



**CLME+ Project**  
Caribbean & North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems

CLME+ PSC Meeting 11-12 October, 2021



## SUMMARY TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

CATALYZING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE SUSTAINABLE  
MANAGEMENT OF SHARED LIVING MARINE RESOURCES IN THE CARIBBEAN AND  
NORTH BRAZIL SHELF LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS (CLME+)



*Catalyzing implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf LME's (2015-2020)*

The author of the Terminal Evaluation was Dr. Andrea Merla, who also authored the Mid Term Review.

## Objectives of the Terminal Evaluation

- Assess the achievement of project results
- Draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of benefits from this and similar projects
- Aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming



# Methodology

- Review of relevant project documents and sources of information e.g. Project M&E Reports, Progress Reports, Mid Term Review
- Interviews with selected National Focal Points; selected co-executing partners; IGOs and CSOs; UNOPS; UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor; UNDP Head, Ocean and Waters Programme; and PCU
- Assessment of project performance undertaken based on expected targets from Project Results Framework
- Assessment of the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized



### Key describing the rows in the table

Description of the Project Outcome as defined in the CLME+ Project Document

Information on status of outputs under a specific outcome. Green means output successfully achieved.

Information on status of outputs under a specific outcome. Yellow means output partially achieved at the time that the Terminal Evaluation was undertaken

## Project Results and Impacts

**Component 1: Consolidating the institutional, policy and legal frameworks for sustainable and climate-resilient shared living marine resources governance in the CLME+ region.**

### TE Observations:

- Largely achieved through IFCM and ICM, integrating fisheries management and environmental health.
- The transition to an overarching “long-term” Coordination Mechanism through a non-binding MoU agreed upon by countries and IGOs and technically cleared by the SC, is now pending the final decision of the countries

All outputs were rated SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED

## Project Results and Impacts

**Component 2: Enhancing the capacity of key institutions and stakeholders to effectively implement knowledge-based EBM/EAF for sustainable shared living marine resources use in the CLME**

### TE Observations:

Largely successful in (i) providing decision and policy makers in the region, including relevant IGOs, with the science, capacity and tools (strategies) that will enable them to address the 3 priority problems identified under the TDAs (ii) assist stakeholders in achieving improved coordination, collaboration and integration among the wide array of ongoing and newly planned projects and initiatives that are of relevance to the wider objectives of the CLME+ SAP

5 outputs evaluated as SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED

1 output evaluated as PARTIALLY ACHIEVED

## Project Results and Impacts

### Component 3: Implementing EBM/EAF in the CLME+ region

#### TE Observations:

Of the five sub-projects, three have been successfully completed, and did determine enabling conditions for stress reduction: *inter alia* the spiny lobster fishery; the flyingfish fishery; the creation of alternative livelihoods.

The other two, started with great delays and impacted by the spread of the pandemic, are still ongoing, with a number of outputs expected to be finalized by April 2021, or that have been cancelled. Notwithstanding, and although actual stress reduction has not been produced, a number of ways to create the enabling conditions for reducing the stress on over-exploited fisheries, degraded habitats, and polluted marine environments have been effectively demonstrated.

3 outputs were evaluated as SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED

2 outputs were evaluated as PARTIALLY ACHIEVED

### Component 4: (Pre-)Feasibility assessments to identify major high-priority investment needs and opportunities in the CLME+ region

#### TE Observations:

While extensive work has been done to identify, characterize and assess at the level of pre-feasibility a number of priority investment opportunities and business cases related to all key issues of concern identified in the CLME+ TDAs, actual financing has not yet been “catalyzed”.

1 outputs was evaluated as SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED

1 output was evaluated as PARTIALLY ACHIEVED



Component 5: Monitoring & assessing progress of and results from the overall implementation of the CLME+ SAP, and experience sharing with the global LME practitioner's community

TE Observations: The project achieved a remarkable level of awareness, involvement and direct engagement of stakeholders throughout the region, and set the foundations and structure of sound monitoring and reporting mechanisms of SAP implementation progress and of the State of the Marine Environment and Associated Economies.

