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

**part i: project information**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| “Realizing the inclusive and sustainable development in the BCLME region through the improved ocean governance and the integrated management of ocean use and marine resources” Short Title – Improving Ocean Governance and Integrated Management in the BCLME | | | |
| Country(ies): | Angola, Namibia, South Africa | GEF Project ID:[[1]](#footnote-1) | 5753 |
| GEF Agency(ies): | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | PIMS 5313 (UNDP) |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Benguela Current Commission | Resubmission Date:  Resubmission Date: | 24 May 2016  10 Aug 2016 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | International Waters | Project Duration(Months) | 63 |
| Name of Parent Program (if applicable):   * For SFM/REDD+ * For SGP * For PPP | N/A | Project Agency Fe e ($): | $981,000 |

1. [**Focal Area Strategy framework**](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/GEF5-Template%20Reference%20Guide%209-14-10rev11-18-2010.doc)**[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focal Area Objectives** | **Expected FA Outcomes** | **Expected FA Outputs** | **Trust Fund** | **Grant Amount** ($) | **Cofinancing**  ($) |
| IW-2 | Outcome 2.1: Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs, ICM principles, and policy/legal/ institutional reforms into national/local plans | Policy/legal/institutional reforms adopted  Agreed commitments to sustainable ICM and LME cooperation frameworks  Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments  Enhanced capacity for issues of climatic variability and change | GEFTF | 9,700,000 | 147,511,000 |
| IW-3 | Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management | Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments | GEFTF | 1,200,00 | 16,404,000 |
| **Total project costs** | | |  | 10,900,000 | $163,915,000 |

1. **Project Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective:** To realize a coordinated regional approach to the long-term conservation, protection, rehabilitation, enhancement and sustainable use of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem in order to provide economic, environmental and social benefits and wellbeing to the region through the implementation of the Benguela Current Convention and accompanying Strategic Action Programme | | | | | | |
| **Project Component** | **Grant Type** | **Expected Outcomes** | **Expected Outputs** | **Trust Fund** | **Grant Amount ($)** | **Confirmed Cofinancing**  **($)** |
| Component 1: Improved Ocean and Coastal Governance through SAP Implementation and Delivery at Regional, National and Local levels | TA | 1.1 Regional Level Ocean and Coastal Governance operating effectively by building on existing institutional governance structures and through cooperative commitments from the participating countries toward an ecosystem-based management approach within the defined priorities of the BCC Implementation Plan and the requirements of the Convention. | A detailed and expanded Full Governance Assessment undertaken (building on the preliminary Governance Baseline Review undertaken during project preparation).  Regional level sectoral correlation of policy and legal frameworks (e.g. between all 3 national fisheries sectors, national mining sectors, etc.) and Development, Adoption and Implementation of Regional Codes of Conduct that include monitoring and compliance mechanisms  Regional consistency and compatibility of ecosystem monitoring programmes, to include appropriate indicators of stress reduction, environmental improvement and human welfare (food security, poverty, livelihoods, etc.) to enhance the LME-wide monitoring programme.  Regionally compatible Water Quality Standards and Monitoring Guidelines for pollution and biosafety developed, adopted and implemented  Regional State of the Ecosystem Information System (SEIS) operational for State of Ecosystem reporting and providing input to adaptive management guidelines and early warning of large-scale variability  Regional Coastal Sensitivity Atlas developed for BCC to guide coastal activities based on science and associated knowledge  Science-to-Governance process strengthened/adopted for the sustainable future of the BCLME through the BCC architecture. | GEFTF | $4,857,882 | $86,210,000 |
| 1.2: National Level Ocean and Coastal Governance strengthened and supported by BCC through inter-sectoral national institutional strengthening and consequent implementation at the national level of the regional codes of conduct, monitoring programmes water quality standards and other supportive adopted stress reduction policies and legislation arising from Outcome 1.1. this provides support to the individual efforts within the countries that are promoting management and policy changes and improvements in line with the creation of an enabling environment for multi-sectoral ocean governance. | The effectiveness and delivery of the National Intersectoral Committees (NICs) supported and strengthened as required by each country  National Strategies for SAP implementation developed and adopted by each country (including adoption and implementation at the national level of the regional codes of conduct, monitoring programmes water quality standards and other adopted stress reduction policies and legislation  The National Science-to-Governance process strengthened and given support for implementation using the NICs and other appropriate and nationally-agreed institutional interactions  Adoption and Implementation (including associated strengthening and realignment of legislation and administrative support) at the national level of regionally-developed sectoral approaches and reforms along with consistent codes of conduct as well as data and information processes (e.g. national ecosystem monitoring programmes and water quality standards)  National Policy-Level Briefing Documents on Blue/Ocean Economy developed and/or available, based on Results and Conclusions from Regional Economic Valuation and Cost-Benefit Analysis  Sustainable fisheries promoted through eco-labelling and by-catch reduction at the national level, and to identify best practices and ‘pilot’ partnerships/ demonstrations that can be replicated as appropriate  Women’s empowerment in the ocean and coastal governance field promoted through the support to the implementation of the gender mainstream strategies in respective countries in the maritime/fisheries sectors |
| 1.3: Evidence-based development and implementation of national-level integrated governance and management mechanisms (in line with the Ecosystem-Based Management approach and in support of SAP Implementation) utilizing a ‘bottom-up’ piloted demonstration-and-replication strategy for each country | National Governance Pilots as progenitors for adoption and implementation of countrywide integrated coastal and marine spatial planning and management mechanisms in line with LME regional SAP implementation and domestic application of the BC Convention  Angola Governance Pilot:  Improving management practices in Angola to reduce stress on fisheries while enhancing fisheries community welfare  Namibia Governance Pilot:  Demonstrate and establish national sustainable strategies for the use of ocean and coastal resources through the development and implementation of integrated and holistic coastal and marine planning and management  South Africa Governance Pilot:  Investigating the causes and impacts of impaired water quality on the living marine resources and associated dependent communities in order to develop/improve national standards and guidelines for water quality maintenance in line with SAP implementation and domestication of the BC Convention |
| Component 2: Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Collaboration to realise sustainable SAP Implementation and Delivery | TA | 2.1: Regional and National level stakeholder engagement activities and interactive cooperation for delivering SAP implementation and BCC Convention domestication | Regional Stakeholder engagement forum established that promotes interaction and inclusive management discussions across all sectors  National Stakeholder engagement fora established through the National Intersectoral Committees, or similar structures, that promote interactions and inclusive management discussions across all sectors  Stakeholder Briefing documents prepared and circulated widely (through different distribution mechanisms) on the role of BCC and the issues and concerns surrounding the BCLME  BCC lessons learned and best practices for the improved ocean governance and the sustainable LME management shared via various outreach mechanisms and platforms | GEFTF | $2,323,029 | $28,650,000 |
| 2.2: Community level engagement activities for delivering SAP implementation and BCC Convention domestication | Strengthening and support for further development and adoption of partnerships between communities and local government /municipalities  Targets and actions agreed and adopted to reduce environmental and social impacts and stresses among pilot communities in line with SAP implementation  Priority gender-related issues and concerns in the pilot communities identified and addressed and lessons and best practices captured for further transfer and replication  Active participation of the youth supported through the annual BCC Youth Summit and other activities of the Benguela Youth Ocean Network (BYON) at national level and regional levels  Awareness raised at community levels about the Convention, BCC and the SAP |
| 2.3: Public and Private Sector Engagement strengthened through partnerships that are developed to support specific SAP and Convention implementation activities as identified under Component 1 and to support relevant priority national, bilateral and regional policy, institutional and management strengthening and improvement, along with sectoral reforms being adopted in line with the SAP and its Implementation Plan | BCC Business Leadership Forum established, in partnership with the regional and national private sectors  Ecosystem monitoring and assessment capacity strengthened through regional industry partnerships in the monitoring and assessment process  Public-Private Sector Partnership for Oil and Gas Exploration, Extraction and potential Spill Response developed and adopted  Adoption of effective national ballast water management practices along with the compliance of the private sector (in particular shipping and port industries) operating in the BCLME region. |
| Component 3: Capacity Building and Training to support sustainable SAP Implementation and Convention Domestication | TA | 3.1: Capacity Development and Strengthening of the BCC, its Secretariat and various associated Committees and Bodies. Areas of focus will include strengthening monitoring capabilities (at both the ecosystem level and the institutional level); strengthening capacity for management of donor funds and activities; delivery of an overall regional and national programme of training and capacity building both for individuals and for institutions | Improved coordination, communication, planning and operations within the BCC Secretariat and its bodies and structure  BCC’s capacity to monitor and report the Convention and SAP implementation progress and its effectiveness strengthened, with the establishment and adoption of agreed indicators of delivery for each strategic solution (priority theme) in the SAP  Regional Capacity Development Programme adopted and implemented in line with agreed national and regional capacity needs for the BCC Convention and SAP implementation and as per the BCC Training and Capacity Building Policy | GEFTF | $1,658,299 | $19,195,000 |
| Component 4: Marketing and Resource Mobilisation and Fiscal Sustainability | TA | 4.1: Sustainable long-term management structures and financing mechanisms adopted by the BCC and its various national and regional institutional bodies and with full political support underpinned by both public and private sector investments | Regional Economic Valuation Studies updated/completed, with a particular focus on biodiversity/living marine resources data  Regional Cost-Benefit Analysis updated/completed to promote and facilitate the implementation of selected proposed policies related to SAP implementation  Pre-feasibility studies conducted for investment in the sustainable blue/ocean economy strategies related to sustainability of ecosystem goods and services in the BCC region  Sustainable financing mechanisms for BCC identified and adopted at the national and regional level that can provide a reliable ‘exit strategy’ from donor funding | GEFTF | $1,166,390 | $22,790,000 |
| Subtotal | | | |  | $10,005,600 | $156,845,000 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC)[[3]](#footnote-3) | | | | GEF TF | $894,400 | $7,070,000 |
| **Total project costs** | | | |  | $10,900,000 | $163,915,000 |

1. **sources of confirmed** [**Co-financing**](http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/GEF_C21/C.20.6.Rev.1.pdf) **for the project by source and by name ($)**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co-financier (source)** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Co-financing Amount** ($) |
| National Government | Angolan Government | Cash 85%a  In-Kind 15%a | 45,000,000 |
| National Government | Namibian Government | 45,000,000 |
| National Government | South African Government | 45,000,000 |
| GEF Agency | UNDP | Cash | 300,000 |
| Bilateral Agency | EAF Nansen Programme | Cash | 5,000,000 |
| Multilateral Agency | Benguela Current Commission | Cash | 2,500,000 |
| Multilateral Agency | GIZ | Cash | 10,125,000 |
| Multilateral Agency | SEAFO | In-Kind | 500,000 |
| Private Sector | SADSTIA | In-Kind | 900,000 |
| Academic Institutions | NMMU | In-kind | 9,590,000 |
| **Total Co-financing** | | | **163,915,000** |

**Cash Co-Financing:** this is Cash co-financing that will be used directly to support project activities

**In-Kind Co-financing**: This where the co-financing is represented by personnel time or parallel activities that contribute to the overall sap implementation and convention objectives

**a** These figures for Cash and In-Kind co-financing for countries are a best estimate of the percentage breakdown prior to actual project implementation

1. **trust fund Resources Requested by agency, Focal Area and country**1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Regional (Angola, Namibia, Comoros) | $10,900,000 | $981,000 | $11,881,000 |
| **Total Grant Resources** | | | | $10,900,000 | $981,000 | $11,881,000 |

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 ($)** | **Co-financing  ($)** | **Project Total  ($)** |
| International Consultants | $510,600 | $400,000 | $910,600 |
| National/Local Consultants | $1,028,100 | $280,000 | $1,308,100 |

1. **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 pif[[4]](#footnote-4)**

|  |
| --- |
| 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.  **NOT APPLICABLE** |

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

**NOT APPLICABLE**

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

**NOT APPLICABLE**

A.4.

The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address remain substantially the same as that presented in the approved PIF, although the structure presented in the Project Document has been slightly refined and streamlined from the original structure presented in the approved PIF. Actual sequencing of the Outcomes, Outputs and Deliverables under the Components have been adjusted to better reflect countries’ needs and to strengthen the logic of the document. The logic of this sequence for each output has been included in the Main Objectives and Deliverables section for ease of understanding.

