



**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
FIFTH REGULAR SESSION
Port Vila, Vanuatu
10-21 August 2009**

SUMMARY OF 2008/2009 IPDCP/WPEA ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED BY THE SECRETARIAT

**WCPFC-SC5-2009/GN-IP-05
15 July 2009**

5th Steering Committee for IPDCP at SC5, Port Moresby

1. The fifth meeting of the Steering Committee on the Indonesia and Philippines Data Collection Project (IPDCP) was held on 12-13 August 2008, at Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, during the Fourth Regular Session of the Scientific Committee. A summary of IPDCP activities supported in Indonesia and Philippines since the establishment of the Project in 2003 is at **Attachment A**.

2. At the fifth meeting the Secretariat reported on recent developments with the proposal to approach the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to support a 3-year project designed to build on the work commenced under the IPDCP in Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam. The Secretariat had been tasked with developing such a proposal at SC3 at Honolulu in 2007.

3. This summary of secretariat activities in 2008/09 may be supplemented by participating country reports.

West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management Project

4. Following endorsement in principle of the proposal submitted by the Secretariat in late 2007, the GEF provided initial funding (US\$75,000), under their Project Preparatory Grant (PPG) facility, to support detailed design of the West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (WPEA OFM).

5. Coordinated by Dr Tony Lewis working under contract to the Secretariat, national resource specialists in each of the three participating countries worked through 2008 to develop a baseline profile of each country's tuna sector, describe existing fishery monitoring capacity and data holdings, capacity to assess the status of stocks, including by-catch, summarise national policy relating to the development, conservation and management of tuna stocks, outline institutional arrangements and summarise activities by government, non-government agencies, industry associations and others with an interest in the tuna sector. The main task was focussed on the identification of gaps that could be targeted for support under the WPEA OFM to strengthen the capacity of these countries to engage in the work of WCPFC. The PPG resulted in the preparation of a Project Document for the WPEA OFM which was submitted to the GEF in late 2008 (**Attachment B**).

6. In March 2009 the Secretariat was advised of the approval of the Project by the GEF with funding support totalling US\$1 million¹ over three years commencing in 2009. The GEF support for the Project was only secured following significant co-financing and partnership commitments from a range of sources including the Japanese Government, through the Japan Trust Fund, Australia (through AusAID), the US National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS Pacific Islands Regional Office) and the Commission's core budget.

7. An Inception Workshop involving officials from the three participating countries and the Secretariat was conducted at Cebu, Philippines in early July 2009 (see separate workshop report, WCPFC-SC5-2009-GN-IP-11). The objectives of the Inception Workshop were to start the process of establishing administrative arrangements for the Project in each country and detail annual work plans.

IOTC/WCPFC logbook harmonisation workshop for Indonesia

8. Indonesia is a member of IOTC (since 20 June 2007) and CCSBT (since 8 April 2008) and has Cooperating Non-Member status at the WCPFC (renewed for 12 months at WCPFC5 at Busan in December 2008). In an effort to monitor fisheries for tunas and tuna-like species in Indonesia the Directorate General for Capture Fisheries (DGCF) and the Research Centre for Capture Fisheries (RCCF) have implemented a range of measures intended to strengthen the collection and processing of fisheries statistics in the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The implementation of some of those measures has been in response to recommendations from the CCSBT, IOTC and WCPFC, calling for Indonesia to strengthen its data collection and processing systems, and in doing so allow them to report detailed statistics to each Regional Fisheries Management Organization (RFMO). Recent developments in the fisheries statistical system in Indonesia have led to marked improvements in the estimation of total catches by species for Indonesian industrial longliners that unload their catches in Indonesian ports; and in the estimation of catches by species and gear for Indonesia's artisanal fisheries (notably those in the Indian Ocean).

9. During 2008, the DGCF informed the IOTC about its plans to implement a logbook system for the Indonesian fisheries, and requested assistance from IOTC in the design of the logbook form and its implementation. The IOTC, in consultation with the WCPFC and the CCSBT, agreed to organize a workshop during 2009 that would assist with the implementation of a logbook system that attempted to harmonize data collection systems in Indonesia without compromising the data requirements of each RFMO in which Indonesia participates. The workshop was supported financial by the Overseas Fisheries Cooperative Foundation of Japan. Apologies were received from CCSBT. The WCPFC Secretariat was represented by Dr SungKwon Soh. The Commission's Data Service Provider (SPC-OFP) was represented by Peter Williams. The workshop was an activity that closely aligned with the objectives of the WPEA OFM.

10. The outcomes of the workshop included:

- 1) The workshop-agreed version of the Indonesian Longline/Handline and Purse seine/Pole-and-line logbooks will be implemented for vessels that target highly-migratory tuna species with these gears and a registered capacity greater than 30 GT.
- 2) The logbook, developed by DGCF with assistance provided by the Swedish Government, will be implemented for vessels with gears not covered in 1 above, that have a registered capacity greater than 30 GT.
- 3) To help communicate the decisions regarding the implementation of logbooks, the Tuna RFMOs will provide an explanation, in layman's terms, on (i) the reasons why logbook data collection is required, and (ii) the benefits that information collected on logbooks can provide to the fishing industry. Information to be translated into Indonesian and incorporated into the logbook or released by other means.

¹ Includes the US\$75,000 for the PPG.

- 4) The Workshop agreed that the phased-in approach envisaged by the DGCF, with implementation of logbooks on vessels having a registered capacity greater than 30 GT is appropriate.
- 5) It was suggested that an initial study and a workshop is required to determine the plan/design, the institutions involved, resources required and the schedule for implementing each of the following :
 - a) Logbook distribution system
 - b) A system for Fishing Industry Liaison (e.g. reviews and training in logbook use)
 - c) Logbook collection system
 - d) Logbook database system (which includes integration with other data types)
 - e) Logbook Data Management requirements (e.g. processing and quality control)
 - f) Logbook data dissemination (reporting) system
- 6) The workshop strongly encouraged the continuation of advice and support from the tuna RFMOs, OFCF of Japan, CSIRO and SIDA for the implementation of the logbook programme in Indonesia.

Advice and recommendations

11. The Steering Committee on IPDCP/WPEA is invited to:
 - a. Note the work of the Secretariat, in association with others, during the last 12 months in relation to activities in the western region of the WCPFC Convention Area;
 - b. Encourage governments, non-government agencies and bilateral and multilateral donors whose activities relate to the interests and mandate of WCPFC to coordinate and consult on their respective activities to promote opportunities for collaborative efforts of mutual benefit;
 - c. Suggest means to secure additional sources of in-kind or direct financial contributions to the WPEA OFM; and
 - d. Provide advice and recommendations in relation to priorities and strategies for consideration during implementation of the WPEA OFM.

