



# 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>	RAP
<b>Country:</b>	Indonesia
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Inland Fisheries Practices in Freshwater Ecosystems of High Conservation Value (IFish)</b>
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	<b>GCP/INS/303/GFF</b>
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5759
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, National Agency for Planning Development, Ministry of Public Works and Housing, Ministry of Energy, Provincial and District Fisheries Office, Agency for Geospatial Information, Agency for Assessment and Application of Technology, Indonesian Institute of Science, SEAFDEC, Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission
<b>Project Duration:</b>	48 months

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	05 March 2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:</b>	20 June 2017
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	19 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>	<b>6,192,694</b>
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	<b>34,162,192</b>

<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.

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

<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD):</b>	951,961
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	12,179,170

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	02/19/2019 (3 <sup>rd</sup> PSC meeting)
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	November 2019
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	Yes
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	No
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	No

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	MS	In view of effective start of project implementation from July 2018 with the recruitment of full project team, limited progress has been made towards achieving objectives and outcomes.
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	MS	Project implementation was accelerated by recruitment of National Consultants in July 2018 and preparation of TORs for various LOAs and consultants by November 2018, with several key activities initiated related to eel conservation, revision of District land use management plans, training needs

<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

		assessments and EAFM/EAA training modules
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Low	Improved involvement of institutional stakeholders, realities of sector policy and planning (both national and local) provide challenges for implementation.

## Status

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

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Ateng Supriatna/National Project Manager, FAO Indonesia	<a href="mailto:Ateng.Supriatna@fao.org">Ateng.Supriatna@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Mr. Weimin Miao, Aquaculture Officer, FAO Regional Office in Asia and Pacific	<a href="mailto:Weimin.Miao@fao.org">Weimin.Miao@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Mr. Stephen Rudgard, FAO Representative in Indonesia, FAO Indonesia	<a href="mailto:Rudgard.Stephen@fao.org">Rudgard.Stephen@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, Technical Investment Center Division, FAO HQ	<a href="mailto:Sameer.Karki@fao.org">Sameer.Karki@fao.org</a>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

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> strengthen the management framework for sustainable use of inland aquatic biodiversity to increase the protection of high conservation-value freshwater ecosystems and their biodiversity in Indonesia.						
<b>Outcome 1: Critical knowledge on the aquatic biodiversity of inland waters incorporated into sector policies and development plans</b>	Area (km <sup>2</sup> ) of critical inland aquatic ecosystems under sustainable management plans	Total inland waters are 26.8 km <sup>2</sup>  Production is 2.8 million ton of fish. Limited area under sustainable management practices and depletion of fisheries and threats to species are poorly documented	2,000 km <sup>2</sup> of critical inland aquatic ecosystems under sustainable management plans	2,949 km <sup>2</sup> of critical inland aquatic ecosystems under sustainable management plans	Revised land use management plans developed by project submitted to district, but not yet endorsed or actively implemented  Due to pending endorsement of revised land use management plans less than 50 km <sup>2</sup> of critical inland aquatic ecosystems are currently under sustainable management plans (based on District level management and protection of eel resources for Cilacap and Sukabumi)	MS
<b>Outcome 2.1: Rural communities pursue improved livelihoods through better fisheries production and conservation in 5</b>	Number of demonstration projects implemented  Number households benefitting Amount of wetland habitat covered	Productivity of aquaculture depends on the implemented technology. Productivity of rice-fish polyculture in rice field is 0.6 ton/year, while the productivity of fish	All 5 demonstration sites operational	5 demonstration projects implemented  12,385 households benefitting from pilot projects directly	All 5 demonstration sites are operational, but not all intended activities fully implemented.  185 households (1.85%) directly benefitting from project activities	S

<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).

