



## REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

### PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: STRENGTHENING THE MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF COASTAL-MARINE BIODIVERSITY IN KEY ECOLOGICAL AREAS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ECOSYSTEM APPROACH TO FISHERIES (EAF)			
Country(ies):	Argentina	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5112
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	628442
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS) and Consejo Federal de Pesca ( Federal Fisheries Council - CFP)	Submission Date:	16 June 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	335,805
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1.2. One (1) new protected area covering at least 833,606 hectares of unprotected ecosystems. Output 1.3 Two (2) Sustainable financing plans.	GEF TF	1,050,000	8,666, 765
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 2.2 Four (4) national and sub-national plan that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEF TF	1,793,426	4,327,183
BD-2	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 2.1. Four (4) policies and regulatory frameworks for production sectors.	GEF TF	691,360	2,827,672
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>3,534,786</b>	<b>15,821,620</b>

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A.

**Project Objective:** To strengthen management capacities and protection of marine biodiversity in environmentally significant areas, by creating new Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and applying the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF).

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Strengthening The Management Of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	TA	<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved protection of marine ecosystems with globally significant biodiversity in key areas by supporting the Burdwood/Namuncura Enforcement Authority for managing the MPA and its transition zones, and creating a new protected area, established beyond the 12 miles of Territorial Waters.</p> <p><i>Targets:</i> a) An increase in the area covered by MPAs: 9.000 km<sup>2</sup> b) GEF BD METT score for Namuncura: 21 c) GEF BD METT score of the new MPA to be created: 12</p>	<p>1.1.1 A new MPA defined, with its geographical boundaries duly drawn, and a proposed participatory Management Plan along the “Front Corridor of Chubut”, covering at least 25% of its total area (37.000 km<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p><i>Targets:</i> a) Proposed bill formulated for creating the new MPA b) Management Plan duly formulated: 1</p> <p>1.1.2 One (1) Management Plan for the MPA Namuncura – Burdwood Bank.</p> <p><i>Target: One (1) Management Plan approved by JGM covering an area of 28.000 km<sup>2</sup></i></p> <p>1.1.3 Two sustainable financing plans designed for MPAs (Front Corridor of Chubut MPA and Namuncura-Burdwood Bank MPA).</p> <p><i>Target:</i> a) A document with sustainable financing guidelines for MPAs in Argentina. b) Two (2) financing plans for MPAs included in their</p>	GEF TF	957,146	8,485,765

			<p><i>Management Plans</i></p> <p><i>c) At least 15 people linked to MPA management trained in financial management tools.</i></p> <p>1.1.4 Institutional, regulatory and operational capacity framework reinforced for the management of MPAs and transition zones.</p> <p><i>Target:</i></p> <p><i>a) Guidelines on good environmental practices for productive sectors operating in MPAs</i></p> <p><i>b) A proposal on rules for the approval of Management Plans</i></p> <p><i>c) Document on lessons learned and recommendations concerning methodological and operational guidelines for managing new MPAs</i></p> <p>1.1.5 One consolidated network of research organizations, governmental agencies and Civil Society Organizations with capacities enhanced and working together on sharing of scientific analysis on costal marine biodiversity and threats to its conservation and best management practices for improved management effectiveness of MPAs</p> <p><i>Target:</i></p> <p><i>a) A set of GIS-based</i></p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>maps – with relevant fishing information</i></p> <p><i>b) Web-based information system operational</i></p> <p><i>c) 20 to 30 people linked to MPA management trained in information system and GIS</i></p>			
2. Mainstreaming the Ecosystem Approach To Fisheries (EAF) into the Normative Frameworks and National Policies for Coastal and Marine Fisheries Management.	TA	<p><b>Outcome 2.1</b> EAF tested in a pilot fishery, to strengthen the sustainability of fisheries and protect marine biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p><i>Target: Impact on benthic communities and demersal species controlled and reduced.</i></p>	<p>2.1.1 Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Plan (EAFMP) for the Patagonian scallop fishery adopted by all stakeholders (Patagonian scallop fishers and fishing companies, INIDEP, CFP, SSPyA, MAyDS, and science institutions)</p> <p><i>Target: One (1) EAFMP adopted in Patagonian scallop fishing area and initial implementation.</i></p> <p>2.1.2 Good catch and management practices for the Patagonian scallop fishery, validated through a participatory process, including zoning and regulation of this activity, fishing techniques and selectivity devices which minimize the impact on non-target species and the benthic community.</p> <p><i>Target: At least three (3) good practices validated for Patagonian scallop catch and management</i></p> <p>2.2.1 Minimum EAF</p>	GEF TF	2,103,842	6,771,577

