



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	LAC
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Argentina
<b>Project Title:</b>	Governance Strengthening for the Management and Protection of Coastal- Marine Biodiversity in Key Ecological Areas and the Implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EEP in Spanish)
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/ARG/025/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5112
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	FAO-Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS, at present SGAYDS) and Federal Fisheries Council (CFP in Spanish)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	FSP
	48 months

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	16 September 2016
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	15 June 2017
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	16 June 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	n/a
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	n/a

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	3,534,786
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	15,821,620

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	1,037,524
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 5.782.453,53

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	12 December 2018. Meeting of Project Technical Consultative Committee (CTC)
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	n/a
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	n/a
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	<b>S</b>	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	<b>S</b>	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	<b>M</b>	

### Status

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Antonio De Nichilo/Project National Technical Coordinator /SGAyDS	<a href="mailto:ajdnichilo@ambiente.gob.ar">ajdnichilo@ambiente.gob.ar</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Alejandro Flores Nava	<a href="mailto:Alejandro.Flores@fao.org">Alejandro.Flores@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Francisco Yofre	<a href="mailto:Francisco.Yofre@fao.org">Francisco.Yofre@fao.org</a>
<b>CBC- GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Hernán González	<a href="mailto:Hernan.gonzalez@fao.org">Hernan.gonzalez@fao.org</a>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1: Improved protection of marine ecosystems with globally significant biodiversity in key areas by supporting the Namuncura /Burdwood Bank Enforcement Authority for managing the Marine Protected Area (AMP in Spanish) and its transition zones, and creating a new protected area, established beyond the 12 miles of Territorial Waters</b>	Area covered by AMP.	Area covered by AMP: approximately 4% of the total EEZ areas and territorial sea is preserved (65.00-0 km2).	Only as of the fourth year.	GEF BD METT score for the other new AMP to be created: 33.	Scientific research cruise carried out in Frente Valdés for assessing oceanographic and biological information in order to build an environment baseline. Progress in outlining fisheries socio-economic information from Frente Valdés. Work was carried out with APN, and several participatory workshops were held. A guideline for the sustainable management plans of AMP document was achieved.	S
	GEF BD METT score for Namuncurá /Burdwood.	GEF BD METT score for Namuncurá: 21.	GEF BD METT score for AMPNBB in Spanish (Namuncurá / Burdwood Bank Marine Protected	GEF BD METT score for AMPNBB (Namuncurá / Burdwood Bank Marine Protected Area): 45.	Support to the enforcement authority: TAG workshops; a Geoportal of oceanographic campaign information, integrated into the SHN data geoportal, interoperable with existing biological and sea data systems, was built and an environmental	HS