The history of IPDCP activities in Indonesia

Duration	Activities	Budget (USD)
2007.1	1 st Eastern Indonesia Tuna Fishery Data Collection Workshop – Overview and Work Plan	0
2007.6-12	Preliminary Research	30,000
2007.11-[2008.3]	Rescue of historical commercial tuna catch data	15,000
2008.5	2 nd Eastern Indonesia Tuna Fishery Data Collection Workshop – Sampling protocol and data collection format	0
2008.7-2009.6	Monitoring the catches of highly migratory species in Pacific Ocean waters of Indonesia – Bitung and Kendari	38,000
2009.1	3 rd Eastern Indonesia Tuna Fishery Data Collection Workshop –Review of Port Sampling	10,000
2009.3	Waiting for final endorsement of the GEF Project Proposal – Indonesia, Philippines and Viet Nam	0
Total budget paid		93,000

The history of IPDCP activities in Philippines

Duration	Activities	Budget (USD)
2005	Port Sampling, estimation of total tuna catch and review process on data collection (first year of the IPDCP by BAS and BFAR/NFRDI)	65,800
2006	Port Sampling and estimation of total tuna catch (second year of the IPDCP by BAS and BFAR/NFRDI)	58,500
2007	Port Sampling, estimation of total tuna catch and review process on data collection (thrid year of the IPDCP by BAS and BFAR/NFRDI)	50,300
2008	Port Sampling continued (fourth year of the IPDCP by BFAR/NFRDI)	15,000
Total budget paid		189,600



UNDP Project Document
UNDP-GEF Medium-Size Project (MSP)

**Governments of the Republic of Indonesia, Republic of the Philippines
and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam**

United Nations Development Programme
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management

PIMS number 4084

Brief description

The project will build capacity in Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam to fully engage in regional initiatives to conserve and manage fisheries for highly migratory fish stocks. This will be achieved by enhancing national capacity within these countries to contribute to the objective of the *Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean* which is to effectively manage, support long term conservation and sustainably use shared highly migratory oceanic fish stocks of global significance in the western Pacific and east Asia. Project interventions will address threats to local food security and economic and social development opportunities offered by these shared resources arising as a result of poor information concerning current harvests, over-exploitation resulting from incomplete and inadequate collaborative arrangements for conservation and management, both nationally and regionally, and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. The *Convention* provides the basis for the institutional framework for international collaboration for conservation and management of oceanic highly migratory fish stocks in this region. Indonesia and the Philippines participated in the negotiations to develop the Convention during the 1990s and Philippines has since ratified it. Vietnam has not yet engaged in the Commission's work and Philippines and Indonesia require considerable support in order to fully participate.

The activities to be carried out under this project will contribute towards the following objective: “*To strengthen national capacities and international cooperation on priority transboundary concerns relating to the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the west Pacific Ocean and east Asia (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam)*”. The project will, *inter alia*, (i) strengthen national capacities in fishery monitoring and assessment (ii) improve knowledge of oceanic fish stocks and reduce uncertainties in stock assessments (iii) strengthen national capacities in oceanic fishery management, with participant countries contributing to the management of shared migratory fish stocks (iv) strengthen national laws, policies and institutions, to implement applicable global and regional instruments. The Project will also strengthen WCPFC as the appropriate regional fisheries management organization responsible for the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in this oceanic region by building the capacity of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam to participate in the work of the Commission. It will contribute to improved scientific information supporting an ecosystems approach to management of shared target and non-target oceanic stocks and strengthened monitoring, regulation and control nationally and regionally. Global environmental benefits will be achieved by strengthened international cooperation on priority transboundary concerns relating to the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the west Pacific Ocean and east Asia. In addition, as a nationally-driven initiative of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam, an improved contribution to sustainable development will be achieved through enhanced information for decision-making in respect of necessary national economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reform and full participation in an existing regional fisheries management arrangement.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
SECTION I : ELABORATION OF THE NARRATIVE	10
PART I: SITUATION ANALYSIS	10
PART II: STRATEGY.....	12
PART III: MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.....	15
PART IV: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN AND BUDGET	16
PART V: LEGAL CONTEXT	23
SECTION II : PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....	25
SECTION III : TOTAL BUDGET AND WORKPLAN.....	33
SECTION IV : ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
PART I:	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1. APPROVED MSP PIF.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2. OTHER AGREEMENTS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
PART II: TERMS OF REFERENCES FOR KEY PROJECT STAFF AND MAIN SUB-CONTRACTS ..	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
ANNEX I: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORTS FORMAT	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
ANNEX II: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF).....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
SIGNATURE PAGE	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

List of Tables

TABLE 1: INDICATIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PLAN AND CORRESPONDING BUDGET	22
TABLE 2: OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE IMPACT INDICATORS	32

Acronyms

APR	Annual Project Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CAE	Country Assistance Evaluation
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CO	Country Officer
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
CTI	Coral Triangle Initiative
EA	Executing Agency
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HQs	Headquarters
IA	Implementing Agency
IR	Inception Report
IUU	Illegal, Unreported or Unregulated (fishing)
IW	Inception Workshop
M&E	Monitoring And Evaluation
MSP	Medium-Sized Project
NAC	National Advisory Committee
PIOFMP	Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RCCF	Research Centre for Capture Fisheries (Indonesia)

RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organization
ROAR	Results Oriented Annual Report
SCS	Sulu-Celebes Large Marine Ecosystem and Adjacent Areas Sustainable Fisheries Management Project
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
TOR	Terms Of Reference
TPR	Tripartite Review
TTR	Terminal Tripartite Review
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

SECTION I : Elaboration of the Narrative

PART I: Situation Analysis

1. The waters of Eastern Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam lie on the western edge of the Pacific Ocean warm pool large marine ecosystem, a globally significant maritime region which supports marine biodiversity that is amongst the highest in the world. The heart of the Coral Triangle lies within Philippine and Indonesian waters. Oceanic fish stocks within the warm pool and surrounding waters support large scale industrial, commercial/artisanal and subsistence fisheries providing livelihoods, food security and economic development opportunities. This is demonstrated by the harvest of oceanic tuna species which in 2007 alone was 2.4 million tonnes, more than half the global catch of these main market species of tunas. More than 25% of this catch, in excess of 600,000t, is estimated to have been taken by Philippines, eastern Indonesia and Vietnamese fishers. In addition, catches of neritic tunas and tuna-like species within this ecosystem are also very large, and although not well estimated, may exceed one million tonnes. Previous tagging studies have demonstrated the shared nature of the oceanic tuna stocks which move throughout this region, and underline the need for cooperative management of the valuable stocks at large marine ecosystem level.
2. The sustainability of the globally significant harvests of these trans-boundary resources, shared to an extent yet to be fully understood amongst these three countries and with the Pacific Island countries within the wider warm pool, is threatened by incomplete scientific knowledge of the oceanic tunas and resources associated with the warm pool ecosystem and adjacent waters, the lack of a comprehensive governance framework which may be unable to prevent overfishing, and the general difficulty of managing oceanic fish stocks without appropriate monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms and a measure of control over the extensive illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing.
3. Currently, even the total catch is not known for the fisheries of two of the three countries with any certainty, let alone the catch by fishing gear, and catch by species, size and area. There is an almost total lack of any operational-level data on the catches for all countries, such that trends in catch rate are unable to be monitored. The difficulty of the catch monitoring task is exacerbated by the complex multi-gear nature of the fishery, the multiple landing points and the importance of diverse widely distributed small-scale fisheries especially in the two large archipelagic states (Indonesia, Philippines) where tuna fisheries make an important contribution to food security.
4. Gaps in biological understanding of the species persist, especially with respect to the relative importance of the area as a source of recruits to the wider WCPO fishery, and as possibly a key spawning ground for the regional resource. As noted, the extent to which the resource of tunas and associated species is shared amongst countries is not completely understood.
5. The Scientific Committee of the WCPFC, which reviews stock assessments of the major species in the WCPO, has repeatedly noted that the incomplete catch, effort and biological data for the Indonesia and Philippines components of the fishery remains the single largest source of uncertainty in current regional stock assessments. At the national level, capacity to undertake and interpret stock assessments and compile status reports is constrained by the same data deficiencies and lack of suitably trained scientists.
6. Comments above regarding the target species of tunas pertain to an even larger degree to other components of the ecosystem, the non-target associated and dependent species of fish, reptiles, birds and marine mammals, as well as fishery impacts on foodwebs and biodiversity.

