



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities			
Country(ies):	Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Philippines	GEF Project ID: ¹	5271
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4754
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Costa Rica Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries of Ecuador Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Philippines Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (NGO)	Submission Date: Resubmission Date: Resubmission Date:	16 Oct 2014 25 Nov 2014 25 Nov 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	50
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	NA	Agency Fee (\$):	\$522,500
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-2	Outcome 2.3. Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, ICM, habitat (blue forest) restoration / conservation, and port management and produce measureable results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and local policy / legal / institutional reforms adopted • Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments 	GEF TF	\$5,500,000	34,550,000.00
Total project costs				\$5,500,000	34,550,000.00

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To mainstream sustainability into seafood supply chains through market and policy mechanisms and partnerships with the overarching goal of rebuilding and protecting fish stocks and livelihoods						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Promotion of global demand for sustainable	TA	1. Increased global market demand for	1.1. Improved seafood purchasing policies and	GEF TF	485,112	8,600,000.00

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

marine commodities		sustainable certified marine commodities and associated reduction of IUU fisheries 2. Increased pressure on RFMOs and their Contracting Parties to adopt more sustainable and science-based practices for shark and tuna conservation and management measures through engagement of international value chains	targets to increase sourcing of certified goods of 15 major supply chain partners (retail and buyers) from EU, Japan and US which are following sustainability guidelines 1.2. Sustainable seafood sourcing policy guidance toolkit for retailers, wholesale buyers and processors 1.3. At least 15 new supply chain partners from EU, Japan and US adopt purchase policies to incentivize sourcing only from fishermen and traders who provide sustainable seafood 2.1. At least four position statements of major international seafood buyers or their suppliers in support of more effective CMMs for tuna, sharks and LPF in IATTC and WCPFC 2.2. Draft regional management rules for mahi mahi presented to IATTC Scientific Advisory Committee			
2. Enabling environments for sustainable marine commodities supply chains	TA	3. Increased synergy and involvement of national and international players in sustainable seafood value chains	3.1. National sustainable marine commodities platforms established in 4 countries to assist suppliers and buyers to coordinate planning improvements in the environmental performance of target supply chains 3.2. Sustainable fisheries action plans (SFAP) in place for best practices in fish harvesting in at least 9 fisheries	GEF TF	2,317,874.08	8,600,000.00
3. Demonstration fisheries improvement projects (FIP)	TA	4. Increased sustainability scores of marine commodities purchased from project fisheries	4.1. Updated guidelines for developing responsible FIPs and progress classification instrument (tracking tool). 4.2. Implement at least 10 FIPs amongst the four countries	GEF TF	1,230,591.20	12,000,000.00
4. Sustainable marine commodities information and knowledge management systems	TA	5. Reliable and verifiable information of target marine commodities is publically available and is used by value chain stakeholders for decision making and engagement in fishery improvement projects 6. Better knowledge	5.1. Profiles of all project target fisheries are developed and maintained in fisheries sustainability databases. 5.2. Scientific working groups for key commodities (BSC, mahi mahi, BET, ITF, snapper, octopus) are created, SFP	GEF TF	1,190,659.96	5,150,000.00

		management on mainstreaming sustainability into seafood value chains	coordinators appointed, and work plans implemented in support of expert networks. 5.3. Information systems tailored to help industry stakeholders adopt proper procurement policies, provide them with advice on improvement actions in problematic fisheries, and track improvements being made toward set goals (i.e., FishSource, FIP Directory). 6.1. Best practices documented and experiences shared with other projects to incentivize change in other fisheries through IW:LEARN (1% of the total budget will be assigned to IW:LEARN) and project website.			
			Subtotal		5,224,237.24	34,350,000.00
			Project management Cost (PMC) ³ (including Direct Project Costs: USD\$107,852.76)	GEF TF	275,762.76	200,000.00
			Total project costs		5,500,000.00	34,550,000.00

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Costa Rica	In-kind	2,500,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries of Ecuador	In-kind	3,750,000
National Government	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia	In-kind	4,500,000
National Government	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Philippines	In-kind	2,200,000
Foundation	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	In-kind	12,500,000
Foundation	Marine Stewardship Council	In-kind	2,500,000
Foundation	Monterey Bay Aquarium	In-kind	4,900,000
Foundation	National Fisheries Institute Crab Council	In-kind	1,500,000
GEF Agency	UNDP Green Commodities Programme	In-kind	200,000
Total Co-financing			34,550,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	International Waters	Global (Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, and The Philippines)	5,500,000	522,500	6,022,500

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

Total Grant Resources	5,500,000	522,500	6,022,500
------------------------------	-----------	---------	-----------

¹ 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.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	458,855.94	648,000	1,106,855.94
National/Local Consultants	1,066,602.00	0	1,066,602.00

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

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

NO CHANGES

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

NO CHANGES

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

NO CHANGES

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

NO CHANGES

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 PIF proposal was very ambitious for the amount of funding requested to the GEF. The project will implement novel approaches for fisheries conservation like direct market engagement, sustainable marine commodities platforms (a first attempt to adapt to marine value chains the concepts from the Green Commodities Programme that have been applied in agriculture) and fisheries improvement projects. There is limited experience with these instruments and therefore the cost estimates calculated during the preparation of the PIF were not precise. Consequently, various elements of the project were adjusted to have an improved cost-benefit relationship and to better use the GEF resources.