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

<sup>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
			Area): 26.		guideline for the productive activities to be performed into the AMP is in progress. Training course in "Marine Spatial Planning" was given with the support of Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO. The activity was aimed at training technicians and other actors with interference in the subject in the activities carried out in the Argentine Sea (at least 45 people). The AMPNBB Technical Secretariat applied METT, in December 2017 and obtained a score of 36. A new METT was applied in June 2019 and a score of 50 was obtained.	
	GEF BD METT score for the other new AMP to be created.	GEF BD METT score for the other new AMP to be created: 0.	Only as of the fourth year.	GEF BD METT score for the other new AMP to be created: 33.	N/A An assessment on oceanographic, biological and socioeconomic information is in progress in order to build an environmental baseline of Frente Valdés. A guideline for the sustainable management AMP plans was achieved.	S
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> EEP tested in a pilot fishery to protect marine biodiversity and ecosystem services and support EEP jobs	Impact level of trawl fishing on benthic communities and demersal species	Impact of trawl fishing on benthic communities and demersal species to be defined in year 1. Few studies have been carried out on accompanying benthic fauna.	Areas for scallop regeneration duly protected allowing an ongoing	Impact on benthic communities and demersal species controlled and reduced.	Based on the agreement with Glaciar Pesquera S.A, INIDEP carried out two research cruises with the company's vessels (USD 240,000.-): biomass, selectivity and efficiency assessing baseline for benthic communities and	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	defined.	Nonetheless, it is necessary to systematize information collection and learn about the impact on biological diversity.	recovery of the resource.		demersal species. Socio-economic indicators are being assessed. Vieira's EEP Management Plan is in progress.	
<b>Outcome 2.2: Enabling conditions and capacities built at the national level for the effective implementation of EEP.</b>	Effective implementation and adoption of EEP by the CFP.	EEP has not been adapted to the national fisheries context or adopted as a supplementary fishery management instrument, and National capacities are still very limited.	Only as of the fourth year.	The EEP approach and its minimum contents have been adopted by CFP as a supplementary instrument for fisheries management.	N/A, At least nine EEP expert meetings were held. More than 100 people from public institutions and fisheries were trained in EEP implementation. Strengthening of project and key stakeholders in matters related to gender and vulnerable groups. An EEP workshop was held. Based on these results, the CFP created an Bycatch Reduction Monitoring Commission (Act 08/2019) and a first meeting was held.	HS
<b>Outcome 2.3: Monitoring and information management systems improved, including socio economic data and information on selectivity, good practices and mitigation: measures, to facilitate decision-</b>	Monitoring and information management systems improved, including socio economic data and information on selectivity, good	Current information systems lack the elements required for guiding EEP application. There is no ecosystem and socioeconomic- based monitoring system that supports decision-making on fisheries management.	Only as of the third year	CFP decisions and follow-up committees by type of fisheries use information on ecosystem and socio-economic indicators in their decision-making.	N/A An agreement was Signed with CONICET to work on surveying fishery-related socio-economic variables. Implementation on good practices and by-catch mitigation tests were carried out. At least 10 fisheries authorities, 5 associations, 15 companies and 200 fishermen (91 % male) were trained on this issues. The project promoted the monitoring and follow-up of the	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
making on the application of EEP in the public and private sectors	practices and mitigation including gender and vulnerable groups' perspective.				National Plans of Action of sea turtles, seabirds, sea mammals and chondrichthyes (3 workshops)	
	Measures, to facilitate decision-making on the application of EEP in the public and private sectors				Work Commission to strengthen measures to reduce bycatch in fisheries (created by Act 8/2019 of the Federal Fisheries Council (CFP) within its framework of ecosystem approach to fishing) was promoted by the Project.	S
<b>Outcome 3.1: Project implementation is results-oriented and project outcomes and lessons learned will be applied in future operations.</b>	Relevance Coverage Effectiveness Efficiency Quality Sustainability Institutionalization Inclusion of a gender and vulnerable groups approach.		50% of outcomes achieved.	100% of outcomes achieved	Taking into account progress in outcomes 1 to 4 and in communication and dissemination tasks evaluated in the three PPRs during these two years of project implementation, 40% of the outcomes have been achieved. The 10% gap is due to: Institutional changes in different government ministries and secretaries that partially affected the scheduled execution timeline of the project. Also, the decision-making process has changed to include new stakeholders in the	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>project, which delays the definition of some activities. The specific dissemination, planning and M&amp;A outputs are being achieved adequately and on time.</p>	



**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Action(s) to be taken</b>	<b>By whom?</b>	<b>By when?</b>

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
1.1.1.: One (1) new AMP geographically designed and delimited, with a participatory management plan outlined for of “Front Corridor of Chubut”, accounting for at least 25% of its total area (37.000 km2).	Q4 Y3	Not applicable according to PRODOC. However, progress was made in signing through agreements and in funding to assist in the creation of a new AMP. Campaigns were planned for the environmental and socio-economic baselines.	Progress was made in signing agreements and in funding to assist in the creation of a new AMP. Scientific research cruise was carried out in Frente Valdés for assessing oceanographic and biological information in order to build an environmental baseline. Outlining fisheries socio-economic information from Frente Valdés is in progress. Work was carried out with APN, and at least 4 participatory workshops were held. A guideline for the sustainable management plans of AMP document was achieved.		n/a	n/a	40%	
1.1.2.:Support to the implementation of the Namuncurá	Q2 Y3	Financing of TAG workshops, agreement for building the Geoportal and	Financing of TAG workshops, a Geoportal of oceanographic cruises information, integrated into the SHN data geoportal, interoperable with	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	Expected project target was achieved in the second year of the