7. The lack of a comprehensive governance framework runs the risk that overfishing will be unable to be prevented. Oceanic tuna stocks are currently partially managed under the auspices of the Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), which was established by the Convention, provides the institutional framework for international collaboration for the conservation and management of oceanic highly migratory fish stock in this region². Indonesia and Philippines participated in the negotiations to develop the Convention during the 1990s and Philippines has since ratified it, whilst Indonesia has cooperating non-member status and may ratify, to become a cooperating member during 2009. Vietnam has not yet engaged in the Commission's work, and Philippines and Indonesia require considerable support in order to fully participate.

8. With the possible exception of the Philippines, which has made some progress in putting in place necessary structures, the countries are ill-prepared to fully participate in, and contribute to the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and protect oceanic marine biodiversity. In some cases, internationally recognized maritime boundaries do not exist or are contested.

9. Appropriate national laws, policies, institutions and enabling programmes are generally not in place to meet the requirements of the Convention. Existing national legal instruments may need to be reviewed, and reforms undertaken where necessary, to enable the Convention to be fully implemented, including issues such as control of national vessels, flag state and port state responsibilities, and monitoring and surveillance activity; international legal instruments such as the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, FAO Code of Conduct and the Convention itself will need to be ratified. Policy and institutional reform at national level may also be needed, to enable oceanic fisheries management administrations to be strengthened, to take the increased responsibility expected under the Convention, stakeholder participation enhanced, and national oceanic fisheries management plans which have statutory force developed.

10. The difficulty of managing wide-ranging oceanic fisheries is recognized, and the spectre of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing looms large in east Asian waters, where previous programs such as the ACIAR "Management and policy frameworks for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in Indonesian and Philippine waters" project have made some progress in identifying issues, developing national plans of action, identifying gaps in current policy and regulatory frameworks, and develop actions to combat IUU fishing. Strengthening costly compliance activities (monitoring, control and surveillance) will generally be beyond the scope of this MSP, although the development of integrated monitoring programmes, including observer programmes, at national level and regional initiatives undertaken by the Commission will assist.

11. With GEF support, the project will therefore target these sustainability threats to shared oceanic stocks. The project will build the capacity of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam to fully participate in the work of the Commission. This will be achieved through improved scientific information supporting an ecosystems approach to management of shared target and non-target oceanic stocks, a strengthened governance framework, and taking steps to improve monitoring, regulation and control, nationally and regionally. As a result, the Commission will be strengthened as the appropriate regional fisheries

² The members and participating territories of the Commission are: American Samoa, Australia, Canada, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Cook Islands, People's Republic of China, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France, French Polynesia, Guam, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Chinese Taipei, United States of America, Vanuatu, and Wallis and Futuna. Belize, El Salvador, Indonesia, Mexico and Senegal are Cooperating Non-Members.

management organization (RFMO) responsible for the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in this oceanic region.

11. Global environmental benefits from nationally-driven initiatives of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam, and improved contributions to sustainable development, will be achieved through enhanced information for decision-making in respect of necessary economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reform, and full participation in an existing regional fisheries management arrangement.

12. The Project will benefit from, and complement, a larger companion 5-year project in the adjacent central and eastern parts of the WCPF Convention Area, the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (PIOFMP), with similar objectives and activities, due for completion in late 2010. In a sense, the current project will complete the circle by having all coastal state members effective players in Commission activities. Under the CTI (Coral Triangle Initiative) umbrella, the project will enjoy linkages to other CTI projects, including the Sulu-Celebes Large Marine Ecosystem and Adjacent Area Sustainable Fisheries Management (SCS) Project, and the IW: LEARN Portfolio Learning in International Waters, with a focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes. The project will also have linkages to other existing or planned sub-regional or regional projects, such as the SPC Pacific Tuna Tagging Project, WWF Observer Programmes in Vietnam and Indonesia, and the FAO Strategies for Bycatch Management in the SCS region.

13. The three countries involved have initiated this project as a demonstration of their commitment to strengthen their individual and collective capacities to fully and effectively participate in the work of the Commission and promote the objectives of the Convention.

PART II: Strategy

14. To build capacity and engender cooperation in tackling the priority conservation management issues for transboundary fish stocks in the western Pacific and East Asia, the project will address the main barriers to sustainable fisheries management, as identified. Under the two primary activity components ie *monitoring, data enhancement and fishery assessment*, and *policy, institutional strengthening and fishery management* and will seek seven main outcomes as central planks in the MSP strategy

Improved knowledge of oceanic fish stocks and related ecosystems

15. Recognizing that incomplete fishery data (catches, species composition, catch by gear, size and area, by-catch and incidental catch) in the three countries represent the main source of uncertainty in current knowledge of the transboundary oceanic fish stocks, the project will develop for each country guidelines for the implementation of national integrated fishery monitoring programmes which will eventually include port sampling, landings data, operational (logsheet) and observer data. These programmes will be gradually implemented or refined in each country, according to the level of development and trained manpower available.

16. In the case of the Philippines, where the development of a national programme is more advanced, port sampling coverage will be extended to additional landing points, and existing data quality and collection procedures reviewed (port sampling data audits, rescue of historical data). Logsheet data collection programmes will be implemented incrementally and a strategic plan for an observer programme developed.

17. In Indonesia, existing pilot port sampling projects will be audited, and port sampling coverage expanded, informed by these initial outcomes. Extensive capacity building in all aspects of fishery

monitoring, from data collection to database development and analysis, will need to accompany these initiatives. Pilot operational data collection and a small observer programme would be developed later in the project.

18. In Vietnam, where fishery monitoring activity is at a rudimentary level, port sampling and data collection activity will be gradually initiated in three provinces, following appropriate training, capacity building and database development. Study tours of better developed programmes in Philippines will assist this process. At a later stage, development of operational level data collection will be tackled and the need for observer programmes assessed, given that extensive work has already been undertaken in Vietnam, focusing on the incidental catch of marine mammals and reptiles.

