



**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: Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas			
Country(ies):	Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam	GEF Project ID <sup>1</sup> :	5393
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	4753
Other Executing Partner(s):	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)	Submission Date:	Feb 18, 2014
		Resubmission Date:	April 15, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration (Months)	36
Name of parent program (if applicable):	Reducing Pollution and Rebuilding Degraded Marine Resources in the East Asian Seas through Implementation of Intergovernmental Agreements and Catalyzed Investments	Agency Fee (\$):	201,022
For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>			
For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			
For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

**A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>**

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co- Financing (\$)
IW-2	Outcome 2.1: Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs, ICM principles and policy/legal/ institutional reforms into national/local plans	Output 2.1: Agreed commitments to sustainable ICM and LME cooperation frameworks	GEFTF	600,000	2,613,525
	Outcome 2.2: Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs and local ICM frameworks demonstrate sustainability	Output 2.2: National and local policy/legal/institutional reforms adopted/implemented	GEFTF	327,217	2,856,000
	Outcome 2.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting of fish stocks with rights based management, ICM habitat (blue forest) restoration/conservation and port management and produce measurable results	Output 2.3: Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments	GEFTF	1,100,000	12,890,000
	Outcome 2.4: Climatic variability and change at	Output 2.4: Enhanced capacities for issues of	GEFTF	206,361	1,500,000

<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.

	coasts and in LMEs incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management and ICM principles	climatic variability and change			
<b>Total Project Cost</b>				2,233,578	19,859,525

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective: To improve the management of highly migratory species in the entire West and Central Pacific (WCPF) Convention area by continuing to strengthen national capacities and international participation of Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam in Commission activities**

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co Financing (\$)
<b>Component 1:</b> Regional governance for building regional and national adaptive capacity of Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam in the management of highly migratory stocks	TA	<p>1.1 Improved regional mechanisms for monitoring and assessment of highly migratory fish stocks and Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing in the POWP LME and the EAS LMEs <i>(Improved monitoring of oceanic tuna fisheries in the EAS: coverage increased by 40%)</i></p> <p>1.2 Enhanced capacity of technical staff, policy and decision makers in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam, to integrate climate change impacts on highly migratory stocks into management regimes</p> <p>1.3 Climate change concerns mainstreamed into national fishery sector policy in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam</p>	<p>1.1. 1.All three countries fully compliant with WCPFC requirements, and all relevant CMMs</p> <p>1.1.2. Countries routinely share information which contributes to development of harvest policy for oceanic tunas across the relevant LMEs and within the WCPFC framework; project coordinates with the EAS Program through the PEMSEA Resource Facility</p> <p>1.2.1. Climate change impacts on EAS and western part of POWP LME predicted and appropriate adaptive management strategies developed</p> <p>1.2.2. At least 4 skilled personnel per country trained to interpret climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and to develop adaptive management strategies.</p> <p>1.3.1. Indonesia: Climate change adaptive management strategy for oceanic fisheries developed and incorporated in national cross-sectoral climate change strategy.</p> <p>1.3.2. Philippines: Pool of experts (4) to mainstream climate change concerns into the national fisheries sector</p>	GEFTF	700,000	3,500,000

			<p>developed. Policies/strategies/plans/programs that integrate climate change into national fisheries regulations approved/implemented. 1.3.3. Vietnam: Climate change concerns articulated and integrated into the national fisheries policy</p>			
<p><b>Component 2:</b> Implementation of policy, institutional and fishery management reform</p>	TA	<p>2.1 Enhanced compliance of existing legal instruments at national, regional and international levels</p> <p>2.2 Adoption of market-based approaches to sustainable harvest of tunas <i>(At least two WPEA tuna fisheries certified)</i></p>	<p>2.1.1. Full and active participation in all WCPFC technical meetings by all three countries 2.1.2. Indonesia: Tuna management strengthened through applying scientific procedure using Reference Points (RPs) and Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) at national level once applied at regional level strengthened Archipelagic Water (AW) management regime. 2.1.3. Philippines: Improved compliance with CMMs of special concern to the Philippines such as FADs and other CMMs. 2.1.4. Vietnam: Incorporation of compatible measures into national legal frameworks. Improved incorporation of relevant WCPFC requirements Full application of relevant CMMs and development of reference points (RPs) and harvest control rules (HCRs) at national level.</p> <p>2.2.1. Indonesia: Supply chain characterized for all tuna fisheries, monitoring systems established and information regularly updated; CoC in place for selected fisheries. Fisheries Improvement Plan (FIP) implemented, and selected fisheries progressing towards full assessment 2.2.2. Philippines: Supply chain fully documents and regularly updated. Several</p>	GEFTF	1,228,899	14,656,000

			<p>tuna fisheries progressing towards full certification in collaboration with tuna associations</p> <p>2.2.3. Vietnam: Supply chain characterized for tuna fisheries, with emphasis on export-oriented fisheries, and monitoring system established; CoC in place for selected fisheries. FIP process fully implemented for longline/handline fishery</p>			
		<p>2.3 Reduced uncertainty in stock assessment of POWP LME and EAS LMEs highly migratory fish stocks, and improved understanding of associated ecosystems and their biodiversity</p>	<p>2.3.1. Sub-regional assessments undertaken with data available and assessment model restructured</p> <p>2.3.2. Indonesia: Indonesian data routinely included in regional and sub-regional assessments; National assessments for target species completed and regularly updated. Risk assessment of retained, by-catch and ETP spp. undertaken.</p> <p>2.3.3. Philippines: Comprehensive observer, catch sampling undertaken and risk assessment available for by-catch and ETP species.</p> <p>2.3.4. Vietnam: Sufficient data collected for national stock assessment of target tuna species. Information for risk assessment collected of retained and by-catch species and assessments undertaken. National level stock assessments of target tuna undertaken</p>			
		<p>2.4 Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) guiding sustainable harvest of the oceanic tuna stock and reduced by-catch of sea turtles, sharks and seabirds (Reduction of catch of Endangered, Threatened or</p>	<p>2.4.1. Application of ecosystem models to EAS</p> <p>2.4.2. Indonesia: Data collection to support application of appropriate ecosystem models. EAFM strategy developed in three FMAs (AW) for trial implementation in one FMA. EAFM conditions incorporated in revised</p>			

		Protected (ETP) species by 25%)	NTMP Mitigation measures fully applied; compliance with shark and sea turtle CMMs and NPOAs. 2.4.3. Philippines: Study area identified that applies EAFM for oceanic fisheries. NTMP revised to include EAFM. Mitigation measures fully applied; compliance with shark CMMs, Smart Gear developed. 2.4.4. Vietnam: Pilot application of EAFM at one site/fishery. Revised NTMP with EAFM included. Compliance with ETP CMMs and NPOAs			
<b>Component 3:</b> Knowledge sharing on highly migratory fish stocks	TA	3.1 Regional knowledge platform established on POWP LME and EAS LMEs shared tuna stocks and associated ecosystems	3.1.1. Active website maintained in collaboration with PEMSEA, and commitment to preparation and dissemination of project publication, newsletters and other information products 3.1.2. Consultative Forum activity widely reported. 3.1.3. Increased participation in international and (sub-) regional knowledge sharing events (one per year), such as IWLearn and related activities and the EAS Congress, equivalent to at least 1% of the budget.	GEFTF	198,318	613,525
Sub-Total					2,127,217	18,769,525
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>					106,361	1,090,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>2,233,578</b>	<b>19,859,525</b>

