



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: Integrated adaptive management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in a Changing Climate			
Country(ies):	Russian Federation	GEF Project ID: ¹	4658
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	4485
Other Executing Partner(s):	UNOPS	Submission Date:	23 September 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	GEF-Russian Federation Partnership on Sustainable Environmental Management in the Arctic ("Arctic Agenda 2020")	Project Agency Fee (\$):	288,990
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>			
➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			
➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-3	Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of waterbodies and local ICM principles	National inter-ministry committees established; Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses & Strategic Action Programmes; local IWRM or ICM plans	GEF TF	3,211,000	10,083,800
(select) (select)			GEF TF		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
Total project costs				3,211,000	10,083,800

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Sustainable and integrated ecosystem-based management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in the context of climatic variability and change						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. State of the WBS LME within the framework of the 5 LME modules of productivity, fish and fisheries,	TA	Mutually agreed priority transboundary issues of the WBS LME, their immediate and root causes'.	A multi-country technical/scientific assessment (TDA) of TB priority issues, immediate and root	GEF TF	677,410	1,400,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

<p>pollution and ecosystem health, socioeconomics, and governance</p>		<p>Better understanding of the functioning of the WBS LME and its major problems.</p> <p>Understanding of the climate change impact on the functionality of the WBS LME</p> <p>Identify key knowledge gaps for ecosystem based management of the WBS LME and local ICM plans.</p>	<p>causes.</p> <p>A West Bering Sea specific geospatial database within the framework of the 5 LME modules and climatic data</p> <p>Strengthened joint collaborative long term monitoring system of changes in the WBS ecosystem. (co-financing)</p> <p>Ecosystem modelling to forecast changes in species composition and distribution due to changing climate.</p> <p>Scientifically sound Climate change scenarios for the Arctic including potential impacts on the marine living resources and coastal zone.</p>			
<p>2. National and regional, sustainable and integrated ecosystem-based management of the WBS LME and its coastal zone in a changing climate</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Appropriate governance reforms (policy, legal, institutional reforms) to address priority TB issues.</p> <p>Improved National inter-sectoral coordination for the sustainable use and management of WBS LME resources and its coastal zone.</p> <p>Improved national capacities to increase</p>	<p>Multi-country regional Strategic Action Programme for the management of the WBS LME resources and coastal zone.</p> <p>Targeted on the ground regional demonstration projects with relevant budgets and time frame (developed in line with the Russian Arctic NAP)</p>	<p>GEF TF</p>	<p>446,156</p>	<p>1,800,000</p>

		<p>level of bilateral inter-governmental cooperation and coordination in WBSLME management and assessment</p> <p>Proposal on regional joint management framework for the shared WBS LME.</p>	<p>Functioning National Inter-ministerial Committee.</p> <p>National level policies incorporating ecosystem based management approaches and ICM, new regulations and standards.</p> <p>Sustainability mechanisms to support joint long-term assessment and management of the WBS LME.</p> <p>Public and stakeholder participation mechanisms at national and international level to inform and catalyze decision-making processes.</p>			
3. Targeted demonstration projects.	TA	<p>Innovative solution for the safety of navigation and prevention of environmental degradation from maritime transport in the Bering sea and Bering straits.</p> <p>Innovative approaches for cooperative management of shared resources and coastal zone under the</p>	<p>Pilot Marine Electronic Highway Bering sea and Bering straits.(jointly with IMO)</p> <p>Sub-regional and local/coastal fisheries management demos, involving key stakeholders including indigenous people and coastal populations</p> <p>Integrated Coastal Zone Management</p>	GEF TF	1,199,074	5,683,800

		CC scenarios Increased public environmental awareness and education on key environmental issues and adaptation to climate change	pilots, involving key stakeholders including indigenous people and coastal populations. Environmental awareness and education programs for indigenous people and coastal populations			
4. Learning and Knowledge Management	TA	Best practice and experiences shared with similar LME projects, adding to the GEF IW portfolio on LMEs.	Transfer of lessons, experiences and best practices with other LME projects through IW:LEARN3 and LME/ICM Ocean Governance project. Functioning website consistent with IW:LEARN guidance. Participation in IW:LEARN3 activities and the LME/ICM COP.	GEF TF	663,384	400,000
Subtotal					2,986,024	9,283,800
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	224,976	800,000
Total project costs					3,211,000	10,083,800

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		In-kind	2,300,000
Others	NOAA	In-kind	6,200,000
Private Sector	CJSC “Koryakgeolgobycha”	In-kind	1,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	300,000
Other Multilateral Agency	IMO	In-kind	0

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

Others	IUCN	In-kind	100,000
National Government	FGUP VNIRO	In-kind	183,800
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			10,083,800

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
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				0	0	0

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.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	120,000	0	120,000
National/Local Consultants	1,041,950	0	1,041,950

F. 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, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

1. The SAP for Protection of the Russian Arctic was developed under the Russian NPA-Arctic Phase I Project and was approved by the Maritime Board at the Government of the Russian Federation, setting the goals, tasks, principal activities and targets in the area of protecting the Russian Arctic environment for the period up to 2020, including the prevention and abatement of the environmental pollution, preservation and improvement of the quality of environment and conditions for traditional nature use by indigenous people of the North, and the prevention and reduction of negative consequences of natural and human-caused disasters, including those caused by global climate change. Through analyses and gap-filling exercises, the proposed project will identify key activities to be undertaken in the WBS LME and strengthen institutional capacity through joint regional interventions which are in line with those identified and implemented under the Russian NPA.

2. The Russian-American Long-term Census of the Arctic (RUSALCA) was a collaborative effort between the Russian Federation and the USA towards joint long-term exploration and scientific research in the Arctic Sea regions, covering both the Bering and Chukchi Seas. The Programme commenced in 2004 and stemmed from the 2003 Memorandum of Understanding for World Ocean and Polar Regions Studies between NOAA and the Russian Academy

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.

of Science. RUSALCA's principal aim was to monitor the biological, geological, chemical and oceanographic characteristics of the Bering and Chukchi Seas to establish benchmark information about the region's environmental parameters as well as the distribution and migration patterns of the region's biota in the light of future climate change and variability.

3. Through its Marine Programme, WWF Russia is involved with local communities and the fishery sector, including coastal fishing enterprises, regional fishery councils and large industries such as the Alaska Pollock Catchers Association and Kamchatka salmon coastal fisheries, to promote the introduction of responsible fishing practices and ecosystem-based fisheries management (including the reduction by-catch and improvement of operational practices) and to combat Illegal Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing. WWF Russia's Marine Programme agenda is fully in line with the objectives of the fishery component of the WBS LME project. Synergies with WWF programme will be explored during the PPG.