The main changes in the project are:

1. Outcome 2 will only focus on two RFMOs. It was originally proposed to increase market pressure in all the tuna RFMOs. However, during project preparation it was found that this was well beyond the scope of the available resources. Therefore, the project will concentrate on the two tuna RFMOs of the Pacific Ocean (i.e., IATTC, WCPFC) in which the four participating countries are Contracting Parties of the conventions.

2. There will be no direct work with shark fisheries. In the PIF it was proposed that the project will address shark conservation in the various components through direct work to decrease by-catch mortality in longline and purse seine tuna fisheries, identify leverage points within the Chinese market, and encourage buyers of tuna to pressure the RFMOs

⁴ 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

to improve data collection and adopt stronger conservation and management measures. The project will contribute to shark conservation by promoting measures to reduce by-catch in the target long-line fisheries (e.g., large pelagic fish in Costa Rica and Ecuador) and urging major buyers to request to the RFMOs, national fisheries authorities and their suppliers to apply robust measures to protect sharks. However the project target fisheries do not include shark fisheries and there will be no supply chain analysis of the Chinese shark fin markets. During project preparation it was determined that this kind of analysis, and the related market engagement work, will be well beyond the reach of the available funding.

3. Outcomes were combined. The PIF had proposed 11 outcomes, during project preparation the number was reduced to six by combining outcomes. The scope of the expected changes and impacts in the four areas of work (i.e., the four components of the project) were maintained but the number of outcomes was reduced to have a more precise and streamlined logical framework.

5. Co-funding was reorganized. To facilitate the monitoring of the counterpart, SFP integrated all the resources that will be channelled by direct contribution from their institutional funds and by foundations and industry donors (e.g., Tesco, Walmart, and Walton Family Foundation). Therefore, SFP co-funding was consolidated into a US\$12.5 million contribution. In addition, the contribution of the National Fisheries Institute Crab Council increased from US\$900,000 to US\$1.5 million, and the Monterey Bay Aquarium joined the project with a contribution in-kind of US\$4.9 million. On the other hand, the contribution of the MSC was reduced from US\$7.5 million to US\$2.5 million. In general, co-funding for the project was not affected. Indicative co-financing in the PIF was US\$34,590,000 and secured co-financing is US\$34,550,000.

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 project risk table was revised during project preparation. The updated Risk analysis is attached below:

Risks	Rating	Risk mitigation strategy
NATURAL. The ENSO. It is well documented that the warm and cold phases of the ENSO strongly affect the fisheries of the four countries. The chance of an El Niño 2014-2015 was 65% on 07 August 2014. It is very probable that an ENSO will develop during project implementation. This will affect the availability of key species like tuna and mahi mahi, therefore influencing the interest of the stakeholder to continue participating / investing in the SMCP and FIPs. Also, El Niño may damage vital infrastructure in coastal areas.	High	At the start of the project the situation will be assessed and the work plan will include provisions in case of an ENSO. The project has mainstreamed this topic in seafood sourcing policies, marine commodities platforms and FIPs. In case of an ENSO, the project will motivate the stakeholders to include mitigation measures in their plans and activities.
POLITICAL. Changes in political administrations in target countries affect the continuity of the national platforms, strategy development, and implementation of joint action plans.	High	All the countries will have elections during project implementation ⁵ . The project will strengthen cooperation mechanisms among stakeholders to ensure continuity during transition periods.
NATURAL. Climate change. Between 1970 and 2004, sea surface temperature around the planet rose between 0.2-1.0 °C with a mean increase of 0.6 °C. The pH of world oceans has decreased by 0.1 units. The tropics and eastern boundary upwelling	Medium	It is not foreseen that in the following five years climate change will dramatically modify the target fisheries. However, the project has mainstreamed this topic in seafood sourcing policies, marine commodities platforms and FIPs. The project will

⁵ Costa Rica just had elections in 2014, and will have the next elections in 2018. Ecuador will have elections in 2017. Indonesia just had elections in 2014 and will have the next elections in 2019. Philippines will have elections in 2016.

Risks	Rating	Risk mitigation strategy
ecosystems such as the Humboldt Current System are among those ecosystems that are particularly vulnerable to changes in pH. These trends may affect migration patterns of pelagic species (like tuna, mahi mahi and LPF) and primary productivity.		motivate that the value chain stakeholders include climate change in their plans and decisions.
SOCIAL. Fishermen and processors in developing countries do not perceive advantages in certification	Medium	It is known that certification, in general, does not command a price premium. The project will provide information and training on sustainable seafood certification to support informed decisions. Also the project will support the use of credible FIPs as a mechanism to establish commercial links among the members of the seafood chain.
POLITICAL. Limited interest by WCPFC and IATTC to adopt stronger CMMs for tuna, sharks and large pelagic fish. Decision making is a very political and complex process in both tuna RFMOs.	Medium	The project will bring to the table some of SFP's major retail partners to work with RFMOs and their Contracting Parties in order to create and adopt more effective CMMs for both target and non-target species, and to enhance data collection efforts. The project will coordinate efforts with other entities that advocate stronger CMMs like ISSF and WWF.
POLITICAL. Limited interest by national fisheries authorities to strengthen fisheries monitoring, and advance in stock assessment, regulations and policies, and fisheries control and enforcement.	Medium	The project will maintain permanent communication with the NFAs to motivate support for improved fisheries management of the target fisheries. Also, the project will motivate major buyers to request more effective CMMs. Finally, the project will coordinate efforts with other entities that advocate improved fisheries management in the participating countries.
SOCIAL. Limited motivation to share information between institutions in public and private sectors at national levels ⁶	Medium	The project will strongly promote open collaboration to create trust among the stakeholders. Signed agreements will be used to guarantee information flow and property (when applicable).
SOCIAL. Reduction of the global demand for seafood	Low	The demand for seafood has continued to grow despite the increase in prices. The project cannot influence the world demand for seafood.
SOCIAL. Major buyers and retailers show little knowledge or interest in changing purchasing policies for marine commodities.	Low	The current trend is that major buyers and retailers from developed countries are making strong commitments to purchase sustainable seafood. In component 1, the project will implement a major

⁶ It is well known that access to relevant and reliable information is a key request of value chain stakeholders to support their day-to-day and strategic decisions. However, it is common that public and private actors are reluctant to share their information.

