

Final Evaluation Report

Your Details	
Full Name	Luciano Hiriart Bertrand
Project Title	Marine and Coastal Areas of Indigenous Peoples: a novel approach to scaling up marine biodiversity conservation efforts in Chile
Application ID	28140-D
Grant Amount	10.000
Email Address	l.hiriartbertrand@costahumboldt.org
Date of this Report	20-02-2022

1. Indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
MCAIP Network				Considering the pandemic and the impact on the impossibility of social encounters, it was impossible to materialise a large MCAIP network encounter. Nonetheless, we had strengthened the participation of more than 12 MCAIP on a network. This network represents more than 3000 people and occasional online exchanges had occurred.
MCAIP National Conservation Strategy & biodiversity policy recognition				During this project length, the MCAIP advance significantly as an ancillary instrument for marine conservation. The MCAIP policy was formally incorporated as a new category of protected area on the newly created National Protected Area Service.
Fishery data tools training				We conducted training on fishery collecting data for two communities. This is relevant because the data collected helped us to develop the first rock reef fishery management plans for the country. This iconic outcome contributed to better managing heavily depleted local fisheries by incorporating a new set of conservation rules based on the need from an ecologic to social importance.
MCAIP and its international recognition				Although there is no formal recognition of MCAIP as a particular conservation instrument, this can fit as other effective area-based conservation measures. We have published a few peer-reviewed articles that demonstrate the first outputs. From improving governance to better understanding the contributions of MCAIP for marine biodiversity, fishery management, marine planning, or institutional validation.

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled.

This project suffered multiple unforeseen difficulties. First, social-political conflict affected the country at the end of 2019. The issues associated with this struggle avoid us to conduct our project due to the complex scenarios that we faced associated with security issues, restrictions for displacement, and lockdown of cities. Following this unpredicted stage, a few months later the pandemic caused by the Covid-19 increased and sharpened the issues that the country was carrying out. From March 2020 to now, we are in a permanent quarantine and lockdowns scheme, opening briefly some territories and closing others to control the virus expansion. In March 2021, the country initiated the vaccination programme, given to the population new hopes for recovering our liberty and normal life. As the rest of the world, this is still ongoing and we keep with quarantines, restrictions for displacements, prohibition of large encounters, among several other control rules. Because an important part of this project considered on-site encounters, visiting different territories, and to assess bioecological components, the time proposed to complete this project was complicated altered, suffering drastic changes and adapting to more remote strategy implementation. Some of the outcomes proposed were achieved completely and others were partially achieved.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

Throughout the implementation of this project, we highlighted the following outcomes:

- I. MCAIP has moved to another dimension of recognition. Since the beginning of the project, MCAIP was not considered formally as a conservation tool. Today, the MCAIP has on the final stages from Chilean State to become a formally protected area category. This recognition was based on the contributions and opportunities that the MCAIP policy has provided and demonstrated throughout the years. As well because the main principle is to safeguard customary uses of coastal indigenous and local communities.
- II. More than 40 MCAIP representative members were trained on fishery data collection using two different approaches; i) Framework for Integrated Stock and Habitat Evaluation (FISHE) is a step-by-step process for providing scientific guidance for the sustainable, climate-resilient management of data-limited fisheries; and ii) FishPath is an approach to setting fisheries on the path to sustainability. Its main element is a stakeholder engagement process guided by the online FishPath decision-support tool. This training results in the assessment and management proposal for the key fishery for commercial and subsistence that were under consideration by the fishery administration.
- III. MCAIPs are receiving strong attention from the international arena. Today, MCAIP are included on the Landmark, a global platform of indigenous and community lands. This platform is the most visited website for searching information, data of indigenous territories in the globe. Additionally, we are in

the process of submitting some success cases of MCAIP to the IUCN global protected areas categories recognition. The success of this exercise will set a novel configuration for this policy, elevating its category to a global scale, and contributing to receiving more attention and support to ensure its management objectives, cultural priorities, and habitat conservation.

