**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT**

**Project Type: Full-sized Project**

**Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund**



**PART I: Project Information**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** **Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS)** | | | |
| Countries: | Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu | GEF Project ID[[1]](#footnote-2): | 4746 |
| GEF Agencies: | FAO UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | UNDP: 4607  FAO: 615567 |
| Other Executing Partners: | Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA);  Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) | Submission Date:  Resubmission Date: | March 7, 2014  27 May 2014 |
| GEF Focal Areas: | International Waters | Project Duration | 48 months |
| Name of parent program: | N/A | Agency Fee ($): | 1,000,000 |

1. In**dicative Focal Area strategy Framework[[2]](#footnote-3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Focal Area Objectives | Expected FA Outcomes | Expected FA Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount ($) | Co- Financing($) |
| IW-2: Catalyze multi-state cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of LMEs while considering climate variability and change | 2.1 Implementation of agreed SAP incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs, … and policy/legal/institutional reforms into national/local plans  2.2 Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs … demonstrate sustainability  2.3 Innovative solutions implemented for … rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, and port management and produce measurable results  2.4 Climatic variability and change at coasts and in LMEs incorporated into SAP to reflect adaptive management | * 1. National and local policy/legal/institutional reforms adopted/implemented   2. Agreed commitments to sustainable LME cooperation frameworks   3. Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments   4. Enhanced capacity for issues of climatic variability and change | GEFTF | 10,000,000 | 84,934,375 |
|  |  |  |
| **Total Project Cost** | | | | 10,000,000 | 84,934,375 |

1. **Project Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Objective:  To support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement and effectively enforce global, regional and sub-regional arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries | | | | | | | |
| Project Component | Grant Type | Expected Outcomes | | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | Indicative Grant Amount($) | Indicative Co Financing($) |
| 1. Regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management | TA | 1.1 Comprehensive set of innovative on-the-water conservation and management measures (CMMs) adopted by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) for stocks of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME, incorporating ecosystem-based approaches in decision-making) and informed by sound scientific advice and information | | 1.1.1 Ecosystem-based CMMs to control fishing mortality for the 4[[3]](#footnote-4) key target stocks and to mitigate impacts on key[[4]](#footnote-5) non-target species reflecting global best practices supported by all Pacific SIDS are submitted to WCPFC for adoption  1.1.2 WCPFC and other regional legal arrangements and compliance mechanisms in 7 key areas (identified in the EOP target) to implement CMMs effectively and deter IUU fishing prepared and/or supported by all Pacific SIDS | GETF | 1,603,900 | 21,242,808 |
|  |  | 1.2 Adaptive management of oceanic fisheries in the WTPWP LME is put in place through better understanding of the impacts of climate change | | 1.2.1 Climate change forecasts and vulnerability of the Pacific SIDS region assessed in relation to 4 major target stocks and 6 key bycatch species and results and recommendations communicated to managers of potential impacts on oceanic fisheries    1.2.2 Sea level rise impacts on fisheries jurisdictions assessed for 14 Pacific SIDS & Pacific SIDS governments informed on priority areas of action and policy options, with related initiatives and related training carried out for 14 Pacific SIDS  1.2.3 Updated TDA for oceanic fisheries and updated oceanic fisheries management aspects of the Pacific Islands IW SAP |  |  |  |
| 2. Sub-regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management | TA | 2.1 Sub-regional conservation and management arrangements are operationalized and enforced, including rights-based cap and trade arrangements for in-zone tuna fisheries, enhancing ecosystem sustainability and incentivized by sustainable fishery certifications | | 2.1.1 Recommendations of the external review of the PNA VDS being implemented and applied to 1 million tonnes of catch in the EEZs of 7 of the 9 participating SIDS  2.1.2 National harvest rights established and monitored for the 5 SIDS TVM participants  2.1.3 Enhancements to other sub-regional management arrangements | GETF | 2,000,000 | 8,645,967 |
| 3. National Actions for Ecosystem-Based Management | TA | 3.1 Innovative ecosystem-based on-the-water CMMs being effectively applied by Pacific SIDS in accordance with national plans and policies and with international, regional and sub-regional commitments and other relevant instruments | | 3.1.1 9 new national management plans and policies in support of ecosystem-based management adopted with enhancement of fisheries management skills of 60 SIDS fisheries management personnel in all 14 SIDS  3.1.2 11 revised national laws and regulations, &/or strengthened MCS programmes, and updated license conditions in all 14 SIDS to operationalise WCPFC CMMs & other relevant conservation & management instruments, with support through skills enhancement of law and compliance in 14 SIDS  3.1.3 Mitigation measures for key bycatch species, including key shark species, integrated into national management planning processes by at least 11 SIDS | GET F | 4,451,200 | 49,543,205 |
|  |  | 3.2 Integrated data and information systems and scientific analysis being used nationally for reporting, policy-making, monitoring and compliance | | 3.2.1 Upgraded national data & information management systems developed & operationalized in 10 SIDS with training for around 350 personnel  3.2.2 National scientific analysis & support for ecosystem-based management provided to all Pacific SIDS, with training for around 120 personnel |  |  |  |
| 4 Stakeholder Participation & Knowledge Management | TA | 4.1 Greater multi-stakeholder participation in the work of the national and regional institutions with respect to oceanic fisheries management, including greater fisheries industry engagement and participation in Project, FFA, WCPFC and sub-regional activities | | 4.1.1 Broader stakeholder (Pacific SIDS, regional institutions, fishing industry & business sector, environmental NGOs, local NGOs, civil society, among others) awareness & involvement  4.1.2 Increased awareness & coordination through project workshops & meetings contributing to wider support for national, sub-regional & regional project activities with increased participation by women  4.1.3 Effective project implementation through M&E with feedback mechanisms utilizing the regional & sub-regional arrangements & existing national mechanisms | GETF | 1,469,900 | 3,369,685 |
|  |  | 4.1 Increased awareness of oceanic fisheries resource and ecosystems management and impacts of climate change | | 4.2.1 Knowledge management & information systems that support communications and advocacy efforts by Pacific SIDS for the best management of their oceanic fisheries resources, including creation of a project website, publications, participation in relevant UNDP, FAO and GEF events and information exchanges particulary in IW:LEARN |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  | |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  | |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  | |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  | |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  | |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total | | | | |  | 9,525,000 | 82,801,665 |
| Project management Cost (PMC)[[5]](#footnote-6) | | | | |  | 475,000 | 2,132,710 |
| **Total project costs** | | | | |  | 10,000,000 | 84,934,375 |

1. **Sources of confirmed co-financing for the project by source and by name $)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co-financier (source)** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Cofinancing Amount ($)** |
| National Governments | Cook Islands | in-kind | 420,772 |
| FSM | in-kind | 1,671,576 |
| Fiji | in-kind | 888,476 |
| Kiribati | in-kind | 1,586,656 |
| Marshall Islands | in-kind | 4,835,608 |
| Nauru | in-kind | 1,716,310 |
| Niue | in-kind | 247,344 |
| Palau | in-kind | 865,416 |
| PNG | in-kind | 15,373,960 |
| Samoa | in-kind | 859,604 |
| Solomon Islands | in-kind | 1,256,650 |
| Tonga | in-kind | 666,434 |
| Tuvalu | in-kind | 808,104 |
| **Total SIDS** | in-kind | **31,196,910** |
| Other Multilateral Agencies | FFA | grant | 6,098,130 |
| in-kind | 34,556,069 |
| SPC | grant | 3,603,000 |
| in-kind | 3,450,000 |
| PNA | in-kind | 2,000,000 |
| GEF Agency | FAO | grant | 500,000 |
| in-kind | 2,500,000 |
| UNDP | in-kind | 750,000 |
| NGO | PITIA | in-kind | 100,000 |
| WWF | in-kind | 180,266 |
| (select) |  | (select) |  |
| (select) |  | (select) |  |
| (select) |  | (select) |  |
| (select) |  | (select) |  |
| (select) |  | (select) |  |
| (select) |  | (select) |  |
| **Total Co-financing** | | | **84,934,375** |