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

4. Under the GEF-5 Focal Area Strategies for International Waters, the Project is fully in line with **GEF strategic objective** IW-3: "Support *foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem-based management of transboundary waters systems*". The project will meet the GEF IW-3 expected outcomes by (i) Agreeing on priority transboundary concerns of the WBS LME through a multi-country technical/scientific assessment (TDA equivalent) identifying priority issues, and their immediate and root causes; (ii) Identifying knowledge gaps and improving understanding of the state of the LME's functioning and in the context of climate change, through predictive ecosystem modelling, long-term monitoring (e.g. RUSALCA) and knowledge sharing (e.g. geospatial database); (iii) Catalyzing national and bilateral inter-governmental cooperation and coordination for sustainable and adaptive LME and integrated coastal management through governance reform, the formulation of a multi-state West Bering Sea-specific SAP and the establishment of a national inter-ministerial committee; (iv) Demonstrating and implementing innovative measures through targeted pilot projects, promoting cooperative resource management and safeguarding ecosystem productivity in the context of climate change and variability; and (v) Contributing to the GEF IW portfolio through knowledge sharing with other LME projects through IW:LEARN-3, and participating and coordinating with IW:LEARN-3 activities and the LME/ICM COP.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

5. UNDP's Strategic Plan for 2008-2013 approved by the UNDP Executive Board includes Managing Energy and the Environment for Sustainable Development (Goal 4), and includes the outcome Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environment and energy concerns into national development plans and implementation systems. UNDP has taken further internal steps to operationalise the mainstreaming elements of the Strategic Plan at a subsidiary level through its Water Governance Strategy endorsed by the UNDP Management Group in 2007. The Water Governance Strategy includes as one of its three Strategic Priorities Regional and Global Cooperation and the associated Outcome, Enhanced regional and global cooperation, peace, security and socio-economic development through adaptive governance of shared water and marine resources, and the principal Output, Assist countries to develop and implement cooperation on transboundary waters through multi-country agreements on priority concerns, governance reforms, investments, legal frameworks, institutions and strategic action programmes.

6. Notably, UNDP's work on improving governance of shared water and ocean resources incorporates both freshwater and marine water bodies and has for some time applied a "ridge-to-reef" approach recognizing the freshwater-marine continuum and important linkages between upstream water and land management and the health and integrity of downstream coastal and marine ecosystems.

7. In managing its LME and transboundary fisheries programmes, UNDP's Ocean Governance Programme (www.undp.org/water/ocean-coastal-governance.shtml) draws on a wide range of staff expertise in marine ecosystems, fisheries and marine/coastal resources management at HQ, in its Regional Centres, and through its network of Country Offices. Senior advisors at HQ and in regional centres all have relevant Ph.D.'s (fisheries economics, marine biology, environmental management/policy, marine resource economics, etc.). UNDP's cumulative LME portfolio, working in 11 different LMEs in all 5 UNDP regions covering over 100 countries, represents \$528 m. in total financing from GEF, UNDP, governments, donor partners and others. This represents the largest investment of any kind in advancing the sustainable, integrated, ecosystem-based management of LMEs, from which over 85% of the world's fisheries are harvested, which contribute \$12.6 trillion/year in goods and services to the global economy, and which provide livelihoods for nearly half a billion people, many in the world's poorest countries.

8. In terms of implementing GEF IW projects, UNDP has consistently delivered results through a broad range of international transboundary water interventions including the high-level adoption of 17 SAPs (8 in LMEs), eight of which are currently being implemented. UNDP has also strengthened or established 20 multi-country marine/coastal, river and lake basin management agencies or commissions.
9. For SAP implementation, especially, UNDP's results on market transformation and assistance to countries to catalyze significant resources to implement priority activities using limited public funds as leverage have been codified in the recent publication, *Catalyzing Ocean Finance*. UNDP aims to replicate these experiences.
10. UNDP also has a Strategy for Supporting Sustainable and Equitable Management of the Extractive Sector for Human Development (December 2012).
11. UNDP also has comparative advantage in supporting national policy reform process, on-ground implementation of coastal development planning and science-based governance of marine ecosystems.

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

12. The first UNDP project in the area was initiated in 1999, \$30,000 were invested in the development of the North Pacific Transboundary Fisheries Stock Conservation and Sustainable Management project, unfortunately the FSP project was not approved due to lack of GEF resources at that time.
13. In 2001-2003 UNDP financed with TRAC a preparatory assistance project (\$28,000). "Sustainable Socio-Economic Development with Indigenous People of the Russian North, Siberia and Far East." The objective of the preparatory assistance project was to prepare an integrated capacity building programme that will contribute to the sustainable socio-economic development of the indigenous communities in the Russian North, Siberia and Far East. The programme was built upon existing experiences of UNDP Russia and within the UNDP network as well as on cooperation with the Russian indigenous people associations (RAIPON and its regional organisations) and international donor community. The preparatory project has delivered the following outputs: Completed analysis of socio-economic environment in the Russian Arctic related to indigenous peoples; analysis of the indigenous livelihoods and potential development options; analysis of the development barriers; draft project document with the Russian Ministry of Economy.
14. In 2008-2009 UNDP financed (\$50,000) through the Bratislava Regional Centre a study and publication "Integrated climate change strategies for sustainable development of Russia's Arctic regions. Case study for the Murmansk Oblast". This was a scoping study to introduce TACC concept. This publication proposes broad approaches to CC analysis and adaptation in the Arctic for the various sectors including fishery and maritime transport and will be used during the preparation of the pre-TDA for the FSP.
15. UNDP Russian CO has co-financed the Kamchatka biodiversity conservation portfolio (Bering Sea basin) in the amount of \$50,000: conservation of wild salmon biodiversity, salmon fishery research and management, coastal biodiversity conservation. UNDP also mobilized substantive co-financing to the GEF-funded Kamchatka projects from CIDA (\$4 mln) and UNF/Moore Foundation (\$180,000).
16. In 2004, project "RUSALCA" started between NOAA and the Russian Academy of Science. The project principal aim was to monitor the biological, geological, chemical and oceanographic characteristics of the Bering and Chukchi Seas to establish benchmark (baseline) information about the region's environmental parameters as well as the distribution and migration patterns of the region's biota in the light of future climate change and variability.
17. As a follow up of this collaborative effort NOAA, Government of Russian Federation and UNDP are providing substantive financing to this baseline project in light of their long standing partnership in managing the LMEs of the world.
18. The NOAA Alaska Fisheries Science Center will provide up to \$1,2 million to the baseline project in order to support joint Russia-USA surveys of the West Bering Sea ecosystem on productivity, fisheries, oceanography, fish stock assessment, pollution and ecosystem health, socioeconomic impacts and governance practices analysis, UNDP will provide up to \$50,000 cash and \$50,000 in-kind on the development of the pre-TDA assessment of the status of the WBS ecosystem and organization of the bi-national scientific symposium to share state of the art info on status of the ecosystem as expert input to the TDA process under the FSP.
19. A firm scientific basis is essential in developing options for mitigating and adaptive actions during the present period of global warming. The LME approach recommends a baseline of information at the LME management scale of changing states of productivity, fish and fisheries, pollution and ecosystem health, and socioeconomic and governance conditions. This time-series information provides for assessment of the extent of overfishing, nutrient over-enrichment, habitat loss, and the progressive warming rates of surface water in LMEs around the globe, against which the success of

climate change mitigation and adaptive actions to advance sustainable development of marine goods and services can be measured.