Risks	Rating	Risk mitigation strategy
		effort to engage new major buyers. A key message will be that to stay in business it is necessary to establish long-term partnerships with their suppliers and to have a sustainable source of seafood.
SOCIAL. FIPs, partnering buyers with fishers, fail to make the latter incorporate best practices.	Low	The project will incentivize buyers to offer increasingly good price premiums and enhance market access to those fishers who may adopt changes towards sustainable harvesting. It will also encourage fish buyers to avoid purchasing from exporters who are suspected of trading IUU fish or incur in seafood fraud.
POLITICAL. The current commitment to cooperate at national level is diminished.	Low	The project will aim to mediate existing conflicts between marine commodities supply chain stakeholders and public institutions to ensure long-term cooperation and joint action to increase adoption of best practices in the harvesting of target fisheries. Also, the project will work to facilitate, and increase, when appropriate, cooperation between the agencies responsible for biodiversity protection (e.g., ministries of the environment) and national fisheries authorities in each country.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives. Of particular importance will be coordination with the following initiatives:

1. The project will seek to use the results of the UNDP/GEF funded project Sulu-Celebes Sea Sustainable Fisheries Management Project (GEF-ID 3524) under implementation with Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines in the Coral Triangle. Of particular interest will be the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis to identify the priority actions that are relevant for the target fisheries.
2. The project will be implemented in coordination with the FAO/GEF funded project Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (GEF-ID 4581) under implementation in the five tuna RFMOs. Of particular interest will be that:
 - a. The current project promotes that major buyers pressure IATTC and WCPFC to adopt the measures of the regional action plans to be prepared by the FAO/GEF initiative.
 - b. The work in Costa Rica, Ecuador and Indonesia incorporate the advances in bycatch mitigation in tuna fisheries to be developed by the FAO/GEF initiative.
 - c. The current project makes sure that training activities do not duplicate those of the FAO/GEF initiative.
3. The project will establish coordination with the recently approved regional UNDP/FAO/GEF funded project Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (GEF-ID 4746) to be implemented in countries of the WCPFC. Of particular interest will be:
 - a. The development of ecosystem-based CMMs for tuna and non-target species in the WCPFC.
 - b. The broad multi-stakeholder involvement into sustainable oceanic fisheries management.

4. The project will establish synergies and linkages with the recently approved UNDP/GEF funded project Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas (GEF-ID 5393) to be implemented in Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam. Of particular interest will be:
 - a. The mainstreaming of climate change concerns into national fisheries policy in Indonesia and the Philippines.
 - b. The work with market-based approaches to promote sustainable tuna fisheries. Coordination will be crucial because this new initiative will also promote fisheries improvement and certification.
 - c. The development of a regional knowledge platform. It will be necessary to link the efforts of both projects on this field to ensure that information, best practice and lessons are easily accessible.
5. The project will coordinate with the recently approved UNEP/GEF funded project Establishment and Operation of a Regional System of Fisheries Refugia in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand (GEF-ID 5401) to be implemented in Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia and Vietnam. An initial action will be to identify the relationship of the fisheries refugia with the target fisheries of the present project to establish synergies.
6. The project will also coordinate with the proposed Conservation International/GEF funded project Improving mangrove conservation across the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) through coordinated regional and national strategy development and implementation (GEF-ID 5771). An initial action will be to identify linkages with target fisheries in Costa Rica and Ecuador to establish collaborations

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

The project incorporates a participatory approach and has maximized the involvement of all the stakeholders of the target seafood value chains. Major buyers will be approached through (1) seafood fairs and meetings (e.g., Seafood Expo) in major markets (i.e., EU, Japan, USA), (2) sector group roundtables, (3) supplier roundtables, and (4) face to face meetings with major buyers (wholesale, retail) and processors. Also, delegations of the four countries will participate in seafood shows/fairs in years 2 and 3 to meet with major buyers in side events organized by Sustainable Fisheries Partnership. Furthermore, the project will support the IATTC's process to perform a regional stock assessment to develop regional management rules for mahi mahi in the eastern Pacific Ocean. In this context, public and private stakeholders will collaborate at national and regional levels. In a similar approach the project will foster regional collaboration and coordination among stakeholders of the blue swimming crab fishery in Indonesia and Philippines.

All stakeholders (i.e., fisheries authorities, fishers, fish traders, processors, wholesalers and major retailers) will participate in the processes to be implemented to build the sustainable marine commodities platforms (SMCP) and to implement the FIPs. Each SMCP will conduct a series of inclusive meetings to promote dialogue and collaboration among stakeholders. Also the SMCP will have fishery-specific working groups to address more detailed matters. Similarly, the stakeholders that voluntarily participate in the FIPs will jointly prepare a work plan, implement actions, and evaluate progress and achievements.