A new Component 4 addressing Marketing and Resource Mobilisation and Fiscal Sustainability has now been added in response to the STAP review recommendation that an ‘exit strategy should take the multiple stages of GEF support to the littoral countries cooperative action into account and provide a scenario for the future’. This new Component will be aiming to ensure that sustainable long-term management structures and financing mechanisms are put in place by the BCC and its various national and regional institutional bodies and with full political support underpinned by both public and private sector investments. It will do this through a sequential process that expands and strengthens Regional Economic Valuation Studies. Updates and strengthens a Regional Cost-Benefit Analysis, conducts Pre-feasibility studies for investment in the sustainable blue/ocean economy strategies related to sustainability of ecosystem goods and services in the BCC region and identifies, Sustainable financing mechanisms for BCC at the national and regional level which can provide a reliable ‘exit strategy’ from donor funding.

Furthermore, where the PIF refers to MPAs and EBSAs as well as Marine Spatial Planning, considerable discussion has taken place between UNDP, BCC, the countries and the GIZ MARISMA project to ensure a collaborative approach and avoid any duplication The GIS MARISMA project is working closely with the same countries and alongside BCC to pilot effective MSP with an emphasis on EBSAs. In this context, the UNDP GEF project on ‘Improving Ocean Governance and Integrated Management in the BCLME’. Will cooperate closely with GZI MARISMA to expand their pilots, and to develop a harmonised and integrated approach through the LME that brings together MSP and ICM as a single ecosystem-based planning and management approach. This has been the subject of significant discussion and negotiation between the two projects and the participating countries to reach an amicable and cost-effective agreement that benefits all parties while making best use of available funding. This arrangement and agreement is captured in the Project Document in a number of relevant places and discussed in some detail under a specific section on Collaboration with the GIZ-supported MARISMA Project under section **2.7 - Partnerships with related Projects and Initiatives**.

A. 5. [Incremental](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1890) /[Additional cost reasoning](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1325): 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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE-Global_Environmental_Benefits_Assessment_Outline.pdf) (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

**NOT APPLICABLE**

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:

**NOT APPLICABLE.** Mandatory UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) has been followed during the project preparatory phase and it is attached to the Project Document.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant initiatives

Coordination efforts have been ongoing and strengthened further during the project preparatory phase.

The principle initiatives within the BCLME Region that are very closely related to the aims and objectives of the Convention, to SAP Implementation and to the overall aims and objectives of the current UNDP GEF BCLME project are:

1. **The GIZ-supported MARISMA Project.**
2. **The FAO/GEF Project’ Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System**

The text above has already explained the strong partnership with MARISMA. The FAO-GEF Climate Change Resilience project is a combined initiative between the Benguela Current Commission, the governments of Angola, Namibia and South Africa, FAO and the Global Environmental facility (GEF). The goal of the project is to build resilience and reduce the vulnerability to climate variability and change of the marine fisheries and mariculture sectors within the BCLME through strengthening adaptive capacity and implementing participatory and integrated strategies in order to ensure food and livelihood security. As both Projects are being executed by the BCC and its Secretariat, the Commission will ensure close coordination between them. Specific areas of collaboration would include:

* Joint evolution of multi-sectoral approaches to adaptation and increased resilience to climate impacts in each country with a strong emphasis on integrating these into marine spatial planning and into community level SAP implementation. The UNDP GEF Project places a strong focus on National Intersectoral Committees for LME SAP Implementation. These Committees can also provide a forum for ensuring that climate resilience is taken into account in any decisions that related to SAP implementation and overall management of resources and livelihoods within the LME.
* Collaboration in the assimilation and dissemination of available knowledge to increase understanding and awareness of the existing and the likely future impacts and implications of climate change and variability on fisheries, and mariculture, and on communities and other settlements dependent on them. The lessons and best practices (which are important deliverables from many of the UNDP GEF outputs, particularly the governance pilots) will provide additional vehicles for the FAO GEF project to disseminate such knowledge.
* Shared piloting of best-practices to strengthen climate resilience in fisheries and aquaculture and thereby improve governance and the security and livelihoods of coastal dwellers. This provides an excellent opportunity for close collaboration within the governance pilots whereby the FAO project can test climate resilience activities and develop best practices alongside the UNDP GEF Community livelihoods and stress reduction support. These lessons and practices can then be captured at the national level as the governance pilots become scaled up.
* Collaborative development and demonstration of pilots for an ecosystem approach to fisheries. In this context, the UNDP GEF Project has recognised the need to collaborate closely with the FAO GEF project at the level of the governance pilots in each country as is captured in Annex 2 and in the discussions and activities of Component 1.3

In order to ensure closer and in-depth collaboration and complementarity between these two closely interwoven projects and their aims and objectives, it is proposed that the Project and the BCC will highlight the more obvious areas of interaction (and options for avoidance of any overlap) at the Inception stage and will further make this the subject of a specific meeting/workshop between the two project and the GIZ MARISMA project to ensure complementarity of efforts and true collaborative delivery in support of the BCC and its SAP Implementation Plan through an agreed work-plan and road-map . As the Management Board of the BCC will be providing the Steering Committee function for both projects it is expected that these two initiatives will be closely interactive and non-duplicative.

In Namibia, The Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project has been tasked to pave the way for an Integrated Coastal Zone Management System in Namibia. This is a GEF-funded initiative which started in March 2006 under the auspices of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Clearly, NACOMA’s work and legacy feeds directly into the aims of this demo project and close partnership will be encouraged via the Namibian demonstration under Component 1) on **integrated and harmonised coastal and marine planning and management for Namibia in line with BCLME SAP implementation**.

Between Namibia and South Africa (as well as other non-BCLME countries), the **Orange-Senqu River Commission (ORASECOM)** promotes the equitable and sustainable development of the resources of the Orange-Senqu River. ORASECOM provides a forum for consultation and coordination between the riparian states to promote integrated water resources management and development within the basin. UNDP GEF supported an initial Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the Basin leading to a Strategic Action Programme. They are now planning a second phase to implement this SAP and the Orange River Mouth will be an important area in that SAP Implementation. The Namibian Demo Project will interact closely with this UNDP GEF supported project for the Orange Senqu River SAP implementation process. This will include the direct involvement of ORASECOM and the Orange-Senqu River SAP Implementation initiative (UNDP GEF Project) in any planning and strategies developed for the Orange River Mouth. The two Commissions (BCC and ORSECOM) have already developed a close relationship through the two GEF projects and ORASECOM senior staff already sit as observers at meeting of the BCC Management Board. The BCLME Project will continue to work closely with its sister UNDP GEF Project for Orange-Senqu River SAP Implementation through these two commissions to encourage more ‘institutionalised’ interactive relationship with ORASECOM, with senior staff continuing to be invited as observers to the appropriate BCC Management and technical meetings in order to better progress the joint activities and joint interests highlighted in ‘From Source to Sea”

**The EAF- Nansen Programme** 2016-2020 is currently being finalised. The new Programme has an expanded scope both as regards research and management activities as compared to the present phase and a new research vessel will be available from about January 2017. The three pillars of the new programme are science, fisheries management (EAF) and capacity development. A draft project document has been developed providing the overall framework and scope. Detailed planning is however still required as regards specific activities in respective regions and countries. For the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) area, the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) has been the key partner for the first phase of the EAF-Nansen Project and this will be the same in the second phase as the converging objectives of the EAF-Nansen Programmme and the BCLME SAP, make the BCC a natural partner for future collaboration with the EAF-Nansen Programme in South West Africa. A recent workshop for the BCLME region resulted in the identification of regional priorities that can be addressed in cooperation with the EAF Nansen Programme and can be used as basis for more detailed planning. In relation to science priorities, it was noted that the following criteria should apply:

1) Sustainable fisheries management is still at the heart of the Programme particularly as regards main transboundary resources. In particular, the elements of BCC’s Implementation Plan that require action to be taken on MCS (and IUU) were highlighted as an equal priority for the EAF-Nansen Programme.

2) Research should primarily address regional issues (e.g. shared fishery resources/stocks), but could be “localized” in nature (e.g. study of recruitment processes for any important regional stock)

3) The EAF-Nansen Programme will operate primarily within countries EEZs but work in ABNJ can also be included in collaboration with RFMOs

4) To the extent possible, research activities should take cognizance of and coordinate with national, regional and international fisheries and marine research Programmes

5) Research should be linked to management needs, either tactical (short-term) (e.g. necessary for fisheries management, assessment or monitoring of oil and gas impacts, or for overall or environmental management), or strategic (long-term), contributing to “global public goods”.

**SEAFO – The South-East Atlantic Fisheries Organization/Convention**

The SEAFO Secretariat is located in Swakopmund, Namibia within the same office building as the Benguela Current Commission.This Convention was signed in April 2001 in Windhoek by Angola, the European Community, Iceland, Namibia, Norway, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Kingdom (on behalf of St. Helena and its dependencies of Tristan da Cunha and Ascension Islands) and the United States of America. It entered into force on April 2003 after the deposit of instruments of ratification by Namibia and Norway and approval by the European Community as required under Article 27of the Convention. The Convention is the first to create a regional management organisation after the adoption of the UNFSA (United Nations Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks). Although the UNFSA was not in force at the time of the signature of the SEAFO Convention and for that reason did not create any binding obligations for the participants in the SEAFO negotiations, it nonetheless formed an essential backdrop to those negotiations. The SEAFO Commission has adopted a **Conservation Measure 08/06** to ensure that IUU fishing in the whole of Atlantic Ocean is minimised. In so doing, the Commission has adopted a measure to list IUU vessels that are in the IUU lists of Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (NAFO), Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) and the Commission for the Conservation of the Antarctic Living Marine Resources (CCAMLR). Furthermore, once the Commission adopts the IUU Vessel List, it has the responsibility and requirement to act on that list in the context of preventing and taking legal action against offending parties (see Project Document for more detail)

**FAO Port State Measure Agreement to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (PSMA)**

This Agreement entered into force on 5th June 2016. Port State Measures (PSM) are requirements established or interventions undertaken by port states by which a foreign fishing vessel must comply with, or is subjected to as a condition for use of ports within the port state. National PSM will typically include requirements related to prior notification of port entry, use of designated ports, restrictions on port entry and landing/trans-shipment of fish, restrictions on supplies and services, documentation requirements and port inspections, as well as related measures, such as IUU vessel listing, trade-related measures and sanctions. The Agreement aims to prevent illegally caught fish from entering international markets through ports. Under the terms of the treaty, foreign vessels will provide advance notice and request permission for port entry, countries will conduct regular inspections in accordance with universal minimum standards, offending vessels will be denied use of port or certain port services and information sharing networks will be created. Along with international and regional initiatives aiming at implementing and enforcing PSM, individual states are adopting such measures. Whether it is the implementation of PSM schemes adopted by Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) or nationally adopted PSM, national legal frameworks and their implementation are crucial in enabling port states to apply PSM to combat IUU fishing. National legal frameworks should empower national authorities to take adequate enforcement action against vessels involved in IUU fishing in their own ports, with a view to contributing to undermining fishing activities that are not carried out in accordance with conservation and management measures adopted by RFMOs, other states and the port state itself.