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

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>pilot areas including 12,385 households on 60,000 of wetland habitat</b>		pond ranges 2.7-480 ton/ha/year. Floating net cage productivity ranges 138-952 ton/ ha/ year No-feed aquaculture technology is available, but not widely used		60,000 ha of wetland habitat under improved management  Cleaner inland waters including lakes and river banks in target areas	Linkages between human activities (especially pollution) and ecosystem health and impacts on fisheries (sustainable livelihoods) raised with communities and authorities in all target Districts.	
<b>Outcome 2.2: Improved capacity for conservation and market access developed for key inland fisheries resources through fisheries value chain analysis of two eel fisheries</b>	Number of fishery value chains with enhanced capacity for conservation and market access	Glass eel fisheries and eel aquaculture ongoing, but not using best practices and not certified or eco-labelled  Glass eel trade is prohibited, but ongoing	Recommendations from value-chain analysis agreed	Two eel fisheries with strengthened capacity for conservation and market access  Guidelines for ecolabelling	The supply chain of two eel fisheries (Cilacap and Sukabumi district) determined  Guidelines for ecolabelling reviewed	MS
<b>Outcome 3: Capacity to assess and monitor inland aquatic biodiversity improved at national level and at local levels in Kalimantan, Java and Sumatra</b>	Percent of wetland areas in project area mapped  Indicators of biodiversity status developed  Number of harvested species not identified to species in national reporting reduced to 30%	Thematic maps of wetland areas related to aquatic biodiversity in Indonesia not available.  Weak data of existing inland aquatic biodiversity	Mapped inland aquatic biodiversity of project area in Kalimantan and Java Islands and Sumatra	90% of wetland areas in project area mapped Indicators of biodiversity status available  Number of harvested species not identified to species in national reporting reduced to 30%	30% of wetland areas mapped. Data to determine the indicators biodiversity status obtained, but biodiversity mapping not yet implemented fully, but under development.  No direct and concrete activities have been undertaken during the reporting period for addressing lack of species detail in National level reporting	MS

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

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>Outcome 4: Project implementation based on adaptive results-based management and sharing of best practices</b>	M&E system is in place to support adaptive results-based management and monitoring of upscaling resulting from the project.	No system in place	Implemented project based on adaptive results based-management	Project delivers expected results and shares best practices	Project implementation plan available, key processes to support M&E and strategic planning in place	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>Outcome 1: Critical knowledge on the aquatic biodiversity of inland waters incorporated into sector policies and development plans</b>	Revised land use management plans, specifically recommendations covering aquatic resources use, endorsed by Districts Practical interventions based on revised land use management plans (co-management plans) incorporating specific activities for aquatic resource management will be formulated Management plans for project target species (Eel, Clown Knife fish and Dragon fish) will be developed	District authorities, with assistance by IFish and local NGOs  IFish, NGOs, District representatives and community stakeholders  IFish, MMAF and MoEF	Revised land use management plans submitted to District by Q1Y3, with endorsement expected by Q4Y3 Co-management plans between District and stakeholder communities developed and implemented from Q3Y3 onwards  Management plans for project target species drafted during Y3
<b>Outcome 2.2: Improved capacity for conservation and market access developed for key inland fisheries resources through fisheries value chain analysis of two eel fisheries</b>	Revise existing report on supply/value chain with recommendations from value-chain analysis agreed during stakeholder workshop Pre-assessment certification for eel fisheries on Serayu River and Pelabuhan Ratu catchments	IFish with MMAF and representatives from Eel collectors and traders  IFish with WWF and University in Sukabumi	Report with recommendations from stakeholders and MMAF available Q3Y3  Field assessment leading to report with implementation plan for certification or eco-labeling available Q3Y3
<b>Outcome 3: Capacity to assess and monitor inland aquatic biodiversity improved at national level and at local levels in Kalimantan, Java and Sumatra</b>	Biodiversity assessment, collating existing data as well as collection of new data on species occurrence and abundance Development of field identification guides and national guide National, District and community level capacity building exercise for biodiversity and fisheries assessments, including stock forecasting Approaches for increasing species detail in capture fisheries data to be developed Changes in species occurrence for Eel and Clown Knife fish to be assessed based on existing baseline data and ongoing data collection Fast-tracking development of building GIS with mapping of aquatic biodiversity for project areas	IFish with MMAF, Universities and National Taxonomist  IFish and National Taxonomist  IFish with assistance of University  IFish in collaboration with MMAF  IFish in collaboration with MMAF  IFish	Ongoing until EOP  Field guides available by Q1Y4  Expected by Q4Y3  Starting Y3Q2  Ongoing data collection until Y4Q2  Ongoing until EOP

<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		
Output 1.1.1: Improved land management plans, including forestry and pollution controls, covering approx. 3,000 km2 of critical inland aquatic ecosystems in Kalimantan, Java and Sumatra	Q2Y2	0%	20%				20%	Existing land use management plans reviewed. Process to revise District land use management plans in progress, with revised plans and recommendations submitted to districts for consideration. Late recruitment of NCs and SPs has meant a delay for revision process. Final revised plans are expected before end of Q2Y3. Endorsement and practical interventions (e.g. review of regulatory framework, zoning, fisheries management plans) by target districts may be delayed until Q4Y3 as additional steps are required to ensure recommended revisions are discussed with Provincial authorities for feedback to District endorsement. District authorities are committed to incorporating the inputs by IFish on aquatic resource management into the revisions of the land use management plans.
Output 1.1.2: Sector policies and development plans reviewed and revised, and legal frameworks for inland aquatic resource extraction strengthened and incentives for enforcement developed	Q2Y2	0%	25%				25%	Sectoral national level development plans reviewed, and initial Focus Group Discussions implemented.  The sector policy document is a medium-term development plan document (RPJMD) for 5 years as the basis for the local technical work plan, some regions are

<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.



								<p>still compiling documents after the 2019 district election process is complete.</p> <p>Limited protection for Eels prepared at National level and endorsed by Ministry.</p> <p>Challenges are related to the amount of time needed for data and gap analysis, internal consultation with related parties including scientific recommendations from Scientific management agencies.</p>
Output 1.2.1: Capacity building plan for sustainable management of inland aquatic resources developed and mechanisms for implementation identified	Q1Y3	0%	45%				45%	<p>Needs assessment ongoing, workshops planned for discussion of draft capacity building plans before end of Q2Y3. Delayed recruitment of SP has caused delays in implementation. Targets for training identified with institutional stakeholders at National, Provincial and District levels, as well as at community level, NGO's are considered to be included, but involvement of private sector is still being considered by the SP (SEAFDEC). Depends partially on inputs by International biodiversity expert mobilisation expected by August 2019</p>
Output 1.2.2: At least 120 environment and fisheries professionals from relevant ministries, the private sector and academia trained in sustainable management of inland fisheries	Q4Y3	NA	15%				15%	<p>Needs assessment and identification of target participants ongoing, part of EAFM/EAA training approach in close collaboration with SEAFDEC Palembang and MMAF</p>
Output 1.2.3: 15 local communities including 3,000 fishers and 1,000 fish farmers trained to implement five land management plans covering 60,000 ha of critical inland aquatic ecosystems	Q3Y3	NA	25%				25%	<p>Needs assessment and target audience for training completed and preparing of training modules ongoing. To optimise availability and participation, actual training of communities will be implemented from Q3Y3 onwards</p>
Output 1.3.1: Multi-agency coordination mechanism established on freshwater ecosystem management at central level and in each participating Province lead by the fishery sector with participation of agriculture, forestry and environment sectors	Q3Y4	0%	15%				15%	<p>Decree for establishment of Technical Working Group in support of project implementation signed (Ministerial Decree of MMAF No.94/2018) with PSC and first TWG organised as a first step in establishing multi-agency co-ordination mechanism, at National level. This involves 6 representatives from outside MMAF (Ministries of Environment and Forestry, Agriculture and Energy), additional participants have been proposed by the project to include Ministry of Public works, Peatland Restoration Agency, National Land Agency, Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI), National Institute of Aeronautics and Space (LAPAN) and Geospatial</p>

								<p>Information Agency (BIG) for technical inputs on IFish interventions.</p> <p>Second TWG planned for July 2019, with detailed TOR prepared for deliberation during TWG</p> <p>Issues exist actively engaging with agencies not directly involved with project implementation. Development of practical interventions at District level (zoning and resource management plans, including biodiversity considerations), expected to be used to develop cross-sectoral working groups at District levels to strengthen collaborations between agencies.</p>
Output 1.4.1: 3 Fishery management plans for globally important freshwater biodiversity	Q2Y2	0%	20%				20%	<p>The policy for eel conservation prepared and developed at National level. Ongoing efforts to expand to National level in close collaboration with MMAF, by preparing comprehensive National level management plan.</p> <p>Limited protection for Eels prepared at National level approved by scientific authority (Indonesian Institute of Science) and ready to submit to Minister for endorsement. A draft version of the eel management plan is available and is currently under consideration in a series of consultations.</p> <p>Additional plans for Clown Knife Fish (Belida) and Dragon fish to be developed with MMAF before the end of Q4Y3. Delay in progress is due to staffing issues within IFish, consideration of adjustments to 'fisheries' management, as both remaining species (Belida and Asian Arowana) are fully protected and officially cannot be fished and limited sense of urgency within government agencies.</p>
Output 1.4.2: Implementation of revised sector policy and land management plans in critical inland aquatic ecosystems in Java, Kalimantan and Sumatra	Q4Y3	0%	15%				15%	<p>National inland fisheries management area (WPP-PD) as sector policy is available, the draft has been agreed and is ready to be legalized by MMAF. Indonesia Fisheries Management Area (WPP) as a reference for inland fisheries management in Indonesia.</p> <p>Discussions for implementation of land use management plan by District ongoing, with IFish assistance planned for Q4Y3.</p> <p>Due to delays in mobilising NCs and SPs to assist in revising land use management plans, no practical interventions have been developed in target Districts.</p>

Output 2.1.1: Implementation of 5 land management plans in pilot communities and establishment of demonstrations on aquaculture management, capture fisheries practices, integrated land management, and fish passage structures	Q4Y4	0%	35%				35%	<p>6 demonstrations on aquaculture (eel culture and breeding of Chitala), capture fisheries (Eel data collection and participatory monitoring of fisheries), and pollution control for fish cage culture established, based on issues identified in the ProDoc.</p> <p>4 additional demonstrations, including design of fish passage structures, garbage management, fisheries management and fish processing identified</p> <p>These will be developed in part as co-management activities in support of implementation of revised land management plans in pilot communities.</p> <p>Implementation was delayed, in part due to increased coverage demanded by some Districts and need to follow due process regarding (District level) endorsement of revised land use management plans.</p>
Output 2.1.2: Aquaculture awareness on pollution and law enforcement	Q4Y2	0%	15%				15%	<p>This has its focus mainly on Kampar District, proposal for training on responsible aquaculture, with emphasis on reducing aquaculture induced pollution in collaboration SEAFDEC formulated. Implementation to start during Q4Y2 but expected to continue until Q3Y3. Discussions on main issues and best approach to implement ongoing with District, communities and NGOs. Delay due to late recruitment of SP (SEAFDEC Palembang)</p>
Output 2.1.3: Best-practice manuals for conservation and sustainable use of inland aquatic biodiversity developed based on evaluation of demonstration activities	Q2Y3	0%	30%				30%	<p>Draft best practices manual for eel fisheries based on experiences in Cilacap and Sukabumi available, prepared together with MMAF, WWF and Academia. Additional BP manuals (capture fisheries and aquaculture) will be delayed until at least to Q2Y4, due to insufficient progress with demonstration activities in Kampar (Clown Knife fisheries and aquaculture) and Kalimantan (Beje management and Dragon fish). In addition, staffing issues and need for involvement of government specialists are expected to make progress slow.</p>
Output 2.2.1: Inland fisheries value/supply-chain analyzed for river eel fisheries on Serayu River and Pelabuhan Ratu catchments	Q4Y2	0%	30%				30%	<p>The supply chain of two eel fisheries documented and analysed. Value chain and market access under review and analysis for development of recommendations. Expanded scope to cover national level has complicated gathering of data and information.</p>
Output 2.2.2: Pre-assessment of certification for eel fisheries on Serayu River and Pelabuhan Ratu catchments	Q4Y2	0%	20%				20%	<p>International certification and ecolabelling guidelines for eel fisheries reviewed and documented.</p>

								SNIs for elver collection and trading, and eel fattening under preparation, discussions held with National level stakeholders.
Output 2.2.3: Guidelines for certification of ecolabelling developed for eel fisheries on Serayu River and Palabuhan Ratu catchments	Q2Y4	0%	0%				0%	Based on results based workplan in ProDoc, no direct and concrete activities need to be undertaken during the reporting period
Output 2.2.4: Capacity building of eel fishery actors along the value chain to apply certification and ecolabelling guidelines	Q4Y4	0%	0%				0%	Based on results based workplan in ProDoc, no direct and concrete activities need to be undertaken during the reporting period
Output 3.1.1: A comprehensive species identification guide for inland aquatic biodiversity developed and translated to local and English languages	Q2Y3	0%	10%				10%	ToR for National Taxonomist and supporting SP available and ready for recruitment. Availability of finalised field guide(s) expected to be delayed until end of Q1Y4, due to issues identifying and recruiting specialists.
Output 3.1.2: Data collection and monitoring system established that includes inventories of aquatic biodiversity of habitats in the 5 pilot areas and the mapping of wetlands in Kalimantan, Java and Sumatra	Q3Y4	0%	20%				20%	Data collection and monitoring method developed jointly with the related national stakeholders upon a series of institutional consultation process and implemented for glass eel fisheries, fattening and trade, as well as for Clown Knife fish. It is unlikely that the project can affect change in species level catch reporting at National level for inland capture fisheries, as requirements for species level reporting for inland capture fisheries have been abandoned since several years. TOR available for developing practical approaches for aquatic biodiversity assessments Only limited progress made with preparation of thematic maps for aquatic biodiversity. Challenges to recruit capable NCs for inland fisheries and data collection have led to delay in implementation.
Output 3.1.3: National and local stakeholders (200) trained in assessment and monitoring of inland aquatic biodiversity at SEAFDEC Centre in Palembang	Q4Y3	0%	10%				10%	Training needs have been established and local and national level training approaches are included in IFish project proposals submitted for implementation. IFish changed approach to a longer experienced based training for district staff and community stakeholders including support for development of species identification tools. Extended implementation allows participants to get a hands-on experience in biodiversity, fisheries and water quality assessments.

Output 4.1.1: Project monitoring system monitors project outcomes and outputs, M&E system operating and used for adaptive project management	Q4Y4	0%	30%				30%	Project implementation plan and progress monitoring available, key processes to support M&E and strategic planning in place
Output 4.1.2: Mid-term review and final evaluations carried out and reports available	Q4Y4	0%	0%				0%	In view of delayed project implementation, mid-term review is scheduled for November 2019
Output 4.1.3: Lessons learnt documented and shared through project dissemination plan and existing national mechanisms	Q4Y4	0%	35%				35%	Project communication strategy developed, social media engagement active, proposal for Knowledge management System and IFish website approved for implementation and newsletters and communication products prepared and disseminated

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

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year)? Max 200 words:**

Several key activities were initiated, including revision of land use management plans, eel protection, data collection and culture using service providers. Working arrangements were clarified between IFish and MMAF on scope and responsibilities for implementation. A third PSC was organized where the implementation plan for 2019 was approved, as well as the first TWG meeting in September 2018. Improvements were made in both M&E and with the communication strategy.

Significant progress was made related to eel fisheries and conservation, with limited protection of eel endorsed at government level. Revised District land use management plans incorporating aquatic biodiversity considerations, were submitted to Districts for consideration and endorsement. National level sectoral plans were reviewed. The needs assessment and identification of target audience for training for EAFM/EAA at National, Provincial and District/Community levels was finished, with efforts ongoing to draft capacity building plans with draft training modules prepared. A breeding programme for Clown Knife fish, conservation efforts and training for sustainable fish cage culture in Kampar was started and demonstration activities have been initialized in all target Districts. Progress with Beje management and conservation efforts for Dragon fish was made in Kalimantan, with planning finalized for FGDs and field assessments to assess restocking sites and Beje fisheries management interventions and locations.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period? Max 200 words:**

Four out of six full-time national consultants needed to be replaced before the end of 2018 because of inadequate level of expected tangible outputs, only one position was filled immediately. Finding suitable staff is challenging, with another 2 staff replacements recruited in April 2019 and the remaining positions by June 2019. Use of SPs for key tasks has proven to be challenging for monitoring and follow-up, especially since some of the field officers recruited are still focused on building and strengthening the relationship with the local government whose knowledge on inland fisheries has to be leveraged. Consequently, much more effort is necessary for NCs, increasing the workload for project staff.

Ongoing external oversight and internal management issues affects project delivery. A change in NPC early 2019 resulted in additional requirements for co-ordination and approval of activities that make it more time-consuming to prepare project interventions. The initial delay in project implementation and staffing issues have led to limited progress, this increases pressure to deliver results. Balancing thorough and effective project implementation against fast-tracking activities, has proven to be challenging for PMU and project staff.

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

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>Rating is based on the remaining project implementation period (2 years) and the significant delays experienced until project field activities got underway in Q2Y2. Project implementation has significantly improved since the previous reporting period, but still suffers from staffing issues and ongoing cumulative implementation delays. Most outputs are expected to be achieved by EOP, assisted by the strong sense of ownership expressed by MMAF, but with some components requiring remedial action or adjustments to the original workplan. Consequently, the ambitious nature of the project is expected to lead to the project underperforming with modest overall relevance for development and global environment objectives.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>Project continues to be behind schedule, but activity implementation has quickened since recruitment of the full project team (National Consultants), service providers and support from a long-term International Consultant. Delivery is accelerating and is expected to reach projected levels during year 3 of the project.</i>

<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.

<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>The implementation and delivery of the project has been significantly behind the original project implementation plan. It has been largely caused by low efficiency in recruiting project consultants and contracting service providers. The planning and implementation of project activities needs to be more effective and result-oriented. The situation has not been significantly improved although the PMU has made some effort since the last PIR. In order to ensure the effective implementation and delivery of the expected project outcomes and outputs according to project timeframe, the following actions need to be taken: 1) the PMU needs to improve the work planning and overall coordination and management of implementation of project activities; 2) the POU needs to consolidate the project consultant team and SPs to ensure the full scale implementation of project; 3) the project MPU needs to strengthen the technical guidance and monitoring the work of the project consultants and SPs; 4) the field project activities needs to be more project-target oriented and better-coordinated.</i>
<b>GEF OFP Indonesia</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>The project has to be able to solve the difficulties that hinder project implementation. It is suggested to have more intense coordination and, if needed, set up a task force, to ensure a more project-target oriented and speeded up implementation of the project.</i>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	The progress towards Outcome is tending towards MU but given the progress since last PIR, I have rated it MS. The project needs to make stronger efforts to speed up implementation, as recommended by LTO (above). The project now has strong baseline of work to ensure this – and I expect to see greater progress being reported in the next PIR. There are some notable low delivery against plan- for example Outputs 1.1.1, 1.12 and 1.4.1's expected completed dates are Q2Y2 but they are self-assessed by the project team to have low progress. If the project team have since revised the target end dates for these Outputs, these should be noted in the PIR in future.

---

<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	

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
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> .

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Weak institutional framework and project coordination	Low	Establishment of a multi-ministry/agency coordination mechanisms at national and district levels. A Project Steering Committee will be established and chaired by MMAF.  The project also focuses on strengthening functional partnerships between government, private sector and civil society.	Multi-ministry/agency coordination mechanisms at national level established and active through the biannual Technical Working Group meetings and PSC. District level mechanisms have been identified through revision of the land use management plans.	Risk now considered to be <b>Low</b> instead of Medium as assessed in ProDoc

<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.

<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".

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Insufficient funding to sustain activities beyond project	Low	<p>Identification and demonstrating win-win inland fisheries and aquaculture practices, generating both environmental and socio-economic benefits. Promotion of credit facilities is part of approach.</p> <p>Effective mainstreaming of sustainable management of freshwater biodiversity is expected to lead to increased government budgetary allocation.</p>	<p>Involvement of public and private sectors has been implemented, with local authorities showing high level of ownership of demonstration activities. Assistance in obtaining credit forms a large part of the livelihood interventions.</p> <p>Mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations for sustainable management, align with existing government policy. Therefore, a shift of resources to sustain project-initiated activities is expected.</p>	
3	Slow Uptake of Policy Recommendations	Low	Policy uptake of recommendations can be slow because of several factors including lack of financial capacity to follow policy advice, short term expectations and political priorities etc.	There has been insufficient progress with training or awareness building activities, to see if this is a genuine risk.	In view of the current government policies this risk is considered <b>Low or even non-existent</b> (from Medium in ProDoc)
4	Climate change	Low	Improving and rehabilitating inland aquatic habitats in the longer term will buffer communities against some of the impacts of climate change and provide communities with a food resource of high nutritional value in the face of extreme climatic events.	No specific progress has been made, however resilience of aquatic habitats and communities reliant on them is increased by project implementation.	
5	changing trade patterns may introduce unforeseen demand for threatened fish species also impacting their habitats	Low	The project promotes an adaptive management approach and strengthens stakeholder capacity to plan and respond to changing conditions.	No specific progress has been made, however, the adaptive management approach through EAFM/EAA and participatory processes will increase the capacity with stakeholders to respond to any threats caused by changing trade patterns.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Changing land and water use patterns may further degrade aquatic habitats	Medium	Establishment of a multi-ministry/agency coordination mechanisms and framework and support dissemination of the value inland aquatic biodiversity.	Multi-agency co-ordination mechanisms have been established, while activities are underway to demonstrate the value of inland aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity	Risk is downgraded to <b>medium</b> (from High in ProDoc), in view of the buy-in by most agencies involved assisted by media and public awareness campaign. Remaining risk is related to conflicts between sectors, especially agriculture, industry and fisheries

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	Risk rating is unchanged from reassessment in first PIR.

#### 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	Some adjustments are deemed necessary, but can only be decided after mid-term review

**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
Project extension	Original NTE: 19 June 2021    Revised NTE: NA

---

<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)?**

After the first gender and livelihood specialist resigned for personal reasons at the end of 2018, the project has only recently recruited a replacement, who will be tasked to ensure that the project will be gender equitable. Participation to meetings and training events is recorded to monitor attendance by gender. The project has a general target for engaging with women, with at least 30% participation for meetings and training events. Efforts will be made to ensure to increase gender balance and inclusiveness in project activities and interventions, paying special attention to gender specific impacts of changes in livelihoods and participation in demonstration activities, as well as consultations, planning and implementation.

During the reporting period overall project, engagements with women made up 38% of all total participants.

Specific project activities related to pollution, fish processing and marketing that traditionally have a higher women participation will continue to be implemented to ensure equitable participation and

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

Indigenous people are present in all project target areas and are especially important for the activities related to traditional fishing methodologies, local knowledge on aquatic resource use and co-management. Indigenous people are the main targets during consultations and workshops and are essential for ensuring that traditional user rights and sustainable resource use are incorporated in revised land use management plans. During this reporting period, the representatives of indigenous people in every demonstration area took part and contributed in several meetings and workshops to establish training needs assessment for EAFM/EAA as well as for providing contribution of main issues and concerns on aquatic resource management, as inputs for a revised land use management plan. IFish also will host an internship for an anthropology student for 3 months for working with Ocu indigenous group in Kampar, Riau Province.

