

Section IV Part V
GEF-4 Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Section One: Project General Information

1. Project Name: Towards Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem
2. Project Type: FSP
3. Project ID GEF: 3749
4. Project ID (IA): 4147
5. Implementing Agency: UNDP
6. Countries: Chile and Peru

Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	Title	Agency
Work Program Inclusion	• Patricia Majluf , Santiago de la Puente, Alicia Kuroiwa • Cinthia Cespedes, Mariano Valverde • Marcelo Nilo (reviewed) • Helen Negret	• Consultants • National Service of Protected Areas of Peru (technical staff) • Head of Corporate Relations • Regional Technical Advisor	• PPG • National Service of Protected Areas of Peru, PPG Team; • IFOP • UNDP
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

7. Project duration: **Planned** 5 years **Actual** _____ years
8. Lead Project Executing Agencies: Peruvian Sea Research Institute IMARPE and Fisheries Development Institute, Chile IFOP
9. GEF Strategic Program:
 - ☐ Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level (SP 1)
 - ☒ Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine PAs in PA Systems (SP 2)
 - ☐ Strengthening Terrestrial PA Networks (SP 3)
10. Project coverage in hectares: see table below for area of protected area coverage. Estimated project coverage is the entire HCLME

Targets and Timeframe	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Total Extent in hectares of protected areas targeted by the project by biome type			
1. Seamount O'Higgins (high seas submarine seamount)	4,300 hectares *(estimated)		
2. Juan Fernández Seamount high seas submarine seamount)	4,300 hectares		
3. Lobos de Tierra (coastal/marine)	18,278.90 hectares		
4. Punta San Juan (coastal/marine)	2,968.8 hectares		
5. Islas Ballestas (coastal/marine)	7,197.01 hectares		
6. Peruvian Guano Islands, Isles and Capes National Reserve (coastal/marine)	190,000 hectares		

*The sites of the seamount MPA have not yet been finalized and require considerable additional exploration prior to finalizing sizes. An estimated size has been based on a 1.5km radius around the apex of the seamount. This will be confirmed once the MPA is established.

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas

Name of Protected Area	Is this a new protected area? Please answer yes or no	Area in Hectares—please specify biome type	Global designation or priority lists (E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 200)	Local Designation of Protected Area (E.g., indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)	IUCN Category for each Protected Area ¹					
					I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. Sea Mount O'Higgins	Yes	Sea mounts	WWF Global 200	To be determined						X
2. Juan Fernández Sea Mount Range	Yes	Sea mounts	WWF Global 200	To be determined						X
3. Lobos de Tierra	Yes	Islands and capes	WWF Global 200							X*
4. Punta San Juan	Yes	Islands and capes	WWF Global 200							X*
5. Islas Ballestas	Yes	Islands and capes	WWF Global 200							X*
6. Peruvian Guano Islands, Isles and Capes National Reserve	Yes	Islands and capes	WWF Global 200							X

* These pilot sites within the reserve will act as specific MPA each with their own management plan that will define different zones with specific decrees of protection and thus equivalent to different management categories. These will be determined during the project

1

- I. Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection
- II. National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation
- III. Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features
- IV. Habitat/Species Management Area: managed mainly for conservation through management intervention
- V. Protected Landscape/Seascape: managed mainly for landscape/seascape protection and recreation
- VI. Managed Resource Protected Area: managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems

Section Two: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas

SEA MOUNT O'HIGGINS

Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet 1

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)		At project design stage this has been filled in by members of UNDP and PPG team and checked by Francisco Ponce SUBPESCA and Marcelo Nilo IFOP. It will be reapplied during the project by the relevant members of the project team			
Date assessment carried out		May 14 th 2009			
Name of protected area		Sea Mount O'Higgins			
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)		Not applicable as the area has not been officially declared			
Designations	National NA (see above)	IUCN Category NA (see above)		International (please also complete sheet overleaf) NA	
Country	Chile				
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)		Center region of Humboldt current			
Date of establishment	The area has not been officially declared				
Ownership details (please tick)	State ☒	Private	Community	Other	
Management Authority	To be determined				
Size of protected area (ha)	To be determined but in the range of 4,300 hectares				
Number of staff	Permanent 0		Temporary 0		
Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs	Recurrent (operational) funds 0		Project or other supplementary funds 0		
What are the main values for which the area is designated	To be determined but includes biodiversity conservation and fisheries and forms part of an ecosystem management approach of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem				
List the two primary protected area management objectives					
Management objective 1	To be determined				
Management objective 2	To be determined				
No. of people involved in completing assessment		3			
Including: (tick boxes)	PA manager ☐	PA staff ☐	Other PA agency staff ☐	NGO ☐	
	Local community ☐	Donors ☒	External experts ☒	Other ☒	
Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.		For the UNDP GEF Regional project Towards an Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem			

Protected Areas Threats: Data Sheet 2

Please tick all relevant existing threats as either of high, medium or low significance. Threats ranked as of high significance are those which are seriously degrading values; medium are those threats having some negative impact and those characterised as low are threats which are present but not seriously impacting values or N/A where the threat is not present or not applicable in the protected area.

It should be noted that this section is filled in based on estimates given that there is currently no protected area and threats levels are not clear and will be defined as part of the project

1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area

Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	1.1 Housing and settlement
			✓	1.2 Commercial and industrial areas
			✓	1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure

2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area

Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation
			✓	2.1a Drug cultivation
			✓	2.2 Wood and pulp plantations
			✓	2.3 Livestock farming and grazing
			✓	2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture

3. Energy production and mining within a protected area

Threats from production of non-biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	3.1 Oil and gas drilling
			✓	3.2 Mining and quarrying
			✓	3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams

4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area

Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)
			✓	4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines.)
		✓		4.3 Shipping lanes and canals
			✓	4.4 Flight paths

5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area

Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)
			✓	5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)
			✓	5.3 Logging and wood harvesting
	✓			5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources

6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area

Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	6.1 Recreational activities and tourism
			✓	6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises
			✓	6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas
			✓	6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)
			✓	6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors

7. Natural system modifications

Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)
			✓	7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use
			✓	7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area
			✓	7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)
			✓	7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values
	✓			7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)

8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes

Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)
			✓	8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals
			✓	8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)
			✓	8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)

9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area

Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water
			✓	9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)
			✓	9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)
			✓	9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)
			✓	9.4 Garbage and solid waste
			✓	9.5 Air-borne pollutants
			✓	9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)

10. Geological events

Geological events may be part of natural disturbance regimes in many ecosystems. But they can be a threat if a species or habitat is damaged and has lost its resilience and is vulnerable to disturbance. Management capacity to respond to some of these changes may be limited.

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	10.1 Volcanoes
			✓	10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis
			✓	10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides
			✓	10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)

11. Climate change and severe weather

Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration
			✓	11.2 Droughts
			✓	11.3 Temperature extremes
			✓	11.4 Storms and flooding

12. Specific cultural and social threats

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices
			✓	12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values
			✓	12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc

ASSESSMENT FORMS

SEA MOUNT O'HIGGINS

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted	0	✓	The project will undertake studies, evaluations and consultations to determine the area and category that will declared
	There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted/covenanted but the process is still incomplete (includes sites designated under international conventions, such as Ramsar, or local/traditional law such as community conserved areas, which do not yet have national legal status or covenant)	2		
	The protected area has been formally gazetted/covenanted	3		
Context 2. Protected area regulations Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)? Planning	There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area	0	✓	idem
	Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses	1		
	Regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some weaknesses or gaps	2		
	Regulations for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and provide an excellent basis for management	3		
3. Law enforcement Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough? Input	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	✓	idem
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget, lack of institutional support)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	✓	idem