Reduced uncertainty in stock assessments

19. Data from the integrated national monitoring programmes will gradually be incorporated into the regional stock assessments carried out by the Commission's science provider, steadily reducing the existing uncertainties in these assessments. To facilitate this process, training through workshops run by appropriate regional consultants, will need to be provided not only in data collection, database development and maintenance, but data quality control and basic data analysis and dissemination.

20. The collaborative tuna tagging work being successfully undertaken in Indonesia and Philippines, in adjacent waters (Palau, Papua New Guinea, FSM) and throughout the region improve understanding of the extent of movement between national EEZs and high sea areas, as well as growth, mortality and other biological parameters. Analysis of the tagging data at national level, which will involve national scientists, will contribute to the development of national tuna management plans, whereas the wider regional data will provide critical new input to regional assessments.

21. Coordination at national level, for tagging project support, data submission and other information which will feed into the stock assessment process, will be provided by National Tuna Coordinators in Indonesia and Vietnam who will also oversee the production of annual reports to the Commission and fishery status reports (see later). Such a position already exists in Philippines, to good effect, and provides a model for the application of this approach.

National capacities in oceanic fishery monitoring and assessment strengthened

22. National capacity to implement, coordinate and maintain monitoring programmes will be provided through workshops and hands-on training, whereas stock assessment workshops will be conducted to build capacity to both undertake basic assessments at national level and importantly, interpret regional assessments for national awareness and necessary action.

23. National fishery status reports, which would include analyses of available monitoring data, fishery catches and trends, stock status, as far as it is known, catch disposal, processing and export figures, and ecosystem issues, would be regularly prepared, initially with the assistance of a regional consultant, but eventually in-house as capacity develops.

National laws, policies and institutions strengthened

24. A legal, policy and institutional strengthening approach would be undertaken at national level to ensure that the relevant capacities are available and adequate laws, policies and institutions are in place to support full participation in the regional management of shared migratory tuna stocks.

25. Comprehensive reviews of existing legal issues and national legal structures would be undertaken, via the medium of national or tri-nation workshops, then any necessary changes in laws, regulations, and agreements identified, to bring legal structures in line with the requirements of the Convention. Training of policy makers and legal personnel may also need to be provided.

25. National policy with respect to oceanic fisheries management would be reviewed and training/awareness-raising for policy makers, fisheries technical personnel and stakeholders provided as necessary. Preparation of a national tuna management plan involving all stakeholders in extensive consultation would be the end product of this process (see later).

26. It may also be necessary to review existing national oceanic fisheries management structures, and institute reforms necessary to enable full and effective participation of the relevant institutions in the work of the Commission.

Applicable global and regional instruments implemented, and participant countries contributing to management of shared migratory stocks

27. Countries would accede to the Convention (where not already done so) and other relevant legal instruments ratified. The table below summarizes the current situation for the three countries with respect to the status of pertinent international legal instruments and conventions.

Instrument	Status		
	Philippines	Indonesia	Vietnam
UNCLOS	Ratified	Ratified	Ratified
UNFSA	Ratified	Being processed	Being processed
WCPFC Convention	Ratified	Being processed	Not yet considered
FAO Code of Conduct	Participant	Principles included in new Fisheries Law	Being implemented
FAO IPOAs	IUU done	Not done (except IUU)	IUU done
FAO Compliance Agreement	Initiated	Accepted	Initiated
CCSBT Convention	Not applicable	Ratified	Not applicable
IOTC Convention	Not applicable	Ratified	Not applicable

28. Combined with the strengthening of relevant laws, policies and institutions, and information contributed from activities enabled under the project, all countries would become increasingly able to participate in the management of transboundary oceanic fish stocks in the Convention Area, through active involvement in, and meaningful contribution to, the Commission’s work.

Key stakeholders participating in the project

29. To promote enhanced cooperation and participation in all aspects of Project activity, industry-based tuna associations would be formed in Indonesia and Vietnam, to fully involve key stakeholders in all aspects of the project. Support to establish and incorporate these associations would initially be provided by the project, but the associations would eventually become self-sustaining.

30. Associated with this increased involvement of all stakeholders, a knowledge management system for dissemination of project-related outcomes and information would be established (see later)

National capacities in oceanic fisheries management strengthened

31. The culmination of many of the activities proposed under the project would be the development of national tuna management plans in two countries (Indonesia, Vietnam) and the regular revision of an existing plan in another (Philippines). These plans, developed with external assistance as necessary, would need to be compatible with existing WCPFC conservation and management measures, yet reflect national development aspirations and sovereignty, and draw on experience gained during the project.

PART III: Management Arrangements (1-3 pages)

32. UNDP will be the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for the project. It will play a key facilitating role in the management and administration of the project providing overall support and guidance on the various actions to be carried out towards the project's implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

33. The United Nations Office of Project Services (UNOPS) will be the project's Executing Agency (EA), in cooperation with the WCPFC. As such, it will be directly responsible for Project Management. In close consultation with national counterparts, designated WCPFC staff will be responsible for project administration and the allocation of the project's resources. The project management and administration activities fall under the third component of the project "Project management" and is thus an integral part of the project. WCPFC, with the assistance of contracted national and regional experts, is tasked with the day to day activities and ensuring that they are adequately executed towards the accomplishment of the project's goal. This will be evaluated against agreed performance indicators.

34. Experts will be recruited following UNDP/GEF procedures, based on clear terms of references, level of expertise and duration of the input required. Additional outside expertise will be called upon for specific tasks necessitating qualifications that are not available in the region.

35. The project's strategic approach will be guided by a Project Steering Committee (PSC), which will provide guidance and recommendations on annual basis or additionally as needed. The Steering Committee will meet annually, in conjunction with the WCPFC's Scientific Committee. The mandate of the PSC is bound by the project's objectives and outcomes; it plays an advisory role in (i) helping the project achieve its goal; (ii) developing and strengthening partnerships for the achievement of the project's goal, (iii) ensuring the project's results are taken up by the institutions represented in the PSC, (iv) supporting the identification and implementation of policy reforms as advocated by the project, and (v) promoting the project's results and lessons learnt at national, regional and international levels. Where possible and necessary, members of the PSC are expected to facilitate the task of the IA and experts recruited for the purpose of the project. The PSC has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the Inception Workshop (IW), and be based on delivery rates and the qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs. The PSC will include National Project Focal Points designated by the countries, UNDP/GEF, UNOPS and WCPFC. In

its operations, the PSC will elect a chair for a one-year term; the specific modalities for the election of the chair, eligibility and responsibilities will be agreed at the IW. To the extent possible, PSC meetings will be held conjunctly with other project activities/meetings.

36. In addition to the PSC, each participating country may form a small National Advisory Committee (NAC) made up of relevant national stakeholders (inter-ministerial, decentralized authorities where sampling is taking place, academia and civil society) to ensure relevance and coordination with related national activities and garner their support for the implementation of activities.