20. The activities supported jointly by NOAA and UNDP under the baseline project, together with the existing bilateral cooperation of the two countries will form as strong scientific basis for the proposed GEF intervention. The proposed GEF project will therefore aim to extend spatial and temporal measurements compatible with the baseline project to continue to monitor ecosystem status and change in order to inform on the adaptive approach in the sustainable, ecosystem-based management of the WBS LME.

21. UNDP will also ensure the information flow and best practices exchange between the proposed project and other LME GEF and non-GEF supported interventions through the UNDP financed Water Wiki portal and GEF IW: Learn project.

22. The WBS LME is a highly productive and species-rich region situated off the northeast coast of the Russian Federation opposite Alaska (US territory) that encompasses the Russian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and the intensely exploited international waters of the deep Aleutian Basin. Global significance of the Bering Sea and its coastal area is determined by its high biological productivity, diversity and unique flora and fauna, as well as the availability of strategic mineral reserves in the coastal territories. Biological productivity of the Bering Sea, due to nutrients brought up to surface waters by deep sea currents in a quasi-stationary nutrient cycle, is comparable with most productive areas of the World Ocean. The Bering Sea is also potentially important for navigation, since its northern part – the Bering Strait – is the marine “gateway” to the Arctic. Given the current warming and melting ice of Arctic seas, the Northern Sea route is becoming a global transportation route. In this situation the key shipping direction from Europe to China and other Asian Pacific Region (APR) countries would go through the western part of the Bering Sea. Subsoil of the continental shelf of the Bering Sea and adjacent territories hold promise for exploration and development of hydrocarbon deposits. The area is thus important for its biological productivity, its mineral resources and its strategic location for transport.

23. The magnitude and nature of the WBS LME’s biological productivity has provided for both indigenous and non-indigenous communities living in the region’s coastal and inland settlements for over 200 years. However, this important ecosystem is now showing signs of stress, which include declines in fishery yields, marine mammals and seabird populations, increased levels of contaminants in the coastal waters, sediments and bio-accumulated in the food chain, and a reduction in the cover of seasonal sea ice. The observed changes in the ecosystem threaten the productivity and biodiversity of this ecosystem and hence the livelihoods, food security and health of the communities that have remained dependent upon these resources for generations. The purpose of the proposed project is to achieve sustainable and integrated ecosystem-based management of the WBS LME whilst taking into account the increasing need for adaptation to climate change and variability. The project will aim to meet this through identifying the priority concerns affecting the LME’s status as well as their underlying root causes, and by integrating these in a national ecosystem-based management framework founded on regional and bilateral coordination and cooperation.

24. The Draft TDA for the West Bering Sea LME (included as an appendix), using the modular LME Approach (productivity, fish and fisheries, pollution and ecosystem health, socioeconomics, and governance) identified five key perceived threats to the aquatic ecosystem: 1) Deterioration of seawater quality; 2) Depletion of the commercially valuable fish stock and variable catches of living marine resources; 3) Deterioration of the quality of coastal environment and alteration of living conditions including those of indigenous northern minorities; 4) Increased influence of global processes and human activities in catchment areas on the marine ecosystem; and 5) The indeterminate status of the WBS LME and its coastal zone in a changing climate.

1. Deterioration of seawater quality

25. Pollution in the WBS LME is primarily related to land-based sources, oil and gas exploration and maritime transport, and the long-range transboundary transport of PTS via atmospheric and oceanic pathways. The contamination resulting from these activities has led to rising levels of PCBs, DDT, Dioxins and heavy metals in sediments, sea-ice, marine organisms and humans. The increased levels of contaminants has amplified the pressure on populations of some already vulnerable species, (e.g. the Steller sea lion, White-Winged scoter, and polar bear). The bioaccumulation of such contaminants in commercial fish stocks, including salmon, plaice, cod and pollock, poses a further threat to fishery yields and profits, which has implications for employment and economic well-being, and is likely to affect both the commercial fishers and the indigenous populations.

26. Chemical pollution: The Bering Sea region has specific mechanisms for the global transfer of pollutant agents (PA) (e.g. atmospheric transfer, river run-off and sea currents), making the region a major recipient of transboundary pollution. The main pollutant types are: acid-causing substances (SO₂, NO_x, NH₃); POP, including DDT, HCH, DDE, PCBs, etc.; and heavy metals. Acid-causing substances are emitted by thermal power stations. There are no large sources

of POP in the region, and the existing local sources are related to active and decommissioned electrical facilities, barrels with used oils and other fuel and lubricants. There are only low inputs of Pb, Cr, Cd and from local sources; their flows to the region are primarily from transboundary long-range transfers. Overall, PA production and use is being reduced by regulatory measures, taken at national and international levels (Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants). Implementation of the conventions remains vital for the Russian Far East, however, as this area is affected by increasing transboundary PA transfer from South-East Asia and North America. These processes require more research.

27. **Oil pollution:** Low hydrocarbons pollution is related to atmospheric fallout of pyrogenous aromatic hydrocarbons and PAH in aerosols. Navarinshy Shelf of the Bering Sea has natural oil shows (hydrocarbon concentrations in seabed layers may be 2–3 times above background levels). Oil pollution is also caused by bilge water discharge from vessels along the Northern Sea Route. Potential hydrocarbons resources on the Russian Bering and Chukchi Sea shelves and contiguous coastal territories are estimated at 5–10 bln tons in oil equivalent. Potential development of these hydrocarbon resources poses danger for the LME. Existing databases on oil pollution of the Bering Sea marine environment are incomplete; there is also lack of proper control over bilge water discharge.

28. **Biological pollution:** Non-indigenous wildlife species have been registered: 24 new species not inherent to the Bering Sea ecoregion have been recorded to date. Non-indigenous flora and fauna penetrate the region on fishing vessels and other ships, primarily in ballast water, and on fishing gear.

29. **Mechanical pollution:** Plastic waste and lost synthetic fishing gear (cages, nets, trawls) are a problem for many marine regions, including the marine ecosystem of the Bering Sea. Plastic waste forms agglomerations in water, leads to death of aquatic organisms, penetrates food chains in various ways, accumulates at the seabed, provides medium for development of organisms in the sea, etc. Waste from residential and industrial territories in the coastal area entering the marine environment through run-off and ship discharge are main contributors of mechanical pollution.