### 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 Co-financing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Other multilateral agency	WCPFC	Grant	75,000
		In-kind	3,200,000
National Governments	Indonesia	In-kind	2,500,000
		Grant	3,892,675
	Philippines	In-kind	4,335,850
		Grant	1,000,000
	Vietnam	Grant	1,000,000
		In-kind	3,700,000

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

GEF agency	UNDP	In-kind	1,156,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			19,859,525

**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
UNDP	GEFTF	International Waters	Global	2,233,578	201,022	2,434,600
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				2,233,578	201,022	2,434,600

<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	45,000	1,480,000	1,525,000
National/Local Consultants	243,000	465,000	708,000

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (select) No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D and 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 PIF<sup>4</sup>**

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

**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:**

NA

**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:**

NA

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

The project will fill an important gap between the management support provided to the UNDP/GEF Pacific SIDS through the Pacific Island Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (PIOFM), and the numerous initiatives on marine and coastal management in the East Asian Seas. PIOFM has assisted Pacific SIDS in building capacity in fisheries management, legal and compliance issues, and provided scientific advice and assistance, delivered through regional organizations, notably the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The new phase, together with FAO on Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) will focus on reforming laws and policies for implementation of WCPFC measures in the Pacific with a special emphasis on smaller SIDS. The three focal countries will not benefit directly from this project, but may be able to share capacity-building opportunities.

The Project will also coordinate its efforts with FAO's global Program on Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) which involves five t-RFMOS (including WCPFC) and will focus on sustainable and efficient tuna fisheries management through application of EAFM, reducing IUU fishing and mitigating adverse impacts of bycatch on biodiversity. The role of WCPFC within FAO/GEF ABNJ program has become clearer since the submission of the PIF and WCPFC is responsible for improving information and management of

---

<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

sharks with the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and to enhance bycatch management through the SPC. The GEF ABNJ program mostly focuses on areas near the Pacific Islands and does not have much coverage of the WPEA area. However, there is a need to cooperate on data collection and information sharing between the WPEA area and ABNJ on bycatch issues and sharks. This data and information will be provided to WCPFC through the proposed Project, and will be incorporated into the WCPFC database for better analyses and management of sharks and bycatch within its entire convention area, including ABNJ. The WCPFC will ensure that these thematic linkages are established and that valuable experiences and lessons learned are exchanged on activities of mutual interest.

Through PEMSEA, and its new project under the EAS programmatic approach on Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA), the Project will coordinate its activities with the East Asian LME initiatives of relevance, including:

- The UNEP/GEF Project, Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand funded by GEF-3 and implemented by UNEP in partnership with seven riparian states bordering the South China Sea. The project has resulted in several spin off projects currently under implementation or development on fisheries and establishment of fisheries refugia, with which synergies will be sought.
- The UNDP/GEF Sulu-Celebes Sustainable Fisheries Management Project with participation of Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. Expected outcomes of the project include: strengthening of institutions and introduction of reforms to catalyse implementation of policies on reducing overfishing and improving fisheries management; increased fish stocks of small pelagics through the implementation of best fisheries management practices in demonstration sites; and capture, application and dissemination of knowledge, lessons and best practices. This project is currently towards its final months ending in September 2014 and a successor project to implement the SAP will be initiated in GEF-6. For the work in Indonesia and the Philippines, coordination will be done at the regional level but primarily at the national level as the national implementing partners are the same.
- The UNDP/GEF project Arafura and Timor Seas Ecosystem Action Programme. This ecosystem is located at the intersection of the two major LMEs, the Indonesian Seas to the north and northern Australian waters to the south. Indonesia, Timor Leste and Australia are the participating countries in the project. The objective of the project is to ensure integrated, cooperative, sustainable, ecosystem-based management of the living coastal and marine resources in the Arafura and Timor Seas, through the formulation, intergovernmental adoption and initial implementation of a regional Strategic Action Programme. This project is winding down as it will end in June 2014. A follow-up SAP implementation project will be submitted in GEF-6. There is no thematic overlap in the projects as they have different focus. Nevertheless, there is scope for coordination through common implementing partners in Indonesia through the MMAF.
- Implementation of the Yellow Sea LME Strategic Action Programme for Adaptive Ecosystem-Based Management that is part of the EAS programme. Lessons will be shared on mechanisms and approaches for regional cooperation on ecosystem-based management.

The Project will also closely work with PEMSEA to ensure that its knowledge management activities become an integral part of the Knowledge Platform for Building a Sustainable Ocean-Based Blue Economy that will be established by PEMSEA.

The project will also coordinate its activities with the FAO/GEF project on Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch Management, which forms part of the GEF-funded CTI Programme. This project will engage the governments and private sector in Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Vietnam and Thailand to develop and adopt best practice guidelines for by-catch management in the shrimp trawling industry.



Finally, the project will establish close linkages with the ADB/GEF project on Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle: Southeast Asia (CTI-SEA), which will support the long-term conservation and sustainable management of coral reef ecosystems and other coastal and marine resources.

The proposed project is however the only one of all the initiatives in the East Asian Seas and the CTI that is currently targeting the management of highly migratory oceanic fish stocks although it is anticipated that new tuna-related projects will be formulated to address targets under Goal 2 of the Regional Programme of Action (RPOA) of the CTI.

The project will also coordinate with IW projects in the region that are in the pipeline of a number of GEF agencies. These include the following:

- UNDP-GEF Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities which is now in PPG phase and covering WPEA countries Indonesia and Philippines. The two projects have shared focus particularly on the supply chains and the engagement of the private sector and in commodities, but potentially only for tuna in Indonesia. The other commodities include snapper (Indonesia) and blue swimming crab (Philippines and Indonesia). Overlap in tuna work in Indonesia will be avoided through coordination with the design team of the Marine Commodities project. Complementation will be achieved through engagement with the private sector and supply chain work once the Marine Commodities project is in place.
- UNEP-GEF Implementing the Strategic Action Programme for the South China Sea which is cleared for WPI for the last work program in GEF-5. This project will implement the SAP and would have geographic overlap in the three countries. There is no overlap in thematic focus as this project is primarily about coastal management and not oceanic fisheries management. Nevertheless, opportunities for synergies in policy work will be explored with the PPG team for the UNEP project.
- FAO-GEF Enabling Transboundary Cooperation for Sustainable Management of the Indonesian Seas which cleared for WPI for the last work program in GEF-5. This is a foundation phase project to undertake a TDA and develop the SAP for the Indonesian Seas LME. The geographic overlap is in Indonesia although thematically it is expected that there is not much overlap considering the foundational stage of the project.

The preceding discussion shows the plethora of IW projects in the region. This project forms part of the EAS Program implemented by UNDP together with two other projects in the Yellow Sea and Implementation of the SDS SEA where program coordination is done through PEMSEA. There is value added in having a more formal coordination mechanism between and among UNDP, UNEP and FAO projects in the region to maximize synergy and impacts. Beyond this project, UNDP will seek dialogue with other GEF agencies towards this end.