All outputs were evaluated as SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED

## Key - Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p><b>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS):</b> exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p><b>5 = Satisfactory (S):</b> meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p><b>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS):</b> more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p><b>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):</b> somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p><b>2 = Unsatisfactory (U):</b> substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p><b>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b> severe shortcomings</p> <p><b>Unable to Assess (U/A):</b> available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p><b>4 = Likely (L):</b> negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p><b>3 = Moderately Likely (ML):</b> moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p><b>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> significant risks to sustainability</p> <p><b>1 = Unlikely (U):</b> severe risks to sustainability</p> <p><b>Unable to Assess (U/A):</b> Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

# Evaluation Ratings

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	HS
M&E Plan Implementation	HS
Overall Quality of M&E	HS

Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	S
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	S
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	S

- See full report for some main findings on each of the categories

# Evaluation Ratings

Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	HS
Effectiveness	S
Efficiency	S
Overall Project Outcome Rating	S

Sustainability	Rating
Financial Resources	ML
Socio-political	L
Institutional Frameworks and governance	L
Environmental	HL
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	ML

- See full report for some main findings on each of the categories



# Conclusions

- **Successful conclusion**, having achieved most of the expected results despite the geographic and environmental complexity of the region, the number of countries, regional organizations and stakeholders involved, and the need to balance the social, economic and environmental factors impinging on fisheries.
- With the aim of enabling the transition to ecosystem-based management of fisheries, **the project has produced advancements in intersectoral coordination within countries and in the region, has reinforced institutional capacities, provided stakeholders with the required knowledge, policy and management tools, and field-tested examples, and opened the way for remarkable achievements**, such as the Introduction of region-wide standards for traceability of fisheries products.

## Conclusions

- **The actual enactment of the legal, institutional and policy reforms depends primarily on the level of country ownership and internalization of the project outputs.**
- **The project has facilitated decision-making processes** by providing the technical basis, and the available options for the national governments and IGOs governing bodies to decide upon. **This country “buy in” process requires time and the support and facilitation of the project.**
- **The project has excelled in adaptive management, monitoring, and reporting of progress.**
  - The creation of a Project Executive Group (PEG) for decision-making was highlighted as a positive achievement



## Recommendations

CLME+ entrusted **regional IGOs and CSOs** with the **formulation of many of the plans, strategies, policy reforms and governance mechanisms and tools called for in the SAP**, and **delegated their approval/adoption to their governance bodies and processes**;

**However, the role of countries should not be underestimated, particularly in IW projects aiming at determining policy, institutional, legislative reforms and investments at the country and regional levels,**

In order to facilitate **country ownership**, and the **internalization of project outputs**, **future efforts should consider expanding the direct role of countries in project execution**, and putting in place effective communication mechanisms with and within countries, streamlined and implemented according to ad hoc protocols.



## Recommendations

**Aligning marine and coastal environmental protection policies and sustainable approaches to wild capture fisheries is a key aspect of the blue economy and an innovative contribution of the CLME+ project that should be broadly replicated.**

Despite efforts on EBM of fisheries, strengthen RFMO's fight against IUU fishing, and support more biodiversity friendly fishing practices, the **transition from wild capture fisheries, to “fish farming” and the creation of alternative livelihoods for fisherfolks have not received noticeable attention.**

The promotion of **sustainable aquaculture** should be a relevant part of **future efforts** in the region aimed at promoting alternative livelihoods for fishing communities.

Need for **broadening the partnership to include multilateral development banks** (CAF, CDB, IDB, The World Bank) and **other potential multilateral and bilateral donors** - could be beneficial for SAP implementation. Systematic dialogue with these critical potential partners has not happened.





## Recommendations

The execution modalities of the project have proven successful, and could serve as example for other similar projects characterized by multi-country transboundary settings and multiple executing partners. Two elements of the execution arrangements are worth noting: the strong PCU, established by UNOPS, the principal executing agency providing also administrative/procurement backstopping; and **the Project Executive Group**, tasked with ensuring the monitoring of progress, coordination and coherence.

The use of virtual meetings and interactions in response to COVID-19 allowed engagement with stakeholders in countries that had not been originally planned for.

A project executing partner (GCFI) produced an outstanding strategic document: *“Science and Research serving effective ocean governance in the wider Caribbean Region”*. Similar studies should guide all efforts to implement the EAF/EBM approaches.