1. **Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency, Focal Area and Country1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Agency** | **Type of Trust Fund** | **Focal area** | **Country name/Global** | **(in $)** | | |
|  |  |  |  | **Grant amount (a)** | **Agency Fee (b)2** | **Total c=a+b** |
| UNDP | GEF TF | International Waters | Global | 5,000,000 | 500,000 | 5,500,000 |
| FAO | GEF TF | International Waters | Global | 5,000,000 | 500,000 | 5,500,000 |
|  | (select) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (select) |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| **Total Grant Resources** | | | | 10,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 11,000,000 |

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.

1. **Consultants working for technical assistance components:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Grant Amount**  **($)** | **Cofinancing**  **($)** | **Project Total**  **($)** |
|
| International Consultants | 2,620,078 | 395,000 | 3,015,078 |
| National/Local Consultants | 663,400 | 150,000 | 813,400 |

1. **Does the project include a “Non-Grant” instrument?**  No.

**part ii: project JustiFication**

1. **Describe any changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF[[6]](#footnote-7)**

The Project Design is closely aligned with the original PIF. The major changes are:

1. Outputs 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 from the PIF have been combined into the new Output 1.2.3; and
2. Outputs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 from the PIF have been combined into the new Output 3.1.2. ,

These changes have been made to streamline project design, with no change to the structure of the Project including the planned activities for these outputs.

Some additional risks and increased co-financing identified in the project design process are noted below

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:

Additional co-financing has been identified, largely as a result of increased commitments to strengthening national oceanic fisheries management programmes by Pacific SIDS as set out below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pacific SIDS ($) | Other ($) | Total ($) |
| PIF Co-financing | 20,000,000 | 50,306,000 | 70,306,000 |
| ProDoc Co-financing | 31,196,910 | 53,737,465 | 84,934,375 |

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:

Project design activities identified two additional risks to those identified in the PIF, The additional risks identified are:

1. an ineffective M & E system; and
2. lack of GEF/UNDP/ FAO Project visibility.

These two additional risks have been included in the Risk Analysis as shown below

| **Risk** | **Rating**  **Impact/**  **Probability (1)** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks Identified in the PIF** | | |
| Limits of SIDS institutional and human resources capacities | I=3  P=5 | This is the key factor that will set the limit of what can be achieved within the 4 year timeframe of the project. Project design emphasises capacity development but has to recognise the limits to the absorptive capacity of smaller Pacific SIDS. The engagement of the regional and sub-regional organisations with an ongoing role in these areas reduces the risk to sustainability of activities and outcomes at national level. The risk is further reduced by the support of other donors for a set of national institutional strengthening projects in several of the smaller, most oceanic fishery-dependent SIDS.. |
| Gridlock in the WCPF Commission | I=3  P=2 | In the face of the systematic shortfalls in performance of other oceanic fisheries RFMOs, there is a risk that the objectives will be less than fully achieved. A key element of this risk is the conflict between developed fishing states with large existing fleets who seek to entrench and protect their existing operations and the developing countries in whose waters the stocks largely occur. The risk is reduced compared to other tuna RFMOs by the high share of fishing and catch within the waters of Pacific SIDS. The project will seek innovative responses to overcome this conflict, and support Pacific SIDS in their efforts to leverage the Commission to adopt effective measures through the adoption of high management standards in their own EEZs using the principle of compatibility in the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the WCPFC Convention. The very large increase in NGO participation in the WCPFC has made it more difficult for fishing states to obstruct progress in the Commission, and the Project NGO partnerships is designed to sustain that influence. |
| Financial Sustainability of the WCPF Commission | I=3  P-1 | The project aims to increase the value of the resources to Commission Members and heighten appreciation of the value of the Commission’s work to its Members, especially Pacific SIDS. WCPFC subscription revenue streams are in place, are substantially greater than originally envisaged, and funding levels are considered to be more than adequate to cover foreseeable costs. The 2012 decision of the WCPFC to adopt by consensus the largest budget of any RFMO globally, along with an adjusted formula for contributions providing relief to the smallest Members is a positive indication of commitment to the financial sustainability of the Commission. |
| Adequacy of financing for national programmes, especially for enforcement | I=4  P=2 | With over 70 permanent new posts established, and around 450 additional monitoring personnel employed, Pacific SIDS have already demonstrated a capacity to find additional resources for oceanic fisheries management, but progress is uneven nationally, and this risk is greater in some countries than others. The Project aims to improve the financial resources available for management programmes from enhanced revenues from commercial oceanic fisheries, contribute to improved effectiveness of enforcement efforts through improved MCS and enforcement coordination, and provide specific technical advice on cost recovery mechanisms aimed at ensuring that resource users pay the full costs of management programmes, including enforcement. |
| Effects of Climate Change on the fisheries and the effectiveness of measures | I=3  P-5 | Climate change could substantially affect the Warm Pool LME and its vulnerability, requiring restructuring of approaches to conservation and management and maintaining ecosystem health, and adversely affecting the prospects for sustainable oceanic fisheries development for some Pacific SIDS. The project will undertake an analysis of the effects of climate change on the LME and the oceanic fisheries of the region, and incorporate these into a revised SAP |
| Non enactment of laws and amendments | I=3 | The high incidence of uptake by Pacific SIDS of regional initiatives through national legislation in the past, the involvement of a high number or national legal and other participants and institutions in Project capacity building activities and bottom-up involvement in other project activities mitigates this risk, but commitments to legal reforms and strengthening vary among SIDS.. |
| IUU fishing | I=3  P=1 | The available evidence suggests that the incidence of IUU fishing is low, and focused in particular areas and fisheries, rather than representing a threat to systematic progress towards Project outcomes. The project aims to strengthen Commission ABNJ monitoring and compliance programmes and the capacities of Pacific SIDS to deter IUU fishing in their EEZs |
| Lack of industry interest | I=2  P=1 | Overall industry interest in the Project scope is intense, However, it is particularly difficult for the generally small fisheries businesses in Pacific SIDS to participate in the relatively technical discussions on regional oceanic fisheries management. The project will provide support to the regional industry organisation (PITIA) to strengthen engagement by industry participants in national, sub-regional and regional oceanic fisheries management arrangements to lower this risk. |
| **Additional Risks Included in the Project Document** | | |
| Ineffective M & E system | I=2  P=2 | A number of lesson’s learned from the preceding OFMP project on the effectiveness of the M & E process have resulted in the investment of additional resources during the design of the project to address some of the practical complexities of the project M & E and remedy the identified weaknesses so the system becomes less of an administrative burden and more of a management tool. |
| Lack of GEF/UNDP/ FAO Project visibility | I=1  P=2 | With the strengths associated with delivery largely through FFA and SPC, and the large volume of co-financing, there is a risk that the identity of the GEF/UNDP/FAO-financed activities will be lost sight of particularly at the national level. This risk is to be addressed through national-level activities and will include but not be limited to the following: interaction with national focal points, rigorous GEF/UNDP/FAO branding, a strong knowledge management process with a GEF/UNDP/FAO identity including Project logos, webpage/site etc., association with IW:LEARN and IW biennial conferences, and other forms of Project visibility activities. |

(1): **High: 5 - Low: 1**

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The PIF included a commitment that the PIOFMP-II would be coordinated closely with the GEF-funded ABNJ Programme, for which FAO is the lead GEF Agency, and particularly the FAO-GEF project “Promotion of Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ). With the ABNJ Project Document available, the PIOFMP-II Project Document describes in detail, especially in the description of the outputs, how the two Projects will be coordinated. This includes identifying synergies, avoiding duplication, and sharing best practices.