Finally, all actions related to knowledge and information management are highly participatory. For example, scientific working groups will be established to prepare and validate information about the target fisheries. These working groups will involve specialists from academic circles and research institutes of the four countries. The project will develop facilities to allow stakeholders to upload information and interact in the project website (which will contain specific webpages for each SMCP) and FIP Directory (a site which compile specific information of FIPs). Also, delegates of the countries will participate in the IWC8 and IWC9.

Finally, the project will take provisions in each country to ensure that non-associated fishers, fish traders and processors are adequately represented and actively participate in the sustainable marine commodities platforms and the FIPs. Also, to prevent a language barrier, the fishery profiles and FIP information of the target fisheries will be available in English and Spanish to facilitate access to local audiences. Project publications will be in English with extended summaries in Bahasa Indonesia, Spanish and Tagalog.

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):

The Project will contribute to sustain highly important fisheries. This will contribute to maintain the benefits that fisheries generate to local communities and the country as a whole (e.g., food security, employment, income). There are no exact figures about the number of fishermen that will benefit from the project, but there are some indications of the magnitude.

In Costa Rica, the improvement of longline fishing will benefit about 1,500 persons that participate in the capture phase. The work with the entire value chain will contribute to benefit the females that mainly participate in the processing phase. It is estimated that women constitute about 14% of the employment of the fisheries sector.

In Ecuador, the project will work with two of the most valuable fisheries of the country: the industrial tuna fishery and the artisanal longline fishery for large pelagic fish (LPF). The industrial tuna value chain employ about 30,000 people. About 60% of these persons are women that work mainly in the processing plants. The project will promote that social aspects (e.g., adequate labour conditions, personnel safety) are mainstreamed on this value chain. Along this line, the project will support the development and application of the Ecuadorian National Ecolabel for Responsible Tuna that incorporate social and production considerations along the entire value chain.

The artisanal longline fishery for large pelagic fish has two components, the fishery for mahi mahi and the fishery for tuna and other LPF (e.g., billfishes, wahoo). The mahi mahi fishery is the most important fishery for artisanal fishermen, mahi mahi is also an important source of affordable protein for national consumers. There is no estimate of the number of artisanal fishermen that fish LPF, but a rough estimate is that they will be at least 20,000. In addition, at least 5,000 people, mostly women, work in the processing plants.

In Indonesia, the project will contribute to sustain artisanal fisheries for tuna, snapper and blue swimming crab. These fisheries are an essential source of food and income for coastal communities. For example, sustaining the blue swimming crab fishery will generate very important social and economic benefits. It is estimated that about 65,000 people capture blue swimming crabs, and an additional 13,000 people work in the crab meat picking plants (mostly women). The project will promote that social aspects (e.g., adequate labour conditions and fair wages) are mainstreamed in these value chains.

In Philippines, the project will contribute to sustain artisanal fisheries for blue swimming crab and octopus. Both are very coastal fisheries that generate food and income for local communities. There are no estimates about the number of blue swimming crab fishermen but the figures could be similar to those of Indonesia.

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

The project will ensure cost-effectiveness of the GEF resources by:

1. Allocating GEF funds to deliverables that are strongly catalytic such as:
 - a. The preparation of a toolkit to facilitate the preparation and implementation of sustainable seafood purchasing policies,
 - b. The update of guidelines for developing credible FIPs and the tools for measuring FIP progress, and
 - c. Electronic platforms to facilitate the access to key information to support informed decision-making.
2. Building on the learnings from the current practice on responsible sourcing, public-private sustainable commodities platforms, fisheries improvement projects, and information management.
3. Transferring the management of the marine commodities platforms and the FIPs to the stakeholders. It is foreseen that until year 3 the platforms will be institutionalised and the FIPs will be industry-driven.
4. Supporting the development of best practices and learnings that are highly replicable worldwide.

In summary, the cost-effectiveness of the project is reflected by the fact that future major changes in the seafood value chains could be obtained with a relatively small investment in key strategic actions, with a high degree of synergy and replicability.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP lead CO ▪ UNDP COs, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: US\$10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP lead CO ▪ UNDP COs ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: US\$45,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP lead CO ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ Implementing partners ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : US\$45,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP lead CO ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Implementing partners ▪ local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team ▪ Implementing partners 	Indicative cost per year: US\$5,000	Every two years
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Dissemination of lessons learnt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government representatives ▪ Project Coordination Unit 	operational budget 0	At least three months before the end of the project
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 250,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

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 [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
LORENA TAPIA	MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT ECUADOR	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT	11/29/2012

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
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		25 Nov 2015	Jose Troya, Regional Technical Advisor, Water & Oceans	(507) 302-4636	jose.troya@undp.org

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).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:

Costa Rica: UNDAF 4.2: The public, private and civil society sectors will progress in adopting and implementing policies and strategies to consider environmental quality management and integrated natural resource management and in the valuation of environmental goods and services, the protection, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Ecuador: UNDAF Direct Outcome 5: CPAP Direct Outcome 3: Prioritization of conservation and the equitable and sustainable management of biodiversity in the development agenda.

Indonesia: UNPDF 2.1.2 Government, private sector and CBO partners have coherent and effective policy frameworks, action plans, implementing arrangement and funding arrangement to sustainably manage coastal and marine ecosystems. CPAP Outcome 2.1: Responsible national institutions and relevant stakeholders are more effective in managing environmental resources and addressing environmental pollution.

Philippines: UNDAF Outcome 4 CPAP Output 4.3 Increased capacities of key duty bearers to provide enabling environment for claimholders' improved access to an enhanced natural resource base, sustainable energy and cleaner environment.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

Costa Rica: Number of "green" companies and initiatives.