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
objectives Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1			
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these objectives	2			
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3			
5. Protected area design Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult	0		Not relevant	
	Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being taken (e.g. agreements with adjacent land owners for wildlife corridors or introduction of appropriate catchment management)	1			
	Protected area design is not significantly constraining achievement of objectives, but could be improved (e.g. with respect to larger scale ecological processes)	2			
	Protected area design helps achievement of objectives; it is appropriate for species and habitat conservation; and maintains ecological processes such as surface and groundwater flows at a catchment scale, natural disturbance patterns etc	3			
	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0		Not relevant	
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Process</i>	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users but is not appropriately demarcated	2			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users and is appropriately demarcated	3			
	There is no management plan for the protected area	0			
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1			
	A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2			
		0	✓	See question 1	See question 1

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
<i>Planning</i>	A management plan exists and is being implemented	3				
<i>Additional points: Planning</i>						
7a. Planning process	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1				
7b. Planning process	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1				
7c. Planning process	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1				
8. Regular work plan Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	✓			
	A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented	1				
	A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented	2				
	A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented	3				
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0				
<i>Input</i> Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1	✓			
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for most key areas of planning and decision making	2				
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support all areas of planning and decision making	3				
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support all areas of planning and decision making	3				
10. Protection systems	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use	0	✓		See question 1	See question 1
Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area? <i>Process/Outcome</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use	1				
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use	2				
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/resource use	3				
11. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0			One survey on seamounts related	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Process</i>	There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	1	✓	with fishery parameters not related to BD	
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2			
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3			
	Active resource management is not being undertaken	0	✓	See question 1	See question 1
12. Resource management Is active resource management being undertaken? <i>Process</i>	Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented	1			
	Many of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being implemented but some key issues are not being addressed	2			
	Requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being substantially or fully implemented	3			
	There are no staff	0	✓	See question 1	See question 1
13. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1			
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2			
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area	3			
	Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management	0		Not relevant	
14. Staff training Are staff adequately trained to fulfil management objectives? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1			
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2			
	Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	3			
	Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	3			
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient?	There is no budget for management of the protected area	0	✓	See question 1	See question 1
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1			
	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3				
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding	0			Not relevant	
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1				
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for regular operation of the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2				
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs	3				
17. Management of budget	Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year)	0			Not relevant	
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1				
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2				
	Budget management is excellent and meets management needs	3				
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs	0		✓	See question 1	See question 1
Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs	1				
<i>Input</i>	There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management	2				
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3				
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0			Not relevant	
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1				
<i>Process</i>	There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities	2				
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3				
20. Education and awareness	There is no education and awareness programme	0		✓	See question 1	See question 1
Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme	1				
<i>Process</i>	There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved	2				
	There is an appropriate and fully implemented education and awareness programme	3				

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question				Comment/Explanation	Next steps
21. Planning for land and water use	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area	0		✓		See question 1	See question 1
Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the long term needs of the protected area, but activities are not detrimental the area	1					
	Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	2					
	Adjacent land and water use planning fully takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	3					
Additional points: Land and water planning							
21a: Land and water planning for habitat conservation	Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pollution levels etc) to sustain relevant habitats.	+1					
21b: Land and water planning for connectivity	Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites and the sea, or to allow animal migration).	+1					
21c: Land and water planning for ecosystem services & species conservation	"Planning addresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species, fire management to maintain savannah habitats etc.)"	+1					
22. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users	0		✓			
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation	1					
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, but only some co-operation	2					
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, and substantial co-operation on management	3					
23. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0				Not relevant	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3		
24. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Not relevant	
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2		
	Local communities directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3		
Additional points <i>Local communities/indigenous people</i>				
24 a. Impact on communities	There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	+1	Not relevant	
24b. Impact on communities	Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1	Not relevant	
24c. Impact on communities	Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	+1	Not relevant	
25. Economic benefit	The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities	0		
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services? <i>Outcomes</i>	Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed	1	✓	
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities	2		
	There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area	3		
26. Monitoring and	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	✓	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
evaluation Are management activities monitored against performance? <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1				
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results do not feed back into management	2				
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3				
27. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities adequate? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need	0		✓		
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation	1				
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2				
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3				
28. Commercial tourism operators Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0			Not relevant	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1				
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2				
	There is good co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, and maintain protected area values	3				
29. Fees If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0			Not relevant	
	Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs	1				
	Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs	2				
	Fees are collected and make a substantial contribution to the protected area and its environs	3				
30. Condition of values What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as	Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	0				
	Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	1				
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		✓		