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

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

The project will engage global, regional and national stakeholders. The WCPFC will have the overall responsibility for coordination and implementation of activities at regional level and will forge stronger partnerships with other regional bodies and institutions, such as the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) and PEMEA. The project will engage the private sector through tuna fisheries associations, WWF, the tuna industry and other CTI partners. At the national level, Ministries in charge of fisheries in the three participating countries will be responsible for implementing monitoring and stock assessment programs. The

Ministries will also ensure national reforms in the fishery sector for coordinated and adaptive management of oceanic fish stocks in response to anticipated climate change impacts and coordination with other relevant sectors.

Stakeholder	Relevant roles in project
WCPFC	Regional coordination and implementation, project executing partner.
PEMSEA Resource Facility	Coordinating EAS Programme
CTI	CTI Regional Plan of Action – IUU and EAFM
<i>Lead national ministry/institutions</i>	
<p>INDONESIA Directorate General of Capture Fisheries (DGCF/MMAF) Research Center for Fisheries Management and Conservation (RCFMC/P4KSI)</p> <p>PHILIPPINES Bureau of Fisheries And Aquatic Resources (BFAR/DA) National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI/BFAR)</p> <p>VIETNAM Directorate of Fisheries (D-Fish, MARD) Ministry of Agriculture and Resource Development (MARD) Dept. of Capture Fisheries and Resource Protection (DECAFIREP)</p>	<p>Data management, implementing WCPFC CMMs, fisheries legislation, observer program Data collection, port sampling, EAFM/biological research,</p> <p>Project oversight, observer programs, MCS, IUU</p> <p>Data collection , port sampling, EAFM</p> <p>Policy and legal issues Project oversight</p> <p>Data collection, port sampling, observer program, database management, adaptive management, climate change</p>
<i>Other national ministries</i>	
<p>INDONESIA DG of Surveillance of Marine Resources and Fisheries (DGSMRF) Ministry of Environment</p> <p>PHILIPPINES Bureau of Agricultural Statistics (DA) National Tuna Industry Council National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (FARMC) Philippines Fisheries Development Authority (PFDA)</p> <p>VIETNAM Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural Resources and Environment (SPONRE) Provincial Peoples Committees (PPCs)</p>	<p>MCS and IUU monitoring</p> <p>GEF Focal Point, environmental policy</p> <p>Fisheries statistics Policy advice Policy advice</p> <p>Port sampling, landings data</p> <p>Environmental management, climate change</p> <p>Environmental and climate change policy Inshore fisheries (&lt; 24nm) management and administration</p>
<i>Provinces/regions in each country</i>	
<p>INDONESIA Sulawesi Utara (Bitung) Sulawesi Selatan (Kendari) Papua (Sorong) Sulawesi Tengah (Mamuju)</p> <p>PHILIPPINES 11 Regions (1,3,4b, 5,6,8,11,CARAGA, ARMM) and 15 sites</p> <p>VIETNAM Binh Dinh Province Khanh Hoa Province</p>	<p>Data collection and port sampling sites</p> <p>“</p> <p>“</p> <p>“ (to be initiated 2014)</p> <p>28 enumerators deployed for data collection, port sampling</p> <p>Data collection and port sampling provinces (intensive)</p> <p>“</p>

Phu Yen Province Da Nang Municipality, Provinces of Quang Nam, Quang Ngai,, Ninh Thuan, Binh Thuan, Baria Vung Tau	“ Data collection, port sampling (upgrade from trial in 2013) “ “
<i>NGOs</i>	
WWF Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (?)	Fisheries Improvement Plans (FIPs), EAFM pilot studies, observer programmes
<i>Scientific/Academic institutions</i>	
INDONESIA Komnas Kajiskan (National Committee on Fish Stock Assessment) Bogor Agricultural University, Centre for Coastal and Marine Resources Studies University of Indonesia, Faculty of Law PHILIPPINES Mindanao S U (General Santos) VIETNAM Research Institute for Marine Fisheries (RIMF), Haiphong, Vietnam Nha Trang University (Fisheries) CSIRO (Australia)	Stock assessment training and collaboration  Fisheries training, fisheries profiles  Legislative reviews  Data collection, port sampling  Stock assessment training, risk assessment, observers Fisheries technology, observers, seafood technology FAD research, data collection, tuna genetics (Indonesia)
<i>Multi-lateral organizations</i>	
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) FFA SEAFDEC Asean TWG CTI Regional Secretariat and CTI Working Groups	Training, database technical assistance Liaison with PIOFM project Liaison and cooperation in various aspects of project Regional policy on post harvest and data collection IUU and other areas to be determined
<i>Bilateral organizations</i>	
ACIAR	Tuna research/supply chain data (Indonesia)
<i>Private sector companies</i>	
Indonesia	
Harini Asri bahari	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attending consultation meetings and workshops (e.g., meetings for updating National Tuna Management Plan, estimating national annual tuna catch, reviewing policy, legal and institutional arrangements of tuna fisheries, etc.);</li> <li>• Cooperation in the provision of data and verification process for the estimates of total tuna catch by industries;</li> <li>• Provision of tuna imports and exports data;</li> <li>• Cooperation in the facilitating of observers on-board deployment and provision of logsheets;</li> <li>• Coordination and/or implementation of the Fisheries Improvement Program (FIP);</li> <li>• Comply with various WCPFC CMMs (VMS, Logbook, IUU, etc.);</li> <li>• Arranging meetings and workshops at provincial level; etc.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Sari Harta Samudera	
Ocean Mitramas	
Aneka Loka Indotuna	
Bina Nusa Mandiri Pertiwi	
Etnieko Sara Laut	
Harini Nalendra	
Jaya Bali Bersaudara	
Jaya Kota	
Lautan Lestari Abadi	
Karunia Laut	
Skipjact Indonesia Pratama	
Agrindo Bahari Kencana	
Agrindo Mina Bahari	
Arabikatama Khatulistiwa Fishing Industry	
Aru Samudera Lestari	
Fischo Marindo Utama	
Jaya Bali Bersaudara	
Indonesia Tuna Association	
Mentari Prima Bahari	
Pathe Maang Raya	
Perikanan Nusantara	
National Fishing Fleet Associaon	
Starcky Indonesia	

Wailan Pratama	
Waranei Perkasa	
Firgo Internusa	
Bitung Fishing Industries Association	
Indonesia Pole and Line, Handline Association	
Indonesia Fish Canning Association	
Philippines	
SOCKSARGEN Federation OF Fishing Industries Inc. (SFFAI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attending consultation meetings and workshops (e.g., workshops for revising National Tuna Management Plan and Operations Guide for Filipino Fishermen, National Tuna Annual Catch Estimates Workshop, National Tuna Fishery Profiles, etc.);</li> <li>• Arrange meetings/workshops at provincial level;</li> <li>• Cooperate in the provision of data and verification process for the estimation of annual total tuna catch by industries;</li> <li>• Comply with various WCPFC CMMs (e.g. observer, VMS, etc.);</li> <li>• Continue to support and facilitate on-board observers and provision of log sheets; etc.</li> </ul>
Frabelle Fishing	
Confederation of Fishing Industries (ConFed)	
RD Fishing	
San Lorenzo Ruiz Fishing	
CHL Fishing	
Trinity Homes Industrial Corp	
TSP Marine Industries	
Trans Pacific journey Industries Corp	
Marchael Sea Ventures	
NH Agro Industrial Corp	
Umbrella Fish Landing Association	
Roel Fishing	
Rell and Renn Fishing Corp	
Damalerio Fishing Corp	
Other tuna companies (e.g. General Tuna Canning Corp.)	
Vietnam	
Vietnam Tuna Fisheries Association (VINATUNA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attending national meetings and workshops convened by Government agencies (e.g. legal and policy review meetings, revising National Tuna Management Plan workshops, Climate Change Capacity Building training courses, etc.);</li> <li>• Coordination and/or implementation of Fisheries Improvement Program (FIP);</li> <li>• Arranging and funding meetings/workshops at provincial level;</li> <li>• Provision of tuna fisheries data, participation in workshops for the estimation of national annual tuna catches, and verification process of tuna catches by industries;</li> <li>• Comply with various WCPFC CMMs (e.g. IUU, observer, VMS, etc.), etc.</li> </ul>
Binh Dinh Tuna Fisheries Association	
Khanh Hoa Tuna Fisheries Association	
Phu Yen Tuna Fisheries Association	
Culimer Vietnam Co., Ltd	
Tin Thinh company	
Vinh Sam company	
Thinh Hung company	
Hai Vuong company	

