaluation will be undertaken at the end of the second year of implementation”. This would have been August 2014 due to the delays in formal approval of the first work plan, however as this date would leave only 8-months before the scheduled closing of the project (March 2015) and in the light of a one year no-additional cost extension request, it was decided to hold the review after one year of full implementation in August 2013.

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.

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 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.

Global significance and relevance to GEF Programmes

This International Waters (IW) Biodiversity protection (BD) initiative is fully compliant with defined priorities under GEF4. As called for under IW-SP1 it provides 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 have been allocated to set-up and make operational MPAs to conserve currently unprotected off-and near-shore marine and coastal habitats increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA Areas in both Chile and Peru by approximately 500 Km² in coastal areas, and by over 3000 Km² in oceanic areas, clearly contributing to SO1/SP2. A management plan for the RNSIIPG will lay the bases for effective protection of approximately an additional 1,414 Km². Moreover by strengthening systemic and institutional capacities for MPA management nationally and across the HCLME, GEF biodiversity resources will enable the up-scaling of pilot experiences and further contribute to the BD-SO1 objective.

The project will also lay the foundations for EBM approaches that will provide for more sustainable livelihoods, improved food security, and biodiversity conservation and protection as called for in both the IW and BD focal areas. Through the SAP process, the project will help the two countries agree upon needed national and regional policy, legal and institutional reforms, and provide for the system-wide application of science to evaluate and ensure the long-term sustainability of the LME's living marine resources. In turn this will increase the sustainability of biodiversity benefits gained through the MPAs by reducing pressures on these over the long-term.

The incorporation of biodiversity conservation considerations into fisheries policy and regulation through advancing multi-species monitoring and marketplace governance mechanisms will contribute to BD-SO2-SP4 goals and this, together with the IW approaches to build foundational capacity for threats abatement in both countries, will further contribute towards the BD-SO2 of incorporating sustainable use of living marine resources and conservation of biodiversity in the productive seascape.

A key focus of the project will be to assist both countries and communities to adapt to fluctuating fish stocks and coastal climatic regimes, including through the incorporation of climate change scenarios into fisheries and ecosystem management strategies and Protected Area system design. Therefore significant lessons for the emerging field of adaptation to climate change will be generated.

Complications

The project document was signed by the executing agency UNOPS on 02.10.2010. The Regional Project Coordinator was at post at the start of April 2011 and the full Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) team of three in place by November 2011. Peru underwent presidential elections during this inception period and there was consequentially a change in government officials. Immediately prior to the intended inception workshop in November 2011, the Peruvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (P-MFA) announced that the Project Document had an error on the legal page (item 302) and that the inception workshop would have to be postponed until the text could be corrected. The latter took 5-months and was eventually resolved via an exchange of letters between UNDP-Lima and the P-MFA dated 28.02.2012 and 07.03.2012 respectively. The inception report was presented and approved at the first Steering Committee meeting held on 18.05.2012. A work plan for the period June 2012 to December 2013 was also presented. During the meeting the activities and corresponding activity budget were approved but not the associated project management costs as these were considered to be disproportionately high. These were eventually approved, with observations, on 16.07.2012.

To address this serious deficit, a tripartite meeting Chile-Peru-UNDP/GEF is to be convened to discuss reprioritizing and focusing remaining resources on key project activities –including reviewing implementing costs–, particularly

the development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) –having first completed the necessary Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)– and the implementation of pilot marine protected areas that underpin ecosystem conservation and resilience, as there will be no additional GEF funds for the project’s current phase. A discussion is also needed on measures to enhance ownership of the project and to mitigate staff rotation at government level.

Some of the work plan observations included comments on the intended activities towards improved management of the joint anchovy stock N. Chile – S. Peru, which should not start until after the judgment is received from the international Court of Justice at The Hague regarding the marine border dispute between Peru and Chile.

In relation to the GEF CEO approval, dated 22.10.2009, and expected start-up in January 2010, the project’s actual start in terms of approved work plan implementation was delayed by 30 months, although a range of preparatory activities were undertaken from April 2011. The Chilean and Peruvian focal points therefore requested a rescheduled mid-term review and revised project end date: August 2013 and March 2016 respectively.

2 OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such reviews established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm>. A key principle of the review is that it must provide clearly documented evidence and analysis, and unbiased assessment.

With the objective to strengthen the project adaptive management and monitoring, mid-term reviews are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. As such the MTR provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. Another objective of the MTR is to ensure accountability for the achievement the GEF objective. Through the identification and documentation of lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects) an MTR also enhances organizational and development learning.