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
compared to when it was first designated? <i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
<i>Additional Points: Condition of values</i>				
30a: Condition of values	The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	+1		
30b: Condition of values	Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	+1		
30c: Condition of values	Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	+1		
TOTAL SCORE 13 questions were deemed to be not relevant		5 from 60. 6% = Poor		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas

JUAN FERNÁNDEZ SEA MOUNT RANGE

Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet 1

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)		At project design stage this has been filled in by members of UNDP and PPG team and checked by Francisco Ponce SUBPESCA and Marcelo Nilo IFOP . It will be reapplied during the project by the relevant members of the project team	
Date assessment carried out	May 14 th 2009		
Name of protected area	Juan Fernández Sea Mount Range		
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)	Not applicable as the area has not been officially declared		
Designations	National NA (see above)	IUCN Category NA (see above)	International (please also complete sheet overleaf) NA
Country	Chile		
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)	Center region of Humboldt current		
Date of establishment	The area has not been officially declared		
Ownership details (please tick)	State ✓	Private	Community Other
Management Authority	To be determined		
Size of protected area (ha)	To be determined but in the range of 4,300 hectares		
Number of staff	Permanent 0	Temporary 0	
Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs	Recurrent (operational) funds 0	Project or other supplementary funds 0	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	To be determined but includes biodiversity conservation and fisheries and forms part of an ecosystem management approach of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem		
List the two primary protected area management objectives			
Management objective 1	To be determined		
Management objective 2	To be determined		
No. of people involved in completing assessment	3		
Including: (tick boxes)	PA manager ☐	PA staff ☐	Other PA agency staff ☐
	Local community ☐	Donors ☐	External experts ☒
Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.		For the UNDP GEF Regional project Towards an Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem	

Protected Areas Threats: Data Sheet 2

It should be noted that this section is filled in based on estimates given that there is currently no protected area and threats levels are not clear and will be defined as part of the project

1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area

Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	1.1 Housing and settlement
			✓	1.2 Commercial and industrial areas
			✓	1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure

2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area

Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation
			✓	2.1a Drug cultivation
			✓	2.2 Wood and pulp plantations
			✓	2.3 Livestock farming and grazing
			✓	2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture

3. Energy production and mining within a protected area

Threats from production of non-biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	3.1 Oil and gas drilling
			✓	3.2 Mining and quarrying
			✓	3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams

4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area

Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)
			✓	4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)
		✓		4.3 Shipping lanes and canals
			✓	4.4 Flight paths

5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area

Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)
			✓	5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)
			✓	5.3 Logging and wood harvesting
	✓			5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources

6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area

Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	6.1 Recreational activities and tourism
			✓	6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises
			✓	6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas
			✓	6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)
			✓	6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors

7. Natural system modifications

Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)
			✓	7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question				Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Process</i>	There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	1	✓			with fishery parameters not related to BD	
		2					
		3					
12. Resource management Is active resource management being undertaken? <i>Process</i>	Active resource management is not being undertaken Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented Many of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being implemented but some key issues are not being addressed Requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being substantially or fully implemented	0	✓			See question 1	See question 1
		1					
		2					
		3					
13. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area	0	✓			See question 1	See question 1
		1					
		2					
		3					
14. Staff training Are staff adequately trained to fulfil management objectives? <i>Inputs: Process</i>	Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	0				Not relevant	
		1					
		2					
		3					
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient?	There is no budget for management of the protected area The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	0	✓			See question 1	See question 1
		1					
		2					