Ecuador: Number of financial sustainability mechanisms designed, agreed with stakeholders' participation, men and women, and implemented.

Indonesia: Condition of coral reefs in Indonesia.

Philippines: Percentage of degradation rates of critical environmental and natural resources; percentage decrease in mortalities, morbidities and economic losses from natural hazards and environmental degradation.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR

2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: IW Objective 2: Catalyze multistate cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) while considering climatic variability and change

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: IW Outcome 2.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, ICM, habitat (blue forest) restoration/conservation, and port management and produce measureable results

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: IW Indicator 2.3: Measurable results for reducing land-based pollution, habitat, and sustainable fisheries from local demonstrations

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective ⁷ (equivalent to output in ATLAS) To mainstream sustainability into seafood supply chains through market and policy mechanisms and partnerships with the overarching goal of rebuilding and protecting fish stocks and livelihoods	MSC certified landings	2012: 6.5 million tonnes (8% of marine capture)	>7.0 million tonnes	MSC Global Impacts Report FAO SOFIA	The end-users and the stakeholders of the seafood value chains have an increased interest in sustainable seafood.
Outcome 1 ⁸ Increased global market demand for sustainable certified marine commodities and associated reduction of IUU fisheries	1a. Number of fisheries for the targeted commodities (tuna, large pelagics, blue swimming crab) that are sourced by SFP partners and their suppliers and that are either in a FIP or MSC certified.	Tuna 17 (11 FIP, 6 MSC) LPF 7 (5 FIP, 2 MSC) BSC 3 (all FIP)	Year 2. >10% increase Year 4. >20% increase	Annual report from SFP through its Metrics system (used by all retail/buyer partners and their suppliers) APR/PIR	Supply of seafood products from certified fisheries and FIPs. Growing demand from end buyers for seafood products from sustainable sources
	1b. Number of international seafood buyers ('buyers' = SFP partners plus suppliers to SFP partners) with sustainable seafood purchasing policies	270 (August 2014)	Year 3. >279 Year 4. >285	Annual report from SFP APR/PIR	There is sufficient supply of seafood products from certified fisheries and FIPs. Buyers are interested in sourcing from sustainable fisheries

⁷ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

⁸ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2 Increased pressure on RFMOs and their Contracting Parties to adopt more sustainable and science-based practices for shark and tuna conservation and management measures through engagement of international value chains	2. Number of buyers ('buyers' = SFP partners plus suppliers to SFP partners) with procurement policies for tuna that include support of more effective CMMs for tuna, sharks and LPF in IATTC and WCPFC	0	Year 2. >2 (IATTC = 1; WCPFC = 1) Year 4. >4 (IATTC = 2; WCPFC = 2)	Annual report of IATTC and WCPFC meetings APR/PIR	International seafood buyers are willing to issue position statements to the OROPs.
Outcome 3 Increased synergy and involvement of national and international players in sustainable seafood value chains	3a Number of Sustainable Marine Commodities Platforms	0	Year 2: >6 Year 3: 9	APR/PIR	There is sufficient market leverage to promote engagement of the seafood value chain of target fisheries. Fisheries authorities support SMCPs. The members of the seafood value chain have interest in participating in the SMCPs.
	3b. Number of Sustainable Fisheries Action Plans under implementation	4 ⁹	Year 3: >8 Year 4: 10	Legal instruments adopting the SFAPs APR/PIR	There is sufficient market leverage to promote engagement of the seafood value chain. The fisheries authorities and the members of the seafood value chain support and participate in SFAPs.

⁹ Costa Rica: 0. Ecuador: PAN-Dorado, PAT-EC. Indonesia: Indonesia National Tuna Management Plan. Philippines: The Philippine Blue Swimming Crab Management Plan.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 4 Increased sustainability scores of marine commodities purchased from project fisheries	4a. Number of FIPs rated 'A' (exceptional progress ¹⁰)	1 (PHI BSC)	Year 3: >3 Year 4: >8	Annual report from SFP APR/PIR	Buyers prefer seafood products from credible FIPs and certified fisheries Fishermen and processors see market opportunities in FIPs and certification.
	4b. Number of fisheries in certification process (have entered process, undergoing assessment, or have been certified)	Fisheries entered into certification process: 0	Year 3: >2 Year 4: >3		
	4c. MSC & FishSource scores	<p>CRI mahi mahi (stock level) http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/3ce5df58-e0c3-11e1-8650-40406781a598</p> <p>score 1: <6; score 2: <6; score 3: <6; score 4: ≥6; score 5: ≥6</p> <p>CRI tuna –</p> <p>Yellowfin - score 1: ≥6; score 2: ≥6; score 3: ≥8; score 4: 7.3; score 5: 8.0</p> <p>Bigeeye – score 1: ≥6; score 2: ≥6; score 3: ≥8; score 4: 8.3; score 5: 8.2</p> <p>Skipjack - score 1: ≥6; score 2: ≥6; score 3: ≥8; score 4: 9.2; score 5: ≥8</p> <p>ECU mahi mahi http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/0374001c-08b9-11e0-9d10-40406781a598</p> <p>score 1: <6; score 2: <6; score 3: <6; score 4: ≥6; score 5: ≥6</p> <p>ECU BET</p>	<p>Year 1: baseline FishSource scores for all fisheries</p> <p>Year 3: For 50% of the target fisheries (50% = 5 fisheries) there is an improvement of at least one level (levels = <6, ≥6, and ≥8) in 2 of the 5 FishSource scores (assuming not ≥8)¹¹</p> <p>Year 4: For 80% of the target fisheries (80% = 8 fisheries) there is an improvement of at least one level (levels = <6, ≥6, and ≥8) in 2 of the 5 FishSource scores (assuming not ≥8)</p>		

¹⁰ Refer to SFP's FIP progress rating system. A: exceptional progress, B: good progress, C: some recent progress, D: some past progress, E: negligible progress.