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Burdwood Bank AMP Management Plan.		collection of information related to historical oceanographic and biological campaigns.	biological and sea data systems was built, and an environmental guideline for the productive activities of AMP is in progress. Training in space marine planning was carried out for national and provincial government agencies. The AMPNBB Technical Secretariat applied a METT, in December 2017 and obtained a score of 36. A new MEET was applied in June 2019 and obtained a score of 50.					Project (Q2 Y2).
1.1.3.: One (1) sustainable financing plan designed for the Front Corridor of Chubut AMP.	Q4 Y4	Work with APN on guidelines for the sustainable management of AMPs and future activities. Lessons Learned from AMPNBB funding.	Not applicable according to PRODOC. However, a guideline for the sustainable management plans of AMP document was achieved. This document include a guideline for sustainable financing plan for AMP's management plans. Work with APN on ToR for hiring consultants in sustainable financing AMP plan.	n/a	n/a	n/a	30%	This output was modified since AMPNBB has an allocated Budget: "Output 1.1.3 One (1) Sustainable financing plan designed for the Front Corridor of Chubut AMP".
1.1.4.: Institutional, regulatory and operational capacity framework reinforced for the management of AMPs and transition zones.	Q4 Y4	Work with APN on drafting guidelines for the sustainable Management of AMPs and planning and management tools for AMP and future activities.	A guideline for the sustainable management plans of AMP document was achieved. In addition, an environmental guideline for productive activities in the AMP document is in progress.	n/a	n/a	n/a	50 %	The product "A guideline for the sustainable management plans of AMP document was achieved" was a target planned for the 3rd year of the project (regarding the new results framework of the project approved on December 2018).

<p>1.1.5.: One consolidated network of research organizations, governmental agencies and Civil Society Organizations (OSCs) with capacities enhanced and working together on sharing of scientific analysis on marine biodiversity and threats to its conservation and best management practices for improved management effectiveness of AMPs.</p>	<p>Q4 Y4</p>	<p>Participation in meetings of government institutions who are members of the AMPNBB Governing Council with the scientific sector (INIDEP and CENPAT). Building of Geoportal, integrated into the SHN data geoportal, interoperable with existing biological and sea data systems.</p>	<p>Ongoing governmental meetings with institutions that are part of the AMPNBB Governing Council and with the Scientific sector (INIDEP and CENPAT).</p> <p>Geoportal of oceanographic campaign information, integrated into the SHN data geoportal and interoperable with existing biological and sea data systems.</p> <p>Database on stranding's of marine fauna is in progress.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>35%</p>	
<p>2.1.1.: Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Plan (EEPMP) for the Patagonian scallop fishery (<i>Zygochlamys patagonica</i>) adopted by all stakeholders (Patagonian scallop fishers and fishing companies, INIDEP, CFP, SSPyA, SGAYDS, and science institutions)</p>	<p>Q4 Y4</p>	<p>Financing and agreements with INIDEP, the private sector and academia. Campaigns carried out for assessing biomass, selectivity and efficiency of Patagonian Scallop. Baseline documents. Progress in outlining socio-economic indicators.</p>	<p>The EEP has been formally presented to the CFP and entrepreneurs (EEP Workshop) and the initiative for its implementation. The working group (WG) for the preparation of the scallop PM has been constituted. Progress is being made in defining socio-economic indicators that must be validated by the WG. Four campaigns were carried out to gather biological, ecological and fishing information. The diagnosis of the scallop fishery, a new model for the management of the fishery, and the evaluation of selectivity measures to reduce the impacts of current fishing practices are available. The mechanisms for</p>				<p>50%</p>	

			surveying social and economic variables in the scallop fishery are available. Socio-economic surveys are being carried out (to employers and workers of the sector) to elaborate indicators that will be used in the EEPPM.					
2.1.2.: Good catch and management practices for the Patagonian scallop fishery, validated through a participatory process, including zoning and regulation of this activity, fishing techniques and selectivity devices which minimize the impact on non-target species and the benthic community.	Q4 Y4	Financing and agreements with INIDEP and the private sector. Document estimating selectivity prepared and work with INIDEP to identify good management and capture practices for the scallop fishery are being validated.	Good capture and management practices in scallop fishing under validation, with participation of the academic sector, government enforcement authorities, CFP and companies. Fishing techniques and selectivity devices that minimize the impact on non-target species and the benthic community were tested. 34 people (50%women) have participated in the elaboration of BP for the scallop fishery (training and workshop).				40%	
2.2.1.: Minimum EEP contents established and adopted by CFP and mainstreamed in the regulatory frameworks for fisheries management	Q4 Y4	Not applicable for this period. It is, however, informed that SGAYDS representatives at the CFP are also members of the UEP (Project Implementation Unit), attend formal CFP meetings and are in permanent contact with SSPyA. CFP	<b>NA</b>				Not applicable to this period according to the PRODOC.	