		<p><b>Outcome 2.2</b> Enabling conditions and institutional capacities built at the national level for the effective implementation of EAF.</p> <p><i>Target: EAF approach and its minimum contents adopted as a supplementary instrument for CFP's management of fisheries.</i></p>	<p>contents established and adopted by CFP and mainstreamed in the regulatory frameworks for fisheries management.</p> <p><i>Target:</i> a) CFP Resolution adopting minimum EAF contents b) At least four (4) regulations on fisheries management include EAF.</p> <p>2.2.2 Analysis of market incentive options (increase in business sector profitability) for applying EAF.</p> <p><i>Target: One (1) analysis of market incentive options performed</i></p> <p>2.2.3 Staff of the institutions involved in fisheries management (INIDEP, PNA, SSPyA and equivalent provincial authorities and provincial environment agencies) and fisheries organizations have developed capacities in the practical application of EAF, including options for sustainable fisheries certification, from a gender perspective and with the participation of youth.</p> <p><i>Target: Fifty (50) people from at least six (6) fishery-related public institutions and trade unions trained in</i></p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p><i>the application of EAF (at least 30% women)</i></p> <p>2.2.4 Fishery-related implementation authorities (SSPyA, provincial fishing authorities, PNA) have improved capacity to implement efficient management, control and surveillance mechanisms (satellite system, landing control), by applying EAF.</p> <p><i>Target: 105 people trained and equipped to reinforce management, control and surveillance mechanisms</i></p>		
		<p><b>Outcome 2.3</b> Monitoring and information systems improved, including data on selectivity, good practices and mitigation measures, to facilitate decision-making on the application of EAF in the public and private sectors.</p> <p><i>Target: CFP and fishery sector committees by harness information on ecosystem and socioeconomic indicators for decision-making.</i></p>	<p>2.3.1 The SSPyA fisheries information system mainstreams easily accessible and relevant socioeconomic variables for applying EAF</p> <p><i>Target: At least eight (8) socioeconomic indicators mainstreamed in the SSPyA fishery information system</i></p> <p>2.3.2 A monitoring and information system for applying EAF in the Argentine Sea.</p> <p><i>Target: One monitoring and information system facilitating decision-making on fishery policies and sustainable fishery management instruments.</i></p>		

			<p>2.3.3 National Evaluation of: i) efficacy of fishing techniques and selectivity devices; ii) mitigation of the impact of these techniques and devices on the ecosystem; iii) inclusion of the recommended measures for the implementation of EAF in the Argentine Sea</p> <p><i>Targets:</i></p> <p><i>a) Four (4) National Plans of Action reinforced through project experiences (NPA for Birds and Sharks approved, Marine Mammals under evaluation, and Marine Turtles under preparation)</i></p> <p><i>b) At least thirty (30) OOB trained and participating in the test of selected fishery/area</i></p>			
3. Project Progress Monitoring, Evaluation And Information Dissemination	TA	<p><b>Outcome 3.1</b> Project implementation is based on results-based management, and project outcomes and lessons learned are applied to future operations.</p> <p><i>Target: 100% of outcomes achieved, demonstrating sustainability</i></p>	<p>3.1.1 Dissemination of EAF concept and objectives as well as best practices and lessons learned from the project among different target groups.</p> <p><i>Target: Project web page and other dissemination channels operational</i></p> <p>3.1.2 Project planning and monitoring system operational and providing systematic information on annually scheduled activities and targets, and progress made in</p>	GEF TF	305,475	358,291

			achieving project outcomes and outputs.  Target: <i>Four (4) Annual Work Plan/Budget</i> <i>Eight (8) semi-annual Project Progress Reports</i>  3.1.3 Mid-Term and Final Evaluations  <i>Target: 1 mid-term evaluation and 1 final evaluation</i>			
			Subtotal		3,366,463	15,465,417
			Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>	GEF TF	168,323	205,987
			<b>Total project costs</b>		<b>3,534,786</b>	<b>15,821,620</b>

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National government	MAyDS	Cash	506,666
National government	MAyDS	In-kind	760,000
National government	Ministry of Security	Cash	4,333,333
National government	Ministry of Security	In-kind	383,538
National government	INIDEP	Cash	732,000
National government	INIDEP	In-kind	1,462,000
National government	CONICET	Cash	150,000
National government	CONICET	In-kind	672,000
National government	SSPyA	Cash	1,665,000
National government	SSPyA	In-kind	715,000
National government	JGM-Pampa Azul	Cash	147,700

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.



National government	JGM-Pampa Azul	In-kind	142,100
National government	CFP	Cash	444,468
National government	CFP	In-kind	190,893
National government	Ministry of Defense	Cash	57,692
National government	Ministry of Defense	In-kind	3,019,230
Private sector	Fishery sector	Cash	240,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	200,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>15,821,620</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Argentina	3,534,786	335,805	3,870,591
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>3,534,786</b>	<b>335,805</b>	<b>3,870,591</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	20,000		20,000
National/Local Consultants	676,973		676,973

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?** No

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

**A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, N/ NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

This section has been updated to reflect the Project's alignment with the new National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. Kindly refer to Sub-section 1.1.5 of the FAO GEF Project Document for further details.