¹¹ As noted, we will identify THREE levels of FS scores: <6, ≥6, and ≥8. If a score is 8 or above– and we do have scores in the range of 9 and 10 – it will count the same as a score of 8 exactly.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		<p>http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/80772932-0895-11e0-92d6-40406781a598</p> <p>(note that this profile is differentiated by jurisdiction, being under EC rather than IATTC, and by using longline gear; for the stock-based Eastern Pacific bigeye tuna profile under IATTC, the scores are exactly the same - see http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/49dba91e-f42a-11de-8bc6-daf105bfb8c2)</p> <p>score 1: ≥6; score 2: ≥6; score 3: ≥8; score 4: 8.3; score 5: 8.2</p> <p>ECU PST http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/2582166e-d6fb-11e1-b0bb-40406781a598</p> <p>score 1: ≥6; score 2: ≥6; score 3: ≥8; score 4: 9.2; score 5: ≥8</p> <p>IDN tuna http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/8b60feaf-0a39-11e0-910f-40406781a598</p> <p>score 1: ≥8; score 2: ≥6; score 3: <6; score 4: 9.0; score 5: 9.2</p> <p>IDN BSC http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/97f035f0-2e53-11dd-87d8-daf105bfb8c2</p> <p>score 1: <6; score 2: <6; score 3: NA; score 4: NA; score 5: <6</p> <p>IDN snapper http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/8087c27e-fcc2-11e1-b533-40406781a598</p> <p>score 1: <6; score 2: NA; score 3: <6; score 4: NA; score 5: <6</p> <p>PHI BSC http://www.fishsource.com/site/goto_profile_by_uuid/4298031c-2e58-11dd-87d8-daf105bfb8c2</p> <p>score 1: ≥6; score 2: ≥6; score 3: <6; score 4: NA;</p>			

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		score 5: <6 PHI octopus -- no FishSource profile/scores at present			
<p>Outcome 5</p> <p>Reliable and verifiable information of target marine commodities is publically available and is used by value chain stakeholders for decision making and engagement in fishery improvement projects</p>	5a. Number of registered users	FishSource: 2270 (individuals) Metrics: 472 (Number of companies subscribed – the number of registered individuals/employees for each company will vary by company size and their management structure)	FS Year 3: >15% increase FS Year 4: >25% increase Metrics Year 3: >10% increase Metrics Year 4: >20% increase	Annual report from SFP APR/PIR	Industry and research/NGO audiences see increased value in registering for FishSource to access features not available to public users. Industry partners to SFP see increased value in assessing their sustainability commitments using Metrics risk ratings.
	5b. Number of visitors (average visitors per month to the site)	FishSource: 1,875 FIP Directory: 282 MSC website: NA	Year 3: >15% increase Year 4: >30% increase	Google Analytics- Annual report from SFP Annual report from MSC APR/PIR	Industry and research/NGO audiences see increased value in obtaining fishery information from FishSource. Industry and research/NGO audiences see increased value on obtaining information on FIPs through FIP Directory.
	5c. Level of satisfaction (in terms of meeting user expectations) of information users for each site (exceeds expectations =3; meets expectations = 2; below expectations = 1; averaging scores for all areas)	FishSource: NA ¹² Metrics: NA MSC: NA FIP Directory: NA	Year 1: baseline for all sites. ¹³ Year 3: average = 2 Year 4: average = 2.5	Survey report from SFP APR/PIR Survey report from MSC	Users of all these sites are increasingly satisfied (in terms of meeting or exceeding their expectations) with the information content, organisation, and navigation.
	5d. Quality level for the profiles for each group/sector (e.g., quality of tuna)	0	Year 1: baseline for all target marine commodities Year 4: One grade level increase by group/sector	Review report from SFP APR/PIR	Independent experts evaluate FishSource profiles highly for the target marine commodity sectors.

¹² No user satisfaction data has been collected yet.

¹³ We cannot differentiate visitors to the websites or their satisfaction level by marine commodities, only by the site itself (overall)

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	profiles), based on review by independent experts, with each sector graded A, B or C.		(assuming not grade A)		
Outcome 6 Better knowledge management on mainstreaming sustainability into seafood value chains	6a Number of visitors of best practice documents	0	Year 3: >750 total Year 4: >1500 total	Survey reports from SFP, GEF APR/PIR	Best practice information shared by the project is increasingly accessed by IW:LEARN users.
	6b Level of utility of best practice documents (exceeds expectations =3; meets expectations = 2; below expectations = 1; averaging scores for all areas)	0	Year 3: 2 average ¹⁴ Year 4: 2.5 average	Survey report from SFP APR/PIR	Users of best practice information increasingly find that it meets or exceeds their expectations.