		standards related to EEP were adopted (Res CFP 3/2017: LEPs – fishing scarecrows)						
2.2.2.: Analysis of market incentive options (increase in business sector profitability) for applying EEP.	Q4 Y2	Not applicable to this period.	The activities to be carried out were defined with the application authority: hiring a consultant for the feasibility analysis of market incentives and the development of tools for the use of market incentives.				20%	
2.2.3.: Staff of the institutions involved in fisheries management (INIDEP, PNA, SSPyA and equivalent provincial authorities and provincial environment agencies) and fisheries trade unions have developed capacities in the practical application of EEP, including options for sustainable fisheries certification, from a gender perspective and with the participation of youth.	Q4 Y3	Agreements with SSPyA authorities, and experts. Meetings on EEP. EEP consultant contracts Strengthening the Project and key stakeholders in gender and vulnerable group matters.	More than 100 people from more than six public institutions and fishing associations have been trained in the EEP application (workshops / training in EEP, Recreational Fishing Workshop, use of scarecrow lines). An EEP Workshop was done.				75%	
2.2.4.: Fishery-related	Q4 Y4	Strengthening of SGAYDS and SSPyA	Training activities on management, control and surveillance systems of				15%	

implementation authorities (SSPyA, provincial fishing authorities, PNA) have strengthened their capacity to implement efficient management, control and surveillance mechanisms (satellite system, landing control), by applying EEP		with the purchase of computer equipment. Training to reinforce control and surveillance mechanisms.	the EEP, directed to inspectors, delegation staff, SSPyA, provincial fisheries authorities, PNA, ARA (Argentinian Army) were planned. Training activities on how to improve the traceability of catches and products, contributing to the reduction of Illegal fishing, not Regulated and Not Declared in the provinces of Rio Negro, Tierra del Fuego, Chubut were also planned.					
Output 2.3.1.: The SSPyA fisheries information system mainstreams easily accessible and relevant socio-economic variables for applying EEP	Q4 Y2	Financing and agreements with UNMdP for outlining socio-economic indicators. Agreements were signed to work with Chubut and Buenos Aires provincial fisheries directorates, and consultations were held with companies and OSCs to identify the socio-economic elements of scallop fisheries and the survey thereof.	Socio-economic surveys are being carried out (to employers and workers of the sector) to elaborate indicators that will be used in the EEPPM (Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Plan)				35%	
2.3.2.: A monitoring and information system for applying EEP in the Argentine Sea.	Q4 Y4	N/A: Milestones will be defined as from year 2.	It was agreed to create a permanent working group to address the issue between national and provincial authorities. A consultancy to strengthen the Fisheries Statistics System of the SSPyA for the incorporation of the socioeconomic				20%	

			variables into the system is planned.					
2.3.3.: National Evaluation of: i) efficacy of fishing techniques and selectivity devices; ii) mitigation of the impact of these techniques and devices on the ecosystem; iii) inclusion of the recommended measures for the implementation of EEP in the Argentine Sea	Q4 Y4	Project financing and agreements with OSCs ( <i>Aves Argentinas</i> & FVSA), CCT-CONICET-CENPAT and CCT-CONICET- IIMyC for implementing good practices and by-catch mitigation tests for marine birds and mammals. Support to NPAs – marine birds and mammals.	Activities of year 1 continue. Project financing of the Working committee to strengthen bycatch reduction measures in fisheries (CFP Res. 8/2019) and evaluation of selective devices for scallop and coastal gillnet artisanal fisheries.				45%	
3.1.1. Dissemination of EEP notions and project objectives and outputs among different target groups.	Q4 Y4	3 options for disseminating information: Monthly progress report (prepared and sent out to key stakeholders) webpage and quarterly newsletter (contents prepared), 2 communicational outputs completed. Whatever is generated is communicated and disseminated by SGAYDS through its press, communication and outreach team.	3 options for disseminating information: monthly progress report (prepared and sent to key stakeholders), webpage and quarterly newsletter was sent and updated by SAYS. 2 communication products were completed. News are regularly sent to the press through SAYS and FAO to national media, and through INIDEP to local press and fishing specialized journalists. In addition, there is an active Communication network with the participation of CCT-CONICET CENPAT, CADIC, INIDEP and SAYS, focused on delivering an EEP campaign.	n/a	n/a	n/a	%	
3.1.2.: Project planning and monitoring system	Q1 Y1 to Q4 Y4	1 Annual Work Plan and Budget (PTPA) and 1 Project Progress	1 2019 PTPA approved by the Technical Consultative Committee (CTC), and 2 Project Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	50%	The implementation of the instruments