37. Additionally to the arrangements above-mentioned, the project will pursue collaborative arrangements and consultations with related projects and other Agencies. In the region, the project will maintain close links with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), which, as the Commission's science provider, will offer support for the establishment of fishery monitoring activities, stock assessment and training. The Project will maintain close links with, and learn from the outcomes of, the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (PIOFMP) which is being executed by the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and which is due for completion in September 2010.

PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget

38. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by designated staff of the joint EA (WCPFC) with support from the UNDP Country Office. The Logical Framework Matrix (see [Section II Part I](#)) provides *performance* and *impact* indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding *means of verification*. These will form the basis on which the project's Monitoring and Evaluation system will be built.

39. The following sections outline the principle components of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will be presented and finalized at the Project's Inception Workshop (IW) following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of M&E responsibilities of the UNDP, WCPFC and national counterpart agencies and staff.

40. The monitoring of the project will be based on the project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan as to be implemented in Component 3 "*Project Management*." This will be complemented by monitoring feedback from stakeholders, who will be consulted and supported to communicate with the PSC on observed issues and specific objectives and interests. The project-based monitoring will be organized by the WCPFC with the guidance of the PSC and in accordance with GEF/UNDP monitoring and evaluation policy. Specific considerations in relation to the monitoring of results and adaptive management approaches will form the basis of Monitoring and Evaluation processes.

41. Risk management forms an intrinsic part of project management, monitoring and evaluation. As such, due diligence will be accorded to the identification, classification, rating and reporting of risks. Whenever such risks are identified that might impede project implementation, the designated staff at WCPFC will alert UNDP and PSC chair as necessary. A risk identification and management section will be systematically included in all project reports as guided by UNDP's risk management approach which will be presented at the IW.

42. The project will specifically aim at tracking progress towards the following two process indicators:

- 1) Enhanced mainstreaming of the conservation, management and sustainable use of shared migratory fish stocks in national level resource management initiatives in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam;

2) Development and implementation of national mechanisms to sustain the active participation of Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam in WCPFC processes for the conservation and management of West Pacific East Asia migratory fish stocks;

43. The Implementing Agency (UNDP), in cooperation with the Executing Agency (UNOPS with WCPFC), will initiate and coordinate an external review process at the end of the project.

MONITORING AND REPORTING

Project Inception Phase

44. A Project Inception Workshop (IW) will be conducted with the designated WCPFC staff, relevant counterparts from the three participating countries (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam), UNDP-GEF at the Regional Centre in Bangkok, UNDP-CO as well as UNDP-GEF HQs where appropriate.

45. A fundamental objective of this IW will be to assist the project partners to understand and take ownership of the project's goals and objectives, as well as to finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the project's logframe matrix. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise finalizing the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

46. Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: (i) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF team, including Country Officers and UNDP Regional Centre staff, which will support the project during its implementation, (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-GEF staff vis à vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the annual project report (APR), as well as final evaluation. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, mandatory budget re-phasing and risk management approaches.

47. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff and decision-making structures such as the PSC will be discussed in order to clarify for all, each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. The IW will provide the opportunity to determine the *modus operandi*, role and scope of the PSC.

Monitoring responsibilities, events

48. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the designated WCPFC staff, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for PSC meetings, and (ii) project related Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

49. Day to day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the designated WCPFC staff based on the project's Annual Work Plan and its indicators. The WCPFC will inform UNDP/GEF if of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion.

50. Designated WCPFC staff and the Project GEF Technical Advisor will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the IW and assisted by the UNDP-GEF team as described under 1.1. Specific targets, progress indicators and their means of verification for the first year implementation will be developed at this Workshop. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team. They will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the Annual Work Plan.

51. Measurement of impact indicators related to global benefits will occur according to the schedules defined in the IW and based on the GEF International Waters results template.

52. *Periodic monitoring of implementation progress* will be undertaken by the UNDP/GEF through quarterly teleconferences with the project proponent, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.

53. *Annual Monitoring* will occur through the PSC. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to PSC meetings at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months of the start of full implementation, most likely in the first August following Project Inception so as to coincide with the annual session of WCPFC's Scientific Committee. Designated WCPFC staff will prepare an Annual Project Report (APR) and submit it to the members of the PSC at least two weeks prior to the meeting for review and comments.

54. The APR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the PSC meeting. Designated WCPFC staff will present the APR to the PSC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the PSC members. The designated IA and EA staff will also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary; specific attention needs to be given to coordination with broader WCPFC activities, programmes and projects as well as to the analysis of risks faced by the project. The PSC meeting is the opportunity for the designated WCPFC staff to call upon the PSC members for specific support and interventions to support the achievement of the project's development objective.

55. UNDP Country Offices and UNDP-GEF staff as appropriate, may conduct yearly visits to projects that have field sites, or more often based on an agreed upon schedules to be detailed in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Any other member of the PSC is also encouraged to participate in such visits. Field visit or mission reports will be prepared and circulated within one month of completion of the mission to the PSC members, designated WCPFC staff and others as deemed necessary.

Final Project meeting

56. The final project meeting will be held in the last month of project operations. The designated WCPFC staff will be responsible for preparing the Final Report and submitting it to WCPFC, UNOPS and UNDP. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the final project meeting in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the meeting. The final project meeting will consider the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader development objective. It will decide whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and act

as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects under implementation or formulation.

Project Monitoring Reporting

57. Designated WCPFC staff in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF team will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. Items (a) through (f) are mandatory and strictly related to monitoring, while (g) through (h) have a broader function and their frequency and nature can be defined at the inception workshop and through implementation. Many of these reports are tied to Monitoring events detailed in section 1.2. of the project's monitoring and evaluation plan, specific references will be made to them as necessary.

(a) Inception Report (IR)

58. A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the IW. It will include the detailed First Year/Annual Work Plan as agreed upon at the IW. The Work Plan will be divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. The Work Plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the WCPFC, the UNDP/GEF team, members of the PSC or contracted experts, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project's decision making structures. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months time-frame.

59. The Inception Report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may effect project implementation.

60. When finalized the report will be circulated to all PSC members and additional project proponents who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to this circulation of the Inception Report, WCPFC team and the UNDP-GEF team will review the document.

(b) Annual Project Report (APR)

61. The APR is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP's central oversight, monitoring and project management. It is a self -assessment report by project management to UNDP which provides input to UNDP's reporting process and the Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), and constitutes a key input to the PSC meetings. An APR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the PSC, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's Annual Work Plan and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work.

62. The format of the APR is flexible but should include the following:

- 3) An analysis of project performance over the reporting period, including outputs produced and, where possible, information on the status of the outcome
- 4) The constraints experienced in the progress towards results and the reasons for these
- 5) The three (at most) major constraints to achievement of results
- 6) AWP, CAE and other expenditure reports (ERP generated)
- 7) Lessons learned

- 8) Clear recommendations for future orientation in addressing key problems in lack of progress
- 9) Key risks identified, an update of their status and additional risks identified during implementation.
- 10) Partnerships developed, facilitating factors which contributed to the project's progress and positive impacts and results that were not captured in the annual workplan, logframe and project document.