Output	Activities
1.1. Improved seafood purchasing policies and targets to increase sourcing of certified goods of 15 major supply chain partners (retail and buyers) from EU, Japan and US which are following sustainability guidelines	a. Seafood expo stand (US, EU, Japan) b. Sector group roundtables (tuna, BSC, LPF) c. Supplier roundtables (tuna, BSC, LPF) d. Face to face meetings with major buyers (wholesale, retail) and processors.
1.2. Sustainable seafood sourcing policy guidance toolkit for retailers, wholesale buyers and processors	a. Prepare draft b. Consultation with stakeholders c. Electronic publication and distribution
1.3. At least 15 new supply chain partners from EU, Japan and US adopt purchase policies to incentivize sourcing only from fishermen and traders who provide sustainable seafood.	a. Present policy guidance toolkit in sector group roundtables (tuna, BSC, LPF) b. Present policy guidance toolkit in supplier roundtables (tuna, BSC, LPF) c. Face to face meetings with major buyers (wholesale, retail) and processors.
2.1. At least four position statements of major international seafood buyers or their suppliers in support of more effective CMMs for tuna, sharks and LPF in IATTC and WCPFC	a. Follow meetings and decisions of IATTC and WCPFC b. Establish long-term communication channels with major buyers of species covered by both RMFOs c. Advocate to major buyers for them to request more effective CMMs
2.2. Draft regional management rules for mahi mahi presented to IATTC	a. Support participation of ECU and CRI delegations b. Follow meetings and decisions and disseminate briefs to stakeholders c. Advocate to major US buyers to press for sound management rules d. Advocate to major ECU and CRI processors and retailers to support sound management rules

¹⁴ Three point scale: 3: exceeds expectations, 2: meets expectations, 1: below expectations

Output	Activities
3.1. National sustainable marine commodities platforms established in 4 countries to assist suppliers and buyers to coordinate planning improvements in the environmental performance of target supply chains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In-depth sector analysis. b. Engage sector specific stakeholders c. Information meetings and training workshops on (i) sustainable seafood value chains, (ii) sustainable seafood certification, (iii) introduction to fisheries improvement projects, (iv) seafood traceability systems, (v) measures to deter IUU and seafood fraud, (vi) MSC standards for sustainable fishing and chain of custody, (vii) effects of climate change on fisheries, and (viii) effects of ENSO on fisheries.. d. Platform establishment. e. Prepare five years strategic plan f. Platform support (market information, meetings with major buyers, roundtables, training) g. Monitoring and evaluation
3.2. Sustainable fisheries action plans (SFAP) in place for best practices in fish harvesting in at least 9 fisheries [CRI: LPF - ECU: mahi mahi, BET, PST, hake – IDN: tuna, BSC, snapper – PHI: BSC, octopus]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establish working group b. Situation analysis of fishery and value chain c. Participatory planning d. Adopt SFAP e. Support SFAP implementation f. Monitoring and evaluation
4.1. Updated guidelines for developing responsible FIPs and progress classification instrument (tracking tool)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the performance and limitations of existing instruments b. Prepare proposed updates and trial run c. Consultation d. Prepare final instruments e. Electronic publication and dissemination
4.2. Implement at least 10 FIPs amongst the four countries [CRI: tuna, mahi mahi - ECU: mahi mahi, BET, PST - IDN: tuna, BSC, snapper – PHI: BSC, octopus]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For ongoing FIPs, conduct external performance evaluation and update FIP plan. b. For new FIPs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Establish FIP agreement among stakeholders (fishermen, processors, buyers, fisheries authority) ii. Conduct pre-assessment and FishSource profile iii. Prepare FIP plan and make all information publicly available c. Training and support for suppliers, fishermen, and regulators to enable an improved understanding of FIPs and the certification process (guidelines for developing credible FIPs and tracking tool) d. Implement FIP e. Monitor FIP implementation and prepare progress reports f. For fisheries interested in MSC certification, encourage and support demonstration fisheries to enter MSC fishery assessment when FIP tracking indicates it is ready.
5.1. Profiles of all project target fisheries are developed and maintained in fisheries sustainability databases (i.e. FishSource.com; MSC.org) based upon reliable, publicly available, up-to-date information on stock status, management quality, and environmental & biodiversity impacts of fishing activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Gap analysis to identify information needs for target fisheries. b. Gather additional information. c. Validate information with SFP improvement team d. Complete fisheries profile with up-to-date information e. Publish fisheries profile in FishSource f. Install Metrics system on each company that participate in the project FIPs g. Train new Metric users h. Update fishery profiles and the corresponding scores and FIP ratings
5.2. Scientific working groups for key commodities (BSC, mahi mahi, BET, ITF, snapper, octopus) are created, SFP coordinators appointed, and work plans implemented in support of expert networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify experts for working groups (3-5 scientists per group x 7 target fisheries) b. Contract experts with specific terms of reference c. Appoint SFP coordinators to oversee the working groups d. Prepare working group work plans e. Implement working group work plans

Output	Activities
5.3. Information systems tailored to help industry stakeholders adopt proper procurement policies, provide them with advice on improvement actions in problematic fisheries, and track improvements being made toward set goals (i.e. FishSource, FIP Directory)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify specific information needs of stakeholders from target fisheries (scientific, industry and general audiences). b. Adjust protocols for information gathering, validation and publication in FishSource and FIP Directory. c. Implement updated protocols. d. Monitor and evaluate satisfaction of target audiences.
6.1. Best practices documented and experiences shared with other projects to incentivize change in other fisheries through IW:LEARN and project website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establish and maintain bilingual project website (i.e., English and Spanish). b. Establish and maintain linkages and interaction with IW LEARN, GCP, SFP, MSC, FIP Directory, and the platforms of the NFAs. c. Document and distil learnings through coordinated national, regional and international workshops in years 2 and 4. d. Participate in IWC8 and IWC9. e. Prepare three electronic publications with project learnings (with extended summaries in Bahasa Indonesia, Spanish and Tagalog). f. Midterm external independent evaluation on year 2 (final quarter) and final external independent evaluation on year 4 (last quarter).