**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 (LDCF/SCCF):**

Oceanic fisheries make significant contributions to employment, nutrition and trade. The stagnation or decline of capture fishery production in many parts of the world underscores the importance of protecting and sustaining the highly migratory fish stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian seas for global food security, employment and trade. The migratory fish stocks in the region have been the source of most of the growth in employment and trade in the fisheries sector in Asia, and it has been shown that international trade in fisheries products has a positive effect on food security in many countries. For example, in the Philippines more than 1.5 million people depend on the fishing industry for their livelihood. The fishing industry's contribution to the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2009 was 2.4%. Indonesia's marine region associated with the WCPFC Convention Area

account for the equivalent of 59.8% of the total national tuna production. Vietnam's tuna export value increased over twenty times from 22.98 million US\$ in 2000 to approximately USD 569 million in 2012. The combined value of tuna exports from the three countries in 2012 exceeded USD 1.5 billion.

Moreover, the fishery sector provides income to millions of women in East Asia. They are important players in the fish supply chain, mostly in fish processing and marketing activities. The export supply chain is often complex, with product passing through several hands and stages of value-added processing before shipment to diverse markets, and it is therefore difficult to provide exact numbers of women involved, but several processing steps employ a significant number of women, such as the canning sector that continues to grow in all three countries. The Project will ensure the participation of women in all its activities and will target at the minimum, 30 percent women participation in the national, regional and international capacity building activities. It will, to the extent possible, provide equal access to and benefits from the Project resources to both men and women. The project will undertake gender-disaggregated monitoring of its activities, outputs and impacts.

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

The regional approach to sustainable management of highly migratory fish stocks promoted by this project will be conducive to cost-effectiveness as it will promote sharing of experiences between Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam on how to meet the requirements for full and effective participation in the WCPFC. The WCPFC in turn will pool its efforts in the EAS under one consistent project minimising its transaction costs for strengthening the governance of the EAS with respect to management of oceanic tuna. The project will also help to reduce the costs of sustainable management by i) helping to ensure that threats are addressed at source (a pre-emptive rather than reactive approach) and ii) maximising the involvement in, and commitment to, sustainable management of oceanic tuna stocks by a wide range of stakeholders including the tuna industry and environmental NGOs. Cost-effectiveness will be further promoted by working with, and through, existing national institutions that already have organisational and logistical capacities established at national and provincial levels, thereby limiting the level of investment that the project will need to make in such capacities. In addition, it is important to note that the leverage factor for this project is 1:9, based on country and non-country level commitments for co-financing of about USD20 million.

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

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

#### **Project start:**

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 3 months of project start with the full project team, participating countries representatives, co-financing partners, the UNDP-Manila and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as well as UNDP-GEF (HQs) as appropriate. A fundamental objective of this Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objective, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the SRF matrix. This will include reviewing the SRF (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-Manila and RCU-Bangkok staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.

- b) Based on the project results framework and the GEF IW Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

#### **Quarterly:**

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

#### **Annually:**

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (1July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

#### **Periodic Monitoring through site visits:**

UNDP-Manila and the UNDP RCU in Bangkok will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

#### **Mid-term of project cycle:**

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as

recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by UNDP-Manila based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit in Bangkok and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The GEF IW Focal Area Tracking Tool will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

### **End of Project:**

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-Manila office based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit in Bangkok and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

The GEF IW Focal Area Tracking Tool will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

### **Learning and knowledge sharing:**

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in *IWLearn*, and/or any other scientific, policy-based networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

### **Communications and visibility requirements:**

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The [GEF logo](#) can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF\\_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The [UNDP logo](#) can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at:

[http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08\\_Branding\\_the\\_GEF%20final\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf).

Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

### **M & E workplan and budget**

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"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 22,700	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>▪ Oversight by Project Manager</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RTA</li> <li>▪ UNDP EEG</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 35,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team,</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost : 35,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ local consultant</li> </ul>	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 101,700 (less than 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
Mr. Dana A. Kartakusuma	Special Advisor to the Minister on Economic and Sustainable Development Affairs	Ministry of Environment, Indonesia	04/01/2013
Ms. Analiza Rebuelta-Teh	Undersecretary	Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines	01/15/2013
Dr. Van Tai Nguyen	Director General, Institute for Strategic Policy of Natural Resources and Environment	<b>Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Vietnam</b>	01/07/2013

**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, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i.		18 February 2014	Jose Erez Padilla	+66 2 304 9100 ext 2730	jose.padilla@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).

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</b>						
<b>INDONESIA - Outcome 5:</b> Climate Change and Environment: Strengthened climate change mitigation and adaptation and environmental sustainability measures in targeted vulnerable provinces, sectors and communities						
<b>PHILIPPINES- Outcome 4:</b> Resilience Towards Disasters and Climate Change: Adaptive capacities of vulnerable communities and ecosystems will have been strengthened to be resilient toward threats, shocks, disasters, and climate change						
<b>VIETNAM – Focus Area One:</b> Inclusive, Equitable and Sustainable Growth						
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b>						
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b>						
<b>Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance</b>						
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: IW-2</b>						
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4</b>						
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b>						
	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>Project Objective<sup>5</sup></b> To improve the management of highly migratory species in the entire West and Central Pacific (WCPF) Convention area by continuing to strengthen national capacities and international participation of Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam in WCPF Commission activities		Status of harvesting of shared oceanic tuna stocks in the WCPF Convention area in the EAS vis-à-vis sustainability criteria set by the WCPF Convention  Application of market-based approaches to sustainable harvesting of oceanic tunas	WCPF Convention and its adopted Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) on e.g. IUU fishing, by-catch.  Current coverage in average of the three countries fishery monitoring is around 15%.  Little compliance with bycatch reduction requirement  No reflection of climate change in the current management framework  Tuna supply chains not well documented, no oceanic tuna fisheries in the EAS certified	Sustainable harvesting of oceanic tunas in the EAS, including: Improved monitoring of oceanic tuna fisheries in the EAS and coverage increased to 40%  Reduction of catch of ETP species by 25%  Enhanced adaptive capacity to manage oceanic fisheries in the EAS under climate change conditions through revision of management framework  Progress to possible certification of at least two oceanic tuna fisheries in the EAS, through FIPs	WCPFC reports and statistics	Changes in policy and decision makers, or other events beyond the control of the project, lead to changes in support for the project objective to improve the sustainable management of highly migratory species in the EAS

<sup>5</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<b>Component 1:<sup>6</sup></b> Regional governance for building regional and national adaptive capacity of Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam in the management of highly migratory stocks	1.1 Improved regional mechanisms for monitoring and assessment of highly migratory fish stocks and Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing in the POWP LME and the EAS LMEs	<b>Regional</b> (WCPF Convention area): Status of participation in WCPFC activities (CMMs, compliance monitoring, MCS etc.) and membership (CCM)	<b>Regional:</b> Close to full participation by Indonesia and Philippines as members; Vietnam not compliant in some aspects and CNM status	<b>Regional:</b> All three countries fully compliant with WCPFC requirements, and all relevant CMMs.	<b>Regional:</b> Annual forum meetings with extensive public reporting. Annual statistical reports and technical reports showing improved coverage and data quality. Signed agreement between WCPFC and PEMSEA	Political support for regional coordination activity, and participation by all parties and fishing entities. Membership acceptable to WCPFC (Vietnam)
		<b>National (common)</b> Formation of task force to prepare and package information for CF Comprehensive national databases for all aspects of oceanic tuna fisheries, including logsheet data, port sampling data, vessel register, MCS data, and bycatch. Comprehensive VMS, IUU monitoring and catch certification system in place for each country	<b>Indonesia:</b> National logbook monitoring system gradually being established under PSDKP MMAF, mainly starting to cover large vessels (>30GT) and not fully integrated with fisheries data. Species composition by gear by species currently available under port sampling programme covering only FMAs 716 (Bitung), 717 (Sorong) 714 (Kendari); Limited data from surveys by research vessel. Statistical data for AW fisheries are available, but biological data and scientific database to verify currently is not available (FMAs 713, 714, 715). VMS and catch certification scheme under development and limited application to deter IUU. No mechanism in place for regional knowledge sharing on oceanic tuna though CF	<b>Indonesia:</b> Logbook coverage of all commercial gears and fleets improved up to 50% for fishing vessels >30 GT (>50%); Coverage of artisanal fleet landings improved up to 50%; catch of retained and by-catch species well documented. Dependent and independent data available (port sampling, observer, logbook, surveys); Scientific database for archipelagic fish resources developed and implemented; extend port sampling to cover AW FMAs up to 25% VMS and catch certification system in place to address IUU. National task force in place for packing of information for CF	Reports from CF VMS compliance, IUU and catch certification reporting Database holdings listed  Reports of task forces in each country with information packaged for CF	Resources including trained manpower, available to implement monitoring systems and establish databases

<sup>6</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.

			<p><b>Philippines:</b>  Current monitoring coverage for small and medium scale tuna fisheries is less than 10% (development of prototype for small scale fisheries).  Current monitoring by VMS limited to PS/RN Phil-flag vessels operating in WCPO HSP1 and other countries' EEZs; limited application of VMS in Phil waters to address IUU.  Delays in manual submission of logsheets resulting in proposing an elogbook system to facilitate timely submission.  No mechanism in place for regional knowledge sharing on oceanic tuna</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b>  Monitoring systems established in three central provinces (Binh Dinh, Phu Yen &amp; Khanh Hoa) under WPEA in compliance with WCPFC requirements, but not covering for all gears and all other provinces.  Current coverage of monitoring landing data is around 35%  No bycatch data are currently documented  No integrated database system established  No mechanism in place for regional knowledge sharing on oceanic tuna.  VMS scheme being implemented but not yet integrated with fisheries data. VMS, IUU and catch certification scheme not in place - under development and initial implementation.</p>	<p><b>Philippines:</b>  Monitoring coverage for small and medium scale tuna fisheries improved by 30%.  VMS monitoring and/or other technologies applied to selected tuna fishers operating in the Phil national waters and WCP CA to reduce IUU  elogbook developed and pilot tested ready for implementation and adoption by stakeholders.  National task force in place for packing of information for CF</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b>  Monitoring systems expanded to 6 other provinces; increased coverage and quality of logsheet data for all tuna fishing fleets.  Landing data coverage of tuna fishing fleets significantly improved to 70%.  Catch of retained and by-catch species well documented.  Integrated database established within National Fisheries Statistics system, including data entry, verification and database maintenance.  National task force in place for packing of information for CF  VMS scheme being developed for selected fisheries to apply for catch</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				certification scheme and to reduce IUU		
1.2 Enhanced capacity of technical staff, policy and decision makers in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam, to integrate climate change impacts on highly migratory stocks into management regimes	Prediction of climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and development of adaptive management strategies  Capacity building to interpret climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and to develop adaptive management strategies and incorporate these into management regimes	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Some information available on impacts on POWP LME but model outputs not yet extended to EAS and integrated with existing data</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Climate change impacts on EAS and western part of POWP LME predicted and appropriate adaptive management strategies developed</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Workshop outputs and climate change stakeholder meeting reports</p> <p>Consultancy reports</p> <p>Reports and attendance of training and capacity building courses</p>	Expertise, appropriate climate change models and associated data available to predict impacts, as well as national/regional capacity to undertake necessary ongoing research and monitoring	
		<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Though National Climate Change Council established in 2008 (Presidential decree no 46/2008), climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and its ecosystems not studied and current analytical capacity in this area is very limited.</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> National climate change strategy developed, but impacts on oceanic fisheries and its ecosystems not yet studied and current capacity limited.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> Lack of trained/skilled personnel and no existing assessment of capacity needed to interpret climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and to develop adaptive management strategies.</p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Task force established to study climate change impacts on oceanic fishery sector; results of preliminary research/modelling on oceanic fisheries (SKJ) available; adaptive management strategies to mitigate impacts of climate change developed.</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> Trial prediction of climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries developed; 4 or more skilled personnel trained to interpret climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and to develop adaptive management strategies.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> Trial prediction of climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries developed; 4 or more technical staff, policy &amp; decision makers to integrate climate change impacts on highly migratory stocks.</p>	Reports with relevant data to support modelling activities and development of indicators of change and adaptation success.		
1.3 Climate change concerns mainstreamed into national	Incorporation of oceanic fisheries indicators and modelling outputs into overall national climate change strategy	<p><b>Indonesia:</b> National policy formulation specific to oceanic fisheries under climate change is very limited, but some information available for adjacent POWP LME, as a suitable</p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Climate change adaptive management strategy for oceanic fisheries developed and incorporated in national cross-sectoral climate change strategy.</p>	Inclusion of oceanic fisheries in national climate strategy, policy and legislation, as	Necessary outputs available from 1.2 (adaptive management strategies) and political acceptance of	

	fishery sector policy in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam	Policies/strategies/plans/program that integrate climate change into national fisheries policies and even legislation/regulations.	model/precedent.  <b>Philippines:</b> No pool of experts to mainstream climate change concerns into national fisheries sector policy. No specific regulations on climate change related to fisheries management established. RA9729: Philippine Climate Change Act of 2009 has served as the basis for the creation of the Climate Change Commission.  <b>Vietnam:</b> No inputs to national policy formulation on climate change currently available for Vietnam, nor to oceanic fisheries.	<b>Philippines:</b> Policies/strategies/plans/programs that integrate climate change into national fisheries regulations approved and/or implemented.  <b>Vietnam:</b> Climate change concerns articulated and integrated into the national fisheries policy	necessary	any recommendations and guidelines
<b>Component 2: Implementation of policy, institutional and fishery management reform</b>	2.1 Enhanced compliance of existing legal instruments at national, regional and international levels	Legal instruments fully compatible with WCPFC requirements, and compliance with WCPFC management requirements, including compliance with CMMs, ROP, RFV and application of reference points, and harvest control rules	<b>Regional:</b> No collaborative governance on tuna fisheries among the three countries and limited compliance with technical application of WCPFC requirements due to limited involvement in WCPFC's technical processes (SC and TCC)	<b>Regional: Sub-regional</b> collaborative governance on tuna fisheries established. Participation in WCPFC's technical processes enhanced through full participation in WCPFC technical meetings (SC, TCC and other technical WG meetings)	<b>Regional:</b> Compliance monitoring reports (CMRs) at TCC, annual reports to SC (Part 1) and TCC (Part 2) and participation in regular sessions of WCPFC.	Funding and personnel available to attend meetings;