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>		3		
16. Security of budget	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	0	Not relevant	
Is the budget secure?	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding	1		
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for regular operation of the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	3		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs	0	Not relevant	
17. Management of budget	Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year)	1		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	2		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	3		
	Budget management is excellent and meets management needs	0	See question 1	See question 1
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs	1		
Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs	2		
<i>Input</i>	There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management	3		
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	0	Not relevant	
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	2		
<i>Process</i>	There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities	3		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	0	See question 1	See question 1
20. Education and awareness	There is no education and awareness programme	1		
Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme	2		
	There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved	3		
<i>Process</i>	There is an appropriate and fully implemented education and awareness programme	0	See question 1	See question 1

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
21. Planning for land and water use	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area	0	See question 1	See question 1
Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the long term needs of the protected area, but activities are not detrimental the area	1		
	Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	2		
	Adjacent land and water use planning fully takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	3		
Additional points: Land and water planning				
21a: Land and water planning for habitat conservation	Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pollution levels etc) to sustain relevant habitats.	+1		
21b: Land and water planning for connectivity	Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites and the sea, or to allow animal migration).	+1		
21c: Land and water planning for ecosystem services & species conservation	"Planning addresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species, fire management to maintain savannah habitats etc.)"	+1		
22. State and commercial neighbours	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users	0	✓	
Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users? <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation	1		
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, but only some co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
23. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Not relevant	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1				
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2				
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3				
24. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0			Not relevant	
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1				
	Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2				
	Local communities directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3				
Additional points <i>Local communities/indigenous people</i>						
24 a. Impact on communities	There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	+1			Not relevant	
24b. Impact on communities	Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1			Not relevant	
24c. Impact on communities	Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	+1			Not relevant	
25. Economic benefit	The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities	0				
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services? <i>Outcomes</i>	Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed	1		✓		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities	2				
	There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area	3				
26. Monitoring and	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		✓		

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
evaluation Are management activities monitored against performance? <i>Planning Process</i>	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results do not feed back into management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
27. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need	0	✓	
Are visitor facilities adequate?	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
<i>Outputs</i>				
28. Commercial tourism operators	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	Not relevant	
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is good co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, and maintain protected area values	3		
<i>Process</i>				
29. Fees	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	Not relevant	
If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs	1		
	Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs	2		
	Fees are collected and make a substantial contribution to the protected area and its environs	3		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>				
30. Condition of values	Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as	Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	✓	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
compared to when it was first designated? <i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3			
<i>Additional Points: Condition of values</i>					
30a: Condition of values	The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	+1			
30b: Condition of values	Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	+1			
30c: Condition of values	Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	+1			
TOTAL SCORE 13 question were deemed to be not relevant			5 from 60. 6% = Poor		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas

LOBOS DE TIERRA

Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet 1

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)		At project design stage this has been filled in by members of PPG team (Patricia Majluf, Alicia Kuroiwa and Santiago de la Puente), members of the National Service of Protected Areas of Peru (Cynthia Cespedes and Mariano Valverde). It will be reapplied during the project by the relevant members of the project team.		
Date assessment carried out		June 19 th 2009		
Name of protected area		Lobos de Tierra of the Peruvian Guano Islands, Isles and Capes National Reserve (Reserva Nacional Sistema de Islas, Islotes y Puntas Guaneras)		
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)		Not applicable as the area has not been officially declared		
Designations	National Proposed as a National Reserve	IUCN Category Natl Reserve is equivalent to IUCN Cat 6	International (please also complete sheet overleaf) NA	
Country	Peru			
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)		Coastal Peru, 6°Lat S		
Date of establishment	The area has not been officially gazetted			
Ownership details (please tick)	State ☒	Private	Community	Other
Management Authority	SERNANP (Peruvian National Protected Area Service) an agency adjunct to the Ministry of the Environment			
Size of protected area (ha)	The proposed area is of 18278.90 ha			
Number of staff	Permanent 0	Temporary 0		
Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs	Recurrent (operational) funds 0	Project or other supplementary funds 0		
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Biodiversity conservation (it harbors large populations and breeding areas for endangered species, guano birds and marine mammals) and fisheries (spawning and development areas for artisanal fishery resources) and forms part of an ecosystem management approach of the HCLME			
List the two primary protected area management objectives				
Management objective 1	To be determined			
Management objective 2	To be determined			
No. of people involved in completing assessment		5		
Including: (tick boxes)	PA manager ☐	PA staff ☐	Other PA agency staff ☒	NGO ☐
	Local community ☐	Donors ☐	External experts ☒	Other ☐

Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.