**B. additional information not addressed at Pif stage:**

|  |
| --- |
| B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.  The key stakeholders of the BCLME region are well known and the BCC is cognizant of new or emerging stakeholders due to changes in the use, governance or conservation of the ecosystem. The project will take advantage of the knowledge and awareness generated and, connections established through the BCLME SAP Implementation Project support and to build on these for meaningful participation. From the Components described, local communities, the youth, private sector, academia, local and regional/ provincial authorities and regional and international partners will all be meaningfully involved in specific SAP and Convention activities to enable effective a shift toward sustainable use of the LME through collective governance. The Inception meeting for this project will aim to ensure broad stakeholder participation to review the Project elements and activities to assure national ownership of the Project. One entire component (Component 2: Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Collaboration to Realise Sustainable SAP Implementation and Delivery) of the project has therefore been allocated to ensure stakeholder engagement and partnership collaboration in SAP implementation and stress reduction within the LME. A regional Stakeholder Engagement Forum is one of the intended Outputs from the Component, along with national stakeholder engagement being captured through the National intersectoral Committees and/or similar national interactive bodies. Stakeholder Briefing documents will also be prepared and circulated under this Component. In promoting and demonstrating improved ballast water management, the project plans an initial stakeholder workshop to identify constraints and review priority requirements. Therefore, through this current project, both on-going partners and new partners will be engaged into the SAP Implementation process. Section 2.6 and 2.7 further describe this process |

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):

The project aims to bring about tangible changes on the ground not only for environmental status of the BCLME but also to the socioeconomic and development status of those who live and utilize the resources of BCLME. The three national demonstrations **integrated management mechanisms and strategies at a pilot scales in each country for the sustainable use of ocean and coastal resources** under Component One will have strong gender and youth focus and an overall strong focus on socioeconomic improvement alongside ecosystem stress reduction within a sustainable development ethos. Socioeconomic benefits to women and youth through the implementation of these demonstration projects will be monitored through the collection of gender and age disaggregated data at the beginning, mid-term, and completion of the demonstration projects. The Ecosystem Valuation and Cost Benefit assessment aspects leading to the investment pre-feasibility studies planned under Component 4 will also drive a process that will be promoting a ‘blue/ocean economy’ approach with a specific focus on investments that can reduce any impacts on the ecosystem and the dependent socioeconomic environment. In particular, it will focus on reducing those impacts and threats to human well-being and socio-economic development and demonstrating how investments pay significant dividends and returns through the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services.

|  |
| --- |
| B.3.Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:  The project aims to embrace a cost-effective approach through a number of active mechanisms as follows:  Partnerships and Collaboration: One priority focus of the BCLME III project will be on strong collaboration and cooperation between various national and regional initiatives that are addressing marine and maritime activities that relate directly to SAP implementation. The Project Document addresses this intention for close collaboration and cooperation between the various related funding initiatives in the region (see A.7. Coordination with other relevant initiatives – above). This collaboration with other projects has been stressed and actively developed during the Project preparation phase.  Active Stakeholder Engagement: Close cooperation with other major stakeholders and ‘players’ within the LME, especially the private sector. An entire Component has been elaborated to address Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Collaboration for Sustainable SAP Implementation and Delivery (Component 2). One of the main focal areas in this Component will be on National and Regional Stakeholder Engagement, the latter through a regional forum and through Industry Stakeholder Days (as part of the Annual BCC Science Forum). As engagement with the Private Sector is considered to be vitally important for the BCLME region, various interactions are planned including a Business Leadership Forum.  Strengthening the Overall Coastal and Ocean Governance Process through a Harmonised Management Approach:  Building and expanding the overall coastal and ocean management process alongside and in parallel with existing and planned government policies and activities such as Operation Phakisa in South Africa, existing plans and initiatives to develop more effective and integrated marine spatial planning and integrated coastal management in Namibia, And government policy in Angola to work more closely with community groups in a cooperative management environment (particularly including the ministries responsible for Fisheries and for Environment)  Sustainable Long-term Management Structures and Financing Mechanisms Implemented:  Since the original PIF was approved, a new Component has been added to address the concerns raised by GEF and particularly the STAP Review in relation to the need to develop longer term sustainability and to reduce dependence on donor funding. This new Component 4 on Marketing and Resource Mobilisation and Fiscal Sustainability has a sequential delivery that aims to make the overall BCC/Convention/LME management process more cost-effective and sustainable without having to continuously rely on donor support. This will be achieved through a progressive development from a regional Economic Evaluation, through a Cost-Benefit Analysis leading to Pre-feasibility studies for investments related to stress reduction and a ‘blue economy’ sustainable development approach, and finally to the identification and implementation of sustainable financing mechanisms alongside an appropriate long-term institutional structure/facility to support and drive such investments.  The Role of the Benguela Current Commission:  Using the Benguela Current Commission as the Executing Agency and incorporating BCC staff into the programme management process increases efficiency and cost-effectiveness. This is a prime example of how the structures and institutional arrangements created and developed through the evolution of an LME project can be harnessed and sustained for long-term management and administrative functions within an LME context |

**C. describe the budgeted m &e plan:**

The project’s Monitoring and Evaluation plan has been budgeted at $165,000 (excluding the inputs from Project staff and countries and cost associated with M&E responsibilities carried out by UNDP as the GEF IA). This includes an Inception Workshop, Quarterly reporting to the Implementing Agency, Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports, standard Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation and site visits.

In addition to the standard M&E plan associated with a GEF project of his nature, the BCLME III Project plans to develop and adopt a Monitoring and Evaluation programme to track progress ‘on-the-ground’ in capacity development and training in the region related to SAP implementation. This will include a Capacity Tracer Study conducted twice during Project lifetime for targeted key institutions in the region and to track placement of trained individuals.

These three components will be supported by a cross-cutting monitoring and evaluation and adaptation learning component (Component 4). The component will ensure a systematic monitoring and evaluation of progress towards the achievement of the objectives. It also serves to promote the wider dissemination of results for replication in other large marine ecosystems

Furthermore, the Benguela Current Commission itself will be monitoring the overall SAP implementation process and the GEF Project and the BCC will be jointly supporting a Monitoring and Compliance post that will focus more specifically on ensuring that the aims and objectives of both SAP implementation and the BC Convention are being complied with and delivered. On a larger global scale of M&E, 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 in as relevant and appropriate, scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus. In particular, the Project will participate within the GEF IW: LEARN and LME: LEARN networks, (contributing a minimum of 1% of project budget to IW portfolio learning), the African LME Caucus and other appropriate regional and global initiatives in an effort to network between International Waters projects both regionally and globally, sharing lessons learned, and developing and deploying innovative ocean governance tools and methods. Other relevant networks will be harnessed where appropriate.

**PART iII: Approval/endorsement by gef operational focal point(s) and gef agency(ies)**

1. **Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point(s) on Behalf of the Government(s):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s)](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/OFP%20Endorsement%20Letter%20Template%2011-1-11_0.doc) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter)](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/OFP%20Endorsement%20Letter%20Template%20for%20SGP%2009-08-2010.doc).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Ministry** | **Date *(MM/dd/yyyy)*** |
| **Mr. Carlos CADETE** | **National Director of Statistics, Planning and Studies Office** | **Min. of Envt, Angola** | **March 7, 2014** |
| **Teofilus Nghitila** | **Environmental Commissioner** | **Min. of Envt& Tourism, Namibia** | **March 5, 2014** |
| **Zaheer Fakir** | **Chief Policy Advisor, International Relations** | **Dept of Envt Affairs & Water, South Africa** | **March 18, 2014** |

**B. GEF agency(ies) certification**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency Coordinator, Agency Name** | **Signature** | **Date  *(Month, day, year)*** | **Project Contact Person** | **Telephone** | **Email Address** |
| Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator | Adriana_signature.png | 10 August 2016 | Akiko Yamamoto | +251 91 250 3316 | akiko.yamamoto@undp.org |
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**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Not Applicable** |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):**  **2.5. Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation**  **1.3. Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste** |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  **IW Objective 2: Catalyse multistate cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) while considering climatic variability and change** |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  **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**  **Outcome 2.2. Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs and local ICM frameworks demonstrate sustainability** |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  **Indicator 2.1: Implementation of national/local reforms; functioning of national inter-ministry committees.**  **Indicator 2.2: Cooperation frameworks adopted & include sustainable financing** |