30. With climate warming and receding sea ice, oil and gas activities as well as ship transport are likely to increase. In addition to the risk from oil spills (accidental, operational or by illegal dumping), shipping activities are also associated with the risk of introducing alien species through ballast water releases or from ship hulls. Oil and gas exploration in itself may result in discharges of drilling chemicals, oil spills, pipeline leaks and physical destruction of benthic habitats such as deep-water coral reefs and kelp forests (“blue forests”).

31. Some of the aforementioned issues are being or have been addressed by a number of international initiatives⁵. With regards to the WBS LME, however, there is a lack of a coordinated and strategic approach to tackle these anticipated concerns in the context of ecosystem-based management and adaptation to climate change.

2. Depletion of the commercially valuable fish stock and variable catches of living marine resources

32. Living marine resources in the WBSLME have been exploited over the past 200 years through commercial whaling, sealing, and fishing by fleets from Russia, the United States, Canada, Japan, (and in recent decades Poland, Korea, Taiwan, and China). Previously, the Bering Sea accounted for between 2 to 5% of global fish (Alaska pollock, Pacific cod, pink and chum salmon, Pacific herring, yellow fin sole, rockfishes, various halibuts and flounders) and shellfish (red king crab, commander squid and shrimps) production and provided the world’s largest fish biomass of Alaska pollock and Pacific cod. Although there is a lack of transparency in Russian catch statistics, there are indications that catch levels for some major commercial species in the WBS are unsustainable. Pollock stocks of the WBS in particular have been in decline since the mid-1990s; this same situation is reflected in the international waters of the Aleutian Basin, where the pollock fishery collapsed in 1992 and has not yet recovered, despite a moratorium, which has been in place for 18 years⁶.

33. Some of the factors underpinning the decline in commercial stocks of the WBS LME include: 1) Illegal fishing, which is especially the case for Alaska pollock and wild salmon⁷ and implies substantial profit-loss for state-run fisheries. It should be mentioned, however, that significant progress has been made through international measures (e.g. the Russian Federation is signatory to the FAO’s Port State Measures Agreement, as well as the EU’s IUU fishing regulation); 2) Rejection of incidental catch and small aquatic organisms; 3) Destruction of abundant brood of the main fishing targets

⁵ The project “Russian Federation: Support of the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (Russian NPA-Arctic - Phase 1)” has been implemented by the Government of the Russian Federation in partnership with UNEP/GEF. The 2nd phase of this project “Phase II of the Russian NPA-Arctic” is anticipated to commence in January 2011 and will focus on public-private partnerships models and investments for environmental rehabilitation of “hot spots” and clean-up projects.

⁶ Burnett, M. et al. 2008. Illegal fishing in Arctic waters. Catch of today – gone tomorrow? WWF International Arctic Programme, Oslo, Norway. 52 pp.

⁷ In the years 2003–2005, the average quantities of annual IUU catches of Russian sockeye salmon were estimated to range from 8000 to 15000 tons, representing a value of US\$40–74 million and demonstrating that actual catches are 60–90% above reported levels.

before they reach reproductive age; 4) Irregular exploitation of commercial stock in its natural area; 5) Change of geographic distribution of aquatic bioresource reserves due to climate change; and 6) Increasing accident rate, primarily for fishing and research fleet due to obsolescence. For some major commercial species, there is a lack of transparency with regards to fisheries stock assessments and little is known about the accuracy and consistency of the data used for the establishment of fishing quota. In addition, discrepancies between Russian and US fishery regulations, highlight the need for an institutional framework engaging North Pacific nations in cooperation on fisheries management.⁸ While progress is being made as a result of international measures and increasingly stringent market requirements (e.g. MSC eco-certification through the Russian Pollock Fisheries Improvement Project (FIP) Partnership), non-compliance and over-exploitation still occur. Furthermore, while some single fisheries may appear to be sustainably fished, a holistic ecosystem-based management approach should be adopted and implemented to safeguard the productivity of the WBS LME as a whole.

34. Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing: Illegal fishing and poaching are especially widespread in the Russian portion of the Bering Sea, where a significant portion of individual fishermen and companies both participating, and the border guard incapable of controlling it. Efficient use of ABR is prevented by: long distances of fishing regions to consumer regions (long distances of delivery to the central part of Russia make sales unprofitable); legislation gaps, creating conditions for IUU fishing; lack of international agreements with countries importing IUU fishing products (Japan, PRC, USA, Canada); lack of mechanisms, preventing economic gain from IUU fishing; lack of detailed analysis of IUU fishing implications for the large marine ecosystem of the western part of the Bering Sea (WBS LME).

35. Rejection of incidental catch and small aquatic organisms (also related to IUU fishing, but deserves special review): Fishing often results in rejection of incidental catch, including small fish and invertebrates and aquatic organisms of low market value, and also processing waste - heads, intestines, spines, tails, etc. As fisheries developed in the Bering Sea, especially in the early phases from 1970s to the end of the 1990s, fisheries waste disposal volumes were rather significant. This led to a transformation of the ecosystems in the fisheries area: increased trophicity, higher numbers of seagulls and other fish-eating birds; many bottom-living predators – cod, halibut, gobies and others - during fisheries seasons almost completely shifted to feeding on fisheries waste. Moreover, this resulted in physiological changes: a drastic increase in the numbers of bottom-living predators with liver disorders. In Navarinsky district areas of the most intensive fisheries, wastes completely covered the bottom with 1-2 meter thick layer, which led to a significant reduction of bottom fish and invertebrate species. In the 2000s, stricter environmental protection requirements for fisheries resulted in waste volume reductions. Currently, rejections of small fish during pollock fishing are estimated at 30%. For drift net fishing for salmon in the Bering Sea, rejections amount to 6-8% of a catch, of which 5-6% is humpback salmon and 1-2% small chum salmon. Up to now, total ban and actual discontinuation of waste disposal is one of the most important tasks to create environmentally-sound fisheries.

36. At present none of Russian fishing vessels are equipped with catch weighing system. Also there are no efficient devices preventing incidental catch of young fish.

37. Destruction of abundant brood of the main fishing targets (pollock, herring) before they reach reproductive age: Starting from the 1980s, the Bering Sea saw wide-scale unregulated pollock fishing, resulting in drastic reduction of reserves. Aquatic organism species (associated with target species) also suffered from it. There have been transformations of the ecosystem due to significant removal of medium and top trophic level consumers from the ecosystem. There is a shift of dominant species in biotic communities and the ecosystem.

38. Irregular exploitation of commercial stock in its natural area: Unregulated fishing by third parties, especially in the central part of the Bering Sea caused reduction of stock, and changed its structure and geographic distribution. With certain fishing restrictions, introduced by the RF and the USA, non-coastal countries are trying to resume fishing in the Bering Sea enclave. Lack of agreed measures to preserve transboundary reserves by Russia and the USA with intensive offshore and commercial fishing in the LME leads to changes in the functional habitat of the populations.