4. What do you consider to be the most significant achievement of this work?

5. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project.

This project is part of a community-based initiative. The involvement of different communities was limited by the impossibility of on-site meetings. However, we were able to conduct some on-person encounters as well with remote meetings for design, conceptualisation, and action implementations.

6. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, as MCAIP are rapidly increasing in the number of areas requested as well implementing, we are expanding our target to incorporate marine biodiversity conservation principles on management plans.

7. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

Most of our results have been published in peer-reviewed journals, reports, social media, and printing materials. We expect this year, and depending on the pandemic situation, to participate in national and international in-person encounters. Most of the encounters that materialised during the last 2 years have been remote affecting the quality of exchange ideas, participation, and validation of the representative process.

8. Timescale: Over what period was the grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

Funds were distributed on a 20 month-period. As mentioned on above question, the alteration of the timeframe proposed for this project altered also funding distribution.

9. Budget: Provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used. It is important that you retain the management accounts and all paid invoices relating to the project for at least 2 years as these may be required for inspection at our discretion.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments

Equipment	500	1100	+600	Printing surveys, brochures and posters were considered on this item Photography
Baseline assessments	4500	2250	-2250	Office and logistic costs were covered on this item This item was spent on VHF radio and mobile communication operations. This item includes field, workshop, meeting, and personnel materials.
Venue's rental	2000	1550	-450	Three main workshops were conducted with the budget proposed in addition with more than six meetings and encounters
Transportation	1000	3000	+2000	Four-wheel vehicle was required. 80% of this item was spent on vehicle rental and the remaining on fuel and toll. Indirect costs were associated to boat rental and fuel. Moreover, cost for renting lodging increased during the project.
Salaries	2000	2100	+100	Salaries were distributed among executive team
Total	10000	10000		

10. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

MCAIP is still on a learning curve stage. Every year the number of areas requested and implemented increases rapidly. Although there are some institutional and political decisions over the MCAIP advance, the instrument is positioned in the domestic arena as the most prominent for marine conservation and cultural rescue. We have played an important role in leading this path. We believe that we need to concentrate further efforts on understanding how this instrument can also provide climate solutions by restoring and protecting some key habitats. For instance, the MCAIP is the only nature-based instrument that can provide large spaces for restoring key habitats such as kelp forests for CO₂ sequestration. This approach is one of the most relevant considering the urgent need as a planet for mitigating the impacts of carbon pollution. As well, exploring other nature-based solutions through traditional knowledge systematisation is required.

11. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the Foundation receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Every activity and material developed acknowledged and uses The Rufford Foundation logo.

12. Please provide a full list of all the members of your team and briefly what was their role in the project.

Luciano Hiriart-Bertrand: Project responsible

Javier Naretto: Fishery and conservation coordination. Javier was responsible of fishery actions and community trainings as well co-design the first management plans for a rocky reef fishery in the country. He plays a key role on providing a set of participative methodologies to increase participation, representation and for collecting traditional knowledge to improve management actions.

Alejandro Correa: Policy coordinator, responsible of Costa Humboldt work at public policy level. He was on charge of promoting the MCAIP as a recognized instrument for marine conservation on the National Protected Area Service bill. Also, Alejandro's has participate actively on coordination meetings for exploring international recognition of MCAIP.

Joseffa Cervantes: General coordinator for field activities. Joseffa is responsible for daily coordination between organization and local communities' duties. She also is helping on diverse stages for MCAIP management plan assessment as well to monitoring inter-community exchanges.

Camila Vargas: Camila is responsible for data analysis as well participatory methodology design. She specialized on different tools for geographic assessments and her contribution to the project has been related to conduct participatory cartographies to link local knowledge with scientific data.

13. Any other comments?

We acknowledge to The Rufford Foundation for contributing to this project and the ones supported on early stages.