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.**

No changes from PIF. Kindly refer to Sub-section 1.1.5 of the FAO GEF Project Document for further details.

**A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:**

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

No changes from PIF.

**A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:**

The problem and barriers the project will address and baseline initiatives have been further analyzed and detailed during the full project preparation. Please see the FAO-GEF Project Document Sub-sections *1.1 General context and 1.1.1 Justification* for further details.

**A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:**

The project aims to strengthen management capacities and protection of marine biodiversity in environmentally significant areas, by creating new Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and applying the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF).

Incremental resources will be invested under Component 1 to provide technical assistance for creating a new MPA, including all related biological, oceanographic and socioeconomic studies; technical assistance and support for the participatory formulation of Management Plans and sustainable financing plans for the MPAs included in the project; support for the drafting of good environmental practices guides for productive sectors, so as to reinforce the regulatory framework for managing MPAs. Furthermore, the GEF grant will support the development of a GIS and a related database to provide information with a view to improving MPA management efficiency.

Under component 2, incremental resources will finance technical assistance, and support participatory designing of a Management Plan from an EAF perspective for the Patagonian scallop fishing area, and the validation of good practices, which includes diagnostic studies, information surveying campaigns, workshops to agree on a plan with stakeholders, and procurement of inputs for the application of good practices. GEF resources will also be used to support those institutions connected with the fisheries sector to reinforce their capabilities for effectively implementing EAF. This includes technical assistance for mainstreaming EAF contents in the sector's regulatory framework, a study of market incentive options for applying EAF, building and strengthening of staff capabilities at the institutions involved in fisheries management and at fishery trade unions, for putting into practice EAF, strengthening of the capabilities of the authorities linked to fisheries management so as to implement efficient management, control and surveillance mechanisms. GEF resources will also be used to reinforce fisheries information and monitoring systems. The project will render technical assistance to SSPyA for bringing in an information system on socioeconomic variables for applying EAF, besides financing the creation of a monitoring and information system for applying EAF in the Argentina Sea, fishing trips for preparing the National Evaluation on fishing techniques and selectivity devices. Based on the above, experts hired by the project will support the Government of Argentina (GoA) in mainstreaming these experiences in the Fisheries Management Plans and in National Plans of Action.

Under Component 3, incremental GEF resources will finance the monitoring and evaluation of the project's progress and its fulfillment of indicators, and the dissemination of information on this initiative.

Though these activities, the project will deliver global environmental benefits related to an increase in the conservation and sustainable use of marine resources in Argentina.

The project will contribute to increase the coverage of MPAs in the Argentine Sea, and to improve the management models and their sustainable financing mechanisms, also helping in the effective conservation of important marine and species ecosystems of global importance (vulnerable, endangered or threatened). The Namuncura – Burdwood Bank Marine Protected Area, the first ocean protected area in Argentina (2013) has a high productivity level and a significant biodiversity (60 species of cold-water corals, 14 endemic and 30 sponge species). It is an important feeding area for many marine species (53,200 specimens of Southern elephant seals on Valdes Peninsula and 19 marine species). The "Front Corridor of Chubut", where the project will support the creation of the second MPA, is important as a hake and Argentine anchovy spawning area (important species for fisheries), distribution area of tope sharks (IUCN vulnerable species) and narrownose smooth-hound (IUCN endangered species), the migration area for the Southern Right Whale to its reproduction site, and the feeding grounds of the Magellan Penguin (IUCN near threatened species) and the Southern Giant Petrel. The project's contribution to the strengthening of the regulatory and institutional framework, and the formulation of policy guidelines agreed on by consensus for MPAs and the transition zones, will create favorable

conditions for the future expansion and consolidation of the conservation system for marine areas in Argentina and the globally valuable biodiversity resources in these areas.

On the other hand, reinforcing EAF, to supplement quota-based or TAC-based regulation mechanisms will allow a better determination of the physical and biological impact of target species fisheries on the marine ecosystem (bottom trawling, incidental fishing, etc.). Within the framework of the Management Plan for the Patagonian scallop pilot fishery test, the main expected direct environmental benefits includes the protection of Patagonian scallop recruitment areas, which will allow a continuous recovery of the resource and a reduction of the impact of the trawling technique on the benthic communities and demersal species. Improvement of the database containing biophysical information and knowledge on the impact of this kind of fishery will allow the formulation and adoption of good catch and management practices for fishing Patagonian scallop (including zoning and regulation of the activity, fishing techniques or selectivity devices) to minimize the impact on the non-target species and benthic community.