39. Change of geographic distribution of aquatic bioresource reserves due to climate change: Currently industry rules and regulations do not account for all of fishing pressure. Changes in stock, structure and functional habitat of the populations are also occurring under the impact of natural and climatic factors. This results in greater fishing pressure on portions of the habitat where density of population has fallen as a result of climate change.

40. Increasing accident rate, primarily for fishing and research fleet due to obsolescence: The overwhelming majority of Russian fishing vessels is overaged and may be decommissioned in the next few years. Use of these obsolete vessels poses a threat of accidents, shipwrecks and sea pollution during fishing that would result in adverse impact on the marine environment.

⁸ A number of international cooperation bodies do exist, although these are limited in scope and potential; these are the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC) and The Convention on the Conservation and Management of the Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea.
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

41. The adoption of an ecosystem-based approach is of particular importance considering the effects of unsustainable harvesting on ecosystem resilience, due to the alteration of functional pathways and food availability for top predators. The livelihoods of the indigenous populations, for whom the traditional economy is based on subsistence harvesting of fish and marine mammals, are also increasingly threatened by overfishing. Furthermore, the decline of fish stocks has repercussions on employment and profit of local fishermen, resulting in increased migration into cities. One of the key outcomes of the proposed project will therefore be the development of a multi-country regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP) outlining the necessary measures for integrated and ecosystem-based management of the WBS LME and promoting the establishment of a regional, joint management framework for the LME.

3. Deterioration of the quality of coastal environment and alteration of living conditions including those of indigenous northern minorities

42. Marine environment pollutant sources in the coastal territory and watersheds: Currently there is no systemic data on “hot spots” in the Russian territory adjacent to the Bering Sea and their impact on the marine environment. In areas of placer mine production, increased sediment and pollutant runoff has changed water quality of freshwater and coastal-marine ecosystems as silt and clay particles are carried by rivers to the sea. For example, over 20000 tons/year of fine-grained material of industrial origin is carried from Vyvenka River basin (Koryaksky district of Kamchatka). Coal, gold, silver and gas are produced in basins of many rivers ([Anadyr](#), Omolon, [Velikaya](#), [Anguema](#), [Bolshoi](#) and [Malyy Anyi](#), [Chegitun](#), [Igelkveem](#), [Ulyuveem](#), [Ionyveem](#) and others). Field development causes vegetation cover destruction, and low efficiency or lack of treatment facilities causes wastewater discharge into watersheds and development of erosion processes in riverbeds, resulting in greater amounts of suspended matter. Commercial facilities (roads, dam and embankment slopes, shift camps, POL storage facilities, parking lots, etc.) are also sources of mechanical and other pollution. Bodies of water in such locations lose their aquacultural significance; fishery resources are also damaged. Another source of pollution is wastewaters of housing and utilities sector production facilities, which are not equipped with water treatment facilities. Water supply systems lack package treatment and decontamination plants and there is no regular cleaning of pipelines, which results in accidents. Many residents are supplied with substandard drinking water, some from water tanks that fail to meet quality standards. In some areas of the Kamchatka Region, some residents are supplied untreated water with no disinfection (from shaft wells and well-points). Solid waste poses another major problem is posed by solid waste and litter in the coastal area; some residential solid waste landfills fail to meet sanitary requirements and in some cases communities have unregulated landfills. There are 43 expired radioisotope thermoelectric generators along the coastline of Chukot AD. There is ongoing accumulation of scrap metal, which is not utilized.

43. Infrastructure not prepared for possible implications of global climate change, threat of infrastructure destruction, especially in high seismic and tsunami hazard areas: Many coastal towns and infrastructure facilities are located on alluvial-marine deposits (sand-banks) and in permafrost areas. Changing climate, increasing wave action, defrosting ground and development of hazardous coastal processes are destroying infrastructure. In 2006 a major 7.8 point earthquake leveled Korf port station (in the northern coast of Kamchatka). The town was declared unfit for habitation; it was proposed that it be closed down and residents be relocated to neighboring communities. The town’s territory is a PED site.

4. Increased influence of global processes and human activities in catchment areas on the marine ecosystem

44. With increasing pollution the LME of the Bering Sea currently maintains dynamic stability of its key parameters (biological productivity, species diversity, biogeochemical cycles of substances). Man-induced impact is expressed in localized areas. The strongest impact is caused at areas near ports and port stations, viewed as “hot spots”. These are Anadyr liman and Anadyr bay, Ossora, Korf (Tilichiki) port stations and others. Over the last decade there have been lower concentrations of organic pollutants in coastal waters to background values due to reduced industrial activities. Modern fishing is a key factor with the most systemic and continuous impact on the biota of the LME of the Bering Sea. The body of water is polluted throughout the year by several dozens (in winter) to several hundred (in summer) of fishing and support ships. Resolution of the issue is prevented by gaps in regulating liability for past environmental damage and lack of required environmental oversight of marine activities in the hard-to-reach region in question.

5. The indeterminate status of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem and its coastal zone in a changing climate

45. Overall, climate change in the Bering Sea does not present any anomalies. Given the current relatively warm period, ice coverage of the Bering Sea during the winter of 2011-2012 was 10-12% above the mean annual. Considering quasicyclic changes, relative climate cooling is expected after 2014. Such changes are obvious in littoral zones and

demonstrated at watershed areas. These processes require more research for adaptation of the population and the economy to climate change. The area of continental watershed is 9 times greater than the offshore area. The volume of river run-off from the watershed is the largest in comparison with other Arctic seas. The volume of this run-off (about 650 km³/year) is insignificant as compared to the water mass of the sea (about 0.02%). About a half of the run-off is contributed by the major rivers, to the shelf part of the sea: Yukon River (207 km³/year), Anadyr River (60 km³/year), Kuskokuim River (58 km³/year). This leads to some decrease in salinity of the surface waters at the shelf (to 31-32‰ versus 33 ‰ in the deepwater portion of the sea).

46. Relations between sea and freshwater ecosystems demonstrate via transfer of significant (as per expert assessments) volumes of biogenic matter during the lifecycle of migratory fish (this process remains underresearched). It is expected that changes in land drainage conditions may have a noticeable impact on the marine ecosystem.

47. The Arctic is highly vulnerable to climate change. Seasonal sea ice supports primary productivity, provides a critical habitat for a number of marine mammals (e.g. breeding and feeding grounds), and exerts a major influence on the distribution patterns of numerous commercially important fish species. Although the extent of sea-ice cover within the Arctic has been marked by inter-annual and inter-decadal fluctuations, thick multi-year sea ice has decreased by 35 percent in the last five years and observations and models indicate that the ongoing changes in the global climate will potentially result in an ice-free Arctic Ocean during summer by 2040. This trend is likely to imply changes in seasonal distribution, ranges, migration patterns, nutritional status, reproductive success and ultimately the species composition and ecosystem structure of the LME. Furthermore, increases in sea-ice melting rates result in pulse releases of contaminants captured in the ice over multiple years.