(c) *Project Implementation Review (PIR)*

63. The PIR is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. Once the project has been under implementation for a year, a Project Implementation Report must be completed by the designated IAEA staff with support of the UNDP CO and/or RCU. The PIR is usually prepared around June/July and should be endorsed by the chair of the PSC.

64. In an attempt to reduce reporting requirements in terms of time and effort and in light of the similarities of the APR and PIR, UNDP/EEG has prepared a harmonized format that combines the two reports.

(d) *Quarterly Progress Reports*

65. Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP Regional Centre by the project team.

(e) *Periodic Thematic Reports*

66. As and when called for by UNDP or UNDP-GEF or the PSC, the designated WCPFC staff will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the designated WCPFC staff in written form by UNDP or the PSC chair and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP/PSC is requested to minimize requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team. To the extent possible, such thematic reports will be planned ahead of time and discussed at PSC meetings to allow the designated WCPFC staff to include them in the annual workplan for the project.

(f) *Project Terminal Report*

67. During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc. and will be the definitive statement of the Project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the Project's activities.

(g) *Technical Reports*

68. Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. The project has already identified a series of such reports within each component; as part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs/PIRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive, specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national and international levels.

(h) Project Publications

69. Project Publications will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the Project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the Project, in the form of journal articles, multimedia publications, etc. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance, scientific worth, etc. of these Reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and will also (in consultation with UNDP, the PSC and other relevant stakeholder groups) plan and produce these Publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

70. There are two mandatory publications in the case of this project, and these are IW:LEARN type experience notes. The format to be used is prepared by IW:LEARN and agreed upon by the GEF IW task force. The specific topic of these two experience notes will be determined during implementation and in consultation with the PSC, IW:LEARN, UNDP/GEF and GEF secretariat if necessary.

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

71. The project will be subjected to one independent external evaluation as follows:

Final Evaluation

72. An Independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal PSC meeting, and will focus on determining the progress and success made towards the achievement of outcomes. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; it will also present lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by UNOPS as executing agency based on guidance from the UNDP Regional Centre.

73. An audit of project expenditure will be done in accordance with agreed UNDP and GEF requirements

LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING

74. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. This will be undertaken

primarily through IW:LEARN and its processes (experience notes, International Waters Conference, Thematic and geographic workshops). In addition:

75. The project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP/GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics.

76. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned.

77. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identify and analyzing lessons learned is an on- going process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every 12 months. UNDP/GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting and reporting on lessons learned. To this end a percentage of project resources will need to be allocated for these activities.

TABLE 1: INDICATIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PLAN AND CORRESPONDING BUDGET

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop	WCPFC UNDP CO UNDP GEF	33,000 USD (included in project component 5)	Within first two months of project start up (May 09)
Inception Report	Designated WCPFC staff with feedback from countries & UNOPS UNDP/GEF	None	Immediately following IW (June 09)
PIR	Designated WCPFC staff UNDP CO UNDP/GEF Others as identified	None	Annually
Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meetings / TPR meetings	Designated WCPFC staff PSC members as designated UNDP CO& UNDP/GEF staff	To be linked to other project events/meetings therefore costs covered in other budget lines	Following Project IW (August 09) & subsequently at least once a year
Final External Evaluation	Designated WCPFC staff	32,000 USD	At the end of

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame
	UNOPS UNDP/GEF External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)		project implementation (May 2012)
Final Project Meeting	WCPFC UNDP CO UNDP GEF	33,000 USD (included in project component 5)	3 months before the end of the project (March 2012)
Final project reports (technical & financial)	Designated WCPFC staff UNOPS UNDP CO UNDP GEF Others as identified	None	6 months following the end of the project (November 2012)
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 98,000	

PART V: Legal Context

78. This Project Document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article I of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Governments of Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam.

79. The UNDP Resident Representative in is authorized to effect in writing the following types of revision to this Project Document, provided that he/she has verified the agreement thereto by the UNDP-GEF Unit and is assured that the other signatories to the Project Document have no objection to the proposed changes:

1. Revision of, or addition to, any of the annexes to the Project Document;
2. Revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs or activities of the project, but are caused by the rearrangement of the inputs already agreed to or by cost increases due to inflation;
3. Mandatory annual revisions which re-phase the delivery of agreed project inputs or increased expert or other costs due to inflation or take into account agency expenditure flexibility; and

4. Inclusion of additional annexes and attachments only as set out here in this Project Document

SECTION II : PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
Goal		To improve conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the West Pacific-East Asia region				
Objectives of the Project		To strengthen national capacities and international cooperation on priority trans-boundary concerns relating to the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the west Pacific Ocean and east Asia (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam).				
Outcomes	Outputs	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
Outcome 1: 1. Improved knowledge of oceanic fish stocks and related ecosystems	1.1 Implementation of integrated fishery monitoring programmes for target and non-target species in Philippines	1.1.1 Expanded port sampling coverage of tunas and associated species	Currently fishery monitoring programmes in Philippines provide incomplete coverage of landings	Effective port sampling programmes established at three new landing points in Philippines	Database acquisitions, quarterly data summaries, annual national reports	Manpower availability and level of training available

		1.1.2 Procedures for the processing of catch data and raising procedures in place	Uncertainty in catch estimates arising from current data processing and raising procedures	Guidelines for revised procedures and their adoption	Review of outcomes of revised procedures, audit of inputs to regional databases	Unwillingness to adopt revised procedures
		1.1.3 Enhanced operational level data collection (logsheets)	Logsheets coverage of industrial fleets poor, and non-existent for artisanal fleets	High level of logsheet coverage (60%) of large purse seine vessels initially, then smaller purse seine and ring net vessels	Regular data summaries from logsheets	Lack of cooperation from industry
		1.1.4 Development of strategic plan for observer programme	No regular observer coverage by fishery agencies, and few data on catches of non-target species for EBFM	Observer programme established on selected fleets in 2010	Observer reports incorporated in observer database, annual reports, data summaries and EBFM	Lack of trained observers; poor industry cooperation