| **Project Strategy** | | | | **Verifiable Indicators** | **Means of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Delivery** |  | **Baseline** | **Overall Output** |
| **Project Objective:**  To realize a coordinated regional approach to the long-term conservation, protection, rehabilitation, enhancement and sustainable use of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem in order to provide economic, environmental and social benefits and wellbeing to the region through the implementation of the Benguela Current Convention and accompanying Strategic Action Programme |  | A Benguela Current Commission has been formally adopted as has a Benguela Current Convention. BCC needs to be more appropriately structured and supported and needs stronger institutional and intersectoral representation at the national level. Both the BCC Implementation Plan and the Convention expectations need to be harmonised under one set of priorities and these need to drive and delivery actual stress reduction activities. Stronger stakeholder engagement in this process is essential for long term management of LME resources as is a long-term investment plan to support stress reduction improvements | BCC fully supported in terms of staffing  SAP Implementation priorities synchronised with Convention requirement  On-the ground demonstrations of more effective and interactive stakeholder engagement and strengthening of the necessary partnerships for sustainability  Development of stronger capacity within the region for ecosystem-based management, including appropriate training strategies  Marketing and resource mobilisation with a strong focus on fiscal sustainability within the BCC and BCLME. This will include leveraging and promoting financial flow/investments that support and pilot real on-the-ground stress reduction processes | BCC has full staff complement  Single work-plan & road-map  Successful pilot project completed with communities and private sector  Capacity Development Trackers  Clear records of successful investments and returns from stress reduction activities by various stakeholders  Approximately 5,000 linear km of Coastline in the LME under ICM and MSP and contributing to preventing further loss and degradation in most significant marine protected areas  Approximately 1,000 sq. km identified and/or designated as EBSAs and/or MPAs with formal management processes and mechanisms in place  BCC provides improved management to 100% of the coastline through SAP implementation and BC Convention | BCC MB Minutes and BCC website as well as documents  Final evaluation reports on pilots  Capacity Development Tracker shows effective delivery of Regional Capacity Development Programme and measurable increase in capacity for SAP implementation  Stress reduction in LME measurable as a result of investment activities and reported through BCC to BCC MB and to UN and GEF  ICM and MSP interactive and enshrined in national legislations (documentation available from BCC)  MPAs and EBSAs formally documented and available from BCC | Continuing support from countries for BCC and BCLME SAP Implementation process. Recent signature of the new Benguela Current Convention supports this |
| **Component 1:**  Improved Ocean and Coastal Governance through SAP Implementation and Delivery at Regional, National and Local levels | **Outcome 1.1**  Regional Level Ocean and Coastal Governance operating effectively through cooperative commitments from the participating countries toward an ecosystem-based management approach within the defined priorities of the BCC implementation plan and the requirements of the Convention. | Countries have made commitments to BCC and to the Convention through an ecosystem-based management approach. Countries have also started to transform legal, institutional and policy approaches and practices in line with these commitments. Countries now need to follow a clear road-map at regional and particularly national level to ensure that A. instruments and institutions are fully functional and interactive, B. That this clearly focuses on stress reduction to the LME and its resources and C. that this is sustainable in the long-term | 1.1.1. A detailed and expanded Full Governance Assessment undertaken (building on the preliminary Governance Baseline Assessment delivered during project preparation) to identify: A. More effective use of existing institutional, legal and policy instruments in support of SAP implementation and ecosystem-based management, B. Strategies for delivering these improvements; and C. Identifying and adopting options for long-term sustainability (including funding) of BCC and supportive national institutions. | Actions within the BCC Implementation Plan and for domestication of the Convention are aligned and prioritised by BCC within one road-map/document with a clear monitoring structure and timed delivery, and adopted by the Commission through its Management Board  Prioritised governance improvements and associated road-map for delivery and monitoring adopted by each country based on a review of the preliminary GBA as well as the above aligned single document (to include sustainability strategies and long-term fiscal arrangements)  Clear evidence presented back to BCC of improved institutional arrangements, legal and policy realignments within each country through annual monitoring and reporting to Management Board and Ministerial Council  Measurable stress reduction within the LME through confirmation of appropriate indicators adopted as part of the aforementioned road-map. These indicators to be directly linked to ecosystem-based management and governance reforms and improvements and to include clear examples of reduced coastal pollution and other stress reductions throughout the LME | New, single document (road-map) adopted by Management Board and in daily use by BCC to deliver and to monitor institutional improvements and policy / legal realignments to ensure stress reduction in the LME  Country level Implementation Plans adopted, monitored and delivery reported to Management Board on a regular basis. National Status-of-Implementation reports to contain details of improvements and relate to actual stress reduction. Management Board to provide reactions and forward to Ministerial Conference,  Biennial State of the LME report produced by BCC and reviewed by Management Board prior to presentation to the Ministerial Conference. | That the countries are ready and willing to make the necessary changes at the institutional and policy levels and support these financially. Commitment to the SAP and the Convention would support that they are ready and willing while further agreement to a new road-map for delivery will provide necessary confirmation.  That countries have the fiscal support from their cabinets and treasury to make this happen and sustainable. It is expected that the Ministerial Conference can provide the platform to ensure this. |
| 1.1.2. Regional level sectoral correlation of policy and legal frameworks and Development, Adoption and Implementation of Regional and National level Codes of Conduct that include monitoring and compliance mechanisms. | Regional ‘Standard’ Codes of Practices and/or Convention protocols adopted by the BCC through its Management Board for:   * Environmental Impact Assessment * Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries * Transboundary fish stock management * Hazardous spill response   Joint monitoring and compliance processes adopted by BCC and its Management Board (and implemented through Cooperative Agreements) for:   * Transboundary fish stock assessment; * Oil, gas and mining sector activities * Coastal development activities   Full ratification/ accession by all BCC countries to the FAO Port State Measures Agreement  Adoption of appropriate legislative instruments and administrative requirements necessary for effective implementation of Port State Measures  Formal Agreements negotiated, signed and implemented with SEAFO and FAO for combatting IUU within the region both at sea and through port state management measures  Full feasibility study report and Business Plan for a regional MCS Centre for consideration and possible adoption by BCC Ministerial Conference and Management Board | Codes of Practice adopted formally by Commission and Countries  Protocols enacted into the Convention  Trans-national agreements on monitoring and compliance in place and countries collaborating as appropriate to the subject matter  FAO PSMA acceded to by all three countries  Appropriate national legislation adopted and/or confirmed in order to implement PSMA  Formal agreements with SEAFO and FAO signed and under implementation  Feasibility and Business Plan available, reviewed by BCC MC and MB and decision minuted | These represent major formal policy and legal commitments by countries and they would need to be willing to drive these through their national legislation.  However, many of these commitments are already enshrined in the SAP and the Convention and merely need legal substance.  All three countries need to have the capacity to implement these and to monitor compliance. This may require additional training and skill-sets to be developed through a CB&T programme |
| 1.1.3: Regional consistency and compatibility of ecosystem monitoring programmes, to include appropriate indicators of stress reduction, environmental improvement and human welfare (food security, poverty, livelihoods, etc.) to enhance the LME-wide monitoring programme. | BCC Management Board adopts a Regional Ecosystem Monitoring Programme (REMP) with very specific Stress Reduction and Environmental/Socioeconomic indicators and deadlines  Distributed to National Focal Institutions for adopt and implementation by member countries at the national level (see Outcome 1.2 below)  Feedback to appropriate BCC bodies (Management board. etc.) on measurable improvements in the overall welfare of the LME and dependent communities  Annual reports circulated in public domain (as part of the existing Data Management Policy and Protocol) highlighting measurable improvement as well as areas of urgent/priority action | Formal minutes of Management Board  REMP lodged at the BCC for open access  Formal letters of Distribution | That ecosystem monitoring needs are same for each country. This will be addressed during development but, at LME level, should be same.  National level governments reticent to adopt due to capacity and financial commitments. See Component 4 for mechanisms to address this including partnerships beyond government. |
| 1.1.4: Regionally compatible Water Quality Standards and Monitoring Guidelines for pollution and biosafety developed and adopted through the Ecosystem Advisory Committee (in potential collaboration with appropriate global bodies such as IMO, WHO, etc.). | Adoption of regional WQS by BCC Management Board  Regional WQS formally adopted at national levels for implementation by appropriate national government institutions and/or mandated bodies  National level feedback to BCC for monitoring purposes and for regular reporting  Annual reports circulated in public domain (as part of the existing Data Management Policy and Protocol) highlighting measurable improvement as well as areas of urgent/priority action | BCC Management Board minutes  Reports from National Focal Institutes to BCC confirming adoption  Regular reporting from NFIs to BCC through Management Board and other appropriate BCC bodies on monitoring of WQ | That countries are willing to adopt a ‘single’ standard. This is already within the spirit of the SAP and the Convention.  Lack of in-country capacity to undertake WQ monitoring. See Component 4 for mechanisms to address this including partnerships beyond government. |
| 1.1.5: Regional State of the Ecosystem Information System (SEIS) operational for State of Ecosystem reporting and providing input to adaptive management guidelines and early warning of large-scale variability (such as coastal erosion, harmful algal blooms, etc.). | Regional SEIS functioning within BCC or similar appropriate national/regional body as selected by countries  Regular and comprehensive reporting from countries through NFIs to SEIS  Regular reporting from the SEIS to the BCC MB and back to the countries to provide input to national adaptive management processes (see below) | Physical presence of SEIS and associated staff, hardware, software verifiable  Country report available within SEIS and proven to be comprehensive and usable  SESI reports to countries and MB available and providing pragmatic advice on adaptive management measures and options | Countries may be cautious about sharing national State of the Ecosystem information at a regional level.  Data sharing agreements need to be confirmed  Countries need to have an effective intersectoral review process that can ensure adaptive management recommendations can be acted upon (See references to NICS below) |
| 1.1.6: Regional Coastal Sensitivity Atlas developed for BCC to guide coastal activities based on science and associated knowledge. | CSA reviewed and approved by appropriate BCC bodies including formal acceptance by Management Board  CSA used by BCC and partners to support the overall regional transboundary marine spatial planning process  CSA formal distributed to countries via NFIs  CSA used at national level by each country to support overall national spatial planning within the LME (i.e. basin and coast to edge of EEZ) | Minutes of various BCC bodies and specifically the Management Board  Formal MSP process adopts and uses CSA as shown through reporting and monitoring of GIZ project  Evidence of use of CSA in national MSP processes | Countries consider the CSA to be accurate and are not deterred by any sensitivities in using it for MSP  CSA will need to have broad stakeholder input including from industry |
| **1.1.7**: Science-to-Governance process strengthened/adopted for the sustainable future of the BCLME through the BCC architecture. | Formal Science / Knowledge to Governance strategy and institutional arrangements adopted and under implementation by BCC MB  Advisory Reports to BCC MB on main conclusions and options for action arising from the Annual Science Forum  BCC MBG actively involved in setting agenda and discussion topics for Annual Science Forum  An Active BCC Peer Review Roster that can review and confirm trends and changes and link them to possible management options  Results from the Economic Evaluations and Cost Benefits Analyses used as part of the development management options and decision-making  Management Board advises the Ministerial Conference on Adaptive Management progress  Formal recommendations to BCC on further research and studies as feedback from MB and from Ministerial Conference  Best Lessons and Practices captured and shared with the regional and global LME and IW community | Formal strategy lodged with BCC and regularly monitored by EAC (with reports to MB) to track progress and actions taken  Minutes of Management Board and EAC  Formal Advisory Reports from ASF to BCC MB (as a required process and output)  Minutes of BCC MB define priority studies as well as agendas for ASF  Peer Review Roster lodged with BCC and regularly updated  Formal reports submitted by BCC MB to Ministerial Conference to include advise on proposed adaptive management options and scenarios  Formal distribution by BCC of Adaptive Management guidelines to NFIs  Feedback Reports from Adaptive Management actions taken through NFIs to BCC and thus to MB |  |
| **Outcome 1.2**  National Level Ocean and Coastal Governance strengthened and supported by BCC through inter-sectoral national institutional strengthening and consequent implementation of at the national level of the regional codes of conduct, monitoring programmes water quality standards and other adopted stress reduction policies and legislation arising from Outcome 1.1. | Absence of effective ecosystem-focused national level intersectoral management structures in the countries. Need to develop a firm basis and institutional structure for multi-sectoral ocean governance in order to effectively deliver SAP implementation and domesticate enactment of the Convention at the national level | 1.2.1: The effectiveness and delivery of the National Intersectoral Committees (NICs) strengthened within each country. | A single, harmonised generic Terms of Reference adopted by BCC and its Management Board to guide the establishment and activities of the National Intersectoral Committees in each country  Each country formally adopts a National Intersectoral Committee with responsibility for taking action on SAP and Convention implementation at the national level  Annual Briefing Reports provided by countries via the Management Board on the role and activities of the NICs | Existence of ToR and adoption in minutes of Management Board  Minutes of each national NICs available in each country to show actions taken | Some countries already have related committees for Coastal Management or similar thematic areas  These may be used to form the basis of the NICs for SAP implementation |
| Output 1.2.2: National Strategies for SAP implementation developed and adopted by each country (including adoption and implementation at the national level of the regional codes of conduct, monitoring programmes water quality standards and other adopted stress reduction policies and legislation arising from Outcome 1.1 and captured nationally by Output 1.2.4 below) | Each NIC is implementing an adopted road-map with appropriate indicators (including verifiable indicators of stress reduction and environmental/ socioeconomic improvement) and associated, agreed budget and monitoring strategy  Annual Monitoring of implementation and delivery (using adopted indicators) is reported formal through NICs and BCC MB | Minutes of NIC meetings  Presence of road-map etc.  Formal reports from NICs to BCC MB | Requires national agreement to report on the results and finding of NICs to regional BCC MB |