operational and providing systematic information on annually scheduled activities and targets, and progress made in achieving project outcomes and outputs.		Report (PPR) prepared. M&E plan and system and instruments for data collection prepared.	Reviews (IRAEP) prepared. Update of Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) done to include gender perspective and vulnerable groups reinforcement, approved by the CTC. Training in M&E done, with participation of most partner institutions.					for data collection and M&E activities represents a challenge for all partner institutions and consultants.
3.1.3.: Mid-Term and Final Review / Evaluation.	Q4, Y2 y Q4, Y4	n/a	Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference prepared. Data collection phase planned between August and September, 2019	n/a	n/a	n/a	15%	

### Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

O 1.1: Support to the Namuncurá / Burdwood Bank Marine Protected Area (AMPNBB in Spanish) Enforcement Authority:

Main achievements: Oceanographic research cruises; Development of a Geoportal, integrated into the SHN data geoportal and interoperable with existing biological and sea data systems; *Environmental guidelines for the productive activities to be performed into the AMP*; Training in space marine planning for national and provincial government agencies. The AMPNBB Technical Secretariat applied METT in December 2017 and obtained a score of 36. A new METT applied in June 2019 obtained a score of 50. Expected project target was achieved in the second year. A scientific research cruise was carried out in Frente Valdés for assessing oceanographic and biological information in order to build an environmental baseline. The team is compiling fisheries socio-economic information from Frente Valdés. Several participatory workshops prepared and validated by key stakeholders were held to elaborate a guideline for developing sustainable management plans of AMPs.

O 2.1: EEP tested in a pilot fishery:

The activities agreed with the stakeholders (INIDEP, the private sector, CFP, SSPyA, SGAYDS and the academia), were leveraged by financing workshops, meetings and research cruises. Important progress was made in the research cruises to assess biomass, selectivity and fishing arts selectivity and efficiency. Baseline for benthic communities and demersal species was also documented. The development of socio-economic indicators to assess the status of scallop fisheries is in progress. Scallop's population model was done and its EEP Management Plan is in progress.

O 2.2 & 2.3: Enabling conditions and capacities built and monitoring and information management systems improved:

- Agreements were made with CFP and SSPyA and a meeting on EEP was held.
- A workshop for the inclusion of the EEP concept in management frameworks and the business sector was held.
- A consultation with companies and OSC to identify the socio-economic variables of scallop fisheries and surveillance was done.
- An agreement was signed to strengthen provincial agencies for them to survey the socio-economic elements of fisheries.

- Implementation of good practices and by-catch mitigation tests was carried out with Project funding.
- An agreement was signed with CONICET to work on surveying fishery-related socio-economic variables. At least 10 fisheries authorities, 5 associations, 15 companies and 200 fishermen (91 % male) were trained on this issues.
- The project promoted the monitoring and follow-up of the National Action Plans of sea turtles, seabirds, sea mammals and chondrichthyes (3 workshops were held).
- A Work Commission to strengthen measures to reduce bycatch in fisheries (created by Act 8/2019 of the Federal Fisheries Council within its framework of ecosystem approach to fishing) was promoted by the Project.

O 3.1: Results-oriented project implementation:

- Presentation of one PTPA and one IRAEP.
- Mid Term Review ToR prepared.
- Preparation of an M&E plan and system.
- Logical Framework Matrix was updated to include changes in baseline and indicators and mainstreams gender and vulnerable groups' perspective.
- Progress in communication outputs: Work was done along with fishermen to make audiovisual material and posters for their sales stalls that show they are involved in Franciscana dolphin protection
- Audiovisual material to communicate the concept of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries and experiences in Argentina was done.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

- Institutional changes in different government ministries/secretaries partially affected the scheduled execution timeline of the project.
- The decision-making process has changed to include new stakeholders in the project, which delays the definition of activities when planning the POA.
- Lack of coordination within and between government agencies that impacted the implementation of the POA.
- The concern expressed by the provincial authorities along the Atlantic coastline with regards to the proposed creation of an AMP, particularly the Front Corridor of Chubut, hinders project execution and its outcomes.
- The execution of the project and its results may be hampered by the the fear of the fishing companies about the role they will have if progress is made in the creation of AMPs (in particular the Chubut Front Corridor)
- The communication and dissemination strategy of the Project is partially compromised by the communication procedures and policies of SGAYDS.

**Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment**

	<b>FY2019 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2019 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Antonio De Nichilo/Project National Technical Coordinator /SGAyDS</b>	S	S	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor, or no shortcomings
<b>Budget Holder</b>	S	S	Project is on track with minor delivery delays
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	S	S	The project is on track with minor delivery delays
<b>CBC- GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	S	S	The Project has performed well and already achieved important project outcomes. Timely delivery of project outputs in spite of some institutional challenges and concerns of provincial authorities and the private sector about the creation of a new APM.

---

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>18</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
LOW	Both the social and environmental classifications are still valid for the project. The actual appropriation of objectives of the project by stakeholders, has allowed for the gradual achievement of objectives. There have not been any significant environmental changes and hence project activities in the field have not been impeded. Delays in the realization of some of the activities have been rather intrinsic (political and administrative).

*Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.*

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>.</i>

---

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
<b>1</b>	<i>Difficulties for accommodating the objectives of the many stakeholders within the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EEP).</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Promote dialogue between, and with, the different actors in search of consensus. Improve communication and dissemination of the Project. Training on Ecosystem Approach.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Some international market regulations for exporting fishery products promote the mainstreaming of EEP. This pressure favours matching EEP objectives with those of the stakeholders.</i>
<b>2</b>	<i>Scarcity of appropriate resources to fulfill all actions within the Ecosystem Approach and improve effective management of AMPs.</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Support sustainable initiatives that promote EA and improve the effective management of AMPs. Development of tools for the effective management of AMPs.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
<b>3</b>	<i>There is scarce socioeconomic information and it is difficult to access it. This represents a risk for EEP implementation and AMP Management Plans.</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>The project addresses this gap through the identification of socio-economic indicators in fisheries and the incorporation of this information in the Fisheries Information System. The project will obtain baseline information through scientific research cruises.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
4	<i>Difficulties to coordinate EEP implementation with provincial governments.</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Consolidate collaborative work between the Project and the provinces on issues of common interest.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
5	<i>Not to materialize the creation of the AMP “Front Corridor of Chubut”, as mentioned at the CTC meeting.</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Project is exploring the feasibility of creating the AMP. We hope the outcome upon Project finalization will show the benefits and advisability of creating this new AMP. Meetings with the fishing entrepreneurs sector to inform about the activities developed by the project linked to this goal.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
6	<i>Impact of institutional changes at government level not allowing Project execution within the scheduled time frames.</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Strengthen coordination and collaboration between the Implementing and Executing Agencies to mitigate the impact of risk.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
7	<i>The outcomes of the Project’s communication and dissemination strategy are compromised by SGAYDS communication procedures and policies.</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Establish a closer link with the communication units of the counterparts and Implementing Agency, providing them with contents to give greater visibility to the Project.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	

**Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):**

<b>FY2018 rating</b>	<b>FY2019 rating</b>	<b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
M	M	The project only faces moderate risks, because we believe that there is a 26% to 50% probability for assumptions to materialize and/or continue throughout time.,

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	No	-
<b>Project Outputs</b>	Yes	As reported in the 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR, Outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.5 and their activities were approved at the beginning of the Project. Consequently, the Logical Framework Matrix was updated, included changes in baseline and indicators according the previous modifications and mainstreamed the gender and vulnerable groups' perspective. These updates have been approved by the CTC on December 2018.

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change	
<b>Project extension</b>	Original NTE: 16 June 2021	Revised NTE: n/a
	Justification: n/a	

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?**

Through consulting services provided by an expert in gender and vulnerable groups (G&VG), a G&VG analysis was carried out within the Project and a proposal was set forth to include conceptual and methodological toolkits to mainstream the G&VG perspective (indicators, data collection instruments, etc.). Data collection instruments will provide gender-disaggregated data such as women and men participation in meetings, workshops and other activities.