1. **Additional information not addressed at PIF stage:**

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

The Project will be executed by the FFA in collaboration with SPC, and with the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA), the Te Vaka Moana Arrangement (TVM), the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG), the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) and WWF-South Pacific Programme. All Pacific SIDS and these organisations and arrangements will participate in the Regional Steering Committee and therefore be directly engaged in the overall management of Project activities. At national level, stakeholders will participate in project implementation through National Consultative Committees which include a wider range of government agencies and non-government actors.

In addition, the regional, sub-regional and national oceanic fisheries management processes have become more open and transparent. Although there is room for more openness and transparency, civil society engagement in oceanic fisheries management processes has greatly increased – 14 civil society organisations participated in the 2012 meeting of the WCPFC, with many other non-governmental personnel represented in the official delegations of Commission members, along with six intergovernmental organisations.

The Project is specifically designed to promote broader stakeholder participation in project management, delivery of project outputs and participation in project activities, especially through the partnerships with PITIA and WWF, and the support for Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification processes, as well as the Project Knowledge Management activities. Based on experience in PIOFMP-I, industry and environmental NGO representatives can be expected to routinely participate and contribute positively to the implementation of Project activities both as participants in national delegations to meetings, workshops and informal working processes and directly as industry and environmental NGO representatives. The national stakeholder analyses included in the National reports provide the basis for identifying appropriate roles for stakeholders in project implementation.

At the same time, there are some elements of the Project where participation by broader stakeholders is appropriately limited, especially in activities related to compliance and enforcement, while still providing for expression of broader stakeholder perspectives to be encouraged and taken into account. .

**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):**

In their commitment to long term conservation and sustainable use through the WCPFC, Pacific SIDS have also pursued longer term socio-economic goals, concerned to ensure the long term viability and value of key oceanic stocks, and the fisheries upon them both for economic growth and food security. These goals include:

• increased access fees for government revenue;

• increased employment and private incomes associated with the domestic fisheries development (including that beyond the catching sector) that is expected to flow from better-managed national fisheries; and

• increased contributions to food security that are projected to be necessary as other inshore marine resources around islands become fully exploited and as populations grow, with protection of the rights of local fishers being an important element.

In choosing to pursue long term goals through the WCPFC, Pacific SIDS expected that there would need to be short term economic sacrifices, including jobs, as limits were applied to fishing and tightened. In practice, the socio-economic outcomes of the initial stages of the WCPFC conservation and management measures have been highly positive. The WCPFC regional observer programme has already created around 500 relatively well paid and highly skilled jobs for Pacific Island onboard observers and onshore observer support, with at least as many additional new jobs likely to be created with the planned further development of the observer programme and planned strengthening of monitoring in port. In addition, another 70 permanent new posts have been established in other areas related to oceanic fisheries management in SIDS fisheries administrations.[[7]](#footnote-8) This large cadre of skilled Pacific Islanders is a key asset for securing the potential global environmental benefits from ensuring the sustainability of the world’s largest tuna fishery and the protection of non-target species affected by that fishery.[[8]](#footnote-9)

More broadly, the establishment of secure participatory rights in the purse seine fisheries for Pacific SIDS is providing incentives for private sector investment in onshore value added processing facilities, and giving Pacific SIDS greater leverage to secure crewing for their nationals. As a result, while overall crew employment may fall as fishing fleets are cut to ensure sustainability, Pacific Island crew numbers and employment in onshore processing are increasing as shown in the figure below, with projections that more than 30,000 new jobs could be created if the new cap and trade management arrangements can be fully and effectively implemented in the purse seine fishery.

A series of FFA and SPC studies on gender and tuna/oceanic fisheries since 2006, most recently an EU-funded SPC study on gender in fisheries science and management, have assessed gender related issues. At the broad socioeconomic level, improving the management of the region’s most valuable single natural resource offers improved food security, public services and income earning opportunities. In terms of gender participation, the 2011 report sees three ways to increase women’s participation in fisheries - raising the profile of fisheries as a potential career as well as the profile of women already working in the sector; providing a support network for women in fisheries and strengthening the institutional level (work environment and conditions). At the industry level, the differences in gender participation are reflected in employment of men almost completely onboard and largely of women in onshore processing facilities. From the employment patterns, 65-75% of the new industry jobs noted above are likely to be filled by women, but even then senior and technical positions will be largely held by men. However, perceptions are changing, as women gain access to education and communication technologies through gender-equity policies across societies and economies, and the preceding Project has been able to successfully use as role models the small but increasing numbers of women in senior commercial and technical positions.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Recently, contributions to Pacific SIDS government revenues from access fees are estimated to have remained stable at around US$70-80m but there are prospects for sharp increases in fee levels over the next five years if the purse seine cap and trade management systems can be fully and effectively implemented. A recent World Bank-funded study has projected fees from the purse seine fishery could increase by US$60-70 million annually if management can be improved, and the ADB has reported improvements in licensing revenue receipts in PNA member countries in 2013 as new higher fee levels work through into revenue streams.[[10]](#footnote-11) If zonal rights-based systems similar to the PNA purse seine VDS can be implemented for the longline fisheries, there should be substantial additional socio-economic gains.

The region’s tuna resources are also of increasing importance for food security. The most optimistic outlook for coastal fisheries is that fish supply per capita from inshore fisheries will slowly decline with overfishing, pollution and habitat destruction – the most likely outcome is a faster decline. There is substantial scope for increased consumption of catches from oceanic fisheries from two major trends to make up for the reduction in coastal fisheries supplies. Firstly, enhanced conservation measures banning dumping and requiring retention of some species are already seeing increased local landings and domestic supplies, and there is scope to greatly strengthen this approach including extending catch retention to other species that are currently generally dumped. Secondly, the development of domestic fleets encouraged by strengthened rights for SIDS increases domestic supplies, especially of lower value bycatches.

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

The physical context for PIOFMP-II is inherently costly, since it involves the delivery of support to 14 mostly small states spread over a huge area of the Earth’s surface with expensive air services. The Project is viable because it addresses cost-effectiveness in three ways. Firstly, it uses the existing institutional structures of the regional and sub-regional organisations and arrangements to deliver the Project assistance. In particular project services are largely managed and delivered through the existing structures of FFA and SPC, including their information services to SIDS and the intense programme of regular workshops, consultations and governance sessions already in place in the region. Secondly, the Project uses and promotes information technology and systems. Pacific SIDS through FFA and SPC have been at the forefront of the development of electronic data collection, and processing, and electronic monitoring on vessels and in ports, as one response to the scales of volumes of information that has to be collected and the scale of distance across which this information has to be collected, transmitted, processed and then made available to SIDS users. Thirdly, the Project promotes shared systems and the use of harmonised approaches that recognise national differences, to promote coherent information outputs, efficient fisheries management services, such as through integrated onboard observer and vessel tracking systems, and effectively harmonised legal and policy frameworks.