The main stakeholders of this MTR are UNDP (Regional – Panama and Country Level: Chile and Peru), UNOPS (Copenhagen) and the Steering Committee members from both Chile and Peru: 1) The Fisheries Institutes (IFOP and IMARPE); 2) The Environmental Ministries; 3) Fisheries Management entities (SUBPESCA under-secretariat belonging to the Ministry of Economy Development & Tourism in Chile plus the equivalent in Peru the Ministry of Production; 4) Entities working with aquatic resource conservation SERNAPESCA in Chile and SERNANP in Peru; 5) The Foreign Affairs Ministries.

3 SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

The review will cover the five major criteria which are: 1) relevance, 2) effectiveness, 3) efficiency, 4) results and 5) sustainability. These five review criteria should be further defined through a series of questions (Annex 2) covering all aspects of the project intervention, broken out in three main sections:

- a) Project Formulation: Logical framework, Assumptions and Risks, Budget (co-finance) and Timing
- b) Project Implementation: IA/EA supervision and support, monitoring (including use of tracking tools) and evaluation, stakeholder participation, adaptive management.
- c) Achievement of Results: Outcomes, Impacts, Catalytic effect, Sustainability, Mainstreaming (e.g. links to other UNDP priorities, including related support programmes set out in the UNDAF² and CPAP³, as well as cross cutting issues)

The Guidance in <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm> details which of the project components need to be rated as well as a definition of the six point rating scale (Annex 3: from Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)⁴.

² The United Nations Development Action Framework

³ Country Programme Action Plan

4 PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE REVIEW

The review team is expected to deliver three products as described in the Guidance

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm>

1. An Inception Report
2. Oral presentation of main findings of the review to UNDP RO⁵ and CO⁶ and Project Team before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of review findings.
3. A review report which is to be in line with the Report Outline described in the Guidance in <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm> and shown at Annex 1.

5 METHODOLOGY OR REVIEW APPROACH

The review methodology is to follow the Guidance in <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm> and the Review Team is to present a fine-tuned proposal in the Inception Report which is to be discussed with the UNDP-Regional and Country Offices and the project's Coordination Unit.

A list of documents to be reviewed by the Review Team is attached in Annex 4.

6 REVIEW TEAM

An international expert, bilingual (Spanish-English), with at least 10 years of natural resources project management and review/evaluation experience, ideally including GEF project implementation and Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) experience. The candidate must be familiar with the TDA-SAP⁷ process and the associated International Waters plus Biodiversity aspects. The international expert will be the team Leader (team of one) responsible for the timely delivery and quality of all MTR reporting and schedule approval. S/he will have experience from work in Latin America and will ideally have worked in both Chile and Peru or at least be familiar with the HCLME and its regional/global importance. The consultant should have a higher degree in biological sciences or similar. Applicants with a social science degree will also be considered providing they can show familiarity with the complex biological processes of importance to LMEs and in particular the HCLME.

The consultant in charge of the MTR will be held to the ethical standards referred to in the Guidance <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm> and are expected to sign the Code of Conduct (Annex 5) upon acceptance of the assignment.

7 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Management Arrangements

The MTR is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and solicited and led by the UNDP RO in coordination with the COs in Peru and Chile, as the project Implementing Agency. The UNDP-CO-Peru, in coordination with the UNDP-CO-Chile and the project Regional Coordination Unit (RCU), has overall responsibility for the logistical arrangements of the

⁴ Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution

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

⁵ RO = Regional Office

⁶ CO = Country Office

⁷ TDA-SAP = Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis SAP = Strategic Action Programme

review as well as day-to-day support to the review team (travel, accommodation, office space, communications, etc) and timely provision of per diems and contractual payments. The UNDP-COs will organize the site missions (travel arrangements, meetings with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, interviews, field trips). The review team will be briefed by the UNDP Country Offices and the RCU upon the commencement of the assignment, and will also provide a terminal briefing. Other briefing sessions may be scheduled, if deemed necessary.

The principal responsibility for logistical arrangements in order to manage this review resides with the UNOPS IWC in Copenhagen. The UNOPS IWC will contract a consultant responsible for the review and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the review team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the review team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Payment modalities and specifications: The reviewers will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 70% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-RO and COs and UNDP-GEF RCU, and the other 30% once the final report has been completed and cleared by both the UNDP-RO & COs and UNDP-GEF RCU. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-RO, COs and UNDP-GEF-RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the reviewers will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures, and will be agreed upon by the UNDP RO, RCU and the UNDP Country Offices. The final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, therefore, the UNDP-RO and COs and UNDP-GEF-RCU will have to formally clear the report (as per the Approval Form in Annex 6).

7.1 Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines

Preparation before field work:

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the countries);
- Inception Report preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team;
- Initial telephone discussion with UNDP and Regional Project Coordinator.

Mission:

- Meeting with UNDP Country office teams;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in both countries
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project sites (Valparaíso in Chile⁸ and Paracas in Peru)
 - Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
 - Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

⁸ A meeting in Valparaíso only as travel to the Chilean Pilot sites on and around the Juan Fernandez Islands is very difficult due to distance and weather conditions. Flights are available but are often cancelled on the day of travel especially in the Austral winter. The Islands can be reached by boat, a journey of between 30 and 36 hours. The boat returns a few hours having completed the unloading-loading process and the next one arrives a month later.