Since the project will contribute to building better conditions and capabilities for the effective implementation of EAF at the national level, it is expected to generate environmental benefits which go beyond the pilot area in the medium run. The adoption of EAF in other key fisheries in Argentina, thus generating environmental benefits beyond the pilot test, will be facilitated by defining minimum EAF contents for their mainstreaming in fishery management regulatory frameworks, training personnel and authorities linked to fishery management in the application of EAF, and developing information management tools in support of decision-making.

### Changes from PIF

While Project objective and main targets remains largely unchanged, the structure of the results chain has been partially modified to reflect and adapt to some changes in the Argentinian context occurred since PIF approval and to respond to the needs identified during project preparation. The main changes are the following:

- During Project preparation, the first MPA has been created in Argentina. As experience in management on MPA is still very limited in the country, it was decided to support management strengthening of this new PA.
- The pilot will not cover a selected area but a selected fishery (scallop). Given the fact that in the country the EAF has never been applied to a fishery, this pilot will provide experience and lessons learned that can be replicated to the benefit of other fisheries in the country.
- Analyses and assessments carried out during project preparation showed the need for the development of a more comprehensive enabling environment, including the capacities to be developed at national level for the implementation of EAF, in order to mainstream the EAF in the normative framework. Outcome 2.1 (now renumbered 2.2) has been reformulated accordingly.
- Analyses conducted during full Project preparation showed that one of the main barriers to the mainstreaming of EAF in the fisheries sector in Argentina is the lack of information or, when information is available, the lack of systematization. Therefore, an outcome related to the improvement of information management and monitoring systems has been included.

In addition, some outcomes and outputs have been renumbered to strengthen the internal coherence of the results chain and the wording has been streamlined.

The following table includes a detailed description of changes:

PIF	CEO Endorsement
<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved management effectiveness of two new MPAs and transition zones established outside the 12 miles Territorial Waters zone conserving threatened marine ecosystems (Increase in protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool –baseline and target to be set during full project</p>	<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved protection of marine ecosystems with globally significant biodiversity in key areas by supporting the Burdwood/Namuncura Enforcement Authority for managing the MPA and its transition zones, and creating a new protected area, established beyond the 12 miles of Territorial Waters.</p> <p>During Project preparation, the first MPA has been</p>

preparation).	created in Argentina. As experience in management on MPA is still very limited in the country, it was decided to support the management strengthening of this new PA. The wording of the outcome and the related outputs has been adjusted accordingly. All the outputs related to this outcome have been renumbered.
<p><b>Output 1.1.2</b> Two (2) new MPAs created, covering 1,000,000-1,500,000 hectares (10,000 to 15,000 km<sup>2</sup>) of previously unprotected marine ecosystems;</p> <p><b>Output 1.1.4.</b> Two (2) Participatory Management Plans (PMPs), developed and implemented in 2 new MPAs. Each PMP includes a Biodiversity Conservation and Monitoring Strategy (women representing at least 30% of participants).</p>	<p><b>Output 1.1.1.: A new MPA</b> defined, with its geographical boundaries duly drawn, and a proposed participatory Management Plan along the “Front Corridor of Chubut”, covering at least 25% of its total area (37.000 km<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p><b>Output 1.1.2.:</b> One (1) Management Plan for the Namuncura – Burdwood Bank MPA.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.1.5.</b> Harmonized regulatory framework for the management of MPAs and transition zones, with the participation of 5 governmental agencies (local, provincial and national), and 3 CSOs (women representing at least 30% of participants).</p>	<p><b>Output 1.1.4.:</b> Institutional, regulatory and operational capacity framework reinforced for the management of MPAs and transition zones.</p> <p>This output has been renumbered and its wording streamlined.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.1.1.</b> One consolidated network of 5 research organizations, 6 governmental agencies and 2 NGOs with capacities enhanced and working together on sharing of scientific analysis on costal marine biodiversity and threats to its conservation and best management practices for improved management effectiveness of MCPAs (Women representing at least 30% of participants)</p>	<p><b>Output 1.1.5.:</b> One consolidated network of research organizations, governmental agencies and NGOs with capacities enhanced and working together on sharing of scientific analysis on costal marine biodiversity and threats to its conservation and best management practices for improved management effectiveness of MPAs.</p> <p>The output has been renumbered.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> The normative framework and legislation that regulate the fishery sector have been harmonized under the EAF informed by suitable technical data and promote good fishery practices (i.e.: reducing specific inter- and intra-pressures on marine biodiversity and communities).</p>	<p><b>Outcome 2.2.:</b> Enabling conditions and institutional capacities built at the national level for effectively implementing EAF</p>
<p><b>Output 2.1.1.</b> The Federal Fisheries Council has improved its guidance to decision-makers on EAF implementation</p>	<p><b>Output 2.2.1</b> Minimum EAF contents established and adopted by CFP and mainstreamed in the</p>