1. **Describe the budgeted M& E plan:**

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan is detailed in Section 7 of the Project Document. The indicative monitoring and evaluation work plan is presented in the Table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of monitoring and evaluation activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Budget**  **(USD)** | **Time frame** |
| Inception Workshop | * CTA/Coordinator * FAO & UNDP Country Offices * FAO Rome & UNDP GEF * FFA, SPC & other EAs | 30,000 | Within first three months of project start up |
| Inception Report | * CTA/Coordinator * FAO & UNDP Country Offices * SPC other EAs | 0 | Immediately following the Inception Workshop |
| Baseline Study to refine and measure Logframe Indicators | * CTA/Coordinator * Consultants as needed | 36,028 | 3rd quarter of the Project |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance | * Oversight by CTA/Coordinator * Measurements by FFA, SPC & other EAs | 0 | Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans |
| APR and PIR | * CTA/Coordinator * FAO & UNDP Country Offices * FAO & UNDP-GEF * SPC & Other EAs * RSC | 0 | Annually |
| RSC Meetings | * CTA/Coordinator * FAO & UNDP Country Offices | 120,000 | Following Project Inception Workshop and subsequently at least once a year |
| Periodic progress reports | * FFA, SPC & other EAs | 0 | As determined by UNDP & FAO Country Offices |
| Technical reports | * FFA, SPC & other EA * trainees * Consultants | 20,000 | As required in the Workplan |
| Mid-term External Evaluation | * FAO Fisheries Department, SAPA & UNDP Country Offices * FAO Evaluation Office and GEF Unit & UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit * External Consultants | 50,000 | At the mid-point of project implementation |
| Final External Evaluation | * FAO Fisheries Department, SAPA & UNDP Country Offices * FAO Evaluation Office and GEF Unit & UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit * External Consultants | 95,550 | At the end of project implementation |
| Terminal Report | * FFA, SPC & other EAs * FAO & UNDP Country Offices | 0 | At least three months before the last RSC |
| Audit | FAO & UNDP Country Offices | 80,000 | Annually |
| Periodic Site Visits | * FAO & UNDP Country Offices * FAO Rome & UNDP GEF | From IA fees & operational budget | Annually |
| **TOTAL indicative COST (**Excluding project team staff time and FAO & UNDP staff and travel expenses) | | US$ 431,578 |  |

**part iii: approval/endorsement by gef operational focal points and GEF agencies)**

**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.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Ministry** | **Date** *(MM/dd/yyyy)* |
| Mr. Vaitoti TUPA | Director, Cook Islands National Environment Service | Cook Is. | 27/10/2011 |
| Mr. Andrew YATILMAN | Director, Office of Environment and Emergency Management | Fed. States of Micronesia | 31/10/2011 |
| Mr. Jope Rinabobo DAVETANIVALU | Acting Director, Environment Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment, Department of Environment | Fiji | 08/11/2011 |
| **Mr. Farran REDFERN** | AG Director, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Kiribati | 29/11/2011 |
| **Ms. Yumiko CRISOSTOMO** | Director, Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC) | Marshall Is. | 25/12/2011 |
| **Mr. Russ KUN** | Secretary, Department of Commerce, Industry and Resources | Nauru | 23/12/2011 |
| Mr. Sione TONGATULE | Director, Department of Environment | Niue | 25/10/2011 |
| Mr. Sebastian R. MARINO | National Environment Planner, Office of the Environmental Response and Coordination, Office of the President | Palau | 26/10/2011 |
| Mr. Wari IAMO | Secretary, Department of Environmental Conservation | Papua New Guinea | March 7, 2012 |
| Mr. Taulealeausumai Laavasa MALUA | Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Samoa | 26/10/2011 |
| **Mr. Rence SORE** | Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology | Solomon Islands | 01/12/2011 |
| Mr. Asipeli PALAKI[[11]](#footnote-12) | Director, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change | Tonga | 21/11/2011 |
| Mr. Mataio TEKINENE | Director, Department of Environment. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Tourism, Environment and Labour | Tuvalu | 26/10/2011 |
| Mr. Albert WILLIAMS | Director, Department of Environment and Conservation, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources | Vanuatu | 27/10/2011 |

**B. GEF Agencies Certification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Agency Coordinator, Agency name** | **Signature** | **Date**  ***(Month, day, year)*** | **Project Contact Person** | **Telephone** | **Email Address** | |
| Gustavo Merino  Director  Investment Center Division  Technical Cooperation Department  FAO |  |  | Mr. Frank Chopin |  | Francis.chopin@fao.org | |
| Adriana Dinu  UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i. | Adriana_signature.png | 27 May 2014 | Jose Erezo Padilla | +66 2 3049100  ext. 2730 | jose.padilla@undp.org | |



**ANNEX A: Project Results Framework**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** IW GEF5 Objective 2: c***atalyze multi-state cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) while considering climatic variability and change***  *PIOFMP-II can be expected to provide one of the 5-6 examples of multi-state cooperation in an LME where 50% of the States adopt or implement national reforms and successfully demonstrate technologies and measures for sustainable fisheries that is the key target in the LME area for IW in GEF-5 while considering climatic variability and change* | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** | **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** | **Contributions of Proposed Project** |
| **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 | **Indicator 2.1:** Adoption or implementation of national/local reforms; functioning of national inter-ministry committees | National reforms and successful management measures will be delivered in all Pacific SIDS in the WTPWP LME to ensure sustainability of the oceanic fishery resources. |
| **Outcome 2.2**: Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs and local ICM frameworks demonstrate sustainability | **Indicator 2.2:** Cooperation frameworks agreed and include sustainable financing | The WCPF Convention and the Commission were agreed and established with GEF support implemented by UNDP through FFA. The Commission is now financially self-sustaining; the proposed project will strengthen WCPFC further by supporting countries meet their obligations to the Convention to ensure long-term sustainability. In addition, the project will support the PNA who have the most productive tuna fishing grounds, to strengthen their subregional organization and management. |
| **Outcome 2.3:** Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, ICM, habitat (blue forest) restoration/conservation, and port management and produce measureable results | **Indicator 2.3:** Measurable results for reducing land-based pollution, habitat, and sustainable fisheries from local demonstrations, including community benefits (disaggregated by gender) | There will be measurable results from innovative management arrangements including rights-based cap and trade management systems, enhanced compliance and enforcement schemes including port state controls and catch tracking, and by-catch mitigation arrangements. These results will include increased benefits for Pacific SIDS. |
| **Outcome 2.4:** Climatic variability and change at coasts and in LMEs incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management and ICM principles | **Indicator 2.4**: Updated SAPs and capacity development surveys | OFM aspects of the Pacific Islands IW SAP will be updated based on a new diagnostic analysis taking into account climate change and achievements in strengthening regional and sub-regional management arrangements |