## 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))

### I. Project Stakeholders:

Stakeholders Involved in project implementation, consultations and planning:

- **Ministrial level:** Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Public works and Housing, the Agency of National Planning and Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI).
- **Local Government:** Marine and Fisheries Office of South Sumatera Province, Riau Province, Central Java Province, West Java Province, Central Kalimantan Province. Marine and Fisheries Office Kampar District, Cilacap District, Sukabumi District, Kapuas District, and South Barito District. Local Planning Office, the office of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Forestry, and Regional Representative People Assembly
- **Private sector:** PT Labas (eel farming) and PT Kresnapusaka Tirtalestari (dragon fish/arwana breeder)
- **Communities and community organisations:** Eel fisher groups, Eel collector groups, Fisher group Koto Panjang (Belida), communities in all project target areas.
- **Academia and NGOs:** Bogor Agricultural University, French Research Institute/IRD, WWF Indonesia, Wetlands International and Borneo Institute. Mitra Insani (Kampar), Yayasan Tahasak Belum (Kapuas and South Barito), Pusat Penelitian Lingkungan Hidup IPB University and Bina Karta Lestari (Foundation)
- **International Organisations:** SEAFDEC IFRMD (Palembang) and ACIAR

## **II. Stakeholder Engagements (Summary)**

**Institutional stakeholders** as identified in the ProDoc from outside the lead Ministry (MMAF) are engaged through the annual PSC (February 2019) for project implementation progress discussions and biannual Technical Working Group meetings (September 2018) where technical feedback is sought on implementation of specific IFish activities, as well as discussions on how agencies can better co-ordinate and collaborate to support common biodiversity concerns and solutions to environmental issues threatening inland aquatic resources. Agencies within the lead Ministry are engaged through the NPC in monthly co-ordination meetings, while individual MMAF staff and scientists are involved in regular strategic and activity planning meetings.

**Local government at Provincial and District level** has been engaged specifically for development of revised land management plans (during March-May 2019), in close collaboration with local NGOs as well for a needs assessment (April-June 2019), to develop a capacity building plan for EAFM/EAA training (leading into formulation of training modules and lesson plans)

**Local communities** are engaged in all target Districts through NGO partnerships to develop revised land management plans for inland aquatic ecosystems (March-May 2019), as well as through activities to improve livelihoods related to Eel fisheries, awareness on pollution issues and learning experiences related to EAFM/EAA. Training has been provided for fish processing, best practices for eel culture and business opportunities (including support for obtaining credit). A needs assessment involving community stakeholders was implemented to develop a capacity building plan for training in EAFM/EAA (April-June).

**Private sector**, represented by aquaculture farms, specifically eel and dragon fish farms have been mobilized to provide assistance for implementation of demonstration activities for Eel farming (November 2018, currently ongoing), as well as for planning and implementation of restocking efforts for Dragonfish and early initiatives to establish broodstock of both Belida and Dragon fish for breeding at District aquaculture stations (June 2019 onwards).

**Academia and NGOs:** Have been engaged both for planning of project activities and to co-ordinate efforts, e.g. developing monitoring of eel fisheries, Eel culture and trade in close collaboration with MMAF and WWF. Discussions have been held with research institutes and international NGOs for exchanging experience and obtaining information on initiatives and activities

Stakeholders at all levels are also targeted through production of Newsletters, distribution of flyers and social media messaging at various meetings.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

One of IFish target species for conservation is eel, and the demonstration area for project intervention for eel is in Cilacap and Sukabumi Districts on Java. As a first step to achieve the goals of conservation eels in the respected areas, IFISH have established an Eel conservation village on 21 November 2019 in close collaboration with Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) and local authorities. The Eel village is the pilot project for eel conservation nationwide.

The event included several activities, including a clean river campaign to remove garbage from the river and riverbanks and a to inform communities of the importance of fighting pollution to preserve Eel habitats, a training on ecosystem approach for aquaculture and fishery management specifically focused on best practices for Eel culture. In addition, selected groups were targeted by a training on the use of new technology for eel process, to reduce wastage and increase income. IFish and MMAF also continue to conduct data collection for Eel fisheries monitoring, including culture and trade. Demonstration activities have been initiated to minimize mortality during glass eel fisheries, transport and fattening, to reduce the amount of glass eel extracted from the rivers, as well as give-back programmes whereby Eel farmers commit to releasing a percentage of eels produced into their natural habitats to replenish stocks. When the Eel Village launched, a representative of the local military unit also attended the training on ecosystem approach for aquaculture for eels. Afterwards they established their own Eel aquaculture based on the ecosystem approach. Exchange visits from farmer groups from Sukabumi District to the Eel village have already convinced farmers from outside the Eel village to implement the EAA guidelines to their own farms and fishing operations. Reduced mortality and reduced feeding will increase profitability and restocking of farmed eels into the natural habitats will support sustainable utilization of the Eel stocks.