For the UNDP GEF Regional project Towards an Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem

Protected Areas Threats: Data Sheet 2

1. Identical and commercial development within a protected area

Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	1.1 Housing and settlement
			✓	1.2 Commercial and industrial areas
			✓	1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure

2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area

Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation
			✓	2.1a Drug cultivation
			✓	2.2 Wood and pulp plantations
			✓	2.3 Livestock farming and grazing
			✓	2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture

3. Energy production and mining within a protected area

Threats from production of non-biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	3.1 Oil and gas drilling
			✓	3.2 Mining and quarrying
			✓	3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams

4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area

Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)
			✓	4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines.)
			✓	4.3 Shipping lanes and canals
			✓	4.4 Flight paths

5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area

Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)
			✓	5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)
			✓	5.3 Logging and wood harvesting
	✓			5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources

6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area

Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
		✓		6.1 Recreational activities and tourism
			✓	6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises
			✓	6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas
			✓	6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)
		✓		6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors

7. Natural system modifications

Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)
			✓	7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use
			✓	7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area
			✓	7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)
			✓	7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values
	✓			7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)

8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes

Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)
			✓	8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals
			✓	8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)
			✓	8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)

9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area

Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water
			✓	9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)
	✓			9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)
			✓	9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)
		✓		9.4 Garbage and solid waste
		✓		9.5 Air-borne pollutants
			✓	9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)

10. Geological events

Geological events may be part of natural disturbance regimes in many ecosystems. But they can be a threat if a species or habitat is damaged and has lost its resilience and is vulnerable to disturbance. Management capacity to respond to some of these changes may be limited.

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	10.1 Volcanoes
		✓		10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis
			✓	10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides
			✓	10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)

11. Climate change and severe weather

Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration
			✓	11.2 Droughts
			✓	11.3 Temperature extremes
			✓	11.4 Storms and flooding

12. Specific cultural and social threats

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices
			✓	12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values
			✓	12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc

ASSESSMENT FORMS

LOBOS DE TIERRA

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun The protected area is in the process of being gazetted/covenanted but the process is still incomplete (includes sites designated under international conventions, such as Ramsar, or local/traditional law such as community conserved areas, which do not yet have national legal status or covenant) The protected area has been formally gazetted/covenanted	0 1 2 3	Awaiting a signature for it to be gazetted.	
<i>Context</i> 2. Protected area regulations Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)? <i>Planning</i>	There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses Regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some weaknesses or gaps Regulations for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and provide an excellent basis for management	0 1 2 3	Lacking capacities for legal enforcement	
3. Law enforcement Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Input</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget, lack of institutional support) The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0 1 2 3	PROABONOS / AGROBONOS has some staff working on it.	
4. Protected area	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The only current management	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
objectives	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1			objectives are oriented to guano harvest.	
Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these objectives	2	✓			
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3				
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult	0			Just 2 miles around the islands, isles and capes are no enough for marine mammals and birds.	
Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being taken (e.g. agreements with adjacent land owners for wildlife corridors or introduction of appropriate catchment management)	1	✓			
	Protected area design is not significantly constraining achievement of objectives, but could be improved (e.g. with respect to larger scale ecological processes)	2				
<i>Planning</i>	Protected area design helps achievement of objectives; it is appropriate for species and habitat conservation; and maintains ecological processes such as surface and groundwater flows at a catchment scale, natural disturbance patterns etc	3				
6. Protected area boundary demarcation	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0				
Is the boundary known and demarcated?	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1				
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users but is not appropriately demarcated	2	✓		It has been defined but not demarked, so the boundary is not fully respected.	
<i>Process</i>	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users and is appropriately demarcated	3				
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	✓			
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1				
	A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2				