|  | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | | **End of project target** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planned Global Environmental Benefits from the Project**  Conservation of the globally important transboundary stocks of tunas, billfish and other large pelagic species, and the protection of the associated transboundary non-target species, especially of sharks, seabirds and sea turtles in the WTPWPLME, while considering climatic variability and change | Status of 4 key [[12]](#footnote-13) WCPO tuna stocks | 3 of the 4 key tuna stocks not subject to overfishing, but fishing mortality is rising on those 3 stocks, measures are needed to maintain sustainability. | | Scientific projections indicate that fisheries on the major target stocks expected to result under the CMMs are sustainable | SC Reports | WCPFC CMMs, PNA VDS & Implementing Arrangements & other regional & sub-regional arrangements are effectively complied with  WCPFC can control fishing in the high seas  Agreement on CMMs can be reached in the WCPFC with other Commission Members |
| Status of key [[13]](#footnote-14)WCPO non-target species | Status of stocks of non-target species largely unknown. WCPFC has adopted mitigation measures to reduce mortalities of key non-target species, and requirements for species-specific reporting of catches of sharks and sea turtles, captures of seabirds and interactions with cetaceans. | | Reductions in catches and/or fishing mortalities of key non-target species. |
| **Project Objective**  To support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement & effectively enforce global, regional & sub-regional arrangements for the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries | Number of Pacific SIDS meeting WCPFC obligations | Principal legislative & policy framework aligned with WCPFC obligations for most Pacific SIDS. But subsidiary legislation, policy instruments and licence conditions need updating. | | All Pacific SIDS’ subsidiary legislation, policy instruments and licence conditions aligned with WCPFC requirements & systematic processes in place in all Pacific SIDS for adoption of new measures. | TCC Reports |  |
| Level of benefits to Pacific SIDS, including:  a) access fee revenue &  b) employment by gender | * 13,803 directly employed in fishing and processing (2010) * Access fees estimated at $111[[14]](#footnote-15) million in 2010 | | * Employment in SIDS growing by up to 5% per year. with increasing proportion of women * Access fees increasing by up to 10% per year | FFA Economic Indicators Report |
| **Component 1 Regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1**:  Comprehensive set of innovative on-the-water conservation & management measures (CMMs) adopted and applied by the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) for stocks of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME, incorporating rights-based and ecosystem-based approaches in decision-making & informed by sound scientific advice & information | Number of key target stocks to which comprehensive WCPFC CMMs are applied in EEZs | Two Interim CMMs in place focusing on bigeye and south Pacific albacore, and both have been identified as insufficient.  No systematic measures for management of other major target stocks | Comprehensive CMMs applied to all four key target stocks in EEZs by 2017. | | WCPFC Reports, including reports of Commission sessions, ,the Scientific Committee (SC) & the Technical & Compliance Committee (TCC) | Differences between WCPFC Members do not result in gridlock in the Commission  WCPFC is financially sustainable  WCPFC SC & scientific work is adequately resourced & functions effectively |
| Number of key non-target species impacted by WCPO tuna fisheries to which WCPFC CMMs are being applied | Four preliminary CMMs in place for protection of cetaceans, whale sharks, seabirds & marine turtles, as well as controls on shark finning, & very recently adopted CMMs to protect some shark species but their effectiveness is not known | CMMs reflecting Scientific Committee advice & best practice among tuna RFMOs in place for protection of all key non-target species | |
| **Output 1.1.1**  Ecosystem-based CMMs to control fishing mortality for the 4 major target stocks & to mitigate fishing impacts on key [[15]](#footnote-16)non-target species reflecting global best practices supported by all Pacific SIDS are submitted to WCPFC for adoption | Extent of submission of proposals for CMMs on target & non-target species by SIDS, & support for proposed CMMs on target & non-target species by SIDS | Partial & interim CMMs are in place on only two of the key target species (south pacific albacore & bigeye tuna), and both have been identified as insufficient.  CMMs in place to reduce the impact of fishing on turtles, seabirds, whale sharks, oceanic whitetip sharks, & cetaceans | | CMMs reflecting global best practices submitted to the Commission & supported by SIDS for conservation & management of key tuna species, & protection of all key non-target species | WCPFC Reports, including reports of Commission sessions, ,the SC & TCC, & the Finance & Administration Committee  Reports of WCPFC External Reviews  FFA briefs for WCPFC meetings  Reports of FFA Management Options Consultations & other relevant ad hoc consultation | Limits of SIDS institutional & human resources capacities do not prevent them from participating effectively in the WCPFC  SIDs are able to maintain positions of regional solidarity in the face of pressure from DWFNs on preparation of proposals & support for WCPFC CMMs |
| Percentage of SIDS participating in WCPFC sessions including proportion of representation & office holding, including those by gender in SIDS delegations | Baseline study will quantify the level of participation by SIDS at WCPFC sessions & SIDS personnel are beginning to become office holders. | | 80% participation maintained by SIDS in all relevant WCPFC meetings, with SIDS personnel holding senior offices in the WCPFC & its subsidiary bodies. Gender target to be established by the baseline study |
| Number of briefs prepared & preparatory working groups facilitated to support SIDS for relevant WCPFC meetings | Processes developed in Phase I for preparation of Briefs & common SIDS positions | | All request for briefing documents and preparatory working groups are completed and improved participation of Pacific SIDS |
| **Output 1.1.2**  WCPFC & other regional legal arrangements & compliance mechanisms in 8 key areas (see EOP target) to implement CMMs effectively & deter IUU fishing prepared &/or supported by all Pacific SIDS | Status of key WCPFC & other regional legal arrangements & compliance mechanisms operationalized. | WCPFC Vessel Monitoring System (VMS), Regional Observer Programme (ROP) and high Seas Boarding I Inspection Programme (HSBI) in early phase of partial implementation, Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) under trial, no Port State Measure or Catch Tracking  FFA MTCs out of date.  Niue Treaty Implementing Arrangements developed but not in effect. | | WCPFC VMS, ROP &HSBI operational, CMS operational & Port State & Catch Tracking CMMs adopted.  FFA MTCs updated  Niue Treaty Implementing Arrangements in effect  Reporting to WCPFC streamlined/automated  Cooperative surveillance & enforcement enhanced under Niue Treaty | WCPFC Reports, including reports of Commission sessions & the Technical & Compliance Committee  Reports of FFA Consultations on WCPFC & relevant FFC reports | Distant water fishing members of the WCPFC are not able to obstruct efforts to deter IUU fishing    Additional & effective sources of assistance to SIDS in MCS capacity building are identified & taken up |
| Extent of preparation & support of proposals for WCPFC & other regional legal arrangements & compliance mechanisms by SIDS | Progress on CMS is constrained, & progress on Port state & Catch Documentation CMMs is severely constrained by considerations related to SIDS capacities | | SIDS submit, or support proposals for CMS & relevant CMMs, including CMMs for Port State & Catch Tracking, & streamlined/automated procedures for reporting to the WCPFC |
| Patterns of participation by SIDS in WCPFC & TCC sessions including extent of representation & office holding, including participation by gender in SIDS delegations | There is a high level of participation by SIDS at TCC sessions & SIDS personnel are beginning to become TCC office holders. | | At least 85% participation by SIDS in all TCC meetings, with SIDS personnel holding senior offices in the Commission & its subsidiary bodies |
| **Outcome 1.2:**  Adaptive management of oceanic fisheries in the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME is put in place through better understanding of the impacts of climate change (CC) | Extent to which understanding of impacts of CC is reflected in management arrangements, including impacts on jurisdiction | There is a general understanding of the expected overall impacts but the information available has not been sufficiently specific to be reflected in management arrangements | | Management arrangements including jurisdictional arrangements have been reviewed to take into account effects of CC | Project Reports  FFA, PNA, TVM & WCPFC Records | Analysis of impacts of CC demonstrates need for management to be adapted |
| **Output 1.2.1**  CC forecasts & vulnerability of the Pacific SIDS region assessed in relation to 4 key target stocks and 6 key bycatch species & results & recommendations communicated to managers of potential impacts on oceanic fisheries | Forecasts of sub-regional CC impacts on major target species made available and accessible | WCPO-wide forecasts prepared for skipjack & bigeye tuna | | Forecasts of sub-regional CC impacts on 4 major target species available by year 3 | Project reports  SPC scientific reports | Appropriate technical experts can be recruited  Available data supports finer scale (sub-regional) forecasts & analysis) |
| Number of assessments of CC impacts on key bycatch species | No information | | Preliminary assessments of CC impacts for 6 key bycatch species by year 4 |
| **Output 1.2.2**  *S*ea level rise impacts on fisheries jurisdictions assessed for 14 Pacific SIDS & Pacific SIDS governments informed on priority areas of action and policy option*s,*  with related initiatives & related training of at least 45 personnel | Scope & quality of technically sound information made available by the Project on the implications of sea level rise/CC on jurisdictional claims, including country-specific information | Some general legal and academic analyses undertaken, but no country-specific or SIDS region-specific work known | | Analyses available of legal, political & economic implications of sea level rise/CC for the Pacific SIDS on their jurisdictional claims & sovereign rights with policy and strategy options, with priority to SIDS most vulnerable to inundation. | Project reports, including reports of national & regional consultations | SIDS attach priority to addressing the effect of sea level rise on fisheries jurisdiction  SIDS can reach agreement on a regional approach |
| Availability of national country assessments and technical reports including impact studies and the regional strategy through a knowledge hub | These analyses available through a knowledge hub |
| No. of SIDS personnel trained in relevant fields. | No record of training in these areas | | At least 45 policy, legal and maritime boundaries personnel trained in legal and socio-economic implications of climate change for oceanic fisheries jurisdiction. |  |  |
| Increased awareness of jurisdictional implications of CC demonstrated | Broad concerns held but no real awareness of possible responses | | Jurisdictional implications of CC addressed at appropriate regional & global fora | Reports of regional & global fora, including the Pacific Islands Forum, & media coverage | Relevant global fora attended by Pacific SIDS high level government representatives |
| **Output 1.2.3**  Updated TDA for oceanic fisheries & updated oceanic fisheries management aspects of the Pacific Islands IW SAP | Status of the revised TDA endorsement and implementation | Transboundary issues analyses undertaken in 1997 | | Revised TDA including climate variability and change adopted by the end of Year 2 | Updated TDA finalized & endorsed by Pacific SIDS | Technical expertise can be sourced to update the technical elements of the TDA & SAP  SIDS have time in a crowded regional calendar to consider the updated TDA & SAP elements |
| Status of the revised SAP endorsement and implementation | South Pacific SAP adopted in 1997 | | Revised SAP incorporates new information on stock status, institutional & economic developments, & climate variability and change prepared by the end of Year 2 | Ministerial level adoption of a declaration to update relevant sections of the SAP by year 3 |

|  | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **End of project target** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 2 Sub-regional Actions for Ecosystem- Based Management** | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1**  Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements are operationalized & enforced, including rights-based cap & trade arrangements for in-zone tuna fisheries, enhancing ecosystem sustainability & incentivized by sustainable fishery certifications | Status of Sub-regional conservation & management arrangements | PNA purse seine VDS in early stages of implementation, other sub-regional arrangements broadly agreed or emerging but not yet implemented | Sub-regional arrangements, including cap & trade arrangements in purse seine & longline fisheries & eco-certification arrangements are in operation & contributing to fishery sustainability | Project records  Records of PNA, TVM & other sub-regional groupings | Sub-regional & arrangements strengthen, & do not undermine sustainable development of oceanic fisheries  SIDS remain committed to sub-regional management arrangements |
| **Output 2.1.1**  Recommendations of the external review of the PNA VDS being implemented and applied to 1 million tonnes of catch annually in the EEZs of 7 of the 9 participating SIDS, including 20,000 tonnes of MSC-certified catch | Status of rights-based cap & trade vessel-day schemes, & other PNA management arrangements | PNA purse seine VDS beginning to operate with acknowledged weaknesses  External review of the purse seine VDS planned  PNA longline VDS in trial phase | VDS recommendations implemented and applied to catch of 1 million tonnes in the EEZs of 7 of the 9 participating SIDS  Longline VDS in operation.  Other PNA management arrangements in operation | PNA Records  MSC Audit reports | PNA Members maintain solidarity on key issues |
| Volume of MSC-certified catch supplied to the market | PNA free school purse seine skipjack fishery certified but no catch marketed | 20,000 tonnes of MSC-certified catch supplied to the market annually | Industry find it attractive to provide certified catch |
| **Output 2.1.2**  National harvest rights established and monitored for the 5 SIDS TVM participants | Status of harvest rights & related management regimes for TVM fisheries | No formal national harvest rights established for TVM tuna fisheries | National Harvest rights for TVM longline & purse seine fisheries agreed & beginning to be used | TVM, FFA & WCPFC (TCC & Commission meeting) records | TVM & other SIDS able to agree on compatible in-zone management arrangements  DWFNs prepared to cooperate in management of key stocks occurring in the high seas |
| Status of monitoring arrangements & operational activities for TVM fisheries | Monitoring arrangements are operational at national level, but these need to be applied to monitoring harvest rights | Monitoring of use of harvest rights for TVM tuna fisheries beginning to be implemented |
| **Output 2.1.3**  Enhancements to other sub-regional management arrangements | Status of other sub-regional management arrangements | Additional sub-regional management arrangements are emerging. MSG FTAC operations initiated, but limited in impact to date | Technical capacity of FTAC strengthened, outcomes and outputs mainstreamed for implementation. Other sub-regional arrangements contributing to sustainable development of oceanic fisheries where appropriate | Project Records  Records of other sub-regional management arrangements | SIDS perceive other sub-regional arrangements as contributing to sustainable development of oceanic fisheries |
| **Component 3. National Actions for Ecosystem-Based Management** | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1**  Innovative ecosystem-based on-the-water CMMs being effectively applied by Pacific SIDS in accordance with national plans & policies & with international, regional & sub-regional commitments & other relevant instruments | Number of Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations | Almost all Pacific SIDS have revised national laws to include obligations associated with the WCPFC Convention, but substantial lags exist in implementation of agreed arrangements through national plans, regulations and licence conditions, particularly for bycatch | At least 11 Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations | FFA Work Programme & Technical Reports  WCPFC Reports |  |
| **Output 3.1.1**  9 new national oceanic fisheries management plans and/or policies in support of ecosystem-based management adopted with enhancement of fisheries management skills of 60 SIDS fisheries management personnel in all 14 SIDS | Number of Pacific SIDS that have adopted new or revised oceanic fisheries management plans and/or, policies | 9 SIDS have been identified as requiring assistance to enhance national plans and policies | New national management plans and/or policies adopted in at least 9 SIDS in support of ecosystem-based management | FFA Work Programme & Technical Reports | SIDS remain committed to regional & sub-regional management arrangements  Countries willing to host & participate in workshops & make staff available for attachments.  Appropriate national personnel able to participate  National specialists available to take part |
| Number of fisheries management institutional & human resources capacity building activities by SIDS | New skills needed as management arrangements become more comprehensive, sophisticated & complex | National capacity building & awareness raising activities conducted in all 14 Pacific SIDS | Project progress reports |
| Number of fisheries management planning & policy personnel trained by SIDS & gender | Large number of new management personnel appointed during Phase I requiring training | At least 60 management personnel in 14 SIDS trained in fisheries management, planning & policy | Training/ workshop/ attachment reports |
| **Output 3.1.2**  11 revised national laws and regulations, &/or strengthened MCS programmes, and updated licence conditions in all 14 SIDS to operationalise WCPFC CMMs & other relevant conservation & management instruments with support through skills enhancement of law and compliance in 14 SIDS | Number of Pacific SIDS that have adopted new or revised national laws, regulations, license conditions & strengthened MCS programmes | Almost all national laws revised to include obligations associated with becoming Party to the WCPFC Convention, but 11 SIDS identified as requiring assistance to include in national laws& regulations additional requirements arising from WCPFC CMMs & other sub-regional & regional instruments.  Related improvements needed in licensing conditions in all 14 SIDS | Revised national laws, regulations &/or strengthened MCS programmes adopted in at least 11 SIDS (to apply WCPFC CMMs, & regional & sub-regional arrangements including PNA Implementing Arrangements, MTCs, & the Niue Treaty subsidiary arrangement).  Updated licence conditions in all 14 SIDS | FFA Work Programme & Technical Reports |
| Number of national legal & MCS reviews, consultations & workshops by SIDS | New skills needed as CMMs & MCS arrangements become more comprehensive, sophisticated & complex, & the threat of IUU fishing increases  Large numbers of new legal & MCS personnel requiring training | National legal & MCS reviews, consultations & workshops conducted in all 14 SIDS |
| Number of legal, MCS & enforcement training activities & personnel trained by SIDS & gender | At least 55 legal & 320 compliance officers trained to implement WCPFC CMMs, FFA MTCs & national laws | Training Reports |
| **Output 3.1.3**  Mitigation measures for key[[16]](#footnote-17) bycatch species, including key shark species, integrated into national management planning processes by at least 11 SIDS | Number of National Plans of Action & National Management Plans for bycatch, & revisions to national laws, regulations & license conditions related to bycatch | Known shortfalls & delays in SIDS implementation of monitoring of bycatch, especially key shark species, & bycatch mitigation measures.  Weak regional standards for shark conservation | At least 11 SIDS have integrated bycatch mitigation into national management planning processes at the national level & aligned national requirements with relevant sub-regional or regional measures or global instruments.  Better understanding of potential contribution of bycatch to food security | Project documentation  WCPFC Compliance Monitoring reports | Sufficient priority attached to bycatch mitigation  Improved information on bycatch rates & mortalities becomes available  Resources available for bycatch mitigation monitoring & research |
| **Outcome 3.2**  Integrated data & information systems & scientific analysis being used nationally for reporting, policy-making, monitoring & compliance | Use of oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis by Pacific SIDS. | Most SIDS have operational monitoring, licensing & MCS (VMS) data systems in place, but their use is limited gaps, weaknesses & lack of integration of data systems.  Phase I outputs, including National Tuna Fisheries Status Reports, national scientific webpages & scientific inputs into ecosystem-based management plans provide a basis with enhanced skills for increased use of scientific advice in Phase II | Enhanced oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis being used by all 14 Pacific SIDS, reflecting upgraded data & information systems in at least 10 Pacific SIDS, and newly integrated systems in at least 4 SIDS. | Project records  FFA, SPC  WCPFC Reports | SIDS capacity constraints do not unduly constrain their participation in data & scientific work |
| **Output 3.2.1**  Upgraded national data & information management systems developed & operationalized in 10 SIDS with training for around 350 personnel | Level of development of SIDS national integrated data & information systems | Most SIDS have operational monitoring, licensing & MCS (VMS) data systems in place, but with some gaps & weaknesses & they are not integrated. | Upgraded data & information systems in operation in 10 SIDS. | Project reports | Countries can afford to release staff for training & attachments. |
| Number of monitoring & data staff trained in each SIDS & gender balance in participation | Large number of new monitoring & data personnel requiring training | Training provided to around 350 national monitoring & data personnel |
| **Output 3.2.2**  National scientific analysis & support for ecosystem-based management provided to all 14 Pacific SIDS, with training for around 120 personnel | Number of comprehensive scientific advice provided to all Pacific SIDS | Basic stock assessment work now financed by the Commission, allowing a shift in emphasis to providing national advice building on Phase I progress. | Scientific advice & analysis on oceanic fisheries applied by all 14 SIDS | SPC Reports  Project reports | All SIDS seek national scientific advice |
| Number of participation by SIDS in SC sessions including extent of representation & office holding, including participation by gender in SIDS delegations | There is a high level of participation by SIDS at WCPFC & SC sessions & SIDS personnel are beginning to become office holders. | 85% participation maintained by SIDS in SC meetings, with SIDS personnel holding senior offices in the SC | SC reports | Limits of SIDS technical & scientific capacities do not prevent them from participating effectively in the SC |
| Number of technical & scientific staff trained in each SIDS by gender | Regional workshops, attachments & in-country training in Phase I have established the foundation for scientific analyses. | Around 120 national technical & scientific personnel trained in stock assessment methods & interpretation & ecosystem assessment & monitoring | Project reports  SPC presentations to SIDS for WCPFC & SC meetings, & relevant SPC & FFA meetings | Countries can afford to release staff for training & attachments. |
| **Component 4. Stakeholder Participation & Knowledge Management** | | | | | |
| **Outcome 4.1**  Greater multi-stakeholder participation in the work of the national & regional institutions with respect to oceanic fisheries management, including greater fisheries industry engagement & participation in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities | Percentage of participation by industry & other civil society stakeholders in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities, including INGO & ENGO participation | PITIA & WWF participated in Phase I & both have recently strengthened their programmes in oceanic fisheries management  Major progress under Phase I in external communications by the Project needs to be built on | Greater understanding of the need for management & the issues involved with proactive contributions from industry & other elements of civil society to the conservation effort | Project reports  PITIA & WWF websites  PITIA, WWF, FFA/FFC, SPC & WCPFC reports | High degree of political commitment to transparency & inclusivity  Project activities & outcomes are effective in contributing to focusing increased attention on oceanic fisheries, especially management & conservation issues |
| Number of national consultative or advisory processes/committees created or strengthened & operational | National consultative & advisory processes are variable & often weak if they exist at all | Formal advisory committees established & operational in at least 10 SIDS |
| **Output 4.1.1**  Broader stakeholder (Pacific SIDS, regional institutions, fishing industry & business sector, environmental NGOs, local NGOs, civil society, among others) awareness & involvement | Pacific Island tuna industry contribution to oceanic fisheries management | PITIA has begun to play a fuller role in 2012. | Widespread understanding among industry of the oceanic fisheries management issues important to the Pacific Islands tuna industry  PITIA providing info on the value of Pacific fisheries to national economies & the importance of management & conservation efforts | PITIA website  Media statements made through agreed collective industry positions  PITIA promotional material  Reports of PITIA meetings | PITIA remains active & able to participate in Project activities  PITIA able to use the knowledge & expertise of its Board & members to contribute to this process |
| Extent of WWF & other ENGO engagement in oceanic fisheries management | WWF has recently strengthened its engagement in WCPO tuna fisheries  Growing interest by ENGOs generally in WCPO tuna fisheries management | Activities of WWF & other ENGOs contribute to improved oceanic fisheries management, including through raising awareness & supporting eco-certification | Websites of WWF & other ENGOs  ENGO media statements & promotional material | WWF & other ENGOs able to maintain a focus on WCPO tuna fisheries |
| **Output 4.1.2**  Increased awareness & coordination through project workshops & meetings contributing to wider support for national, sub-regional & regional project activities with increased participation by women | No. of SIDS participating in Project Meetings | Level of participation in PIOFMP-I | Full participation by SIDS | Reports of Project activities and Meetings  Project Gender Analysis | Senior SIDS personnel can find time to participate in the Inception Workshop & RSC meetings |
| Percentage of participation of women in such events based on sex-disaggregated data | Level of participation in PIOFMP-I | Increasing nos. of women participating as SIDS representatives |
| Key FFA and FAO staff from PIOFMP-II and ABNJ Tuna Projects participate in respective PSCs, where PIOFMP-II/ABNJ Tuna Project coordination is discussed | Key FFA, SPC and FAO personnel have been involved in the development of the PIOFM-II and ABNJ Tuna Projects | FFA CTA attends Tuna ABNJ Project PSC  FAO Tuna Project LTO attends PIOFMP-II RSC  PIOFMP-II/Tuna ABNJ coordination is discussed at respective PSCs |
| **Output 4.1.3**  Effective project implementation through M&E with feedback mechanisms utilizing the regional & sub-regional arrangements & existing national mechanisms | Use of M&E Information | N/A | M&E information being used to ensure effectiveness of project activities & being fed into regional fisheries processes | RSC, FFC & SPC Heads of Fisheries Reports  Mid-term and Final Evaluation Reports | SIDS participate effectively in M&E processes |
| **Outcome 4.2**  Increased awareness of oceanic fisheries resource & ecosystems management & impacts of climate change | Level of media coverage of relevant issues | Phase I & the early period of operation of the WCPFC have generated greatly increased interest, focused on iconic non-target species, especially sharks. Awareness of associated with target stocks is inadequate in relation to their regional & global importance  General awareness of the expected impacts of CC on oceanic fish stocks & fisheries, but key institutional & legal aspects have not been raised. | Widespread, well informed coverage in Pacific Islands media of issues associated with conservation management of target & non-target species, & CC impacts | Internet searches  Project documentation  Technical Reports & media coverage | Project activities & outcomes are effective in contributing to focusing increased attention on oceanic fisheries, especially management & conservation issues |
| No. of communiques from relevant regional fora, including Pacific Island Leaders’ meetings covering oceanic fisheries | Oceanic fisheries management regularly addressed in Leaders’ communiques | Communiques from Pacific Leaders’ meetings & other regional fora |
| Continuing donor interest in funding oceanic fisheries agencies & projects | Donors, including the ADB & World Bank shied away from fisheries as catches approached their limits because of perceived lack of potential development gains. | Success in this Project & related activities encourages increased donor interest in Pacific Islands oceanic fisheries, attracted by the scope for increasing value through better management, | Donor reports |
| **Output 4.2.1**  Knowledge management (KM) & information systems (IS) that support communications and advocacy efforts by Pacific SIDS for the best management of their oceanic fisheries resources, including creation of a project website, publications, participation in relevant UNDP, FAO and GEF events and information exchanges particulary in IW;LEARN | KM & IS strategy developed and adopted | Phase I strategy provides a basis but needs further development | Strategy developed in year 1 and implemented by Year 2 | KM & & IS strategy documentation | Skilled media expertise can be attracted to work with the Project  Sufficient interest among stakeholders to make website \effective means of communication & information dissemination |
| Project website established and launched in Year 1 | Website from Phase I still in operation, but needs updating | Website is in operation by Year 2, and routinely  updated, capturing results  from Project activities, and providing links to key sources of information on regional oceanic fisheries | Measures of website use |
| Number of Pacific SIDS using quality promotional materials | Some experience in Phase I, with some successes, that can be built on, but this was an area identified as needing greater priority in PIOFMP-II | Project promotional materials being used by all 14 SIDS | Project CDs, pamphlets, videos, publications & giveaways |
| Number of staff participation in relevant UNDP, FAO & GEF events (especially IW:LEARN) | Partnership developed with UNDP & GEF now needs to be complemented by association with FAO | Number of Project staff & counterparts participating in GEF, UNDP & FAO events especially biennial IW Conferences | Project Documents including travel reports | Counterparts available to participate in these events |

**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. Council Comments**

None

**2. STAP REVIEW**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STAP Review Questions** | **Responses to STAP Review** |
| * 1. **STAP Advisory Response**: Consent | No response required |
| * 1. **Further guidance from STAP:** STAP suggests that in addition to anticipated results from regional, sub-regional and national institutional strengthening the full project brief should clearly indicate the targets and indicators regarding GEBs to result from the project. These should include longer term targets beyond the life of the project to which the WCPFC Commission is committed. | Longer term targets for sustainability of target stocks and protection of non-target species are included in the Results-Based Framework. The targets aim at having measures adopted and being implemented for sustainability of target stocks and protection of non-target species by the end of the project, but recognise that the effectiveness of the measures will only be measureable beyond the life of the project. |

**ANNEX C: Status of Implementation of Project Preparation Activities and the use of Funds[[17]](#footnote-18)**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: | | | |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Implemented*** | ***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)*** | | |
| ***Budgeted Amount*** | ***Amount Spent To date*** | ***Amount Committed*** |
| 1.      Project Preparation Planning | $29,000 | $23,186 | $0 |
| 2.      Technical Analyses | $57,000 | $60,178 | $0 |
| 3.      Project Structure and design | $42,108 | $34,006 | $0 |
| 4.      Stakeholder consultation on final project design | $50,892 | $65,658 | 0 |
| 5.      Project Document Preparation | $21,000 | $16,045 | $927 |
| **Total** | ***$200,000*** | ***$199,073*** | ***$927*** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0 |

**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

1. Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Refer to the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Includes bigeye, skipjack, south Pacific albacore and yellowfin tunas, which make up over 95% of the commercial catch in SIDS waters [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Includes 13 species of sharks impacted by fishing, 5 species of sea turtles, seabirds and cetaceans [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 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 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The posts established by each Pacific SIDS government are shown in the Annexes II to the National Reports set out in Annex F to this Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See for example <http://www.islandsbusiness.com/news/fisheries/2707/pacific-fisheries-observers-help-crack-down-on-ill/> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. See for example <http://www.ffa.int/gef/files/gef/OFMP%20Profile%201.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. <http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/radio/program/pacific-beat/tuna-fee-revenue-higher-than-expected-in-four-pacific-countries/1228676?autoplay=1228416> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Tonga advised that Mr Palaki had replaced Dr Halatuituia but this change was still in the process of being notified to the GEF. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Includes bigeye, skipjack, south Pacific albacore and yellowfin tunas, which make up over 95% of the commercial catch in SIDS waters [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Includes 13 species of sharks impacted by fishing, 5 species of sea turtles, seabirds and cetaceans [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. FFA Economic Indicators Update, October 2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. See footnote 33 [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. See footnote 33 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)