1.2 Implementation of integrated fishery monitoring programmes for target and non-target species in Indonesia	1.2.1 Audit of existing pilot port sampling at two sites, in agreed format	Little or no port sampling; pilot sampling schemes initiated on trial basis yet to be evaluated	Audit completed and plan for extended coverage developed	Pilot port sampling, moving to substantive port sampling schemes if successful	Pilot schemes prove unsuccessful
	1.2.2 Expanded port sampling coverage of tunas and associated species	Pilot scheme currently underway at two selected landing sites, but no other catch sampling in eastern Indonesia	Effective port sampling programmes established at three selected landing points in Indonesia	Database acquisitions, quarterly data summaries, annual national reports; Regular annual audit	Manpower availability and level of training
	1.2.3 Capacity building in responsible agencies for processing and assimilation of catch data for tuna and assoc. species	Current capacity inadequate for data processing and interpretation	Training in database development and data analysis provided and applied	Training workshops held; data summaries developed; improved data inputs to regional stock assessments; annual reports prepared	Suitably motivated staff unavailable
	1.2.4 Pilot operational-level data collection, with progression to expanded data collection	Logsheet coverage of all fleets non-existent	Logsheets developed and distributed to selected vessels/gear	Regular data summaries, coverage estimates and quality checks	Lack of cooperation from industry
	1.2.5 Strategic plan for observer programme developed and implemented	No observer coverage by fisheries agencies at present	Plan discussed and accepted, with implementation planned for 2011	Observer reports incorporated in observer database Annual summary observer reports	Lack of cooperation from industry

	1.3 1 Implementation of integrated fishery monitoring programmes for target and non-target	1.3.1. Port sampling and data collection initiated in three provinces	No coordinated data collection by fisheries agencies, national and provincial	Sampling forms and sampling strategy developed; audit procedures developed	Regular data summaries and data quality checks (audit)	Suitable staff not available for training and implementation
	species in Vietnam	1.3.2 Enhanced capacity in monitoring and data collection and analysis	Current capacity rudimentary	Training workshops in port sampling, database development and maintenance, and basic data analysis; format for data summaries adopted	Workshop evaluation; database holdings listed; regular data summaries provided	Suitable staff not available for training and implementation
		1.3.3 12 Pilot operational-level data collection, with progression to expanded data collection	Logsheet coverage of all fleets non-existent	Logsheets developed and distributed to selected vessels/gear	Regular data summaries, coverage estimates and quality checks	Lack of cooperation from industry
		1.3.4 Study tour of port sampling programmes in Philippines	No prior experience of port sampling programmes in Vietnam	Experience of similar programmes with similar vessels and species catch gained	Technical report prepared, including lessons learned	n/a

Outcome 2: Reduced uncertainty in stock assessments	2.1 Improved data for stock assessment	2.1.1 Data quality control training	Experience and skills currently lacking in most cases	Training workshop held, regular audit	Regular preparation of data summaries; databases well maintained	
		2.1.2 Collaborative tuna tagging activity in-country (Philippines, Indonesia)	Information lacking on many basic tuna population parameters eg movement, natural mortality, growth, exploitation rate	National counterparts on tagging vessels; effective coordination of publicity and tag recovery	Involvement in, and delivery of, tag-based national tuna fishery assessment and tuna management plan	Poor publicity and lack of coordination of tag recovery efforts; lack of cooperation by fisheries in returning tags with complete information
		2.1.3 National data coordination and research (where currently absent)	No or limited data or tuna research coordination in Vietnam and Indonesia at national level	Funding for National Tuna Coordinators posts (Vietnam, Indonesia) provided	Annual reports for WCPFC as primary output	Suitable person not available
Outcome 3: National capacities in oceanic fishery monitoring and assessment	3.1 Training of national fishery monitoring and stock assessment staff	3.1.1 Data analysis and stock assessment training	Current capacity not well developed for oceanic fisheries	Stock assessment workshops; studentships for post-graduate study	Uptake of capacity reflected in national representation in WCPFC Scientific Committee; annual fishery status report	

strengthened		3.1.2 Database and analytical training	Current capacity not well developed for oceanic fisheries	Training workshops; annual database audit	Database acquisitions used in stock assessments; quarterly data summaries; audit of inputs to regional databases	
		3.1.3 Preparation of national fishery status reports	Only Philippines currently prepares such a report, in part.	Assistance with development of reporting template	Regular submission of status reports to WCPFC and national stakeholders	
Outcome 4: Participant countries contributing to management of shared migratory stocks	4.1 Review of policy and institutional arrangements for oceanic fisheries management	4.1.1 Review of policy and legal arrangements for WCPFC-related matters;	Indonesia and Vietnam not well prepared; Philippines still needs some revision	Legal and policy training workshops held	Workshop proceedings; review of current arrangements tabled	
		4.1.2 Review of institutional arrangements	Indonesia and Vietnam not well prepared	Institutional review undertaken	Review outcomes of review; implementation plan for institutional strengthening	
	4.2 Strategy to support national reform	4.2.1 Identify reform necessary to existing arrangements	Countries not well placed to be fully effective in WCPFC	Implementation of proposed initiatives derived from previous reviews		

<p>Outcome 5:</p> <p>National laws, policies and institutions strengthened. To implement applicable global and regional instruments</p>	<p>5.1 Implementation of the WCPFC Convention and related instruments</p>	<p>5.1.1 Prepare checklist of compliance shortfalls</p>	<p>Convention requirements not fully adopted by countries</p>	<p>Address checklist of compliance issues; action to become fully compliant</p>	<p>Implementation of necessary actions; more effective participation in WCPFC</p>	
<p>Outcome 6:</p> <p>Key stakeholders participating in the project</p>	<p>6.1 Knowledge management system for dissemination of Project-related information, lessons and best practice</p>	<p>6.1.1 Establish appropriate KLM in all countries</p>	<p>Currently no system in place for systematic dissemination of relevant information</p>	<p>Development and establishment of KLM system</p>	<p>Regular information dissemination to stakeholders</p>	
	<p>6.2 Establish Tuna Associations (Vietnam, Indonesia) to fully involve industry</p>	<p>6.2.1 National body coordinating provincial and national work</p>	<p>No coordination amongst key producing provinces or management areas</p>	<p>Effective national initiatives and reporting procedures established</p>	<p>Association articles, annual; meeting and activities reports</p>	
<p>Outcome 7:</p> <p>National capacities in oceanic fisheries management strengthened</p>	<p>7.1 Development of National Tuna Management Plans (Indonesia, Vietnam) or revision of existing plans (Philippines)</p>	<p>7.1.1 Assistance provided to develop NTMPs in two countries and revise in the third</p>	<p>No TMP in place (Indonesia, Vietnam) or needs revision (Philippines)</p>	<p>Develop template for NTMP for each country; convene workshop to develop NTMP compatible with WCPFC CMMs</p>	<p>NTMP prepared, launched and integrated in national policy</p>	

TABLE 2: OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE IMPACT INDICATORS

Please refer to the column Verifiable Indicators in the above Table for each Outcome and Output indicator.