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
<i>Planning</i>	A management plan exists and is being implemented	3				
<i>Additional points: Planning</i>						
7a. Planning process	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1				
7b. Planning process	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1				
7c. Planning process	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1				
8. Regular work plan Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented <i>Planning Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0			There are some regular monitoring activities but not an Annual Operational Plan as such.	
	A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented	1		✓		
	A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented	2				
	A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented	3				
9. Resource inventory Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Input</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		✓		
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1				
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for most key areas of planning and decision making	2				
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support all areas of planning and decision making	3				
10. Protection systems Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area? <i>Process Outcome</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use	0				
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use	1		✓		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use	2				
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/resource use	3				
11. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0			Very limited information available	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Process</i>	There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	1	✓		for species but there is neither a research plan nor a set of coordinated research activities between different sites.	
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2				
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3				
12. Resource management Is active resource management being undertaken? <i>Process</i>	Active resource management is not being undertaken	0			Only for guano	
	Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented	1	✓			
	Many of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being implemented but some key issues are not being addressed	2				
	Requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being substantially or fully implemented	3				
13. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0				
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1	✓			
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2				
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area	3				
14. Staff training Are staff adequately trained to fulfil management objectives? <i>Inputs: Process</i>	Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management	0	✓			
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1				
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2				
	Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	3				
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient?	There is no budget for management of the protected area	0				
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1	✓			
	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2				

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3				
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding	0	✓			
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1				
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for regular operation of the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2				
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs	3				
17. Management of budget	Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year)	0	✓			
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1				
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2				
	Budget management is excellent and meets management needs	3				
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs	0				
Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs	1	✓			
<i>Input</i>	There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management	2				
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3				
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	✓			
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1				
<i>Process</i>	There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities	2				
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3				
20. Education and awareness	There is no education and awareness programme	0	✓			
Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme	1				
<i>Process</i>	There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved	2				
	There is an appropriate and fully implemented education and awareness programme	3				

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
21. Planning for land and water use	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area	0	✓		
Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the long term needs of the protected area, but activities are not detrimental the area	1			
	Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	2			
	Adjacent land and water use planning fully takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	3			
Additional points: Land and water planning					
21a: Land and water planning for habitat conservation	Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pollution levels etc) to sustain relevant habitats.	+1			
21b: Land and water planning for connectivity	Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites and the sea, or to allow animal migration).	+1			
21c: Land and water planning for ecosystem services & species conservation	"Planning addresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species, fire management to maintain savannah habitats etc.)"	+1			
22. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users	0			
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation	1	✓		
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, but only some co-operation	2			
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, and substantial co-operation on management	3			
23. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		Not relevant	

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1				
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2				
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3				
24. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		✓		
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1				
	Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2				
	Local communities directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3				
<i>Additional points Local communities/indigenous people</i>						
24 a. Impact on communities	There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	+1				
24b. Impact on communities	Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1				
24c. Impact on communities	Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	+1				
25. Economic benefit Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services? <i>Outcomes</i>	The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities	0			Lobos de Tierra has aquaculture and seed (mussels & shellfish) production.	
	Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed	1				
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities	2		✓		
	There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area	3				
26. Monitoring and	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0				

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question			Comment/Explanation	Next steps
evaluation Are management activities monitored against performance? <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1	✓			
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results do not feed back into management	2				
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3				
27. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities adequate? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need	0	✓			
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation	1				
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2				
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3				
28. Commercial tourism operators Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	✓			
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1				
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2				
	There is good co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, and maintain protected area values	3				
29. Fees If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	✓			
	Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs	1				
	Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs	2				
	Fees are collected and make a substantial contribution to the protected area and its environs	3				
30. Condition of values What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as	Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	0			Due to protection dedicated for guano management.	
	Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	1				
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	✓			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
compared to when it was first designated? <i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
<i>Additional Points: Condition of values</i>				
30a: Condition of values	The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	+1	✓	
30b: Condition of values	Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	+1	✓	
30c: Condition of values	Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	+1	✓	
TOTAL SCORE 1 question was deemed to be not relevant			26 from 96 (27%)	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas

PUNTA SAN JUAN

Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet 1

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)		At project design stage this has been filled in by members of PPG team (Patricia Majluf, Alicia Kuroiwa and Santiago de la Puente), members of the National Service of Protected Areas of Peru (Cynthia Cespedes and Mariano Valverde). Also by Helen negret from UNDP. It will be reapplied during the project by the relevant members of the project team.			
Date assessment carried out		June 19 th 2009			
Name of protected area		Punta San Juan of the Peruvian Guano Islands, Isles and Capes National Reserve (Reserva Nacional Sistema de Islas, Islotes y Puntas Guaneras)			
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)		Not applicable as the area has not been officially declared			
Designations	National Proposed as a National Reserve	IUCN Category Natl Reserve is equivalent to IUCN Cat 6		International (please also complete sheet overleaf) NA	
Country	Peru				
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)		Coastal Peru, 15° LS			
Date of establishment	The area has not been officially gazetted				
Ownership details (please tick)	State ☒	Private ☐	Community ☐	Other ☐	
Management Authority	SERNANP (Peruvian National Protected Area Service) an agency adjunct to the Ministry of the Environment				
Size of protected area (ha)	The proposed area is of 2,968.8 ha				
Number of staff	Permanent 0		Temporary 0		
Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs	Recurrent (operational) funds 0		Project or other supplementary funds 0		
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Biodiversity conservation (it harbors large populations and breeding areas for endangered species, guano birds and marine mammals) and fisheries (spawning and development areas for artisanal fishery resources) and forms part of an ecosystem management approach of the HCLME				
List the two primary protected area management objectives					
Management objective 1	To be determined				
Management objective 2	To be determined				
No. of people involved in completing assessment		5			
Including: (tick)	PA manager ☐	PA staff ☐	Other PA agency staff ☒	NGO ☐	

boxes)	Local community ☐	Donors ☐	External experts ☒	Other ☐
Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.		For the UNDP GEF Regional project Towards an Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem		

Protected Areas Threats: Data Sheet 2

1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area

Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	1.1 Housing and settlement
			✓	1.2 Commercial and industrial areas
			✓	1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure

2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area

Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation
			✓	2.1a Drug cultivation
			✓	2.2 Wood and pulp plantations
			✓	2.3 Livestock farming and grazing
			✓	2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture

3. Energy production and mining within a protected area

Threats from production of non-biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	3.2 Oil and gas drilling
			✓	3.2 Mining and quarrying
			✓	3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams

4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area

Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)
			✓	4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines.)
			✓	4.3 Shipping lanes and canals
			✓	4.4 Flight paths

5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area

Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)
			✓	5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)
			✓	5.3 Logging and wood harvesting
	✓			5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources

6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area

Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
		✓		6.1 Recreational activities and tourism
			✓	6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises
			✓	6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas
			✓	6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)
		✓		6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				area staff and visitors

7. Natural system modifications

Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)
			✓	7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use
			✓	7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area
			✓	7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)
			✓	7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values
	✓			7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)

8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes

Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)
			✓	8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals
			✓	8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)
			✓	8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)

9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area

Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water
			✓	9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)
	✓			9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)
			✓	9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)
		✓		9.4 Garbage and solid waste
		✓		9.5 Air-borne pollutants
			✓	9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)

10. Geological events

Geological events may be part of natural disturbance regimes in many ecosystems. But they can be a threat if a species or habitat is damaged and has lost its resilience and is vulnerable to disturbance. Management capacity to respond to some of these changes may be limited.

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	10.1 Volcanoes
		✓		10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis
			✓	10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides
			✓	10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)

11. Climate change and severe weather

Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	✓			11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration
			✓	11.2 Droughts
			✓	11.3 Temperature extremes
			✓	11.4 Storms and flooding

12. Specific cultural and social threats

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			✓	12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices
			✓	12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values
			✓	12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc