



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	RAP
Country (ies):	Indonesia, Timor-Leste
Project Title:	Enabling Transboundary Cooperation for Sustainable Management of the Indonesian Sea (ISLME)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/RAS/289/GFF
GEF ID:	5768
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) of Indonesia and Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) of Timor-Leste
Project Duration:	48 months

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	6 September 2016 (CEO Endorsement)
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	20 July 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	19 July 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4 000 000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	25 114 000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	427,300
Total estimated co-financing	

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	
Review and Evaluation	
Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	Regional: 19 July 2018 Indonesia: 6 March 2019; Timor-Leste: 3 April 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	Early 2020
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes X or No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes or No X
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes X or No

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS	Project implementation has been delayed but despite this, the project remains relevant and will achieve its objectives.
Overall implementation progress rating:	MS	Project implementation is delayed. The project became operationally active on 7 November 2016 and actual implementation started on 20 July 2017.
Overall risk rating:	Low	No change in the risk classification.

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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
Project Manager / Coordinator	Muhammad Lukman, National Project Officer, FAO Indonesia (acting on behalf of Project Manager)	muhammad.lukman@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Susana V. Siar, Fishery and Aquaculture Officer, FAORAP	Susana.Siar@fao.org
Budget Holder	Stephen Rudgard, FAO Representative for Indonesia and Timor-Leste, FAOID	Stephen.Rudgard@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, Investment Center Division, FAO Rome	Sameer.Karki@fao.org

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
<p>Objective(s): The Global Environmental Objective (GEO) of the ISLME project is to <i>facilitate the implementation of ecosystem approaches to fisheries and coastal management (EAFM/EBM) to ensure the sustainable development of ecosystem resources in the Indonesian Seas Large Marine Ecosystem (ISLME) through a TDA/SAP</i></p> <p>The Project Development Objective (PDO) of the ISLME project is to <i>improve the capacity of stakeholders within the ISLME to effectively utilize transboundary ecosystem-based approaches to the management of marine and coastal resources and ecosystems and to strengthen the resilience of coastal communities within the ISLME through promotion of responsible fishing practices and livelihood enhancement and diversification, contributing to food security and poverty eradication.</i></p>						
Outcome 1.1: Regional agreement on the transboundary threats and their root causes to marine environment (including fisheries) in the ISLME	Regional agreement (TDA) endorsed by stakeholders	Limited information on transboundary issues and their root causes, and limited analysis of Provincial level management capacity and processes	TDA completed and approved by two national TDA-SAP Technical Groups, and then the Project Steering Committee (by end of Year 2)		FAO and Department of Fisheries of Thailand signed a Letter of Agreement for the Thailand–Timor-Leste Collaborative Survey on Marine Fisheries Resources and Environment in the Exclusive Economic Zone of Timor-Leste. The survey findings will support the development of the Transboundary	US

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) report. The survey started in the beginning of June 2019. Process for recruitment of consultants underway	
Outcome 1.2: An agreed and endorsed Strategic Action Program (SAP) to ensure the long-term institutional and financial sustainability of the ISLME fisheries and marine ecosystem signed off by the appropriate ministers in both countries	SAP endorsed by stakeholders	No plans or strategies for transboundary management of the ISLME, including a regional SAP or harmonized NAPS, have ever been developed, and to date interventions have been fragmented, site specific and largely uncoordinated	National Action Plans are completed and endorsed nationally by the end of year 2, and include gender sensitive targets and actions (GEF 6 gender indicator, 2)	By the end of year 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ISLME SAP is completed and signed off by the appropriate ministers in both countries. ▪ A strategy is developed for ISLME SAP implementation (post-project), including for sustainable financing and a system to monitor the performance of SAP implementation over the medium and long-terms 	ISLME will utilize the existing PEMSEA and CTI working group to support development of TDA and SAP. The members of technical working group will be invited in these discussions.	US

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2.1. Ecosystem Approaches to Fisheries Management (EAFM) and Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM) utilized for sustainable marine management	Number of Fisheries Management Plans (FMPs) based on EAFM under implementation, and that incorporate gender dimensions (GEF 6 gender indicator 4)	FMPs based on EAFM exist for lobster, mud crab, blue swimming crab, live bait fish in Indonesia	Initiated in Year 1	6 FMPs based on EAFM prepared and approved in consultation with stakeholders at project pilot sites by the end of year 3	Initial activities to develop 4 species specific (blue swimming crab, lobster, demersal fishery and mud crab) FMPs for are prepared. Activities will be implemented under LOAs with identified EAFM learning centers	S
Outcome 2.2. Regional and national governance of fisheries and natural resource management (including legal and institutional frameworks) strengthened	Programs to control IUU fishing and management of fishing ports implemented	Existing systems for control of IUU fishing and management of fishing ports are ineffective (Indonesia) or virtually non-existent (Timor-Leste)	None	Training programs and enhanced institutional cooperation results in strengthened Port State controls and IUU monitoring by year three of the project	One of TL government staff attended RPOA-IUU training workshop in Cairns, Australia	MS
Outcome 2.3: Environmental threats from poorly planned aquaculture development are mitigated through the development of advisory and planning tools, and communicated to the aquaculture industry and	EAA-based Aquaculture Management Plans (AMPs) implemented.	0 Indonesian and 0 Timor-Leste nationals trained as trainers.	30 Indonesian and Timor-Leste nationals trained as trainers in 'Essential EAA' specific to Indonesia and Timor-Leste by the end of year 3	5 AMPs based on EAA prepared and approved in consultation with stakeholders at project pilot sites by the end of year 2	Discussions the activity ToR is ongoing	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
provincial planning bodies in the ISLME						
Outcome 2.4: Development policies are guided to support innovative opportunities for alternative livelihoods and blue growth development of coastal communities, especially those dependent upon fishing for their livelihoods	Revised policy framework developed.	Existing policies related to blue growth, sustainable small-scale fisheries, climate change resilience and gender mainstreaming are insufficient and do not take account of transboundary issues or regional collaboration	None	Policies to promote blue growth, sustainable small-scale fisheries, climate change resilience and gender mainstreaming for coastal and fishery dependent stakeholders are included in endorsed SAP	N/A as planned for next year	MS
Outcome 2.5: Pilot projects demonstrate improved approaches for fisheries and aquaculture management	Ability of local level fisheries management to sustain fish stocks and fisheries operations, as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Catch Per Unit Effort ▪ Compliance levels ▪ Fisher income ▪ Fishing effort / capacity 	1. Fisheries activities at project pilot sites are ecologically unsustainable and producing declining levels of income for local residents (baseline to be determined during project inception)	None (Both)	1. By end of project, approved FMPs are producing positive effects on key fishery indicators (targets to be determined during project inception) 2. By end of project, approved AMPs are producing positive effects on key aquaculture	N/A as planned for next year	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<p>Ability of local level aquaculture management to preserve coastal ecosystems and sustain local livelihoods, as measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. of new aquaculture operations implementing Blue Growth production techniques ▪ % of existing aquaculture operations transitioned to Blue Growth production techniques ▪ No. of persons employed in Blue Growth aquaculture operations 	<p>Aquaculture activities at project pilot sites are ecologically unsustainable and producing declining levels of income for local residents (baseline to be determined during project inception)</p>		<p>indicators (targets to be determined during project inception)</p>		
Outcome 3.1: Strengthened cooperation between fisheries, marine science and natural resource	<p>Effective integration of information and monitoring networks in both countries to enable better management of</p>	<p>No existing collaboration / information sharing on IUU fishing within the ISLME, and limited collaboration</p>	<p>Coordination and information sharing networks strengthened by end of year 2</p>	<p>Cooperation arrangements in place by end of project</p>	<p>N/A as planned for next year</p>	<p>MS</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
monitoring networks to contribute to ecosystem-based approaches to management of the ISLME	marine and coastal resources	on oceanographic and climate data				
Outcome 3.2: Regional ISLME knowledge platform developed to share information between stakeholder	Information and scientific (natural and social) data sharing with other regional LME programs	No information sharing mechanisms exist	Initial sharing of information and a regional workshop with other LMEs convened by the end of year 2	Increased regional awareness about the objectives of, approach to, and “lessons-learned” derived from the ISLME project by the end of the project	A draft project communication strategy document developed to be discussed and finalized in September 2019	MS

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
All outcomes	Team building workshop and review of work plan and budget	Regional Coordinator, two National Project Advisors (Indonesia and Timor-Leste) and administrative support staff	To be conducted immediately following the recruitment of new Regional Coordinator

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Transboundary threats to marine resources and ecosystems and their root causes are identified	Q4 Y1	<i>ToRs for consultants developed Recruitment for the TDA leader initiated</i>					1%	Output 1.1.1 – Output 1.1.5 are part of the TDA development. The draft roadmap of TDA process are waiting for the endorsement from both countries. The Indonesia NPSC endorsed to start development of the TDA.
Output 1.1.2: An ecosystem valuation analysis is undertaken and the benefits and services derived from	Q3 Y1	<i>ToRs for consultants developed</i>					1%	

¹¹ 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.

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

¹³ 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)

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

the marine ecosystem are assessed and valued								
Output 1.1.3: Significant socio-economic drivers and trends that create environmental pressure on ecosystem resources and services in the ISLME region are assessed.	Q3 Y1	<i>ToRs for consultants developed</i>					1%	
Output 1.1.4: The governance and institutional structures, including stakeholders who are relevant to the management of fisheries and the ISLME ecosystem, are identified and analysed.	Q3 Y1	<i>ToRs for consultants developed</i>					1%	

Output 1.1.5: A regional TDA (Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis) incorporating an analysis of the key transboundary issues (including potential climate change), root causes, governance and stakeholders, is accepted and adopted by the Project Steering Committee	Q3 Y2	<i>ToRs for consultants developed</i>					1%	
Output 1.2.1: The vision and the ecosystem quality objectives for the ISLME, together with the institutional arrangements for cooperation on	Q1 Y3						0%	Output 1.2.1 – Output 1.2.4 are part of the SAP development that will start once the TDA process is initiated. As much as possible the SAP process (identification of actions) will start as the TDA document is being

monitoring and management of natural marine resources in the ISLME, are developed								
Output 1.2.2: Management actions and priorities to mitigate identified transboundary issues at the local, national and regional levels are agreed	Q4 Y3						0%	
Output 1.2.3: Inter-intra-Ministerial Working Groups to advise on coordination and institutional arrangements established. Financial and institutional requirements to support and sustain the SAP are	Q3 Y4						0%	

identified and sustainable financing plans developed								
Output 1.2.4: A SAP for the ISLME is completed and endorsed by the Governments of Indonesia and Timor-Leste	Q2 Y4						0%	
Output 2.1.1: One (1) national capacity needs assessment of relevant institutions needed for fisheries and coastal natural resource management in pilot areas	Q4 Y1	<i>ToR finalized and procurement process ongoing</i>					10%	Two national capacity needs assessments will be done as there are difficulties for national partners to conduct assessment in other country. Procurement process for Indonesia capacity needs assessment is in the final stage and activities expected to start in July 2019
Output 2.1.2: Two (2) training courses for 30 Govt. Staff and four (4) local training	Q4 Y2	<i>ToRs developed for national-level activities</i> Discussions on the most					10%	The workshop needs to be structurally defined as to involve proper existing regional EAFM Module and to find best-available trainers. Indonesia: this training will

organizations to develop to conduct fisheries management planning consistent with EAFM and within a broader EBM framework		effective training method have been discussed with the national PSC in both countries						involve relevant Governmental officials (from Pilot sites determined by the needs assessment report).
Output 2.1.3: Strengthened capacities in EBM (multi-sectoral planning) and EAFM planning is developed on the job through two (2) national pilots at province level and creation of six (6) EAFM-based fisheries management plans at the site level	Q4 Y4	<i>ToRs developed and procurement process initiated</i>					10%	Indonesia: Developing Fisheries Improvement Program for Demersal and Mud Crab Fishery in FMA 712 and 713; lobster fishery in NTB (FMA 713 and 573); Blue Swimming Crab Fishery in FMA 712. The activity is divided into sub-activities, EAFM Assessment for the 4 commodities (demersal, mud crab, blue swimming crab and lobster fisheries) and Proposed Intervention Management Actions. Procurement process of the sub-activity is ongoing, expected to start in July 2019.
Output 2.1.4: Mainstreaming of capacity development in EBM, EAFM and EAA	Q4 Y4	Identification of the capacity development topic have been					1%	Indonesia: Migratory Fishers (<i>Nelayan Andon</i>) Management have been identified as the most needed topic for the capacity development in EBM, EAFM and EAA

through curriculum development and adoption of existing training course in two (2) national universities or training colleges.		discussed with Indonesia NPSC						
Output 2.1.5: Two (2) national reviews of habitat enhancement for fisheries, including artificial reef development, are developed and policy advice provided through one (1) regional workshop	Q4 Y2	<i>ToRs developed</i>					5%	Indonesia has started to develop a TOR for national review
Output 2.2.1: Training of province level units in two (2) national pilot sites provides institutional support to	Q4 Y1	<i>ToRs developed</i>					5%	Indonesia: Implementation of activities will focus on improving the function of Fisheries Management Council of WPPNRI 712, 713, 714, and 573 Indonesia is preparing a TOR, planned to be implemented in

strengthen capacity to combat IUU (Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated) fishing and the unsustainable use of coastal natural resources at the Provincial level								Q1 Y3 One of Timor-Leste government staff attended RPOA-IUU training workshop in Cairns, Australia
Output 2.2.2: Four (4) training courses in capacity building in Port State Controls for fishing vessels targets forty (40) national and provincial fishery officers and forty (40) private sector port/fishing company representatives	Q4 Y3	ToR under development					0%	Indonesia: ToR for National activity on Improvement of compliance in fishing reporting currently under development. Preparations and arrangement at the regional level is needed for both countries.

Output 2.2.3. Improved capacity of fisher in combatting IUU fishing	Q4 Y2	<i>ToRs being developed</i>					5%	
Output 2.2.4. Improved the use of e-log book or log book by small-scale fishers (<10 GT)	Q4 Y2	<i>ToRs developed</i>					10%	Indonesia: TOR for National activity on Implementation of capture fisheries logbook for coastal and small scale fisheries developed and procurement process is ongoing
Output 2.3.1: Existing, unsustainable aquaculture practices are identified in four (4) provincial pilots and solutions for mitigation of environmental impacts are developed through EAA planning workshops	Q4 Y1	<i>ToRs being developed</i>					5%	Indonesia: Identification of aquaculture practices in provincial pilots will be provided by the result of the Needs Assessment (2.1.1.) TOR for EAA activity being prepared and implementation expected to start Q1 Y3.
Output 2.3.2: Training in planning of sustainable aquaculture development provided to	Q4 Y3	<i>ToRs being developed</i>					5%	Indonesia is preparing the TOR to roll-out the EAA training at 3 pilot sites (NTB, NTT, East Kalimantan) planned to be implemented in Q1 Y3.

thirty (30) provincial officers and private sector producers through EAA (Ecosystem Approach to Aquaculture) and creation of 5 EAA-based aquaculture management plans at the site level								
Output 2.4.1: Regional stocktaking of successful lessons of other initiatives in the ISLME for prospective or innovative alternative livelihoods (including responsibly managed aquaculture) is conducted	Q4 Y1	Discussion with Indonesia NPSC has agreed that activities in Indonesia will be postponed for the Q1-Q2 of Y3					0%	<p>the activities will consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of livelihood activities in ISLME • Workshop to present the review report and lesson learned
Output 2.4.2: Policy advice for sustainable small-scale	Q2 Y2	Discussion with NPSC in both countries agreed that					0%	<p>Indonesia: The assessment is partly embedded in the national activity under Output 2.2.4</p>

fisheries building on the draft VGSSF South East Asia Action Plan is developed and communicated		assessment report on small-scale fisheries policies in Indonesia and Timor Leste is planned for Q1 Y3 and Two national workshops to review report (Q4 Y3)						
Output 2.4.3: Identification and communication of options to reduce vulnerability of coastal communities in pilot areas to climate variation	Q4 Y2						0%	
Output 2.4.4: Capacity building in gender mainstreaming for alternative livelihoods undertaken in four (4)	Q2 Y3						0%	

provinces targeting thirty (30) government officers and sixty (60) representatives of women's groups, private sector and NGOs.								
Output 2.4.5. Improved management of fishing port for plastic and marine debris (at pilot sites)		Scope of work identified Activity discussed with NPSC					5%	in Indonesia National activities planned to start Q1 Y3 Activity needs to be further elaborated with MMAF Indonesia work program for year 2019 or later Activity needs to be further elaborated with MMAF program
Output 2.5.1: Four (4) pilot fishery management plans developed and applied to the management of regional/sub-regional fishing areas (stocks)	Q4 Y4	Discussions with Indonesia NPSC agree this activity will commenced in Q4 Y2 – Q4 Y4	•				0%	Indonesia: Indonesia: Activities consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) will produce plans in each pilot area; • FMP implementation using EAFM approaches in six pilot areas Marine Spatial Planning at local level (RZWP3K) will be identified, and aligned with EAFM FMP developed in this project. This activity is integral with the outcome 2.1.

Output 2.5.2: Four pilot plans for aquaculture development and management in provinces where aquaculture has strong potential to contribute to blue growth	Q4 Y4	Discussions with Indonesia NPSC agree this activity will commenced in Q4 Y2 – Q4 Y4	•				0%	Indonesia: Activities consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of Marine Spatial Plans at each pilot area; • AMP implementation using EAA approaches in five pilot areas Marine Spatial Planning at local level (RZWP3K) will be identified, and aligned with EAA AMP developed in this project. This activity is integral with the outcome 2.4
Output 2.5.3: Existing habitat enhancements, including artificial reef sites, evaluated and subject to management improvement plans	Q4 Y4	Discussions with Indonesia NPSC agree this activity will commenced in Q1 Y3 – Q4 Y4	•				5%	Indonesia: Activities consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify specific opportunities to partner with existing habitat enhancement activities; • Implement habitat restoration activities at selected sites This activity is linked with outcome 2.1 The Review of Management Plan and Zoning (RPZ) will be under Output 2.1.5
Output 3.1.1: Improved monitoring and reporting of IUU (Illegal, Unreported and	Q2 Y4	<i>ToRs being developed</i>					5%	Discussions Indonesia NPSC this activity will start in Q4 Y2. Activities consists of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need analysis 2. Development of cooperation mechanisms (annual NDFA/MMAF

Unregulated) and unsustainable fishing issues in the ISLME supports cooperation with neighbouring LMEs & countries to combat IUU fishing								meeting) 3. Pilot testing of transboundary cooperation on IUU fishing at Batugade-Atapupu pilot area 4. Support to convening of ASEAN inter-ministerial meeting on IUU
Output 3.1.2: Coastal environmental remote sensing data generated by initiatives and projects in the ISLME region is used to monitor threats to fisheries and coastal resources and inform planning of pilot activities	Q4 Y4	<i>ToRs being developed</i>					5%	options for permanently funding INDESO through cost recovery mechanisms will need to be explored. Discussions with Indonesia NPSC this activity will start in Q1 Y3. Activities consists of: 1. Training in the application of INDESO data to managers at project pilot sites; 2. Explore mechanism to integrate Timor-Leste into the INDESO system Explore options for permanent funding of INDESO through cost recovery mechanisms
Output 3.1.3: Institutional linking provides oceanographic information relating to	Q4 Y4						0%	This activity is expected to enhance the Fisheries Information Data System of the MMAF with the Oceanographic information Discussions with Indonesia

large scale processes, and climate variability to inform the TDA and inform the planning of pilot activities								NPSC agree this activity will start in Q3 Y3 Activities consists of: 1. Collaboration with INAGOOS and other programs on large-scale oceanographic processes and climate change 2. Convene an ISLME Oceanographic Coordination Workshop
Output 3.2.1: Project monitoring program established and under implementation	Q4 Y4	<i>Regional and National inception workshops and PSC meetings completed</i>					20%	National Inception Workshops in both countries were held in March 2019 (Indonesia) and April 2019 (Timor Leste). Indonesia has established a MMAF Project Implementation Team by the Decree of the Director General of Capture Fisheries. (No 23 / KEP-DJPT / 2019) on the implementation of the Grant of the ISLME Project. This team will also function to monitor the ISLME activities for adaptive management.
Output 3.2.2: Communication and information management systems established for the overall ISLME project	Q4 Y4	<i>Communications specialist recruited</i>					20%	Development of communication Strategy is ongoing.

and the TDA and SAP								
Output 3.2.3: Policy Communications, based on outputs delivered under project Component 2, developed and communicated to national stakeholders	Q4 Y4	Development of communication Strategy is ongoing.					0%	Consolidation and Dissemination of the Project Outputs 1. Consolidate key lessons and best practices generated by project activities under Component 2 2. Develop Policy Communications documents 3. Disseminate policy communications using systems established under Output 3.2.2
Output 3.2.4: Information sharing with other LMEs in the region and the LME Regional Caucus	Q1 Y4						0%	Planned to start in Q1 Y3 Coordination Mechanism and Regional Meeting 1. Establish coordination mechanisms with key partners 2. Organize and carry out regional meetings
Output 3.2.5: 1% of GEF project budget allocated to regional and global knowledge sharing via cooperation with the IW:LEARN	Q4 Y4	<i>Participated in meetings, training and workshops</i>					20%	Consists of: 1. Participation in workshops and training modules of IW:LEARN 2. Updating of project information / materials in IWLEARN.net 3. Exchange of information and experiences with other LME experts 4. Collaboration with other relevant regional and global

Programme, the UNDP “LME/MPA/ICM Governance Project”, and other initiatives								<p>programs</p> <p>ISLME Consultant participated in LME 20 and IWC 9 meetings (1-9 November 2018); Mangroves for the Future Regional Committee Meeting (25-27 September 2018); East Asian Seas Congress (25-27 November 2018); Regional inception workshop of TCP, Support to countries to address IUU fishing (13-15 November 2018).</p>

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:

The project startup phase focused on establishing the regional governance mechanism, recruitment of key staff and registration of the project in Indonesia.

- FAO project agreement was signed by Timor-Leste on 18 April 2017 and Indonesia on 25 December 2016.
- Regional Steering committee was established and PSC members/ National Coordinators nominated by governments. Indonesia MMAF on 6 June 2018, and MoEF on the 3 July 2018. Timor-Leste provided all nominations on the 15 November 2017.
- A pre-inception workshop was held between MMAF and MAF on 17 May 2018. The purpose of the meeting was to identify next steps and to undertake initial planning for the project Inception Workshop and PSC.
- Regional Inception Workshop was completed on 17-18 July 2018 in Jakarta. This was followed by the first meeting of the regional Project Steering Committee on 19 July 2018 hosted by MMAF in Jakarta.
- Timor-Leste organized its first national project steering committee meeting on 21 November 2018.
- For Indonesia, the project has been officially registered with the Ministry of Finance (obligatory) on 6 February 2019. It officially marked the implementation of the project in Indonesia. Following the registration process, a national inception workshop and the first national project steering committee meeting was undertaken on 5-6 March 2019. The inception workshop on ISLME national program was a strategic way to align and put measures on the effectiveness of the implementation of planned activities in the prodoc. The national PSC was to exercise the national PSC functions, among these are: (i) review and advice on national level project outputs; (ii) review work plan and activities at national/site level. The workshop and meeting raised a national commitment to expedite and implement 28 planned activities to achieve the set outcomes and outputs in components 2 and 3, whereas the TDA/SAP of component 1 can be started soon.
- Timor-Leste organized its national inception workshop on 2 April 2019 followed by a second national project steering committee on 3 April 2019.
- Recruitment of key project staff including Regional Coordinator and National Project Advisers for Indonesia and Timor-Leste have been completed.
- Finance and administrative support staff have also been recruited.
- ToRs for specific activities have also been prepared and ready for procurement. Other ToRs are prepared by each relevant Directorate within MMAF (Indonesia).

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

Max 200 words:

The project was approved in 2017 and a major challenge has been securing nominations for the PSC and NC in order to organize a steering committee meeting. Moreover, the obligatory registration of the project with the Ministry of Finance in Indonesia was completed only on 6 February 2019. This meant that activities cannot be implemented in Indonesia until the registration process was completed.

In Indonesia, the procurement process of approved activity takes time and because of this, no activity has been started. In addition, the development of activity ToR by the relevant Directorate within MMAF also takes time because this requires formulation of activities adjusted to their planned activities/programs.

MMAF Indonesia objected to the contract extension of the consultant who had been taking the role of Regional Coordinator pending a definitive appointment. A vacancy announcement was issued and concurrence of the two governments on the preferred candidate was obtained for the recruitment of a Regional Coordinator. Because of existing contractual commitments, the Regional Coordinator could only start the appointment after 17 July 2019. In this regard, there was a five-month gap between the departure of the previous consultant (15 February 2019) and the entry on duty of the Regional Coordinator.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	<i>The activities of the project pursuant to the Project Document 2016, have been on the plan for the implementation, and activities for the component 2 and 3 have been aligned with the national (MMAF and MAF) programs through endorsement of NPSC. For Indonesia national activities (Comp. 2 and 3), the TOR and procurement process are undergoing, and will step into the implementation, although the procurement process is considered relatively drawn-out</i>
Budget Holder	MS	MS	<i>The Project is on track to achieve its objectives despite delays in implementation, for a variety of reasons due mainly to procedures on the part of the Indonesian government.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	MS	<i>Project implementation has been delayed but still expected to achieve its objectives. The delay had been due to the time required for endorsement of the project by the governments, establishing the regional governance mechanism, and registration of the project in Indonesia.</i>
GEF OFP Indonesia	MS	MS	<i>The project needs to learn lessons from it delays at first two years of implementation. To avoid any unnecessary delay that may hinder the project achievement, it is a must for the project to install a system/practice in order to strengthen coordination and collaboration among stakeholders at all level in both countries.</i>

¹⁵ **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.

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

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MU	MU	<i>The project's implementation has focused on strengthening bilateral mechanisms for decision making and building capacities – which are both necessary pre-requisite to the successful outcome of this project. However, progress judged against planned completion of several outputs that were supposed to have been completed by Year 1 (1.1.1; 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 2.1.1, 2.2.1) have had very low progress. If the planned completion dates for these have been changed, the project team should ensure that these are reflected in future reporting.</i>
GEF Focal Point Timor Leste	S	S	<i>The project well informed to government counterparts, relevant stakeholders and communities even though delay on implementation of the activities. More collaboration inter-ministerials of the implementation of ISLME project to strengthen the capacity and product sharing to address climate change issues associate with transboundary activities.</i>

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 ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	No change in the risk classification.

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 Project Document and reflects also any new risks 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, as relevant .					
	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force

¹⁸ **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.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ 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 ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Lack of ownership / responsibility by flag states for activities of fishing vessels limits the effectiveness of IUU cooperation activities	Medium	The project will facilitate communications between MMAF and MAF with Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) such as the Asia Pacific Fisheries Commission (APFIC) and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), and other IUU fishing and MCS networks (RPOA, SEAFDEC), to increase pressure on flag states to perform their responsibilities. FAO may be able to assist in coordinating with other flag countries to establish regional dialogues.	No action taken during this reporting period.	
2	Involvement of private sector, for example in the decommissioning of oil rigs, is limited, and oil and gas sector does not cooperate in information gathering on potential pollution impacts to fisheries	Low	The project will engage the oil and gas sector early in the project to explain the focus of the advisory work to be developed and how it will support their business interest. High level support to the dialogue is canvassed by the project from NDFA and MMAF	No action taken during this reporting period.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Low capacity of sub-national management authorities requires extended capacity building and slow delivery of pilot fishery management plans	Medium	Under Component 2, the project is devoting significant attention and resources to training of sub-national (provincial and district level) fisheries authorities. This capacity building will include focused technical training in EAFM and EAA practices that will include the development of EAFM-based Fisheries Management Plans and EAA-based Aquaculture Management Plans for the project pilot sites as an integral part (and product) of the training. In addition, EAFM and EAA experts will provide on-going mentoring to provincial and district authorities in implementing the pilot level FMPs and AMPs.	No action taken during this reporting period.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Relevant institutions and projects are reluctant to share data		Extensive consultation with partner institutions and projects was carried out during the project preparation phase, and the project design includes strategies for collaboration with key projects such as the ATSEA II, Shoreline Resilience, OFMP II, COREMAP-CTI III, CTI-SEA, Coastal Fisheries Initiative, and others (see Appendix 10). Equally importantly, the project executing agencies MMAF and MAF are the lead authorities in Indonesia and Timor-Leste respectively for management of coastal and marine resources, and thus have the authority and responsibility to engage with stakeholders during the project to procure relevant information and data. Finally, to the greatest extent possible, the project will build on existing national and regional data sharing mechanisms and cooperation activities.	Regional partners participated in the regional inception workshop.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	Climate change impacts such as sea-level rise, coastal inundation, severe storms, flooding, tropical cyclones and drought could complicate transboundary cooperation and negate the positive benefits of the project's pilot site activities	Medium	Most potential climate change impacts are unlikely to produce widespread or sustained effects during the lifetime of the proposed project, although localized impact from storms, changes in rainfall patterns, and coral bleaching events could impact some site level activities and the achievement of site level targets. In these cases, project activities will be adjusted to accommodate short-term impacts, based in part on the climate change resilience assessments that will be carried out for each pilot site.	No action taken during this reporting period.	
6	Failure to agree on common frameworks for EAFM and EAA within the ISLME	Low	Both an "Essential" EAFM training course and an EAA training program have been developed in Indonesia; during the project preparation phase, both MMAF and MAF agreed to use these programs to extend training to relevant fisheries authorities (Provincial and District authorities in Indonesia, and National, Provincial and Local authorities in Timor-Leste). Regional ICM/EBM training is also available through PEMSEA programme.	No action taken during this reporting period.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Fragmentation of effort between countries and between international donors within the ISLME	Medium	Due to its archipelagic nature, there is a wealth of marine focused initiatives in the ISLME. A key feature of the project will be reaching out to coordinate with relevant partners to achieve the project outcomes; this process began during the project preparation phase, as described in Section 1.1.3 on Stakeholders and in Appendix 10 on Major Related Projects. Particular attention will be paid to ensuring that existing data collection, analysis and knowledge sharing processes are effectively engaged to support the development of the TDA and SAP.	Dialogue with relevant partners initiated.	
8	Limited availability of scientific data	Low	This risk principally applies to Timor-Leste where specific needs for primary data collection will be assessed. The project will develop some simple fisheries assessments based on participatory tools and the collection of secondary data, including local ecological knowledge and monitoring of catches. The project will also engage in risk-assessment type planning approaches (i.e. EAFM) that take into account limited knowledge of fisheries resources and attempt to build in monitoring of resources into the management plans developed.	FAO has executed a Letter of Agreement with the Department of Fisheries of Thailand for the resource survey of the north coast waters of Timor-Leste which will provide input to the TDA.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
9	MMAF rescinds Ministerial Decrees 1 and 2, which could impact the project's ability to deliver activities in North Java, East Kalimantan and Lombok. A related risk is that fishermen may ignore the new rules and that the Govt. won't have the will or capacity to enforce them, so that the project is developing management strategies that comply with the FMPs and Decrees but actually are infeasible given conditions on the ground.	Medium	Ministerial Decrees 1 and 2 were issued in early 2015; any changes to these decrees are likely to be made before the project starts implementation in early 2016, and the pilot site activities (and selection of sites) can be adjusted if necessary. In fact, the design of the project calls for extensive training, as well as marine spatial planning, activities to take place prior to the implementation of fisheries / aquaculture management activities, which won't begin until early-mid 2017, allowing further time for adjustment to any changes in the regulatory and policy environment.	The capacity needs assessment under output 2.1.1 includes a review of policies related to the implementation of Fisheries Improvement Programs and will advise on the project's intervention.	
10	Different priorities and interests from local governments in managing marine resources might reduce willingness to adopt policy recommendations on small-scale fisheries.	Low	This will be addressed by strong collaboration with local governments, not only the marine and fisheries officers but also the members of local government parliaments and the head of local government; the project will assess local government interests and integrate these interests in developing policies to manage small-scale fisheries.	No action taken during this reporting period.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
11	Existing public views and cultural barriers with regard to the role of women in fisheries and aquaculture may affect the willingness of some stakeholders to mainstream gender considerations into these sectors.	Low	The project will work to improve awareness of and support for the role of women in both fisheries and aquaculture at the management level and in livelihoods activities, targeting both the general public and decision makers.	ToRs developed for a gender expert.	
12	Lack of political commitment from national or provincial authorities to effectively implement stronger port controls	Low	If serious port of convenience or other IUU issues related to port controls emerge, FAO and RCU will work closely with national agencies to raise awareness of the importance of effective Port Control.	No action taken during this reporting period.	
13	Lack of political will to (i) cooperate on IUU issues across borders and (ii) to provide greater authority for IUU risk assessment and response at local levels, could impact activities to strengthen monitoring and reporting of transboundary IUU fishing	Low	During the project preparation phase, both MMAF and MAF expressed their interest in and intention to explore mechanisms for transboundary cooperation on IUU fishing. To further this goal, Output 3.1.2 of the project includes activities to support the two countries in creating a formal agreement for cooperation in using the INDES system, as well as establishing communication and data transfer arrangements and arranging for training of Timor Leste operators. The project also will encourage MMAF and MAF to grant more authority to local agencies to participate in monitoring and response to IUU fishing activities, and will pilot this approach at the transboundary project pilot site.	No action taken during this reporting period.	