| 1.2.3: A National Science-to-Governance process strengthened and implemented using the NICs and other appropriate and nationally-agreed institutional interactions in support of the effective implementation at the national level of the Adaptive Management and Policy Decisions agreed at the BCC and/or national level. | Formal procedures adopted and implemented by NICs (from a standard format ToR approved by BCC MB) for translating technical and scientific data into adaptive management guidance. This to include a Scientific Review Panel or similar structure.  Formal deliver of management options/scenarios and potential policy options from NICs to appropriate government departments  Review of national-level SAP Implementation and domestication of Convention undertaken by each NIC every 24 months and reported back to BCC MB | Minutes of NICs and reports back to BCC MB  Adaptive Management guidelines and recommendations formally delivered to national ministries (recorded in NICs Minutes.  Formal Reports from NICs to BCC MB every 24 months | Ministries will act on the adaptive management guidelines and recommendations (Actions will be captured in 24-monthly reports)  NICs and countries willing to share information on progress in SAP Implementation and domestication of the Convention |
| 1.2.4: Adoption and Implementation (including associated strengthening and realignment of legislation and administrative support) at the national level of regionally-developed sectoral approaches and reforms along with consistent codes of conduct as well as data and information processes (e.g. national ecosystem monitoring programmes and water quality standards) | National level adoption and implementation of the regionally-correlated Codes of Conduct along with any requisite legislative and administrative improvements and strengthening  Adoption and implementation by countries of national ecosystem monitoring programmes (including water quality standards for monitoring) in line with regional agreements for ecosystem monitoring  National ecosystem monitoring programmes implemented and functional and include measurable & verifiable indicators of stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic indicators of sustainable development)  Monitoring and compliance programme for same in place along with long-term budgeting  NICs reporting back to BCC MB on status of all of above with BCC providing feedback and advise on delivery and any adaptive processes required | Codes of Conduct enacted in national legislation  National Ecosystem Monitoring Programmes underway using regional standards and similar methods and indicators and confirmed through NICs reports to BCC MB  Overall monitoring and compliance programmes for codes of conduct captured in reports from NICs to BCC MB | Countries will share their information and status updates at regional BCC level  Data sharing agreements are an imperative |
| 1.2.5: National Policy-Level Briefing Documents on Blue/Ocean Economy developed, based on Results and Conclusions from Regional Economic Valuation and Cost-Benefit Analysis and distributed through NICs | NICs adopt Briefing Documents on National Blue/Ocean Economy Status and road-map  Briefing Documents used in national marine spatial planning process by appropriate government bodies with feedback to BCC via Management Board | Briefing documents along with national road-maps for implementation made available to BCC bodies and to Management Board  Reporting from NICs to BCC on MSP progress and how economic Valuation and Cost Benefit Analyses are being used. | Ministries need to be prepared to use the Briefing Documents and to pursue the road-map to deliver effective MSP |
| 1.2.6: Sustainable fisheries promoted through eco-labelling and by-catch reduction at the national level, and to identify best practices and ‘pilot’ partnerships/demonstrations that can be replicated as appropriate | Partnership agreements adopted and signed for sustainable fisheries in the BCLME and lodged with BCC  Sustainable fisheries pilot programme running successfully under partner management and including regional eco-labelling and bycatch reduction activities  Formal reporting back to BCC (including Science Forum) on success and challenges of the ‘sustainable fisheries through ecosystem labelling’ programme | Partnership agreements lodged with BCC or appropriate national/regional institutions  Pilot programme reporting to BCC and its Management Board and publishing/reporting its activities | Fishing industry needs to be on-board as a partner as do all Fisheries Ministries |
| 1.2.7: Women’ empowerment in the ocean and coastal governance field promoted through the support to the implementation of the gender mainstream strategies in respective countries in the maritime/fisheries sectors. | Comprehensive gender analysis completed for the BCLME region and its institutions and governance mechanisms  National gender mainstreaming strategies approved and distributed by NICs (with appropriate indicators as noted in main ProDoc text)  Formal support from BCC Management Board for national recommendations on gender mainstreaming strategies (including training programmes and website facilities)  Provide support to an ‘umbrella’ organisation or gender NGO that can promote gender mainstreaming issues and practices | Formal reporting from NICs  National Gender Mainstreaming strategies discussed and supported by BCC MB | Needs commitment at national level to strengthen gender mainstreaming |
| **Outcome 1.3**  Evidence-based development and implementation of national-level Local level integrated governance and management mechanisms (in line with the Ecosystem-Based Management approach and in support of SAP Implementation) utilizing a ‘bottom-up’ piloted demonstration-and-replication strategy for each country | Limited involvement of communities in the governance structure from local up to national levels. | 1.3.1: National Governance Pilots as progenitors for adoption and implementation of countrywide integrated coastal and marine spatial planning and management mechanisms in line with LME regional SAP implementation and domestic application of the BC Convention | (See Annex 2 – Results Frameworks for each country pilot for further details)  **Angola Governance Pilots**  Improving management practices in Angola to reduce stress on fisheries while enhancing fisheries community welfare  **Pilot Area 1 Indicators**  Community level management organisations established within 17 communities within the Luanda province  Spatial mapping and planning finalised and implemented  A Sustainable Economic Development Strategy adopted and implemented  Eco-friendly fishing practices including gear restrictions and exchanges implemented  (see Annex 2 – RF for further details)  **Pilot Area 2 Indicators**  Community cooperatives for mariculture adopted and under implementation mariculture stations in place and functional  throughout the North, Central and Southern coast of Benguela Province, which represents some 39,827 square kilometres.  **Pilot Area 3 Indicators**  Spatial mapping and planning process completed across the 98 square kilometres of the target area  Intersectoral stakeholder Development Advisory Board (DAB) formally adopted and functional  Local Economic Development Plan formally agreed and under implementation by DAB and other appropriate government agencies along with Investment pre-investment feasibility studies  **Namibia Governance Pilot**  Establish national sustainable strategies for the use of ocean and coastal resources through the development and implementation of integrated and holistic coastal and marine planning and management  **Pilot Level Indicators**  Ecosystem Valuation and Cost Benefit Evaluation Reports finalised  Local Economic Development Plans and associated investment feasibility studies agreed and implemented at Pilot sites (with direct involvement and interaction between BCC and ORASECOM at Commission level and Technical level)  **South Africa Governance Pilot**  Investigating the causes and impacts of impaired water quality on the living marine resources and associated dependent communities in order to develop/improve national standards and guidelines for water quality maintenance in line with SAP implementation and domestication of the BC Convention  **Pilot Level Indicators**  Water quality standards and practices adopted at pilot sites following agreement on Diagnostic Analysis  Communities and partners providing regular marine water quality monitoring reports and providing managers and decision-makers with adaptive management advice and options | Formal Reports delivered to BCC by Lead National Agencies  Terminal Evaluation Report confirms | National Commitment to demonstrations (including co-financing) is forthcoming and national ownership includes all relevant stakeholders (especially at community level) |
| **Component 2**  Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Collaboration to realise sustainable SAP Implementation and Delivery | **Outcome 2.1**  Regional and National Level Stakeholder Engagement Activities for Delivering SAP Implementation and BCC Convention domestication | Current engagement with and involvement of all stakeholders (governmental and non-governmental) into the LME management and ocean governance process is very limited generally although it varies from one country to another. There is a need for stronger community involvement in the coastal and marine spatial planning and management process. There is also a need for stronger interaction between the public and private sector to encourage more industry involvement and interaction. | 2.1.1: Regional Stakeholder engagement forum established that promotes interactions and inclusive management discussions among government, private sector, NGO, community-based organisation, academia and partners on policy and institutional strengthening and improvement. | BCC identifies/hires a specific member of staff or a consultancy group/company to be responsible for developing and promoting stakeholder engagement  A stakeholder engagement work-plan (and associated budget) agreed and adopted by BCC  BCC Annual Science Forum has specific Industry Stakeholder days allocated and orchestrated by a Stakeholder Steering Group  Industry Stakeholders will provide conclusions and proposed actions that should be taken by industry in partnership with government; identified support actions and funding | Post and/or ToR formally adopted and person in position  Minutes of BCC MB and presence of work-plan lodged in BCC files/archives  Formal reports and recommendations from the Industry Stakeholder days submitted to BCC MB  Monitoring by BCC and MB of actions taken by Industry in partnership with government | Industry and government can work in harmony and agree on priorities  Industry understands the value and is prepared to invest in the sustainability of the LME goods and services |
| 2.1.2: National Stakeholder engagement fora established through the NIC that promote interactions and inclusive management discussions at country level among government, private sector, NGO, community-based organisation, academia and partners on policy and institutional strengthening and improvement. | ToR adopted for a National Stakeholder Fora  Regular national Stakeholder meetings that develop more interactive management approaches (particularly PPPs)  Summary outcomes of the National Stakeholder Fora included in NICs reports to BCC Management board | ToRs formally approved by NICs and available through NFIs  Formal reports from Stakeholder meetings showing effective interactions | National Governments willing to engage with comprehensive stakeholder involvement |
| 2.1.3: Stakeholder Briefing documents prepared and circulated widely (through different distribution mechanisms) on the role of BCC and the issues and concerns surrounding the BCLME as well as the economic importance and long-term sustainability of its goods and services | Stakeholder Briefing documents developed and distributed to national and regional stakeholders  Policy briefs developed, packaged and disseminated from BCC and through NICs  Briefing Documents, press releases and Media Information circulated by BCC and NICS | Stakeholder awareness raised (as assessed by consultation with stakeholders)  Senior level Ministers, Company Directors, etc. aware of Policy Briefs and confirm actions being taken  High level of awareness at media level and physical presence of information in and on media platforms | All stakeholders are prepared to review the awareness information and are equally prepared to act on it as appropriate |
| 2.1.4: BCC lessons learned and best practices for the improved ocean governance and the sustainable LME management shared via various outreach mechanisms and platforms | BL & P and Experience notes prepared by BCC and circulated through IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN  Regional workshops and round-tables for LME management issues delivered by BCC in close collaboration with LME/IW:LEARN  Participation of BCC personnel in IWC  Twinning exercises identified and implemented with other African Caucus member LME communities | BL & P reports and Experience notes available to MTE and confirmed received by LME/IW:LEARN  Reports from Workshops and Round-tables and inclusion of activity details in IW:LEARN newsletters  Participants lists for IWC plus any presentations  Reports lodged in BCC on results of twinning exercises communicated to IW:LEARN | Sufficient funding for BCC personnel to attend IWC and undertaking twinning  Some funding included into the project to cover this |
| **Outcome 2.2**  Community Level Engagement Activities for Delivering SAP Implementation and BCC Convention domestication | Very limited interaction directly between communities and government, especially in relation to SAP implementation and management of resources within the LME. Community level impacts to the LME as well as stresses on the communities as a result of non-community involvement in management threaten to create widening rifts between communities, local/municipal government and ultimately national government. This further threatens to overall management strategies for ocean and coastal resources and SAP implementation | 2.2.1: Strengthening and support for further development and adoption of partnerships between communities and local government /municipalities to assist countries in their efforts to involve communities in all aspects of SAP implementation at the local level | Local Community Ecosystem Councils or similar established through intervention of NICs and through advisory ToRs from BCC  Strengthening of Distance Learning and Information Sharing Technology by BCC  Priorities for SAP Implementation activities identified and adopted by community groups, including long-term monitoring of stress reduction, environmental and socioeconomic indicators  Feedback from Community Councils/Groups to NICs on actions taken and successes  Best lessons captured from actual activities and reported to NICs  NICs report to National Government and to BCC Management Board on activities, lessons, practices and status of indicators | ToRs, membership and minutes from meetings  Work-plan for addressing priority issues  Reports on specific activities available from NICs  Replica activities recommended and carried out where feasible | Local municipalities are prepared to work with communities  Funding available to support activities (Some allocated via project) |
| 2.2.2: Targets and actions agreed and adopted to reduce environmental and social impacts and stresses among pilot communities in line with SAP Implementation | Priority environmental and social impacts/concerns captured in a formal study/report as overseen by NICs and supported by BCC  DLIST functional between BCC and Communities  Community-level stress reduction pilot areas selected and stress reduction activities completed successfully with measurable and reported results  Community-based ecosystem monitoring under implementation by the communities at same sites  National strategy and work-plan for replication adopted, circulated and under implementation through the NFIs and other appropriate national agencies | Formal Report submitted to BCC identifying priorities  Detailed terminal report on community activities delivered by NFIs to BCC  Regular reporting from pilot communities to NFIs on monitoring results and subsequent feedback from NRIs to BCC  Road-map for replication of lessons submitted by NFIs to BCC  Reporting on progress for replication from NFIs to BCC | Government and communities agree to cooperate  Communities accept value of undertaking ecosystem monitoring activities an see benefits from both pilot processes and monitoring |
| 2.2.3: Priority gender-related issues and concerns in the pilot communities identified and addressed and lessons and best practices captured for further transfer and replication in other communities | Priority gender issues identified through a detailed gender analysis within pilot communities as part of formal study/report under 2.2.2  Single Action Plan and Road Map adopted by NICs and pilot communities incorporating results from Gender Mainstreaming review and identified pilot communities’ priority issues.  Pilot areas for demonstration of gender-related mitigation activities selected by communities and NICs and gender impact mitigation and mainstreaming demonstrated successfully and reported back through NICs to BCC  National strategy and work-plan for replication adopted and implemented | Formal Report submitted by NFIs to BCC identifying priorities  Detailed terminal report on community piloting of gender impact mitigation and associated community mainstreaming delivered by NFIs to BCC  Road-map for replication of lessons submitted by NFIs to BCC  Reporting on progress for replication from NFIs to BCC | Government and communities agree to cooperate on addressing gender related concerns within the communities  Communities willing to alter and amend practices in order to embrace mitigation of gender-related impacts and threats |