48. Continued sea ice reductions are likely to lengthen the navigation season in the WBS LME and increase access to the Arctic region's natural resources by activities such as oil and gas exploration, tourism and commercial fishing. Not only will these activities put further pressure on the resources of LME, but also increase the likelihood of operational and accidental pollution, especially in the light of increasing climate variability and extreme weather conditions. In order to address these concerns, the proposed project intends to pilot a Marine Electronic Highway for the Bering Sea and Bering straits, in cooperation with the IMO and focusing on the adoption of new technologies and management systems to enhance navigational safety and minimize pollution risk. Finally, another predicted consequence of climate change is ocean acidification caused by anthropogenic emission of CO₂. While the long-term effects of ocean acidification are still relatively uncertain, it is an emerging problem which may have significant impacts on the WBS LME in the future and should therefore be incorporated into an ecosystem-based management framework.

49. Overall, there is still much uncertainty about the extent and nature of the impacts climate change will have on the WBS LME and the Arctic region as a whole. While existing data and predictive modelling may provide some guidance, ongoing monitoring and regional cooperation and coordination will be crucial in understanding and addressing climate change impacts on the LME's functioning and status, as well as the socio-economic implications which include infrastructure protection, transportation and community resilience. A vital part of this process will be the adoption of innovative approaches for cooperative management of shared resources. The proposed project will enable this through sub-regional and local/coastal resource management demos, involving key stakeholders including indigenous people and coastal populations.

50. The future health and productivity of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem, and hence the food security, well-being, and socio-economic development of the indigenous peoples and coastal communities that are reliant upon its resources, are dependent upon restoring ecologically sustainable conditions within the LME and maintaining these in the context of anticipated climate change and variability. The proposed project will promote broad stakeholder participation at national and international level, and build upon and coordinate with existing initiatives to create a bilateral cooperative framework for the integrated, adaptive and ecosystem-based management of the LME, aimed at reducing the unsustainable harvesting of fishery resources, reducing the risk of future degradation of the quality of the marine and coastal environment, and exploring and helping to implement adaptive management measures to the anticipated changes in the global climate.

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:

51. The baseline situation as described in Section B.1 shows that a number of different initiatives address issues such as resource management and pollution reduction. However, the overall picture is fragmented, with a lack of coordination and transparency, at national and bilateral level. Despite the willingness of the Russian Federation to participate in

international agreements and organisations, the WBS LME and its associated stakeholders are not benefitting from the concerted approach, know-how and technical and institutional capacity that is vital to an effective integrated, adaptive and ecosystem-based management mechanism. The proposed project organises a national and bilateral partnership of all stakeholders, decision makers and scientists towards a framework of ecosystem-based and adaptive management of the WBS LME, promoting full transparency, coordination and cooperation with the international community. Without the proposed GEF project the existing pressures on the LME are likely to continue or exacerbate. In combination with anticipated climate change and the lack of a bilateral cooperative framework the aforementioned pressures are likely to lead to reduced ecosystem productivity and resilience with detrimental consequences for the indigenous and coastal communities of the region, including reduced food security and regional stability, as well as increased poverty levels. The project is fully in accordance with the targets identified at the WSSD, and its global environmental benefits include increased global food security, protection of biodiversity of global importance, regional social and political stability, and improved and sustained socio-economic development of indigenous and coastal communities. Finally, through experience and knowledge sharing, the project will act as a valuable source of information for the GEF IW portfolio, with particular emphasis on issues relating to transboundary fishery management and adaptation to climate change in Arctic environments.

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:

52. Risks which could affect the success of the project’s objectives are outlined in the table below with their corresponding mitigating measures. The project’s achievements will depend on a number of factors, including the degree of cooperation between the major countries involved, i.e. the Russian Federation and the USA, and the degree of public and stakeholder participation in decision-making processes. Furthermore, the durability of the project’s outcomes will depend on the political will of the RF to ensure financial sustainability beyond the life of the project. Finally, while this is difficult to predict, the rate and extent of climate change may affect the political and economic stability of the countries involved with direct consequences for the project’s success. All the above risks are low to moderate in nature and can or have been mitigated for.

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Stakeholder countries and organizations/ institutions are unwilling to cooperate and share information in a transparent way	Low	The need for bilateral cooperation is recognised by the project’s main stakeholder countries, i.e. the Russian Federation and USA. Previous and existing initiatives such as RUSALCA and the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea provide proof that there is political and financial support for this.
Political commitment to ensure financial sustainability beyond the life of the project	Moderate	Assistance provided through the proposed project will allow the Russian Federation the opportunity to develop and demonstrate novel mechanisms that promote various economic tools and incentives, and the formation of public-private partnerships, to ensure the sustainability of the LME management framework and key activities.
Limited public and stakeholder participation in the management of resources in the WBSLME	Low	The potential lack of public involvement and stakeholder participation in decision-making processes would be resolved by the development of a suitable participation plan to establish effective public and stakeholder consultation at both national and regional level.
Uncertainty regarding climate change impacts on political and economic status of involved countries	Moderate	The proposed project will incorporate the issue of climate change into the management framework. By promoting knowledge sharing, by supporting joint scientific research and monitoring, and by demonstrating adaptive measures, the project will enable the participating countries to meet the anticipated challenges.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

53. The project is submitted in the framework of the Arctic 2020 Programme and will be coordinated with the initiatives included into this programme framework. The project will be building upon the outcomes of the Arctic NAP Phase 1. It will also liaise with and utilize lessons from the on-going and completed GEF-supported initiatives, including:

Project Title	Implementing Agency and Other	Stage of implementation and role

	Executing Agencies	
MCPAs. Strengthening the marine and coastal protected areas in Russia.	UNDP/GEF, Ministry of natural resources and environment of Russia	On-going. The project's work at the Commander Island Biosphere Reserve is directly relevant to the suggested IW proposal through pilot interventions in Bering sea biodiversity (fish, marine mammals) monitoring, protection and enforcement as well as support to indigenous communities. The knowledge management component of the project will deliver lessons and solutions on invasive species, oil spills mitigation and early action, fisheries, etc.
CASPECO. The Caspian Sea: Restoring Depleted Fisheries and consolidation of a Permanent Regional Environmental Governance Framework Project	UNDP/GEF, Ministry of natural resources and environment of Russia	On-going. The project generates important lessons on fishery management and conservation and pollution abatement in the Caspian LME. Transboundary cooperation and coordination arrangements, stakeholder engagement and specific threat removal solutions delivered by the project will be utilized during the development and implementation of the proposed Bering Sea project.
ECORA. Integrated ecosystem approach to conserve biodiversity and minimize habitat fragmentation in the Russian Arctic.	UNEP/GEF	Completed. The Chukotka pilot site of the project addressed marine mammals monitoring and conservation programmes.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