Draft report To be provided by 13th September 2013 (70% of the total payment)

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and UNOPS + Project team.
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP RO, COs and UNOPS + RPC
- Completion and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions. Comments and suggestions to be sent within 1 month from 13th September submission date

Final Report (30% of the total payment)

- Presentation of final review report with comments incorporated by 28th October(Annex 7 review Report Outline).

VIII. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: UNDP GUIDANCE ON EVALUATION OF GEF FINANCED PROJECTS (VERSION FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS)

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm>

ANNEX 2: REVIEW QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by the UNDP Regional Technical Adviser (RTA) 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?			
- Is the project relevant to the GEF IW strategic priorities and how does support the GEF IW focal area?	•	•	•
-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?			
-Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	•	•	•
-Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
-Has the project been effective in achieving its midterm targets of expected outcomes? Answer the question for all the outcomes.	•	•	•
-What has been the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Are these sufficient?	•	•	•
Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?			
-What changes can be made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
-Has adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?	•	•	•
-Do the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?			
-Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?			
-Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?			
-Is project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)			
-Does the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?			
-How has results-based management used during project implementation?			
-To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations have been encouraged and supported?	•	•	•
-What is the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?			
-Which methods are successful or not and why?			
-How can the project more efficiently carry out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?	•	•	•
-What changes can be made to the project in order to improve its efficiency?			
-Has the project been efficient in achieving its expected outcomes?	•	•	•

ANNEX 3: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></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><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></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><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i> 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 4: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED BY THE REVIEWER

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
4. Steering Committee minutes and presentations
5. Approved 2012-13 work plan and revised 2013 work plan
6. Financial reports 2011 and 2012
7. Letters from the project focal points in Chile and Peru requesting an extension of the project
8. National Intersectoral Committee documentation: Chile and Peru
9. PIR 2012
10. QORs 2011, 2012 and 2013
11. Reports from IFOP-SUBPESCA re visits to the Juan Fernandez Islands - Chile
12. Territorial Use Rights for Fishing (TURF) workshop proceedings - Chile
13. Regional Coordination Unit - Back to the Office Reports
14. Publications to date:
 - a. IMARPE documents
 - b. Risk Analysis texts Peru and Chile
 - c. http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/environment-energy/water_governance/frontline-observations-on-climate-change-and-sustainability-of-/
 - d. AAAS Boston 17.02.2013 "The Resilience and Robustness of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem" M. J. Akester
15. The project website: www.humboldt.iwlearn.org and documents available at the site
16. EBM training course report
17. TDA-SAP training and kick-off workshop
18. Previous TDA-SAP documentation (2003)
19. Biodiversity study Isla Lobos de Tierra (Northern Pilot Site Peru)
20. Baseline data (Biological and Socio-economic) Marcona (southern Pilot Site Peru)
21. Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) training materials
22. Actor mapping work in three areas next to the Capes and Guano Islands National Reserve – Peru
23. 5 LME thematic study reports from both Chile and Peru
24. Causal Chain Analysis Workshop proceedings – Chile and Peru
25. Official cooperation agreement between SERNANP and IMARPE
26. Seamount and Canyon working group documentation - Chile
27. Documentation relating to the Capes and Guano Islands National Reserve – Master Plan Vision development
28. GEF tracking tools

ANNEX 5: REVIEW CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Reviewers:

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 review findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the review 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. Reviewers must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Reviewers are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance a review of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting reviews. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Reviewers 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, reviewers 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 review. Knowing that a review might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, reviewers should conduct the review 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 review.

Review Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

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 Reviews.

Signed at place on date

Signature: _____

ANNEX 6: REVIEW REPORT CLEARANCE FORM TO BE COMPLETED BY CO AND RCU AND INCLUDED IN THE FINAL DOCUMENT

Review Report Reviewed and Cleared by:	
UNDP Regional Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP Country Office - Peru	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP Country Office - Chile	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNOPS Regional Project Coordinator	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ANNEX 7: REVIEW REPORT OUTLINE⁹

- i.** Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Review time frame and date of revision report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Review team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Review Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual¹⁰)
- 1.** Introduction
 - Purpose of the revision
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the revision 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 rated¹¹)
- 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
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and

⁹The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹⁰ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹¹ 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.

- 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
 - Annex 1: UNDP Guidance on Evaluation of GEF Financed Projects (Version for external reviewers)
 - Annex 2: List of Documents to be revised by the reviewer
 - Annex 3: Reviewer Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form
 - Annex 4: Review Report Clearance Form to be completed by CO and RCU and included in the final document
 - Annex 5: Review Report Outline
 - Annex 6: Rating Scales
 - Annex 7: Review Questions
-