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).

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF). Date of screening: March 10, 2013.

1. A strength of the design is that it calls for a comparative approach in which fisheries management initiatives are carried simultaneously in a diversity of contexts. The project focal area specific framework (Section 1) includes pollution abatement, port management, ICM and habitats (blue forest) restoration/conservation. At the PPG stage, proponents should clarify whether these non-fisheries topics would be considered for intervention, perhaps by stating that these are elements of the broader context within which fisheries management initiatives evolve.

The project will not directly address the above mentioned non-fisheries topics. Pollution abatement will be a topic indirectly addressed when working with value chain stakeholders in the sustainable marine commodities platforms (component 2 of the project) and the FIPs (component 3 of the project). The project will promote that both fishing and processing operations comply with national environmental regulations to prevent pollution of the marine and coastal areas. Similarly, habitat conservation will be a topic indirectly addressed. The project will not work with fisheries that operate in marine protected areas, on the contrary all activities are aimed at disincentive poaching and IUU.

2. The emphasis upon demonstration projects is strategically important. However, if the full benefits of learning and drawing lessons from a diversity of initiatives conducted in distinct governance contexts are to be drawn, the project needs to strengthen its lesson-drawing, monitoring, and evaluation component. The project should select a common conceptual framework that can be applied to all the demonstration projects and thereby promote a consistent approach to drawing conclusions. Those leading each country initiative should be brought together periodically, for example at 18 month intervals, to report on their strategies, progress made and the barriers encountered and how changes in the larger context within which they are operating is influencing their outcomes. Such comparative assessments are most useful when they apply a common conceptual framework and are managed by a competent facilitator familiar with the methods that are being applied. STAP recommends exploring the possibility for strengthening learning and evaluation component of demonstration projects.

The learning and evaluation component was strengthened and a learning approach was mainstreamed along the entire project, including a grid of digital platforms to facilitate stakeholders' interaction and dissemination of learnings and best practices. A strategy was designed to document and distil learnings in years 2 and 4. The main elements are:

1. In the last trimester of years 2 and 4, national two-day workshops will be organised in each country. The stakeholders of the SMCPs and FIPs will participate in these workshops to document advances, best practices and lessons. The memoirs of the workshops will be translated to English and Spanish for the benefit of a wider audience and published in the project website.
2. Afterwards, the results of the national workshops will be presented in one-day online regional workshops (i.e., America and Asia). These workshops will allow the exchange of experience among stakeholders and to identify commonalities in best practices and lessons. The memoirs of these workshops will also be translated to English and Spanish and published in the project website.
3. Finally, a one-day international online workshop will be held to present regional findings, exchange experiences and document best practices and lessons. This workshop will have simultaneous translation to facilitate participation of all the stakeholders. The memoirs of the international workshop will be in English, with an extended summary in Spanish to facilitate access to local audiences.

In the final year, the project will produce three electronic publications to document the experience, best practices and lessons. These publications will be in English with extended summaries in Bahasa Indonesia Spanish and Tagalog and will be widely available through the grid of electronic platforms.

3. An important issue will be to focus at the beginning of each country component on the degree to which the enabling conditions for new practices in fisheries are present - with particular emphasis on political will expressed as sustained governmental support for each initiative. The status of the enabling conditions should be characterized at the initiation of each country component and then periodically reviewed during program implementation. The governance baseline

documentation and subsequent monitoring through self-assessments provides for framework for the assessment of shifts in enabling conditions (LOICZ 2009).

This is an important recommendation that was mainstreamed into the project design. During the PPG: (i) enabling conditions for SMCPs and FIPs were assessed, and (2) the target fisheries were selected in consultation with the national fisheries authorities and key stakeholders. In year 1, before initiating work on SMCPs and FIPs, an in-depth sector analysis will be prepared in each country. This will allow to have a clear idea of the scenario at the beginning of the project, including willingness to contribute from public and private stakeholders and market conditions (e.g., level of market leverage). The enabling conditions will be monitored through the project and mitigation actions will be applied if necessary (see the project risk matrix).

4. The commodities and knowledge information system described in component 4, places an emphasis upon the delivery of actionable information to seafood buyers to assist them in assessing whether their sources of sea food are on track to meeting sustainability standards. This is a potentially useful strategy but should not replace learning and lesson drawing on the process of transitioning to sustainable fisheries at the fishers and national government levels. Project proponents are advised to consider introducing a coherent approach to knowledge and lessons learned during this project taking into account the entire supply chain of sea food products.

Component 4 was adjusted to facilitate information to all value chain stakeholders, from fishermen to international buyers, as well as interaction in the project website and FIP Directory. As mentioned before the project now incorporates a strategy to document and disseminate learnings along the entire supply chain of the target seafood commodities.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁵

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

NONE

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$150,000			
<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>
Technical review, assessments and preliminary studies	<i>53,500</i>	<i>50,698.82</i>	<i>1,500.26</i>
Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	<i>30,000</i>	<i>33,570.60</i>	
Financial planning and co-financing investments	<i>10,000</i>	<i>11,196.69</i>	
Validation workshop	<i>46,500</i>	<i>46,689.77</i>	
Completion of final documentation	<i>10,000</i>	<i>6,343.86</i>	
Total	150,000	<u>\$148,499.74</u>	1,500.26

¹⁵ 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.