through a biennial report validated with local stakeholders and CSOs.	regulatory frameworks for fisheries management.
<b>Output 2.1.2.</b> Fifty (50) people from at least six (6) institutions (INIDEP, PNA, National Under-Secretariat of Fisheries and equivalent provincial authorities, and provincial environment agencies) have developed capacities in the practical implementation of EAF, with a gender perspective and involving young people and options for sustainable fisheries certification such as the MSC Standard. (Women representing at least 30% of participants).	<b>Output 2.2.3.:</b> Staff of the institutions involved in fisheries management (INIDEP, PNA, SSPyA and equivalent provincial authorities and provincial environment agencies) and fisheries organizations have developed capacities in the practical application of EAF, including options for sustainable fisheries certification, from a gender perspective and with the participation of youth.
<b>Output 2.1.3.</b> EAF has been mainstreamed in the national and provincial normative frameworks and legislations that regulate the fishery sector (in the provinces involved in the project), with FAO technical support;	<b>Output 2.2.1:</b> Minimum EAF contents established and adopted by CFP and mainstreamed in the regulatory frameworks for fisheries management.
<b>Output 2.1.4.</b> One (1) monitoring and evaluation system of the progress in and outcomes and impacts of the implementation of the EAF in the Argentine Sea area operating providing systematic feedback and resulting in continuous improvements in EAF policies, plans, and techniques and adaptive management in key biodiversity and fisheries areas	This output has been moved to Outcome 2.3, as it as it aims to provide information for EAF based decision making. The wording has been simplified.
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> EAF has been mainstreamed into fishery management plans covering 150,000-300,000 ha of production seascapes of the Argentine Sea	<b>Outcome 2.1.:</b> EAF tested in a selected pilot fishery to strengthen the sustainability of fisheries and protect marine biodiversity and ecosystem services.
<b>Output 2.2.1.</b> EAF tested in at least one (1) selected area, along with INIDEP and fisheries stakeholders (private sector, institutions, academia, and scientific sector). Each pilot case has generated 4 sub-products: i) One (1) EAF Management and Action Plan agreed, implemented, and validated through a participatory process; ii) Three (3) tested capture methods, fishing techniques, or selectivity devices, that minimize the impact on non-target species, validated through a consensual and participatory process; iii) Assessment of options and incentives for sustainable fisheries certification such as the MSC Standard; iv) One (1) monitoring	<b>Output 2.1.1.:</b> Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Plan (EAFMP) for the Patagonian scallop fishery adopted by all stakeholders (Patagonian scallop fishers and fishing companies, INIDEP, CFP, SSPyA, MAyDS, and science institutions)  <b>Output 2.1.2.:</b> Good catch and management practices for the Patagonian scallop fishery, validated through a participatory process, including zoning and regulation of this activity, fishing techniques and selectivity devices which minimize the impact on non-target species and the benthic community  Item iii) has been moved under Outcome 2.2 (enabling environment), as it will refer to the

<p>system of the outcomes of the implementation of the EAF Management Plan including indicators capturing interactions between biodiversity and fisheries.</p>	<p>fisheries sector in general and not only to the scallop fishery pilot. It has been reformulated as <b>Output 2.2.2:</b> Analysis of market incentive options (increase in business sector profitability) for applying EAF.</p>
<p><b>Output 2.2.2</b> National evaluation that assessed: i) the efficiency of fishing techniques and selectivity devices; ii) the mitigation of impacts of these techniques and devices on un-intended by-catch species; iii) the inclusion of recommended actions for EAF implementation in the Argentine Sea. Findings of the evaluation have been mainstreamed into the inter-institutional management mechanisms for the fishery sector in the Argentine Sea.</p>	<p>Moved under outcome 2.3, as it aims to provide information for EAF based decision making.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2.3</b> Control and surveillance mechanisms, have been strengthened</p>	<p>This outcome has been included under <b>Outcome 2.2</b> as <b>Output 2.2.4:</b> Fishery-related implementation authorities (SSPyA, provincial fishing authorities, PNA) have improved capacity to implement efficient management, control and surveillance mechanisms (satellite system, landing control), by applying EAF.</p>
	<p>Analyses conducted during full Project preparation showed that one of the main barriers to the mainstreaming of EAF in the fisheries sector in Argentina is the lack of information or, when information is available, the lack of systematization. These needs have been reflected in the project strategy through a new outcome.</p> <p><b>Outcome 2.3:</b> Information management and monitoring systems improved, including socioeconomic data and information on selectivity, good practices and mitigation measures to facilitate decision-making on the application of EAF in public and private environments</p> <p>It includes the following outputs:</p> <p><b>Output 2.3.1.:</b> The SSPyA fisheries information system mainstreams easily accessible and relevant socioeconomic variables for applying EAF.</p> <p><b>Output 2.3.2.:</b> A monitoring and information system for applying EAF in the Argentine Sea.</p> <p><b>Output 2.3.3.:</b> National Evaluation of: i) efficacy of fishing techniques and selectivity devices; ii) mitigation of the impact of these techniques and devices on the ecosystem; iii) inclusion of the recommended measures for applying EAF in the</p>