Some links to articles covering the story:

- <http://humas.cilacapkab.go.id/2018/11/21/kaliwungu-kedungreja-diproyeksikan-jadi-kampung-sidat/>
- <http://cilacapkab.go.id/v2//?pilih=news&mod=yes&aksi=lihat&id=6873>
- [http://m.rrl.co.id/purwokerto/post/berita/602058/cilacap/desa\\_kaliwungu\\_cilacap\\_ditetapkan\\_sebaagai\\_kampung\\_sidat.html](http://m.rrl.co.id/purwokerto/post/berita/602058/cilacap/desa_kaliwungu_cilacap_ditetapkan_sebaagai_kampung_sidat.html)
- <https://satelitpost.com/regional/cilacap/kaliwungu-jadi-kampung-sidat>
- <https://www.suaramerdeka.com/news/baca/147715/pemkab-cilacap-canangkan-kampung-sidat>
- <https://www.gatra.com/rubrik/nasional/pemerintahan-daerah/366187-KKP-Tetapkan-Kaliwungu-Cilacap-Sebagai-Kampung-Sidat>
- <http://banyumaspos.com/rencana-kunjungan-menteri-kkp-dalam-rangka-pencanangan-kampung-sidat-di-desa-kaliwungu/>
- [http://krjogja.com/web/news/read/83972/Produksi\\_Menurun\\_Cilacap\\_Canangkan\\_Kampung\\_Sidat](http://krjogja.com/web/news/read/83972/Produksi_Menurun_Cilacap_Canangkan_Kampung_Sidat)
- <https://www.liputan6.com/regional/read/3713870/upaya-konservasi-sidat-ikan-mirip-ular-kesukaan-masyarakat-jepang>
- <https://tabloidpamor.com/index-2.php?view=news&kembangkan-budidaya-sidat-berbasis-ekosistem&PMR=VFZSak5VNW5QVDA9>
- <https://tni.mil.id/view-141486-jaga-populasi-ikan-sidat-pangkalan-tni-al-cilacap-lakukan-tabur-benih.html>
- <https://www.kabarnusa.com/2018/11/jaga-populasi-ikan-sidat-lanal-cilacap.html>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RP1DSafWF0o>
- <https://youtu.be/NhmzVvqLdM>
- <https://ppid.posokab.go.id/2019/01/31/pengembangan-dan-penetapan-status-perindungan-ikan-sidat-oleh-pemerintah/>
- <https://tni.mil.id/view-147307-dinilai-modern-kolam-budidaya-sidat-lanal-cilacap-dikunjungi-pemkab-sukabumi-fao-dan-kkp.html>
- <https://bercahayafm.cilacapkab.go.id/2019/03/14/potensi-sidat-cilacap-jadi-perhatian-fao/>
- <https://infonewscilacap.com/beritautama/pemkab-sukabumi-fao-dan-kkp-kunjungi-kolam-ikan-sidat-lanal-cilacap.html>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1065788572140105728?s=12>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1065788237463998464?s=12>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1065786535650353153?s=12>
- [https://twitter.com/brsdm\\_kp/status/1065490920542396417?s=19](https://twitter.com/brsdm_kp/status/1065490920542396417?s=19)
- [https://twitter.com/brsdm\\_kp/status/1065517969726332928?s=19](https://twitter.com/brsdm_kp/status/1065517969726332928?s=19)
- [https://twitter.com/brsdm\\_kp/status/1065520323905302528?s=19](https://twitter.com/brsdm_kp/status/1065520323905302528?s=19)
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1090885089041440768?s=21>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1090886091932983296?s=21>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1090887910633676801?s=2>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1090889420629262338?s=21>
- <https://twitter.com/faoinonesia/status/1090891434100752384?s=21>

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019	Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	disbursement by the end of the project
National budget	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF)	In kind	24,406,000	11,721,878		
Provincial government	Central Java Province	In kind	2,394,444	0		
Local Government	District in Java, Kalimantan, and Sumatera	In kind	6,311,748	457,292		
FAO	FAO	In kind	800,000	0		
University	James Cook University	Grant	250,000	0		
<b>TOTAL</b>			34,162,192	12,179,170		

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement** The project has been unable to contact the graduate programme on international Development Practice at James Cook University and it is likely that this contribution and associated technical assistance and advice relating to fisheries management in areas of high value for conservation of biodiversity is still available to the project. FAOID will assess the current level of co-financing already disbursed after the responsible staff are back from leave. The currently projected total disbursement of co-financing by the end of the project from national and local government is expected to be less than anticipated. Even though an increase in spending is anticipated, this isn't likely to more than double the current reported amounts. Remedial actions will be discussed before the upcoming mid-term review.

<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.

## **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.