			<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Some fisheries legislation under revision to accommodate all WCPFC requirements, framework for AW management through FMAs currently minimal but progressively being developed (7 FMAs); no RPs and HCRs considered yet as a scientific procedure.</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> Existing FAD management policy and other CMMs needs to be revisited for compliance, but Philippines currently compliant with most of the WCPFC CMMs.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> Limited compliance with CMMs or other management arrangements; no RPs and HCRs considered yet as a scientific procedure.</p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Tuna management strengthened through applying scientific procedure using Reference Points (RPs) and Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) at national level once applied at regional level; Archipelagic Water (AW) management regime established.</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> Compliance with CMMs of special concern to the Philippines primarily FADs committed.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> Incorporation of compatible measures into national legal frameworks and incorporation of relevant WCPFC requirements completed. Full application of relevant CMMs and development of reference points (RPs) and harvest control rules (HCRs) at national level.</p>	<p>Legislation reviewed/ revised, achieving compatibility with WCPFC requirements Reference points and HCRs developed and incorporated into national tuna management plans</p>	<p>Country status can be resolved and full membership in WCPFC achieved (Indonesia and Vietnam)</p>
2.2 Adoption of market-based approaches to sustainable harvest of tunas	<p>Supply chain characterized for tuna fishery sector, including processing, and custody systems <b>established</b> for tuna fisheries</p> <p>Improvements to fisheries to meet sustainable fishery standards for selected fisheries</p> <p>Number of private sector companies that cooperate in relevant project activities</p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited data available on supply chain, and monitoring and custody system not established for any fishery.</li> <li>Growing market demand for sustainable certification but limited eco-certification conducted</li> <li>30 companies already cooperate in project activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Philippines:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply chain complex, information available but not compiled</li> <li>Growing market pressure for ecolabelling certification relating to sustainable fishing. Several pre-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply chain characterized for selected tuna fisheries, monitoring systems established and information annually updated; custody system in place for selected fisheries.</li> <li>Eco-certification achieved for selected tuna fisheries.</li> <li>Sustained participation of 30 companies and increase in number of companies by at least 5 as appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b>Philippines:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply chain fully documents and annually updated.</li> <li>Several tuna fisheries progressing towards full certification.</li> <li>Sustained participation of 16 companies and increase</li> </ul>	<p>Reports with characterization of supply chains and information regularly updated and made available to CF</p> <p>Reports documenting eco-certification for selected fisheries, with custody systems</p>	<p>Selected fisheries able to meet required standards</p>	

			<p>assessments initiated. 16 companies already cooperate with BFAR</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> Incomplete data available on supply chain and chain of custody scheme not established for any fishery MCS pre-assessment of yellow fin/big eye hand line and long line fishery unfavourable and need for FIP identified. 9 companies already cooperate in project activities</p>	<p>in number of companies by at least 5 as appropriate</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> Supply chain characterized for tuna fisheries, with emphasis on export-oriented fisheries, and monitoring system established; CoC in place for selected tuna fisheries. FIP process implemented for long line/hand line fishery Sustained participation of 9 companies and increase of companies by at least 5 as appropriate</p>		
2.3 Reduced uncertainty in stock assessment of POWP LME and EAS LMEs highly migratory fish stocks, and improved understanding of associated ecosystems and their biodiversity	<p>Integration of data from oceanic tuna fisheries in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam into regional assessments of target tuna species</p> <p>Sub-regional/national assessments for target species; regular national assessments of target species</p> <p>Documentation and risk assessment of retained species and by-catch, including ETP species, in all fisheries/gears</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Assessments not explicitly available on sub-regional scale because of data gaps and lack of assessment model spatial structure</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Sub-regional assessments undertaken with data available and assessment model restructured</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Sub-regional assessments reported as component of regional assessments</p>	<p>WCPFC science provider able to undertake sub-regional assessment within new model area Resources available to undertake all necessary activity Necessary data collected to undertake national stock assessment and scientists adequately trained Necessary data gathered to undertake risk assessments of selected species</p>	
		<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Some target species data available from WPEA-1 with coverage of FMA 716, 717 and 714 for assessment. National stock assessment board exists and plans for national assessment underway. Limited information on retained/by-catch species and no risk assessment study for tuna by-catch and ETP species</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> Limited understanding of ecosystem supporting the oceanic tuna fishery. Retained species and by-catch species for all gears incompletely characterized.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b></p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b> Indonesian data included in regional and sub-regional assessments; National assessments for target species completed and annually updated. Risk assessment of retained, by-catch and ETP spp. undertaken. (National Commission for fish stock assessment)</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b> Comprehensive observer, catch sampling undertaken and risk assessment available for by-catch and ETP species.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b></p>	<p>Reports of assessment outcomes at regional and national level</p> <p>Updated FIPs with data incorporated to eventually meet requirements for full MSC assessment.</p> <p>Reports with national stock assessments to guide implementation of National Tuna Management Plan</p>		



			<p>Data collection on target species initiated under the WPEA project, but coverage incomplete for some fisheries; data not fully incorporated in regional assessments;</p> <p>Limited research on retained/by-catch species conducted but not regularly studied.</p> <p>Research surveys using two gears undertaken - no national stock assessment currently available but planned.</p>	<p>Annual total catch estimates produced and biological data collected for national and/or regional stock assessment of target tuna species.</p> <p>Information for risk assessment collected of retained and by-catch species and assessments undertaken</p> <p>National level stock assessments of target tuna undertaken</p>		
2.4 Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) guiding sustainable harvest of the oceanic tuna stock and reduced by-catch of sea turtles, sharks and seabirds	<p>Application of ecosystem modelling to EAS EEZs to complement those for POWP LME and EEZs</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Ecosystem models available for POWP LME but not EAS</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Application of ecosystem models to EAS</p>	<p><b>Sub-regional:</b> Model outputs applied to EAFM at national level</p>	<p>Funding and resources available to support sub-regional modelling</p> <p>Capacity building to support modelling activity and interpretation</p>	
	<p>Incorporation of EAFM principles in national tuna management plans</p> <p>Pilot scale application of EAFM for oceanic species at selected sites/fisheries</p> <p>Reduction of by-catch of endangered, threatened and protected (ETP) species, such as sea turtles, sharks and seabirds</p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b></p> <p>Limited data collected for the application of ecosystem modelling;</p> <p>Some commitment to EAFM exists through community-based activities.</p> <p>NTMP lacking EAFM components</p> <p>Turtle by-catch studied and some mitigation measures underway; shark catch and seabird interactions not well documented; low level of compliance.</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b></p> <p>No study of EAFM for oceanic fisheries, legal basis uncertain.</p> <p>NTMP may lack EAFM compatibility</p> <p>Turtle by-catch studies and some mitigation measures underway; shark catch and seabird interactions poorly documented; low level of compliance.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b></p> <p>No EAFM application and legal basis uncertain</p>	<p><b>Indonesia:</b></p> <p>Data collection to support application of appropriate ecosystem models.</p> <p>EAFM strategy developed for trial implementation in one FMA.</p> <p>EAFM conditions incorporated in revised NTMP</p> <p>Mitigation measures applied in selected fisheries; compliance with shark and sea turtle CMMs and NPOAs committed.</p> <p><b>Philippines:</b></p> <p>Potential study area that applies EAFM for oceanic fisheries selected.</p> <p>NTMP revised to include EAFM.</p> <p>Mitigation measures applied; Compliance with shark CMMs committed, Smart Gear developed.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b></p> <p>Pilot application of EAFM at one selected site/fishery</p>	<p>EAFM applied to selected tuna fisheries/sites</p> <p>Revised NTMPs with EAFM included</p> <p>Linkage to mitigation measures in adjacent areas; compliance with a range of CMMs in EAS</p>		