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
NA	Low	The project is just starting implementation and the risk rating is still valid.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	Yes	Indonesia is already implementing the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management, so national activities under Outputs 2.1.1 to 2.1.5 were revised and adapted to the national context. In addition, Indonesia added new outputs under 2.2, namely, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.

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: 29 May 2020 Revised NTE: 19 July 2021 Justification: Project implementation delayed.

²¹ 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)?

The project will apply gender sensitive approaches. A gender strategy for the project will be developed and ToRs for a gender expert have been prepared. This strategy will follow FAO's guidance and lessons from previous LME projects. Gender considerations will be integrated into the project and the TDA/SAP.

The project is expected to contribute to gender equality in the following results areas:

Output 1.1.3: Significant socio-economic drivers and trends that create environmental pressure on ecosystem resources and services in the ISLME region are assessed.

Output 2.1.3: Strengthened capacities in EBM (multi-sectoral planning) and EAFM planning is developed on the job through two (2) national pilots at province level and creation of six (6) EAFM-based fisheries management plans at the site level

Output 2.4.4: Capacity building in gender mainstreaming for alternative livelihoods undertaken in four (4) provinces targeting thirty (30) government officers and sixty (60) representatives of women's groups, private sector and NGOs.

Output 3.2.2: Communication and information management systems established for the overall ISLME project and the TDA and SAP

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

The project was designed prior to the development of the FAO guidance on Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). The FAO FPIC guidance will be followed during implementation and in the consultation processes for the development of the TDA and SAP. The project integrates good practice through implementation of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small- scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines) and the implementation of ecosystem approaches.

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))

Stakeholder engagement during the year 2017-2019 continue to be limited to dialogue with government counterparts in securing nominations for the PSC and National Coordinators.

Stakeholders from Indonesia include those from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF) and Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF). Stakeholders from Timor Leste included those from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) and Ministry of Environment (MoE).

In depth consultations involving wider technical stakeholders within the ministries in both countries including national project partners and organizations were established and brought together at the national inception workshop.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

No knowledge products to share during this reporting period as the project has just started its implementation.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Government of Indonesia	In-kind	USD 12 550 000			
National Government	Government of Timor-Leste	In-kind	USD 2 634 000			
National Science Agency	CSIRO	In-kind	USD 2 740 000			
CGIAR Center	WorldFish	In-kind	USD 1 200 000			
Bilateral/International Aid and Development Agency	NZAID	In-kind	USD 3 270 000			
International Non-Government Organization	Wildlife Conservation Society	In-kind	USD 150 000			
GEF Agency	Food and Agriculture Organization	Grant	USD 2 450 000			
GEF Agency	Food and Agriculture Organization	In-kind	USD 120 000			
		TOTAL	USD 25 114 000			

²² 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.