	Argentine Sea.
<p><b>Output 3.1.1</b> Project monitoring system operating providing systematic on- progress information related to project outcome and output targets</p> <p><b>Output 3.1.3</b> Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons-learned”, published</p>	<p>In order to simplify the structure of the results chain, the two dissemination-related outputs have been unified:</p> <p><b>Output 3.1.1.:</b> Dissemination of EAF concept and objectives as well as better practices and lessons learned from the project among different target groups.</p>

**A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

The risks identified in the PIF and related mitigation measures have been further assessed and described. Please refer to Appendix 4 “Risk Matrix” of the FAO GEF Project Document for the full risk assessment.

**A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

FAO, MAyDS and CFP will collaborate with the executing agencies of other programs and projects, in order to identifying opportunities and facilitating mechanisms to achieve synergies with other relevant GEF-supported projects, as well as projects supported by other donors.

Among others, the project shall develop special collaboration with projects that can provide specific information on the Management and Protection of Coastal Marine Biodiversity and inputs for the application of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries as, for instance: i) *Sustainable Management of the Water Resources of the la Plata Basin with Respect to the Effects of Climate Variability and Change* (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay) (GEF ID 2095); ii) *Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water* (GloBallast Partnership) (GEF ID 2261), which will implement long-term coordinated measures to minimize the adverse impact of alien aquatic species transferred by the ballast water of ships to coastal and marine ecosystems; iii) Implemented almost simultaneously, GEF project ID 4768 on “*Strengthening of Governance for the Protection of Biodiversity through the Formulation and Implementation of the National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (NSIAS)*”, will be implemented with FAO as GEF agency and MAyDS as executing partner. It will especially consider the incidence of ballast water and fouling, and in collaboration with the Working Group on Aquatic Resources (GTRA - MAyDS), it will implement a pilot project on the “System for early detection, dispersal prevention and early action with regard to IAS in ports and adjacent areas”.

Kindly refer to Sub-section 4.1 of the FAO GEF Project Document for further details

**B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

**B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

**B.1.1 Project implementation and management arrangements**

The project management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E. For the implementation of the project, a Technical Consultative Committee (TCC) will be created. The TCC will be chaired by the National Project Director, appointed by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS). Other committee members will be the following: the Project National Technical Coordinator (PNTC), a representative from Under-secretariat of Fisheries and Aquaculture (SSPyA); one representative from the Federal Fisheries Council; one representative from each of the provinces’ fisheries departments; a representative from the Chief of Cabinet Ministry, one representative from the Argentine Coastguard - PNA and one representative from FAO-Argentina. The TCC will make decisions on the project’s overall management and will be in charge of keeping the project’s operations aligned with the strategic focus. TCC functions will include: (i) carrying out the overall supervision of project progress and achievement of expected outcomes through Project Progress Reports (PPRs) to be submitted every six months; ii) making decisions with regard to the project’s organization, coordination and practical implementation; (iii) facilitating cooperation among MAyDS, SSPyA, CFP, FAO and other institutions and organizations participating in the project; (iv) informing MAyDS/PNTC about ongoing or scheduled activities in

order to facilitate cooperation between the Project and other programs, projects and initiatives regarding marine biodiversity protection and EAF, particularly in project intervention areas; (v) facilitating timely and efficient co-financing; (vi) reviewing PPRs and financial reports prepared every six months and approving Annual Work Plans and Budgets (AWP/B). (It will meet for the first time before the Inception Workshop to approve the AWP/B and will establish its schedule of activities and meetings which will be at least one or two a year); and (vii) submitting to CFP relevant information proposed for its inclusion in the NAPs and/or measures recommended for the application of EAF in the Argentine Sea.

### B.1.2 Stakeholder involvement

The role of main stakeholders in project implementation is summarized in the following table.

Stakeholder	Description	Role in Project implementation
Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS)	In its capacity as National Environmental Authority, MAyDS is the focal point for the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD), for GEF in Argentina, and is thus responsible for coordinating the programming of GEF resources, and the supervision of the GEF project portfolio in Argentina, in cooperation with GEF executing agencies and project implementing partners.	MAyDS will have the role of coordinating the project. It shall be responsible for project technical implementation, monitoring and financial planning. MAyDS will provide a National Project Director, who will be the direct supervisor of the activities and achievements of the project, and technical fisheries specialists.
National Council of Scientific and Technical Research (CONICET)	CONICET is one of the autarchic agencies within MINCYT, and devotes its efforts to promoting and applying science and technology in Argentina. CONICET provides scientific research grants.	CONICET will carry out campaigns for the Namuncura-Burdwood Bank MPA through its two research vessels.
Argentine Coast Guard (PNA)	PNA has policing powers and carries out direct monitoring actions, based on the registration of position and speed, and oversight at port of reported and effectively used fishing gear, and it can issue violation tickets that it submits to the SSPyA. It grants registration numbers to fishing vessels flying the country's flag.	PNA will perform activities for control, surveillance and prevention of pollution in the Sea.
National Institute for Fisheries Research and Development (INIDEP)	INIDEP is a decentralized agency advising SSPyA, CFP and MREyC in the rational use of resources, with the purpose of preserving the marine ecosystem for future generations.	INIDEP will provide research vessels to conduct campaigns in protected marine areas.
Under-secretariat of Fisheries and Aquaculture (SSPyA)	SSPyA directs and enforces national fishery and aquaculture policies, and is responsible for follow-up, control and	Will participate in Project activities through the National Directorate of Fisheries Planning to keep updated the Integrated Control System of



	surveillance of the above activities.	Fishing Activities.
Federal Fisheries Council	Agency responsible for: establishing national fishery policies; fishery research policies; TAC by species, and for planning national fisheries development	The Federal Fisheries Council, as the regulatory authority for fisheries, will be the setting where the minimum contents of the ecosystem approach to fisheries will be negotiated. These meetings will involve other institutional bodies and NGOs, the private sector and fishery associations.
Private sector	Fishery companies and organizations	The private sector will perform survey and research tasks in tides and will participate in discussions on the analysis of alternative market incentives for ecosystem approach to fisheries. In addition, it will participate in training, pilot and validation activities.
Civil Society Organizations	<i>Fundación Patagonia Natural, Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina (Argentine Wildlife Foundation), Wildlife Conservation Society, Forum for the Conservation of the Patagonian Sea and Areas of Influence, Global Penguin Society, Centre for Sustainable Fisheries Development (CeDePesca), Aves Argentinas.</i>	They will participate in training activities and exchange of information.

Kindly refer to Sub-section 1.4 of the FAO GEF Project Document for further details on project participants and stakeholders.

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):**

So far, management of fisheries by target species has privileged management by objectives of total allowable catch, on the basis of biological indicators by species. The adoption of EAF will allow social aspects to be taken into account, as well as the maximization of employment based on environmental sustainability criteria, ensuring social benefits for workers out at sea, and at landing ports.

The project will pioneer the generation of socioeconomic indicators for different priority fisheries which will be included in the current SSPyA information system on fisheries to support EAF application. This will allow socioeconomic factors to be taken into consideration in decision-making related to fisheries management. For instance, certain fishing practices can negatively affect other fisheries in the same fishing zone but so far there are no data to quantify related socioeconomic impacts. The project will generate socioeconomic indicators by fishery and by fishing zone (value of production, total and land-based economic spillover, number and quality of jobs disaggregated by gender, among others), which will help guide fishery management decisions within an ecosystem approach to fisheries so as to optimize socioeconomic and environmental benefits.

This focus on the beneficiaries of fisheries (companies, male and female workers at sea and on land) is a fundamental factor to ensure their support to EAF, with a view to maximizing output-based added value instead of a maximization of catch.

When preparing Management Plans for the two MPAs, special efforts will be made to identify and characterize socioeconomic stakeholders carrying out their activities in such zones or in their areas of influence, and to seek consensus with these actors for defining the management objectives of each MPA, and the management measures to be mainstreamed in the management plans. The project's design will include the necessary information disclosure, awareness-raising and participatory planning sessions to reach consensus among the main socioeconomic actors and ensure the social sustainability of the outcomes.

In view of the above, the project strategy includes training for all key stakeholders, covering the following: (i) training of consultants who are a part of the Project Execution Unit, and project partners, particularly in participatory and consensus-building forums; (ii) Project activities will be scheduled in consultation with stakeholders, in order to link them with relevant social, cultural and religious events and activities in each community, age group and gender; (iii) Dissemination and replication of best practices: considering the sustainability of actions beyond the project's time horizon, actions for disseminating and replicating practices are particularly relevant.

EAF applied from a gender perspective guarantees equal opportunities for women, youths and vulnerable groups, and reinforces even further the favorable conditions in which fisheries currently take place, including processing on land, research, management and oversight of this resource. During project implementation great efforts will be made to guarantee gender equality and the participation of youths. Therefore, each component includes actions to promote human development and gender equality during their implementation, above all in the case of EAF pilot initiatives. All efforts will be made to guarantee the participation of women and youths when these are not represented in the participating organizations and institutions, by drawing maps beforehand to identify distortive deviations in prior phases. Therefore, before calling upon the organizations to perform each activity, key actors will be mapped, especially assessing that the gender share is appropriate.