			No inclusion of EAFM in NTMP Few data on ETP species and no compliance on bycatch mitigation	Revised NTMP with EAFM included Compliance with ETP CMMs and NPOAs		
<b>Component 3 Knowledge sharing on highly migratory fish stocks</b>	3.1 Regional knowledge platform established on POWP LME and EAS LMEs shared tuna stocks and associated ecosystems	Monitoring and knowledge sharing between POPW LME and EAS LMEs for target and associated species and their management Commitment to information sharing at all levels amongst WPEA members and beyond Current provincial/FMA resource profiles updated and disseminated Participation in global knowledge sharing events	Limited information shared via WCPFC mechanisms, meetings and WPEA website and limited outreach to stakeholders at national and sub-regional level No interagency cooperation mechanism such as CF established Limited participation in knowledge sharing events, including IWLearn.	Active website maintained in collaboration with PEMSEA, and commitment to preparation and dissemination of project publication, newsletters and other information products Consultative Forum activity reported. Increased participation in international and (sub-)regional knowledge sharing events (one per year), such as IWLearn and related activities and the EAS Congress, equivalent to at least 1% of the budget.	Website promotion with hits recorded; feedback from stakeholders; project newsletter widely distributed.  Presentations at international and (sub-)regional knowledge sharing events available on IWLearn and EAS websites	Regional and national commitment to sharing of information on highly migratory stocks

**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).

1. GEF Secretariat comments at PIF approval

<b>Question</b>	<b>Secretariat comment</b>	<b>UNDP response</b>
Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes, the components and their outcomes and outputs is clear enough at this stage, but are to become much more quantifiable at the time of CEO Endorsement.  Include wording that explains how the activities under Component 1 are to become sustainable after project closure.	Quantifiable indicators and targets have been included in the Project Framework for all components and in the Project Results Framework (Annex A) and in the Tracking Tools.
Are global environmental benefits identified? Is the description of the incremental reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, however, please provide at time of endorsement a more explicit description of the incremental reasoning.	The incremental reasoning has been made more explicit and the global benefits are clearly identified in the Project Framework as well as in the GEF IW Tracking Tool.
Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means of their engagement explained?	Please include at time of endorsement a much more detailed analysis of the public stakeholder groups as well as other global, regional and national stakeholders.	This has been provided both in the ProDoc and in the CEO Endorsement Request that include a detailed list of stakeholders and their roles from global, regional to national level for all three countries.
Has co-financing been confirmed?	Do work during project preparation towards attracting more financial support from the private sector, as the buy in of the supply and processing chain of tuna seems to be central to that sustainable long-term management changes will take place.	Private sector firms feature prominently in the list of stakeholders who will be involved in the project, and it is to be hoped that these sources can be tapped during the project lifetime.

2. STAP comments

<b>STAP comment</b>	<b>UNDP response</b>
Strong scientific and technical links need to be developed with the FAO ABNJ project. Specific collaboration should be explored on testing the potential of Rights Based Management in conjunction with adoption of instruments such as the Port State Measures Agreement.	WCPFC will ensure close collaboration between the proposed project and the FAO ABNJ project in the area of reduction of by-catch of endangered, threatened and protected (ETP) species, such as sharks.
Regarding testing of market-based instruments, such as certification, the proponents should consider carefully the equity measures applied to developing countries.	Yes, this will be considered under outcome 2.2 as several tuna fisheries are progressing towards certification in collaboration with tuna associations.
The PIF does not include a component on project management, coordination, monitoring and assessment. STAP requests that these missing elements and an explanation of how the project will connect with the parent programme are detailed in the project brief.	A project management budget was already included in the PIF and the section on management arrangements and the ProDoc as well as the project budget notes further explain how the project management arrangements will work and be funded, following standard GEF and UNDP guidance.  Coordination, monitoring and assessment are part of

	<p>component 1, outcome 1.1., and output 1.1.2: Countries routinely share information which contributes to development of harvest policy for oceanic tunas across the relevant LMEs and within the WCPFC framework; project coordinates with the EAS Program through the PEMSEA Resource Facility.</p> <p>Monitoring and assessment is also part of Component 2 and the regional knowledge platform to be established under Component 3 will contribute to enhanced coordination and sharing of monitoring and assessment data.</p> <p>Activities that will deliver the output are detailed at regional level and by country in Annex 5 in the ProDoc.</p>
The project could examine the feasibility of spatial planning approaches, such as migration corridors and seasonal exclusion zones.	This will not be part of this project that is of limited size and scope, but linkages with the ABNJ programme will be developed in this regard.

### 3. GEF Secretariat Comments at CEO Endorsement

<b>GEF Review Comments</b>	<b>Responses &amp; Modifications</b>
<p><b>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</b></p> <p>March 5th 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes; however, see note in #7 regarding the need to clarify and quantify baselines in the Frameworks.</p>	<p>Refer to responses to item #7.</p>
<p><b>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</b></p> <p>March 5th 2014 (Ikarrer): Most of the outcomes have clear and quantified targets; however there are several that are quite vague and, therefore, need to be clarified. For example, in Outcome 1.1, "<u>Countries routinely share information</u>" - "<u>routinely</u>" needs to be quantified; for Indonesia "<u>coverage of artisanal fleet landings significantly improved</u>" - "<u>significantly improved</u>" needs to be quantified. Please review all the targets to ensure clear and quantified.</p> <p>Relatedly, the baselines need to be clear and quantified as well so that progress can be measured. In the above case for Indonesia, the baseline for coverage of artisanal fleet landings needs to be quantified (even if "none"). In Philippines the target is "improved by 30%" but the baseline level is not noted. Please review all baselines and edit to clarify and quantify.</p> <p>A few of the indicators do not have relevant targets. In particular: 1) Outcome 1.1 Indicator is "Improved...and IUU..."; however targets related to IUU are not provided for the nations nor are baselines provided except for Vietnam.</p> <p>2) Outcome 1.2 Indicator is "Prediction of climate change</p>	<p>Baseline, Targets and Indicators in the Project Results Framework have been revised following recommendations from GEFSEC:</p> <p>1.1 <u>Sub-regional</u> target have been changed to: Countries once a year share information; <u>Indonesia</u> targets have been changed to: Logbook coverage of all commercial gears and fleets improved up to 50%...; Coverage of artisanal fleet landings improved up to 50%...</p> <p>The baseline has also been revised and quantified for all three countries.</p> <p>1) IUU: targets and baselines have been clarified for each country</p> <p>2) It has been explained that 'trial prediction of</p>

impacts on oceanic fisheries and development of adaptive management strategies"; however these are not explained for Philippines and Vietnam targets. Since Outcome 1.3 discusses climate change policies, perhaps could move the indicator to Outcome 1.3 where there are relevant targets.