Nevertheless, there are strong limitations to establish a G&VG baseline. Some reasons are the lack of disaggregated statistical information for the fisheries sector by sex or vulnerable groups or the high level of informality prevailing in the sector, and the different scales of activity in the fisheries sector.

Furthermore, a training was held on this topic to strengthen key actors in the project's implementation (SGAyDS, FAO, SSPyA) and favour the application of the G&VG approach in this and future projects. In addition, gender mainstreaming was part of the M&E training to partners' institutions. However, prioritization of gender goals is still a challenge because of the project staff and stakeholders' lack of expertise and interest.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

At present, there are no indigenous communities directly involved in the Project. Nonetheless, training in Gender and Vulnerable Groups in March 2018 included indigenous matters, with the participation of the SGAyDS coordinator on indigenous peoples. In this workshop, the participants agreed that there are no experiences of good fishing practice of indigenous peoples in Argentinean maritime areas, at least systematized as such.



## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

**Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))**

Gubernamental institutions: SGAYDS, MS, CONICET (IIMyC, CIMAS, CENPAT, CADIC), INIDEP, SSPyA, CFP; JGM, APN, MD, Fishing Directorates, Buenos Aires, Río Negro, Chubut, Santa Cruz and Tierra del Fuego provinces; Academia: Universidad de Mar del Plata (UNMdP), Universidad Nacional del Comahue; Private sector: fishing chambers/companies and OSC: FVSA, Aquamarina, Aves Argentinas, Fundación Mundo Marino, Karumbe; int'l institutions: IOC-UNESCO and FAO.

New stakeholders: APN since 04/2019 as CTC new member;

New actors are being incorporated into the project, both governmental institutions and OSCs as well as fishing companies which actively participate in the activities to which they are called.

FAO's prestige facilitates dialogue between the different actors and promotes participation and involvement, strengthening the policies of government agencies.

The challenge is the possible change of government that may unfavorably impact on products and expected results of the project.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

**Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval**

In accordance with the work proposed by the National Action Plan to Reduce the Interaction of Marine Mammals with Fisheries, the Project is supporting a real-scale implementation of acoustic alarms to avoid bycatch of the Franciscan Dolphin in fishing nets. The activity is carried out together with fishermen from the Coast Department of the Province of Buenos Aires. In this case, support of fishermen who are committed to placing alarms in their net is crucial. By doing this, the Project seeks to reach a sustainable bycatch, which will allow the protection of the Dolphin, the most threatened cetacean in Argentina. In addition, it generates a solution for the fishermen who face the consequences of the inconvenience, since entanglement implies a high cost for the replacement of the damaged nets. This activity is intended to reach the community. Work was done along with fishermen to make audiovisual material and posters for their sales stalls that show they are involved in Franciscana dolphin protection.

Audiovisual material was created, to communicate the concept of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries and experiences in Argentina where these characteristics can be found. Check the below links

- [Ecosystem Approach to fisheries in Argentina](#)

[Puerto Madryn, Chubut](#)

- [Puerto Madryn, Chubut II](#)

In 2019 we celebrated the World Oceans Day and shared materials through [INIDEP](#) and [FAO](#) twitter's account.

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval (USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019- (USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS at present SGAYDS)	In-kind and grant	1,266,666	170,389		
National Government	Ministry of Security (MS)	In-kind and grant	4,716,871	1,610,894		
National Government	National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET)	In-kind and grant	822,000	108,202		
National Government	National Institute for Fisheries	In-kind and grant	2,194,000	177,429		

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

	Research and Development (INIDEP)					
National Government	Under-secretariat of Fisheries and Aquaculture (SSPyA)	In-kind and grant	2,380,000	78,975		
National Government	Chief of Cabinet Ministry (JGM)	In-kind and grant	289,800	2,773,832		
National Government	Federal Fisheries Council (CFP)	In-kind and grant	635,361	81,629		
National Government	Ministry of Defense (MD)	In-kind and grant	3,076,922	296,157		
Private Sector	Glaciar Pesquera S.A.	Grant	240,000	388,407		
Multilateral Organization	FAO		200,000	96,535		
		<b>TOTAL</b>	15,821,620	5,782,453		

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement**

## **Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions**

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

**Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.