### **B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

The following are the key elements of the project's cost-efficiency strategy:

- Its focus on cooperation between public institutions working on fisheries and the environment, fisheries and marine research and normative institutions, and the quest for synergies in the activities they carry out or co-finance, particularly oceanographic measuring cruises.
- Complementariness between the generation of specific experiences in a limited number of areas (two MPAs and a fishery sector) and work at the regulatory level and in strengthening institutional capacities to maximize the replication potential of these pilot experiences during project implementation.
- The mainstreaming of sustainable financing strategies of MPAs to ensure financing of the budgets included in the Management Plans of national institutions.
- Market-based incentives (appraisal and certification schemes by output) to favor the adoption of good practices by fishery companies, within the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The table below summarizes the project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. For further details please see the FAO-GEF Project Document, sections 4.5 and 4.6.

<b>M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Agency</b>	<b>Deadline / Interval</b>	<b>Estimated costs</b>
Inception Workshop	MAYDS/PNTC; FAO (PTM with the support of LTO, BH and the FAO – GEF	Two months after project start-up	USD 20,000

<b>M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Agency</b>	<b>Deadline / Interval</b>	<b>Estimated costs</b>
	Coordination Unit)		
Project Inception Report	MAYDS/PNTC and FAO PTM approved by LTO, BH and the FAO – GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after inception workshop	-
Impact Monitoring “in the field”	MAYDS/PNTC; and other project participants	Continually	9% of PNTC’s time. PNTC will be provided through co-financing.
Supervisory visits and progress appraisal in PPR and Annual PIR	MAYDS/PNTC; FAO (PTM, LTO, FAO – GEF Coordination Unit)	Annually or as required	FAO visits will be funded with GEF agency fees. Project Coordination visits will be funded with resources from the project travel budget.
Project Progress Reports (PPRs)	MAYDS/PNTC; with inputs from other institutions participating in project implementation.	Every six months	5% of PNTC’s time. PNTC will be provided through co-financing.
Annual Project Implementation Review reports (PIR) (Annual PIR)	FAO (LTO y PTM) with the support of MAYDS/PNTC. Approval and submission to GEF by FAO – GEF Coordination Unit	Annually	Financed with GEF agency fees.
Technical Reports	MAYDS/PNTC; FAO (OTL, GO)	As appropriate	-
Co-financing Reports	MAYDS/PNTC with inputs from other co-financers	Annually	PNTC. The PNTC will be provided through co-financing.
Independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE)	External consultant, project team, including GEF Coordination Unit and other actors	Half way through project implementation	USD 40 000 for external consulting services. FAO staff travel expenses and time will be funded with GEF agency fees.
Independent Final Evaluation (IFE)	External consultant, FAO Independent Evaluation Unit, in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and other actors.	Upon completion of project implementation.	USD 40 000 for external consulting services. FAO staff travel expenses and time will be financed with GEF agency fees.
Final Report	MAYDS/CTNP; FAO (GPO, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, the Report Unit, TSC)	Two months before end of Implementation Agreement	6,550
<b>Total Budget</b>			<b>USD 106,550</b>


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
 (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OPF endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Graciela B. Conesa	GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	07/12/2012

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation and Programme Management FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		16 June 2016	Alejandro Flores Senior Fisheries Officer, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	+56 2 29232131	<a href="mailto:alejandro.flores@fao.org">alejandro.flores@fao.org</a>
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division. FAO				+3906 57055680	<a href="mailto:GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org">GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org</a>

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Kindly refer to Annex 1 of the FAO GEF Project Document (pp. 95-112).

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

*Germany's Comments*

We suggest creating a clearer link between components 1 and 2 by focusing the EAF mainstreaming into fishery management plans of those seascapes that are adjacent to and/or surrounding the newly created MPAs. This may contribute to improving the project scope to focus resources in order to leverage additional synergies between the two components, and to clearly demonstrating the benefits of MPAs to the fisheries sector.

FAO response: During project preparation, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, the Patagonian scallop fishery was selected to pilot the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries according to the following criteria: i) availability of baseline information, which will speed up preparation for implementation; ii) since it is a benthic resource, there is little uncertainty about mobile or migratory resources, and is thus a good option for developing EAF. Although the management units of the Patagonian scallop do not overlap with the two MPAs, the synergies between the two components will be ensured through the mainstreaming of the EAF in the management plans of the two MPAs.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 118,182			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Salaries Professional	6.690	6.614	0
Consultants	85.650	70.806	4.389
Travel	17.000	16.699	0
Training	8.842	10.538	0
Expendable Procurement	0	2.098	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>118.182</b>	<b>106.755</b>	<b>4.389</b>

<sup>5</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A