| 2.2.4: Active participation of the youth supported through the annual BCC Youth Summit and other activities of the Benguela Youth Ocean Network (BYON) at national level and regional levels | BYON and BCC Youth Summit identify priority activities and a road-map to address youth-related concerns as part of priority SAP Implementation  NICs approve and adopt these priorities along with a road-map for delivery (identifying responsible parties) and a budget and monitoring strategy  Youth engagement activities along with related environmental education and outreach delivered effectively by identified responsible parties  Feedback from activities via NICs to BCC as best lessons and practices | Report from Network and Youth Summit meetings to BCC  Actual youth engagement in SAP implementation and actions undertaken, effects measured and reported back to BCC  BL&P reports to BCC and further distributed to NFIs and to LME/IW:LEARN | Community youth sees value and personal interest in such SAP implementation activities |
| 2.2.5: Awareness raised at community levels about the Convention, BCC and the SAP and discussions stimulated on the Convention and SAP and their impacts on livelihood, food security, job creation and sustainable development of coastal communities; using appropriate platforms. | Active concrete evidence of information distribution at community level by BCC through NICs and Community Councils  Discussion fora and platforms established by Community Councils and active, providing feedback to NICs  DLIST running effectively as a technology out of BCC  Measurable and widespread evidence of use of social media and other forms of IT being used by BCC, NFIs and Communities themselves to raise awareness at community level | Direct feedback from pilot communities via reports from pilot projects and through formal project Evaluation process  Results from discussions captured by community leaders and pilot project managers  Physical presence of IT awareness raising processes and confirmation by communities of social media as a vehicles (Evaluation) | Information on LME and SAP implementation is of interest at the community level and both excites and invites engagement |
| **Outcome 2.3:**  Public and Private Sector Engagement strengthened through partnerships that are developed to support specific SAP and Convention implementation activities as identified under Component 1 and to support relevant priority national, bilateral and regional policy, institutional and management strengthening and improvement along with sectoral reforms being adopted in line with the SAP and its Implementation Plan. | Effective SAP implementation and resource management is threatened by the weak interactive engagement between the public and private sector. Successful management of LME resources and a sustainable ecosystem approach can only be realised through the active and supportive involvement of industry and commerce | 2.3.1. BCC Business Leadership Forum established, in partnership with the regional and national private sectors, to promote private sector commitments to and the establishment and adoption of their stress reduction targets to the BCLME system. | Regional BCC Business Leadership Forum (BLF) established by BCC in collaboration with business leaders and with broad representation.  Voluntary Action Plan(s) agreed between BCC and BLF members to incorporate EBM into cooperate strategy  Realignment of corporate strategy and policy to support an EBM approach negotiated and adopted by the various key economic sectors | Formal BLF reports to BCC  VAP formally adopted as per BCC MB and BLF minutes |  |
| 2.3.2: Ecosystem monitoring and assessment capacity strengthened through regional industry partnerships in the monitoring and assessment process Sensitisation of the value and benefits of maintaining ecosystem health to influence cooperate behaviour, operational practice and management | Partnerships established by BCC and BLF for ecosystem monitoring  Activities undertaken at industry level through BCC and BLF to raise awareness on cost-benefits of improvements in behavioural and operational practices  Documented changes within industry partners in such practices (to bring them in line with the EBM approach and SAP implementation) reported back to BLF and BCC | Partnership Agreements signed with BCC and at national levels with clearly defined aims and responsibilities  Changes in corporate practice and industrial/commercial activities to promote the EBM approach and better management and sustainability of LME resources (confirmed through company reports, BCC MB minutes and project evaluation) | Commitment from industry is genuine and Good relations can be developed and maintained at the public-private sector interface |
| 2.3.3: Public-Private Sector Partnership for Oil and Gas Exploration, Extraction and potential Spill Response developed and adopted. | BCC report on discussions and negotiation with industry to identify mutually agreed areas of SAP implementation improvement and coordination  5-year Plan of Action & Road-Map agreed between BCC and industry for improvements on corporate management practices (including exploration and extraction)  All National & Regional Oil and Hazardous Spill Contingency Plans (OHSCP) reviewed and updated/completed and tested through the guidance and oversight of BCC and in collaboration with industry and appropriate regional and global response bodies and expert institutions (e.g. IMO, ITOPF, etc.)  OHSCP and Response needs captured by BCC and its appropriate body within CB&T activities (Component 3) | Formal BCC report available.  Plan of Action agreed and signed and deposited with BCC  Relative components of the PoA and associated actions completed as per a road-map based on date of signature (confirmed by BCC)  OHSCP available from BCC  Reports from national and collaborative regional response exercises available from BCC  Best lessons and practices assessments shared with IMO and relevant conventions (Abidjan/Nairobi) | Industry is receptive to these partnerships and to make the appropriate corporate changes and improvements |
| 2.3.4: Adoption of effective national ballast water management practices along with the compliance of the private sector (in particular shipping and port industries) operating in the BCLME region. | Stakeholder workshop organised and successfully completed by BCC to identify constraints to ratification and actions needed to be taken  Engagement of BCC with industry for identification of priority national/regional requirements and associated actions necessary to improve ballast water management including road-map and budgeting as well as potential partners and responsibilities  Pilot projects undertaken and completed to demonstrate effective compliance, monitoring and enforcement of Globallast Convention requirements at selected sites in each country  Replication of best lessons and practices of effective compliance, monitoring and enforcement (as demonstrated at pilot sites) throughout all ports within the LME with an aim to reduce uncontrolled and non-compliant ballast water release to an agreed and realistic level (a target of 50% reduction) by the end of the project  Best lessons and practices captured and distributed through IMO and LME/IW:LEARN  CB&T priorities related to Globallast implementation identified and included under Component 3 | Report from stakeholder workshop to BCC and IMO  Priority national/regional requirements and associated actions included in this report  Evaluation reports from pilot projects delivered to BCC showing successful achievement of objectives  BL&P and Experience Notes lodged with IMO and IW:LEARN  Training components for Globallast included in Component 3’s Regional Capacity Development Programme |  |
| **Component 3**  Capacity Building and Training to support sustainable SAP implementation and Convention domestication | **Outcome 3.1**  Capacity Development and Strengthening of the BCC, its Secretariat and various associated Committees and Bodies. | Considerable requirement for further Capacity Development within the region to support effective SAP Implementation and Stress Reduction within the LME. Monitoring of the LME, its resources and the environmental quality objectives requires strengthening and a more comprehensive and feasible programme and platform for training is needed. | 3.1.1: Improved coordination, communication, planning and operations within the BCC Secretariat and its bodies and structure as per recommendations from the capacity reviews conducted by UNDP in 2011 and more recently by the Commission itself | BCC budget and work-plan finalised cooperatively between Project and the Commission and with funding and road-map for filling priority BCC positions (Aligned with and supported by other partner projects such as GIZ and FAO)  Mechanism adopted (and responsibilities defined) by BCC and partners for monitoring output and outcome indicators as established in performance framework  Formal mechanism operational for coordination and communication between BCC, MB and NICs | All agreed BCC administrative and technical positions filled through support from countries and various partner projects by end of UNDP GEF project  M&E Specialist responsible for monitoring of performance framework. Annual reports and end-of-project report lodged with BCC and reviewed by MB and Ministerial Conference as appropriate  Management Board minutes show formal adoption of communication and coordination mechanism | Suitable funding allocated by partner projects with a road-map agreed for long-term non-donor funding including country commitments. |
| 3.1.2: BCC’s capacity to monitor and report the Convention and SAP implementation progress and its effectiveness strengthened, with the establishment and adoption of agreed indicators of delivery for each strategic solution (priority theme) in the SAP | BCC Implementation Plan and Convention delivery requirements harmonised into one 5 –year work-plan by BCC and partners, with clear prioritisation of actions and associated measurable indicators of delivery  Road-map for delivery of activities linked to specific partnership responsibilities and funding  SAP Implementation Partnership/Alliance formed for completion of 5-year road-map  Results-Based Reporting Mechanism adopted by BCC with appropriate Monitoring and Review to allow for adaptive management focused on outcomes | Revised single 5-year SAP/Convention implementation plan approved by MB (Minutes)  Partnership Agreements signed and lodged with BCC  Permanent BCC monitoring body set up under M&E Specialist to monitor and report on activities of 5-year work-plan  Annual reports on work-plan delivery from Monitoring & Review Board circulated to appropriate BCC bodies and fora | Projects and other activity and funding sources are prepared and committed to working together |
| 3.1.3: Regional Capacity Development Programme adopted and implemented in line with agreed national and regional capacity needs for the BCC Convention and SAP implementation and as per the BCC Training and Capacity Building Policy | Regional Capacity Development Programme (RCDP) for SAP Implementation agreed and adopted by BCC and partners/stakeholders,  Regional partnerships agreed (through BCC negotiations and Management Board agreement) for more cost-effective sharing of resources and skills to deliver CB&T  Training workshops and mentoring programmes undertaken within region by these partnerships and overseen by BCC, and as part of African LME Caucus training programme  National and regional level institutional capacities measurably strengthened (and confirmed by institutions) in priority areas related to SAP Implementation  CB&T Tracking Programme adopted by BCC and Regional Training Advisory Group, and Capacity Tracker Studies undertaken and providing annual feedback on improvements in capacity as well as gaps and future needs | RCDP approved in BCC MB minutes  Regional partnership document signed to deliver RCDP  Training workshops on SAP implementation priority issues delivered (as per work-plan) and reported back to BCC and MB other regional partners (African LME Caucus)  Road-map for strengthening institutional capacities agreed and completed by end of project  CB&T and RCDP tracking process reported back to MB (minutes) and seen to be successful (at least 80% delivery in project lifetime) | Effective institutional agreements and partnerships within BCLME and African LME Caucus to deliver cost-effective regional level training  Agreement on training priorities between countries |
| **Component 4**  Marketing and Resource Mobilisation and Fiscal Sustainability | **Outcome 4.1**  Sustainable long-term management structures and financing mechanisms adopted by the BCC and its various national and regional institutional bodies and with full political support underpinned by both public and private sector investments. | No structured financing mechanisms or resource mobilisation presently in place to support SAP implementation and BCC structure. Current dependence on donor funding and inter-related projects to deliver SAP implementation. Need for long-term investments that address stress reduction in BCLME. This will require investment pre-feasibility studies | 4.1.1: Regional Economic Valuation Studies updated/completed with a particular focus on biodiversity/living marine resources data | National Economic Valuation studies of ocean and coastal goods and services completed as overseen by BCC  NEVs integrated into a single regional Economic Valuation of LME good and services through BCC and its bodies  EVs at national and regional levels agreed and published in literature as appropriate  Results of EVs fed into Output 1.1.7 to assist in the Science-to-Governance process being strengthened and to advise on management options | NEVs from each country formal shared with BCC and findings reported to MB  Integrated regional EV for BCLME presented to Annual Science Forum and other appropriate BCC fora and shared with Management Board for formal endorsement  BCLME EV publication available on BCC and IW:LEARN website | Main risk is in ensuring that countries undertake and effective national EV and provide requisite information and documentation |
| 4.1.2: Regional Cost-Benefit Analysis updated/completed to promote and facilitate the implementation of selected proposed policies related to SAP implementation. | Comprehensive Cost Benefit Analysis completed by specialist team, approved by BCC, and reflecting both national and regional Cost Benefits of the EBM approach, SAP Implementation and conformity to the Convention.  Results of CBAs fed into Output 1.1.7 to assist in the Science-to-Governance process  CBA actively used in policy briefing document and adaptive management justifications (feedback to Outcome 1.2) | CBA formally adopted by countries (NICs Minutes) and BCC (MB Minutes) and available on BCC and IW:LEARN websites  Policy level briefings and adaptive management guidelines, as distributed through Components 1 and 2) show clear reference to CBA as support and justification for action | No real risks – some assumption that information will be available at national level. Will require proactive national technical team/specialists to complete this exercise successfully |
| 4.1.3: Pre-feasibility studies conducted for investment in the sustainable blue/ocean economy strategies related to sustainability of ecosystem goods and services in the BCC region. | Investment Pre-feasibility Study (IPS) completed under BCC supervision and making full use of EV and CBA processes and results above  Specific investment opportunities identified by appropriate BCC partners and bodies through pre-feasibility studies and through a national investment stakeholder meeting (linked to donor and business forums)  On-the-ground investment enterprises deliver real and measurable / verifiable stress reduction activities and developments in priority SAP implementation | IPS Study reviewed by appropriate BCC bodies and MB and endorsed (See minutes and website)  Individual pre-feasibility proposals available for review  Delivery Reports from Investment bodies are shared with BCC  Physical structures and changes in operations are evident to scientific and technical review teams that are clearly linked to stress reduction and can be verified by project Evaluators | Sufficient investment interest can be leveraged. This risk can be mitigated by the presence of an effective institutional body/facility providing technical and financial advice and guidance |
| 4.1.4: Sustainable financing mechanisms for BCC identified and adopted at the national and regional level that can provide long-term sustainable support to BCC and Countries for SAP and Convention Implementation while providing an ‘exit strategy’ from donor reliance end. | TAIF established within an existing or new regional body which is working closely with BCC  Catalytic financial mechanism established by TAIF and tested within BCLME region to support sustainable investments related to stress reduction  Percentage interest from investments feeding back into BCC as a financial contribution to support long-term functions of BCC  Specific road map for long-term non-donor funding (including country commitments) adopted and implemented  Dependence on direct funding from GEF to BCC and BCLME for core funding is phased out during the project lifetime and replaced by national contributions to support BCC’s financial and administrative needs  Dependence on funding from other donors and projects for core BCC activities is measurably reduced and gradually phased out and replaced by income from an ‘accomplishment fee’ from the investment process | TAIF formally established and running (physical presence)  Actual investments documented and stress reduction activities showing measurable results  BCC Annual Financial Statements show injections of funding from these investments on accomplishing their objectives  Terminal Evaluation confirms the presence and implementation of a long-term non-donor funding (including country commitments)  GEF funding to support core BCC activities is phased out during the project lifetime and fully replaced by national contributions and other partner co-funding |  |