54. At the international level the project will engage with the Arctic Council and its keystone programmes – AMAP, ACAP, CAFF and PAME. The project will also work with USA-Russia bilateral bodies such as the Russian American Pacific Partnership (RAPP) and other foras established in the framework of the U.S.-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission (BPC). RAPP is a bilateral forum engaging the private-sector and governments to identify and address barriers to business and commerce between the Russian East and the United States (the latest meeting held in July 2011 in Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Russia). State and private sector stakeholders from Canada, Japan, China, Korea will also be outreached through the project. At the national level the project will be engaging a variety of government stakeholders both international cooperation, policy level and line ministries. In Russia the main government stakeholders include the Ministry of Economic Development, Ministry of Natural resources and Environment (with its subordinate Roshydromet – climate studies, and Rosprirodnadzor – environmental controls), the Federal Fishery Agency, Ministries of transport, energy, foreign affairs, regional development, federal border service. At the sub-national level the project will work with the Governments of the Kamchatsky Kray and Chukotsky Autonomous Okrug. The private sector stakeholders will be engaged since the early phases including shelf oil & gas industries, transportation and fishery businesses and associations (e.g. Alaska Pollock Catchers Association). The primary NGO partners are: WWF (with their extensive activities in the Bering Sea region focusing on fisheries), Wild Salmon Centre (pacific salmon conservation programmes), RAIPON (Russian association of the indigenous peoples of the North and their partner associations in the U.S.). Finally the project will engage the Russian Academy of Science (climate change vulnerability studies) and sectoral research institutes (fisheries/VNIRO, etc.).

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):

55. The proposed project will create socio-economic benefits at national and local levels through building the institutional capacity to stem the loss in ecosystem goods and services. The project will promote the mainstreaming of gender into WBS LME and ICM governance at national, regional and local levels. The project will analyse the specific needs of both women and men in the proposed project initiatives and incorporate targeted interventions to enable women and men to participate in and benefit equally from the project outcomes and outputs. The education and training course provided through the project will advocate the direct involvement of both women and men, and will incorporate the provision of training in the development and harmonization of gender-balanced policies and legislative frameworks. To

ensure that the gender perspective is successfully incorporated into the proposed interventions a gender audit will be conducted during the PPG, to help identify potentially gender sensitive issues and to incorporate gender considerations into the project design.

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

56. The project will work with and benefit from existing programs in the region, including national and international NGOs, sectoral research institutes, and private sector stakeholders. Through coordination of existing projects, the West Bering Sea LME will reduce duplication efforts, thereby reducing costs and improving outcomes. The project aims to achieve a multiplier effect, with the demonstration projects and development of the TDA and SAP that will be directly used in the regional strategic planning. The project will use depend primarily on local consultants and personnel to ensure that travel and salaries remain cost-effective.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

57. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures by the project team, Project Support Office in Moscow and the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) in Bratislava. The Strategic Results Framework Matrix provides impact and outcome/indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities.

Project start:

58. A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

59. 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 CO and RCU 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 relevant GEF 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.

60. 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 (30 June to 1 July). 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 CO and the UNDP RCU 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 the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit 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 relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools 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 CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit 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 relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools 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 scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through 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. 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. 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.

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)
Mr. Rinat Gizatulin	Deputy Minister GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT	2 SEPTEMBER 2011

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
Ms. Adriana Dinu Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator UNDP		23 September 2013	Mr. Vladimir Mamaev	+421 2 59337 267	vladimir.mamaev@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: n/a					
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-3					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of waterbodies and local ICM principles					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: National inter-ministry committees established; Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses & Strategic Action Programmes; local IWRM or ICM plans					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective⁹ Sustainable and integrated ecosystem-based management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in the context of climatic variability and change					
Outcome 1¹⁰ State of the WBSLME within the framework of	Mutually agreed priority transboundary issues of the WBSLME, their immediate and root	A draft TDA has been completed, but additional research needs to be done and priorities need to be	A multi-country technical/scientific assessment (TDA) of TB priority issues, immediate and root causes.	Completed TDA submitted, including a causal chain analysis to prioritize areas for interventions, investments	Assumes all entities, including the two involved governments and non-governmental organizations, are willing to collect and share data in a transparent way. The need for bilateral cooperation is recognised

⁹ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

¹⁰ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

<p>the 5 LME modules of productivity, fish and fisheries, pollution and ecosystem health, socioeconomics, and governance</p>	<p>causes.</p> <p>Better understanding of the functioning of the WBSLME and its major problems.</p> <p>Understanding of the climate change impact on the functionality of the WBSLME.</p> <p>Identify key knowledge gaps for ecosystem-based management of the WBSLME and local ICM plans.</p>	<p>agreed upon.</p> <p>No West Bering Sea specific geospatial database exists.</p> <p>Limited monitoring being undertaken, but it is insufficient and there are gaps that do not allow for adequate planning to address climate change and sound ecosystem management.</p>	<p>A West Bering Sea specific geospatial database within the framework of the 5 LME modules and climatic data</p> <p>Climate change model scenarios decided upon. Strengthened joint collaborative long-term monitoring system of changes in the WBS ecosystem. (co-financing)</p> <p>Ecosystem modelling to forecast changes in species composition and distribution due to changing climate.</p> <p>Satellite Climatology of Fronts and Currents of the West Bering Sea LME.</p> <p>Scientifically sound Climate change scenarios for the Arctic including potential impacts on the marine living resources and coastal zone.</p>	<p>and reforms within the SAP.</p> <p>Geospatial database operational and distributed.</p> <p>Improved monitoring plan in place and monitoring results shared among collaborators.</p> <p>Report detailing forecast modelling supporting the LME modules published and used to test impacts of future increased pollution, climate change, overfishing and other stressors.</p> <p>Climate change scenarios developed to determine likely ecosystem responses and to provide input to the TDA.</p>	<p>by the project's main stakeholder countries, i.e. the Russian Federation and USA. Previous and existing initiatives such as RUSALCA and the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea provide proof that there is political and financial support for this.</p>
<p>Outcome 2</p> <p>National and regional, sustainable and integrated ecosystem-based management of the</p>	<p>Appropriate regulatory and management reforms (policy, legal, institutional reforms) to address priority TB issues/ Strategic Action</p>	<p>Current governance regime of the Russian Federation does not allow for ecosystem-based management.</p>	<p>Series of measures to improve/reform governance to address primary transboundary issues in the WBSLME recommended.</p>	<p>Participatory workshop held and regulatory and management reform recommendations included in workshop</p>	<p>This assumes continued political will to devolve control of the WBSLME resources from the central government to different ministries, as well as will to improve the legal and policy</p>

<p>WBSLME and its coastal zone in a changing climate</p>	<p>Programme.</p> <p>Improved National inter-sectoral coordination for the sustainable use and management of the WBSLME.</p> <p>Improved national capacities to increase level of bilateral inter-governmental cooperation and coordination in WBSLME management and assessment</p> <p>Proposal on regional joint management framework for the shared WBSLME.</p>	<p>Coastal zone management not properly addressed by current Russian legislation and policies. Decisions are made at the national level and intersectoral coordination does not occur.</p> <p>Bilateral intergovernmental cooperation currently occurs on only a limited basis.</p> <p>There currently is no regional management framework for shared WBSLME.</p>	<p>Functioning National Intersectoral Committee (NIC) guiding the process of harmonization of existing policy and insitutional frameworks.</p> <p>Policies and mechanisms for enhancing capacity for expanding bilateral coordination developed.</p> <p>Establishment of bilateral working goup on WBSLME management and preparation of Joint Management Framework proposal.</p> <p>Multi-country regional Strategic Action Programme for the management of the WBSLME resources and coastal zone.</p>	<p>report.</p> <p>Implementable regulatory and management reforms included in SAP.</p> <p>National Inter-ministerial Committee (NIC) meets regularly and makes decisions.</p> <p>Annual workshops on inter-governmental cooperation will be held with Russia and USA participating.</p> <p>Meetings held and Regional Joint Management Framework for the WBSLME developed.</p>	<p>context for ecosystem-based management. This also assumes that the will to cooperate will continue beyond the life of the project. The long-term cooperation in fisheries management indicates a longstanding will to collaborate on issues of shared resources.</p> <p>Approved SAP includes real, tangible measures and milestones.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--

<p>Outcome 3 Targeted demonstration projects.</p>	<p>Innovative solution for the safety of navigation and prevention of environmental degradation from maritime transport in the Bering sea and Bering straits.</p> <p>Innovative approaches for cooperative management of shared resources and coastal zone under climate change scenarios.</p>	<p>No Marine Electronic Highway for the Bering Sea and the Bering Straits currently exists.</p> <p>No oil spill preparedness/response programme exists in the West Bering Sea.</p> <p>Climate change scenarios do not currently exist.</p>	<p>Pre-feasibility study safety of navigation and oil spill response in the west bering sea and bering straits region</p> <p>Voluntary Measures for shipping studies through Demonstration Project.</p> <p>Best available technologies into mining activities on Vyvenka River Basin for safe reclamation and reduction of environmental risks.</p> <p>Informed participation of indigenous/local population in WBS.</p> <p>Demonstration project for coastal territory and marine area integrated development (CTMAID) at locations for intensive maritime activity (Anadyr Bay) and specially protected natural reservations (Commander Islands</p> <p>Integrated adaptive management of the West Bering Sea walleye Pollock (<i>Theragra chalcogramma</i>) as a keystone species in the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem.</p> <p>Development and testing of technology, allowing to recover the number of natural populations of blue king crab by</p>	<p>Pre-feasibility study for Safety of Navigation and Oil Spill Preparedness/Response Programme completed.</p> <p>Demonstration projects completed and final reports published, including replication strategy.</p> <p>A network of correspondents from indigenous and local people of Kamchatka and Chukotka developed. Information, educational, and legal situation will be improved. All participants of the WBSLME project and all stakeholders will get access to the databases on problems of the traditional use of water recourses, on traditional knowledge of indigenous people and the local population, connected with consequences of climate change and traditional strategy of adaptation to climate changes.</p>	<p>There is always a risk that the co-financing for pilot projects will not be actualized. Further, the financing required for turning these demonstrations into full projects may not come through. The proposed partners for these projects have been engaged in other longer-term projects, indicating their commitment to the programme and ecosystem-based management of the WBSLME. Their commitment level is strong.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

			the methods of artificial reproduction.		
Outcome 4 Learning and Knowledge Management	<p>Increased public environmental awareness and education on key environmental issues.</p> <p>Best practice and experiences shared with similar LME projects, adding to the GEF IW portfolio on LMEs.</p>	<p>There currently are few opportunities for public participation in environmental decision-making, particularly among IMN.</p> <p>Knowledge of WBSLME issues among IMN and local populations is low.</p> <p>No website for the WBSLME currently exists. Cooperation with other LMEs is low.</p>	<p>Public and stakeholder participation mechanisms put in place at national and international level to inform and catalyze decisionmaking processes.</p> <p>Establishment of a stakeholder dialogue and environmental education program using print and electronic media.</p> <p>Collaboration with local organizations and activists to exchange information with IMN and local populations.</p> <p>Transfer of lessons, experiences and best practices with other LME projects through IW:LEARN3 and LME/ICM COP.</p> <p>Functioning website consistent with IW:LEARN guidance.</p> <p>Participation in IW:LEARN3 activities and the LME/ICM COP.</p>	<p>Stakeholder analysis completed and stakeholder engagement and communication plan completed and put into effect.</p> <p>Regional network formed and education materials provided to local communities.</p> <p>Participation in other LME/ICM COP and IW:LEARN3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of experience notes - Participation in the IWC7 - Use of GEF IW tracking tool <p>WBSLME website operational.</p>	

STAP Comments and Responses:

1) Comment: Component 3 (Targeted demonstration projects) of the project is too vague and reads more like a PFD description. This section should be made more precise in the full project brief, and STAP offers to peer review the design of these projects prior to CEO endorsement.

Response: The targeted demonstration projects have been identified and described in full in the Project Document.

2) Comment: Governance concerns are again an issue, i.e. what is the likelihood that the project manages to establish a future regional joint management framework for the natural resources of the LME for the future?

Response: The ProDoc has identified an Intersectoral Committee to assure coordination within the RF, and also a series of bilateral meetings to identify what actions can be taken bilaterally. In addition, one demonstration project addresses voluntary measures, which are typically much more rapid to set up, compared to policies and regulations.

GEF Secretariat Review Comments and Responses:

1) Comment: 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?

Not fully. Although the component 3 on targeted demonstration projects mentions indigenous population socioeconomic development, the information on including CSO is missing. Please clarify.

Response: The Public Outreach component has been strengthened. In addition, the largest Demonstration Project in the ProDoc focuses on CSOs and indigenous peoples and their input to the project.

2) Comment: 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?

Information is missing. Please clarify.

Response: The project implementation/execution arrangements have been clarified in the Project Document.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹¹

A. 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>
1. Baseline study of priority TB issues; Inventory of national scientific data, gaps analysis, adaptation measures needs assessment.	45,000	23,420	10,830
2. Preliminary policy, legal and institutional capacity analysis for LME, ICM, and ecosystem-based management	15,000	10,030	10,220
3. Identification and involvement of major national and regional stakeholders	15,000	10,460	9,790
4. Definition of the programme of targeted demonstration projects	60,000	18,023	42,227
5. Identification and agreement on project activities and financing. Establishing partnership.	15,000	15,000	0
Total	\$150,000	\$76,933	\$73,067

¹¹ 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)