3) Outcome 1.3 Target for Philippines of 4 experts is already noted under Outcome 1.2 (and more relevant to Outcome 1.2; perhaps delete in Outcome 1.3 as still have regulations as target for Philippines)

4) Outcome 2.1 Outcome is "Enhanced compliance of existing legal instruments..."; however, the regional target is participation in meetings. This regional target needs to relate to legal instruments. In the text, there is discussion regarding developing governance among these three nations as a subset within WCPFC, which might be appropriate to create a target. The regional target noted under Outcome 1.1 (all three countries fully compliant with WCPFC requirements, and all relevant CMMs) might be appropriate here as ties to legal instruments.

Note that minimum of 1% of funds need to be clearly allocated for IWLearn related activities and noted in the Frameworks.

Please ensure the B. Project Framework information matches the Annex A. Project Results Framework. For example, the Project Results Framework does not include in Outcome 1.1 "Improved monitoring of oceanic tuna fisheries in the EAS: coverage increased by 40%", which is noted in the Project Framework. Please cross-check throughout for consistency.

With regard to sustainability, further explanation is needed regarding financial and institutional sustainability. In particular, it is noted that the WCPFC will continue to support to the full participation of the three countries in the Commission. How can that be continued in the future - where will the funding come from to replace GEF funding?

Finally, private sector engagement is an important aspect of this project (see comment in #17 below. While certification of a fishery is useful, please include at least one more indicator / target to reflect private sector engagement (e.g. # of suppliers

climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries will be developed in both Philippines and Vietnam.

3) The target of 4 experts for the Philippines has been deleted under 1.3, but kept under 1.2.

4) The regional target has been changed to: Sub-regional collaborative governance on tuna fisheries established. Participation in WCPFC's technical processes enhanced through full participation in WCPFC technical meetings (SC, TCC and other technical WG meetings). As noted, the target is linked to the target under 1.1 on full compliance with WCPFC.

The 1% allocation to IWLearn is incorporated in output 3.1.3. Increased participation in international and (sub-) regional knowledge sharing events (one per year), such as IWLearn and related activities and the EAS Congress

This has been addressed and added to the Project Results Framework where it was reflected at Project Objective level.

WCPFC has its Convention which requires its members to fully comply with the work of the Commission. Full compliance is the member's obligation. So the three participating countries will have an opportunity to gradually take over key project activities such as tuna catch data collection within 3 years with their own budget.

Project activities on certification issues will be minimal in the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase project (such as limited to feasibility study on implementation of certification or preliminary research on the impacts of certification process on fishery monitoring and harvesting) and/or just apply to Vietnam. Refer to Annex 5 (Project Activity) in the Project Document.

Annex 7 listing the private sector companies to be involved in the project and the expected nature of involvement is added in the project document.

<p>that have invested in fishing communities to move them toward sustainability).</p>	<p>A new indicator on number of private sector companies that cooperate in project activities is now included under outcome 2.2, with the baseline as indicated in Annex 7</p>
<p><b>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</b></p> <p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Following up on the PIF request to explicitly describe the incremental benefits (as well as the note by the STAP regarding explaining ties to the FAO project), a much more thorough explanation needs to be provided regarding how this project will build upon existing initiatives and how it will ensure complementarity (and not duplication). This is a major concern as there are several quite similar projects in the region and the Project Document does not adequately explain how this project contributes to regional needs beyond what is provided by existing projects; instead in only mentions that they will work together. At this stage there should be a very clear understanding of how this project contributes to this wealth of projects on fisheries in the region. In addition to the projects noted in the Pro Doc, the following projects also need to be addressed: UNDP Marine Commodities (which has sites in Indonesia and Philippines); WCPFC Tuna Project and the FIP Project. In addition, please note it is important to commit to working with upcoming projects, for example, a fisheries related project is under discussion for Indonesia Seas.</p>	<p>The linkages between this project and the UNDP/FAO-GEF project <i>Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS)</i> and the FAO-GEF project <i>Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)</i> are described in the section on incremental benefits. The description shows the complementarity among these three interrelated projects to ensure the sustainable management of oceanic fishery resources in the WCP Convention area.</p> <p>The description and linkages with other projects are done in Section 5 – Coordination with related initiatives (item 12).</p>
<p><b>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</b></p> <p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): While general information was provided in the PIF, at this stage a more thorough explanation is warranted for the Pro Doc (see comment in #8).</p>	<p>Refer to additional text in Section 5 – Coordination with related initiatives.</p>
<p><b>13. Comment on the project’s innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</i></li> <li>• <i>Assess the project’s strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</i></li> <li>• <i>Assess the potential for scaling up the project’s intervention.</i></li> </ul> <p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Once comments above and below are addressed will have a stronger sense of how the project will be sustainable and scalable.</p>	<p>The project completes the work on tuna and other oceanic fishery resources in the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention area, together with the UNDP/FAO-GEF PIOFM project and its successor project and the FAO-GEF project on ABNJ to ensure achievement of GEBS. This project supports the countries (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam) to meet their obligations in the WCPF Convention.</p> <p>With respect to sustainability, additional clarification is included in the prodoc.</p>
<p><b>17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co- financing been confirmed?</b></p> <p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): The Project</p>	<p>Refer to Annex 7 for the list of private sector companies that have been engaged in the preparation of the prodoc and the scope of engagement in the project. There is also information provided in the table in “Stakeholder</p>

Document indicates there are plans to work with the private sector. As indicated at the PIF review, we expected there to already have been extensive discussions during the PPG phase with the private sector to the point of seeking financial support. While it seems the private sector has not committed to financial support, what has been the nature of your discussions with the various regional and national businesses and organizations listed in the Pro Doc? What is the nature of your relationship with these institutions? What activities will they be engaged in, which institutions will be engaged and what is their commitment to engagement?

Along with the point regarding how this project fits with existing initiatives, this is a critical point to address.

Analysis”. The level of engagement of the private sector varies from one country to the other. In the Philippines where the development of the Tuna Management Plan is most advanced, the commitment is the strongest. However, it is expected that their engagement in Vietnam and Indonesia will intensify in this phase of the project with the work on FIPs. During the PPG, the continuing involvement and commitment of the private sector in the ongoing work on access and provision data and implementation of various CMMs requiring their participation.

It is expected that the private sector may be requested to provide some form of cofinancing in the FIP and in finalizing the Tuna Management Plans. Their contributions will be tracked during implementation and will be reported through the PIR process.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>7</sup>**

- Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD60,000			
<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>
International Consultants	29,300	57,400	
Local Consultants	3,000	0	
Travel	9,200	1,411	
Supplies	500	184	
Training/consultation (National Workshops)	18,000	674	331
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>59,669</b>	<b>331</b>

<sup>7</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