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (**from GEF Secretariat at further Request for CEO Endorsement)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSE TO GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW OF JUNE 30 2016** | | |
| **QUESTION NUMBER** | **SECRETARIAT COMMENTS AT SUBMISSION REQUIRING FURTHER ELABORATION** | **RESPONSE TO LATEST SECRETARIAT COMMENTS OF JUNE 30, 2016** |
| 7: Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | 1. We expressed concern regarding the lack of stress reduction measures beyond regional adoption. In particular, the need to clearly state plans for implementation. In the response UNDP noted these are addressed in Output 1.1.2; however, while this output does note the development and adoption by BCC of regional, harmonized protocols and plans for assessment and monitoring, it does not state that these will actually be implemented, which requires national level commitments. Further, the noted Verifiable Indicators are at the regional level not national implementation. The UNDP response notes they will "'mirror' that implementation requirement at the national level", but we do not find this reflected in the text. | 1. Addition text was added to the original project document at the last submission as **Output Logic Flow Charts** under **Main Objectives and Deliverables** (P. 28) and prior to the detailed description of various Outcomes, Outputs and Activities. The intention of this additional text was to clarify the various logical and sequential stages so as to address this earlier misconception. This simplifies any complexity in the detailed text and shows the logical flow from **Regional Level** harmonisation (Outcome 1.1) and adoption of codes of conduct, ecosystem monitoring programmes, water quality standards etc., into the **National Level** legislation and operational implementation (Outcome 1.2).   The important point to note is that Outcome 1.1 deals with the regional harmonisation process while Outcome 1.2 then translates this into implementation at the national level. This may have been lost in the understanding due to the use of ‘delivery’ rather than ‘implementation’ in a number of places.  The original Output 1.2.4 captures this clearly with its text ‘**Adoption and** **Implementation as appropriate at the national level of regionally-developed sectoral approaches and reforms along with consistent codes of conduct as well as data and information processes’.** To further clarify and simplify this intention, the wording under the Verifiable Indicators has been amendedso instead of reading National level adoption and use of the regionally-correlated Codes of Conduct’ it now reads “National level adoption and i**mplementation** of the regionally-correlated Codes of Conduct’. Furthermore, the subsequent text of ‘National ecosystem monitoring programmes functional.’ has been amended to ‘National ecosystem monitoring programmes **implemented**…’.  This national level implementation is clarified further with the addition of text under Outcome 1.2 as per ‘**strengthening and consequent implementation at the national level of the regional codes of conduct, monitoring programmes, water quality standards and other supportive adopted stress reduction policies and legislation arising from Outcome 1.1. this provides….’**  Output 1.2.2 seems to cover this quite clearly with its reference to ‘**National Strategies for SAP implementation developed and adopted by each country** building on the Governance Assessment undertaken above, with a work plan, budget and M&E framework with measurable indicators related to SAP Implementation’ and then with its activity of “NICS review, adopt and implement their own road-map along with indicators of delivery (including verifiable indicators of stress reduction and environmental/socioeconomic improvement and sustainability) and associated funding structure and monitoring requirements as appropriate (using guidance from the GBA under Output 1.1 above) into their national level ocean and coastal governance strengthening and support activities  There was in fact a typo in the text for Output 1.1.2. It previously read ‘and Development and Adoption of Regional Codes of Conduct***and*** national level that include monitoring and compliance mechanisms’. This has now been rectified to remove the typo and also to strengthen the emphasis on implementation. It now reads‘Development, Adoption and Implementation of Regional and National level Codes of Conduct that include monitoring and compliance mechanisms’. This text now also has an additional inclusion at the end stating that ‘The intention here will be to capture the regional harmonisation and adoption of these codes of conduct through national level implementation coordinated via the BCC. This will then capture these regionally-harmonised agreements within the national level policies and management strategies.  In the context of joint assessment and monitoring, the current text (under proposed Activities for Output 1.1.2) clearly states “development and **Implementation** (through appropriate **BCC and national channels**) of joint assessment and monitoring Cooperative Agreements and associated processes/activities… including transboundary fish stock assessment and monitoring; oil, gas and mining sector monitoring and compliance; coastal development monitoring and compliance, and others as deemed necessary ‘. [See highlighted bullet under Output 11.2 – Proposed Activities]. The required ‘national level commitments’ referred to are part of the cooperative agreements for implementation. National level commitments are clearly important but this is a transboundary ecosystem approach and these commitments must be made within the context of (and supervised by) cooperative implementation under the BCC. |
|  | It would seem that Outcome 2 is actually more relevant as it focuses on national level activities. Here the statements are better, but still vague. Of the entire suite of outputs, Output 1.2.2 and 1.2.4 seem most relevant with the Indicators including "adopted road-map with appropriate indicators€¦ and agreed budget and monitoring strategy€¦" and "National level adoption and use of the regionally-correlated Codes of Conduct through sectoral reform processes." While "adoption" is a critical step, it is not the same as "implemented", which entails specific legislation, budget and enforcement measures. At this stage in the history of BCLME, there needs to be implementation of strategies. Please address this point. | 1. (Continued) Indeed and that is the intention as was clarified in the **Output Logic Flow Charts** under **Main Objectives and Deliverables** which clearly show the sequence of Outcome 1.1 = Regional Level Harmonisation and Outcome 1.2 = National Level Implementation.   Output 1.2.4 clearly states **Adoption and** **Implementation as appropriate at the national level of regionally-developed sectoral approaches and reforms along with consistent codes of conduct as well as data and information processes** (e.g. national ecosystem monitoring programmes and water quality standards). In order to strengthen this and clarify intent, the wording ‘**including associated strengthening and realignment of legislation and administrative support’** has now been added. The following Proposed Activity has also now been added ‘Codes of conduct, monitoring programmes and other standards (as harmonised and agreed at the regional level) successfully implemented at the national level The Verifiable Indicators for this Output also state ‘National level adoption and implementation of the regionally-correlated Codes of Conduct’ along with any requisite legislative and administrative improvements and strengthening  In order to further address this point the word ‘implementation’ has been added into the various parts of the text wherever feasible |
|  | 1. The revised Results Framework to tighten the indicators now has extensive text that is too much information for what you be a concise Results Framework focusing on succinct information. This is particularly evident in Outputs 1.2.1, 1.2.7 and all of Outcome 1.3 outputs. The details and explanations (i.e. the “story') should remain in the text. Not only is a clear RF important now, but will be critical for initiation, at MidTerm and Terminal Evaluations to be able to determine change over time. The text for the pilots (1.3) is particularly long and does not fit into a clear logical structure for a transparent RF. | As requested, the Results Framework has now been amended, abbreviated and improved with a reduction in any unnecessary ‘story-telling’, much of which is already captured in the main text. Emphasis now is on clear and transparent indicators and their verification. Verifiable indicators have been copied across to the Main text under each Output to ensure that any changes in the RF are captured in the main text as well.  In the case of the text for Pilots, this has been made more concise and to-the-point for the expected indicators. The more detailed descriptions of the Pilot Stress Reduction Objectives at the ‘site’ level and the National Indicators that can provide Best Lessons and Practices for National Adoption/Replication have now been added to the main text for each country/pilot under Annex 2 and just before the individual Results Frameworks for each country within that Annex (and highlighted) |
|  | 4. Related to the request on pollution levels:  a) For the Angola: Pilot Area 1 - please specify as an output how many community level organizations will be established; Pilot Area 2 - please specify as an output how many formal agreements will be signed for communication cooperatives for mariculture; Pilot Area 3 â€“please specify size of spatial planning area.  b) For the Namibia pilot - please disaggregate agricultural pollution reduction targets. Specifically separate out load targets for fertilizers and BOD from heavy metals and from pesticides since permissible loads differ by order of magnitude for these categories.  c) For the South Africa pilot - please also separate targets. In addition, the industries being addressed and key pollutants being targeted need to be noted.  Also related to the RF indicators - in Component 3 the Assumption noted under Outcome 3.1 is, "road-map agreed for long-term non-donor funding including country commitments", which is more of an Output and would be useful to have in the Exit strategy output in 4.1.4. | 4. a.  Angola Pilot 1: As articulated in the Pilot Description in Annex 2, 17 fishing communities in the Luanda province will be included within this process of community level organisation. This figure has been further specified/clarified now in the main text under both the list of Pilot One Deliverables and under the associated Verifiable Indicators.  Angola Pilot 2: It is not possible pre-pilot implementation to estimate the number of signed formal agreements of communication cooperative for mariculture – any figure would clearly be only a guess at this stage. The purpose of the pilot is to undertake a case study on small-scale community mariculture and this needs first to identify appropriate species and techniques and then assess them for possible distribution and expansion depending on their requirements (both biochemical/physical as well as in the context of community support and financing). So, although the specific number of agreements cannot be realistically stated at this time, the actual number is not, in itself, important as it doesn’t provide any sense of delivery as such. However, the geographical extent/ area of these initiatives gives a clearer idea of ‘delivery’ and has been clearly identified in Annex 2 – Pilot Projects as North, Central and Southern coast of Benguela Province located south of Angola, with an area of some 39,827 km2. This explanation has also been added into the Pilot Two Deliverables text.  Angola Pilot 3: As defined in Annex 2, the geographical extent of the spatial planning activity is an area of 98 square kms and this has now also been included in the list of Deliverables to simplify for the reader.  4.b.  This is a valid concern as the figures quoted are not appropriate. These have now been separated and stress reduction figures for pesticide and fertilizers, as well as heavy metals, are now quoted as a percentage reduction from the baseline as follows. (BOD levels are still valid).   * Agriculture pollution reduction practices = 40% reduction from pilot inception baseline in pesticides and fertilizer levels at point-of-contact with coastal waters within Pilot lifetime. * 40% reduction from pilot inception baseline in heavy metals (as measured at final discharge) within Pilot lifetime. * < 10mg/l of BOD in all rivers and river mouths in the pilot area (where baseline is above this value at start of project)   4.c.  Also a valid concern regarding disaggregation of levels and this has been addressed as above  Stress Reduction Objectives now modified to read:   * Reduction in levels of primary pollutants in Municipal wastewater (nutrients, BOD, COD, E.coli, oil, cleaning fluids, etc.) by 30% from Pilot inception baseline within lifetime of Pilot project * Reduction on levels of primary pollutant in Industrial wastewater (BOD, COD, oil, surfactants, persistent organic pollutants, sediments, thermal pollution, etc.) by 30% from Pilot inception baseline within lifetime of Pilot project * Agriculture pollution reduction practices = 40% reduction from pilot inception baseline in pesticides and fertilizer levels at point-of-contact with coastal waters, such as river mouths and environmental flow discharges, within Pilot lifetime. * 40% reduction from pilot inception baseline in heavy metals (as measured at final discharge) within Pilot lifetime. * < 10mg/l of BOD in all rivers and river mouths in the pilot area   As explained in the text (Annex 2), the site(s) selected for investigation within this South African Pilot will be chosen on the basis of a number of criteria as agreed by the responsible agencies.  This South African Pilot specifically includes the activities under the Output that will map the sources of pollution and categorize and identify them by sector, therefore these are not identified in the ProDoc yet.:  **Output 3:** Mapping of the existing sources of marine water quality pollution including categorizing the sources of pollution per sector. Determination of the aggregated impacts on water quality.  **Deliverable(s):** Diagnostic Analysis of Threats and Causes including A. Demo Site maps of point-sources and other impacts as well as their ‘origins’, and B. Quantitative report on the magnitude and extent of individual impacts.  Therefore, this Output and these activities will provide the more specific information on key industries and targeted pollutants.  The potential polluting sources and the intention to target these has now been captured more clearly in both the main Objectives section (P.55) of the ProDoc as well as in Annex 2 with the following text additions:  A number of primary sources of pollutants are affecting the marine ecosystem around South Africa and also potentially impacting on the ‘users’ of the coastal and marine environment. Some of the main sources of pollution come from sewage and effluents from municipalities, other effluent and pollutant discharges from a number of different industries (e.g. fertilizer factories, pulp/paper mills, chemical and explosive factories, oil refineries, sugar mills, fish factories, textile factories, food canning, aluminium smelters, power stations, dredging and sand-mining). Types of discharges vary widely from surf zone and estuarine discharges of municipal sewage or industrial wastewater to discharges through well designed offshore marine outfalls fitted with hydraulically efficient diffusers operating in water depths of more than 20 metre.  The site(s) selected for investigation will be chosen on the basis of a number of criteria as agreed by the responsible agencies. In developing these criteria, the following concerns will be taken into consideration.  Selection Criteria …. will include specific targeting of primary pollutant sources.  Furthermore, the Deliverables for this Pilot in Annex 2 have now been expanded as follows  Diagnostic Analysis of Threats and Causes of marine water quality pollution at selected areas. This will help to confirm the main activities causing pollution and identify the targets for stress reduction.  Identify improvements to wastewater treatment and mitigation of point-source and chronic pollution that can be adopted to improve stress reduction. This deliverable will focus on the main polluters as identified through the Diagnostic Analysis  Where appropriate, figures and comments have been lifted now out of Annex 2 and placed into the main text in order to simplify and clarify the review process.  Also, on the last point raised by the GEF Review, please note that the final Activity now identified under 4.1.4 is as follows:  Specifically, develop and implement a road-map for long-term non-donor funding which includes country commitments  The RF itself also contains this statement as a Verifiable Indicator with an associated Means of Verification identified as Terminal Evaluation confirms the presence and implementation of a long-term non-donor funding (including country commitments) |
|  | 10. Regarding the request to address MCS and IUU - while clear in the description of the EAF Nansen Programme, plans to address MCS and IUU are not noted in Output 1.1.2. To what extent fisheries projects address IUU is a question we often receive. It is, therefore, important that this is explicitly stated in the Project Strategy section. This request relates back to our concern that the Outputs are vague on substance of what pressures/sectors they will address and what measures they will actually undertake to reduce pressures. IUU and MCS are relatively basic expectations but because Output 1.1.2 and addressing so many sectors, these aspects were not noted. | This is an important point. Although the participating countries have a good track-record of monitoring and surveillance against IUU (see P. 7), there is no doubt that IUU and MCS are important on-going issues for BCC and therefore for this project to consider and engage with. The new FAO Port State Measures Agreement will provide one partnership platform for the Project once all countries have ratified or acceded. As of now, only South Africa has fully acceded to the PSMA. Angola has signed but not yet ratified and Namibia has neither signed nor acceded. The Verifiable Indicators now recognise this important requirement as ‘Full ratification/ accession by all BCC countries to the FAO Port State Measures Agreement’ and ‘Adoption of appropriate legislative instruments and administrative requirements necessary for effective implementation of Port State Measures (see P.40) BCC also works closely with SEAFO which maintains a list of IUU vessels under a special agreement by its members (Conservation Measure 08/06) and which has adopted a System of Observation Inspection, Compliance and Enforcement, which includes Control Measures; Monitoring of Fisheries; At-Sea Inspection, Observer Programmes; Port State Control; Measures to Promote Compliance; and Research. This information has now been captured under a new section on  **‘Additional Existing Initiatives that Relate Directly to Objectives of the BCLME Project’** below under **2.7 Partnerships with related Projects and Initiatives** (P.95)  The Text for Output 1.1.2 has been expanded to specify IUU and MCS as specific areas where partnerships will evolve for stress reduction activities. This now reads as follows  ‘In support of the overall EAF strategy, collaborate closely with both SEAFO and FAO in achieving full ratification/accession to the Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA) and their implementation and overall Monitoring, Compliance and Surveillance within the LME in order to reduce and prevent illegal, unlicensed and unreported (IUU) fisheries activities. (see **‘Additional Existing Initiatives that Relate Directly to Objectives of the BCLME Project’** below under **2.7 Partnerships with related Projects and Initiatives).** As part of the development of harmonised regional Codes of Conduct and their adoption and implementation at the national level, BCC will work with the countries to ensure full ratification/accession to the PSMA. Furthermore, BCC and its member countries will actively seek to ensure that appropriate Port State Measures against IUU are adopted into national legislation and implemented’ (See P. 39 and 40)  Also note that the imminent BCC Ministerial Conference meeting has the following items on its Agenda:   1. Illegal unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU) – Member States are collaborating at the regional level in combating IUU fishing include hot pursuit which is consistent with SADC protocol on fisheries.   **Action**: Ministers are invited to commit more resources to a coordinated approach to combatting IUU fishing in the region (hot pursuit).  Ministers are further invited to strengthening collaboration at operational levels so that IUU fishing activities are jointly curbed.   1. Joint monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) – helps the Member States to stop the plundering of their resources by illegal operators in their EEZs   **Action:** Ministers are invited to direct the Commission to investigate the establishment of the regional MCS centre and report the findings at the next MC meeting in 2018.  The text on P. 7 has been expanded to capture this and the amended Proposed Activity under Output 1.1.2 (on P. 39 and as noted above) has been further expanded to read:  This will include a feasibility study to be undertaken for the establishment of a regional MCS (Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Centre) including an initial Business Plan and Budget requirements (taking into account the need to establish a real-time VMS system, on-board observers, other monitoring and compliance tools as necessary) as well as identifying potential sources of sustainable financial support for such an enterprise and to encourage the commitment of further resources by each country to LME-wide IUU and MCS. |
|  | 13. Also related to this point, the outputs - and this is particularly important in Component 1 - do not consistently and clearly state what sectors will actually be addressed. For example, Output 1.1.2, which is intended to address all sectors does not indicate it will address coastal development in the first paragraph but then all sectors are noted in the first and fourth Proposed Activities. Clarifying which sectors will be addressed for the various outputs is very important at this planning stage. In reading through the Pro Doc and the SAP, the sectors of concern are oil and gas, offshore mining, fisheries and coastal development with occasional mention of shipping and agriculture. Please provide an overarching statement at the beginning of the Project Strategy noting all the sectors and then explaining to what extent they will be addressed by the Outputs. Please also ensure the outputs are clear as to which sectors will be addressed. | The revised 2013 TDA for BCLME identifies the key economic sectors that need to be engaged and addressed (in the context of SAP Implementation and the Convention). As requested, an overarching and detailed statement has now been added to the early text of the project Strategy which identifies these Key Economic Sectors and their outstanding requirements in the context of the SAP and the Convention (see ‘Main Economic Sectors which need to be engaged into the Ecosystem-Based Ocean Governance and Integrated Management of Marine Resources’(P. 23)  Output 1.1.2 now also includes reference to these same sectors and this additional section with the following addition:  The Main Economic Sectors and their outstanding areas of impact that need to be addressed are captured above and include primarily Fisheries, Oil and Gas, Marine Transport, Tourism, Coastal and Marine Mining and other Coastal Development Activities. In order to ensure effective and equitable management and interaction with these sectors, the project aims to correlate and, wherever feasible, harmonise the management and regulatory requirement for these sectors/industries, e.g. to achieve (among other harmonised agreements, standards and Codes of Conduct). There are also further additions in 1.1.2 for better clarification |
|  | Relatedly, Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 1.2.2 and 1.2.4 all emphasize addressing the range of sectors. And then Output 1.1.4 is specific to water quality and 1.2.6 is specific to fisheries. It would seem that these water quality and fisheries outputs would be addressed already under the broader previous outputs. Please clarify | Under Outcome 1.1 we see that, at the REGIONAL level, Harmonisation of Specific Codes of Conduct for the main economic sectors and associated industries (Output 1.1.2) require very different negotiation and stakeholder engagement to the development of regionally-consistent Ecosystem Monitoring Programmes (Output 1.1.3) that allow comparison of ecosystem changes throughout the LME; and to Regionally compatible Water Quality Standards and Monitoring Guidelines for pollution and biosafety (Output 1.1.4) which will be nationwide requirements for all activities.  Under Outcome 1.2 we see that Output 1.2.2 is the actual ‘Governance’ strategy at the national level for SAP Implementation (which includes the various sectoral codes of conduct water quality standards etc.). Output 1.2.2 focuses on institutional ‘delivery’ of these products, putting the management structures in place for SAP Implementation at the National level. Output 1.2.4, on the other hand, is the actual physical legal and policy process of adopting and implementing these Codes and Standards (once 1.2.2 has created the necessary ‘National sectoral Committee’ institutional basis that can manage and oversee them)  Output 1.2.6 is a separate activity. Although Codes of Conduct will hopefully have been developed, adopted and implemented within the fisheries industry at sea and at landing and processing, there is still a separate need to promote and support sustainable fisheries practices through eco-labelling which will help to ‘buy’ the long-term national support for the improved fishing practices and underpin the Codes of Conduct and their implementation/enforcement.  Again, careful consideration of the **Output Logic Flow Chart** that was added after the last GEF Review (see P. 28) helps to understand and clarify this. This Flow Chart has now been expanded within the description of Component One to include the additional clarifying text as follows:  It will do this through a sequential set of Outputs under Outcome 1.1.at the Regional level and then under Output 1.2 at the National Level. These outputs will a. develop and adopt priority codes of conduct for all sectors as well as b. regional water quality standards and c. a regional ecosystem monitoring programme. These are each dealt with separately under different Outputs as they require different stakeholders, different types of negotiation and a different legislative and policy approach.  And…  Under the Outcome 1.2, National institutional arrangements (National Intersectoral Committees) to support BCC will be established (or reconfirmed as appropriate) first in order to provide the requisite institutional basis and mandate for national-level implementation, and these will oversee the national-level SAP implementation activities and adoption of codes of conduct and standards at the national level (Including eco-labelling of national fisheries and gender mainstreaming at the country level). |
|  | 19. Regarding the private sector partnerships, which are an important part of the project. Under output 2.3.3, the Verifiable Indicators section notes "all national and regional oil and hazardous spill contingency plans reviewed through the support and oversight of the BCC." Please delete "support" as the project is not providing financial support to the oil and gas operations or else clarify not financial support. | The word ‘support’ has been removed to avoid any financial connotations and has been replaced so the section now reads “All National & Regional Oil and Hazardous Spill Contingency Plans (OHSCP) reviewed and updated/completed and tested through the **guidance** and oversight of BCC’ |
|  | 20. Regarding the exit strategy plans (4.1.4), the financial sustainability needs clarification, particularly that the project core functions of the BCC, including the ED, technical and administrative/financial officers' salaries, office equipment and space, will be funded by country contributions and/or sustainable revenues to BCC and not dependent on donor/project support. While there may be future projects through the BCC, the core functions will be covered by non-project funds. Please edit the Overall Output, the Verifiable Indicators (e.g. delete "measurably reduced") and Means of Verification (e.g. replace "falls" and "increase" to terms such as "phase out"). | Although this was the intent of Outcome 4, and Output 4.1.4, this has been further clarified as follows  New text under Outcome 4.1 reads ‘The essence of this Outcome is to move the Commission, the SAP and Convention Implementation, and the overall management and administrative responsibility for the LME away from its dependence on donor funding and to embed it securely and sustainable under the financial and administrative responsibility of the countries. This will ensure that the core functions of the Commission and its counterpart national entities and representative institutions (e.g. technical and administrative staff positions, office equipment, accommodation costs including utilities, etc.) will no longer be funded through GEF or other projects but will be fully sustained from national funding allocations and other partner contributions’  ‘measurably reduced’ refers to the funding input from **ALL** donors, not just GEF so BCC would hope to continue to see some funding coming in from non-GEF donors to support specific and focused administrative matters that still need to be evolved effectively through professional support (e.g. Monitoring, Control and Surveillance). Also, the wording ‘as well as leveraging public sector revenue streams to support BCC and SAP Implementation” has been added to the Proposed Activities on P.72. However, to qualify this process, wording under the Verifiable Indicators for Output 4.1.4 has been amended to read:   * Dependence on direct funding from GEF to support BCC and BCLME for core funding is phased out during the project lifetime and replaced by national and other contributions to support BCC’s financial and administrative needs * Dependence on funding from other donors and projects for core BCC activities is measurably reduced and gradually phased out and replaced by income from an ‘accomplishment fee’ from the investment process   Also the term **‘falls’** in the Means of Verification refers, once again, to **ALL** donor contributions. While this is an admirable target, actually ‘removing’ or ‘phasing out’ all non-GEF donor contributions is not only undesirable but is not a decision that this project can make on behalf of other partners. To avoid this confusion, the ambiguous Means of Verification has been completely removed as it need not be the Result of a GEF project. It has, instead, been replaced with:  Verifiable Indicator  Dependence of BCC on ‘core’ funding from donors and projects is phased out and replaced by income from an ‘accomplishment fee’ from the investment process  Means of Verification  GEF funding to support core BCC activities is phased out during the project lifetime and fully replaced by national contributions and other partner co-funding |
|  | 21. Side note: please edit Project Strategy section, Output 1.1.2 to be "Regional Codes of Conduct AT THE national level" | This text now amended |
|  | 22. NEW text/info from UNDP. The added logic framework is very useful for showing the connection of outputs within each outcome. However, it does not show how these outcomes are then related under their component. The text also does not make this connection. In particular it would seem that there is a strong link between Outcome 1.1 and Outcome 1.2. Outcome 1.1 is more regional with a focus on assessments, harmonization and adopting codes/standards and then Outcome 1.2 is more focused on national adoption and implementation of what was developed in Outcome 1.1. The only mention of this linkage is the last bullet in Output 1.1.1 Proposed Activities. Please clarify in logic flow and text how the outputs under each of these outcomes are tied together so reader can understand that the regional work will feed into the national level. This will help address the earlier comment #1 regarding the need for stress reduction measures. | New sections have now been added to each of the Logic descriptions for each Component as requested. These now show how the outcomes are sequentially and logically related (see p. 28 onwards) |

**Annex C: status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds[[5]](#footnote-5)**

1. provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **$300,000** | | | |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Implemented*** | ***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)*** | | |
| ***Budgeted Amount*** | ***Amount Spent To date*** | ***Amount Committed*** |
| Formulation of the Full-sized Project | 300,000 | 248,000 | 52,000 |
| **Total** | 300,000 | 248,000 | 52,000 |

**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)

**NOT APPLICABLE**

1. Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624) when completing Table A. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.  
    [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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-5)