SECTION III : Total Budget and Workplan

TOTAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN

Award ID:	Tbd
Award Title:	West Pacific - East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management
Business Unit:	Tbd
Project Title:	West Pacific - East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management
Project ID: PIMS no. _____	
Implementing Partner (Executing Agency)	WCPFC / UNDP

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Total (USD)
OUTCOME 1: Improved knowledge of oceanic fish stocks and related ecosystems	WCPFC		GEF		International Consultants	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$45,000
					Travel	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$45,000
					Local Consultants	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
					Contractual services	\$92,000	\$120,000	\$115,000	\$322,000
					sub-total GEF	\$132,00	\$160,000	\$155,000	\$447,000
			WCPFC			International Consultants	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000

				Travel	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000	
				Local Consultants	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$25,000	
				Contractual services	\$50,000	\$40,000		\$100,000	
				sub-total WCPFC	\$70,000	\$60,000	\$15,000	\$145,000	
			AusAID	Local Consultants	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000	
				Contractual services	\$25,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$135,000	
				Sub-total AusAID	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$110,000	
				Total Outcome 1	\$232,000	\$260,000	\$210,000	\$702,000	
OUTCOME 2: Uncertainties in stock assessment reduced	WCPFC		GEF	71200	International Consultants	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$40,000
				71600	Travel	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
					sub-total GEF	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$55,000
			NOAA/ NMFS		Contractual services	\$50,000			\$50,000
					sub-total NOAA	\$50,000			\$50,000
				Total Outcome 2	\$65,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$105,000	
OUTCOME 3: National capacities in oceanic fishery monitoring and assessment strengthened	WCPFC		GEF		International consultants	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$50,000
					Contractual services	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$35,000
					Sub-total GEF	\$25,000	\$35,000	\$25,000	\$85,000

			JTF	International consultants	\$5,000	\$5,000		\$10,000
			JTF	Contract services	\$25,000	\$25,000		\$50,000
			JTF	Sub-total JTF	\$30,000	\$30,000		\$60,000
				Total Outcome 3	\$55,000	\$65,000	\$25,000	\$145,000
OUTCOME 4: Participating countries contributing to shared management of migratory fish stocks	WCPFC		GEF	International consultants	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$25,000
				Local consultants	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$20,000
				Contract services	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$40,000
				Sub-total GEF	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$25,000	\$85,000
				Total outcome 4	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$25,000	\$85,000
OUTCOME 5: National policies laws, and institutions strengthened	WCPFC		GEF	International consultants	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$30,000
				Local consultants	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
				Contract services	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$25,000
				Sub-total GEF	\$35,000	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$70,000
			AusAID	International consultants	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$20,000
				Sub-total AusAID	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$20,000
				Total outcome 5	\$45,000	\$30,000	\$15,000	\$90,000
OUTCOME 6: Key stakeholders participating in the	WCPFC		GEF	Contractual services	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$50,000
				Local consultants	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000

project				Sub-total GEF	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$65,000
		AusAID		Contractual services	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$25,000	\$95,000
				Sub-total AusAID	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$25,000	\$95,000
				Total outcome 6	\$65,000	\$50,000	\$45,000	\$160,000
OUTCOME 7: National capacities in oceanic fisheries management strengthened	WCPFC	GEF		Contractual services	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
				Local Consultants	\$5,000			\$5,000
				sub-total GEF	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$20,000
		AusAID		International consultants	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$20,000
				Contract services	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$25,000
				sub-total AusAID	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$45,000
					Total Outcome 7	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT	WCPFC	GEF		Int. Consultants	\$40,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$60,000
				Workshops	\$20,000		\$18,000	\$38,000
				sub-total GEF	\$60,000	\$10,000	\$28,000	\$98,000
		WCPFC		Int. Consultants	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$20,000
				Workshops	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$40,000
				sub-total WCPFC	\$30,000	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$55,000
		AusAID		Contract services	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
					sub-total AusAID	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000

				Total Manage.	\$100,000	\$35,000	\$48,000	\$183,000
PROJECT TOTAL					\$617,000	\$510,000	\$408,000	\$1,535,000

Summary of Funds:³

GEF	Project	\$332,000	\$300,000	\$293,000	\$925,000
AusAID	Co-finance	\$110,000	\$95,000	\$95,000	\$300,000
WCPFC	Co-finance	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$200,000
NOAA/NMFS	Co-finance	\$50,000			\$50,000
JTF	Co-finance	\$30,000	\$30,000		\$60,000
ACIAR	In-kind	\$25,000			\$25,000
WCPFC	In-kind	\$45,000	\$55,000	\$40,000	\$140,000
SPC/OFP	In-kind	\$528,000	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$628,000
WWF/NOAA	In-kind	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
DANIDA	In-kind	\$25,000			\$25,000
Philippines	In-kind	\$180,000	\$205,000	\$225,000	\$610,000
Indonesia	In-kind	\$125,000	\$155,000	\$190,000	\$470,000
Vietnam	In-kind	\$105,000	\$135,000	\$130,000	\$370,000
TOTAL		\$1,705,000	\$1,185,000	1,083,000	\$3,953,000

³ Summary table should include all financing of all kinds: GEF financing, co-financing, cash, in-kind, etc. etc

Explanatory Notes for the TBWP table - WPEA OFM MSP

For Adaptive Management reasons, the above budget breakdown and budget notes below are only indicative. They will be subject to changes throughout the project execution, based on review of progress and changes in project conditions, risks and assumptions. All the contracts listed below will be procured as per UNDP/WCPFC rules and regulations.

Outcome 1: GEF funding will be used to support field work (technical assistance, logistical support etc.) and for coordination of respective activities of national teams (three consultants for 20 weeks total, at \$2,000 per week plus expenses; local consultants hired and local technical staff contracted to supplement in-country personnel for the project monitoring activity - \$352,000 in total; WCPFC and AusAID co-funding will provide attenuating support activities for this component, in cash (two international consultants for 6 weeks, local consultants and contracted services for \$270,00) supplemented by other in-kind financing, notably the country contributions.

Outcome 2: Through GEF funding, technical assistance, hands-on training in database management and analytical approaches will be provided (three international consultants for 15 weeks at \$30,000 plus costs). Co-financing cash (NOAA/NMFS - \$50,000) will be applied to deploy technical assistance to enable improvements in data collection methods in one country (Philippines) to be improved; improved stock assessments will result from co-financed (in-kind) tagging activity on a large scale in two of the countries (Indonesia, Philippines) and in adjacent areas (Palau, FSM, PNG etc)

Outcome 3: Through GEF-funded technical assistance, training will be provided in data analysis and stock assessment through workshops at national or regional level (two consultant trainers for 12 weeks at \$25,000 plus costs); an anticipated five workshops will be conducted, with at least two participants from each country. This will continue and expand training currently supported (in-kind) by a companion project (PIOFMP). Co-financing (cash) will be applied to support this activity (JTF) and services contracted in-country as required

Outcome 4: National workshops, utilizing international and local consultants, will be held early in the project to review institutional arrangements and reporting requirements, as they relate to full participation in the WCPFC (two international consultants for 6 weeks (\$18,000 plus costs; three national workshops and one regional workshop, with a total of 20 participants). GEF funding will be provided to support enhanced national reporting, through the activities of national tuna coordinators (two coordinators at \$20,000 per year, including operational costs(see outcome 6).

Outcome 5: National workshops, utilizing international and local consultants, will be held early in the project to review current policy/legal arrangements, and institutional arrangements, as they relate to full participation in the WCPFC. This key activity will be supported by GEF project funding and co-financing cash (Aus AID), with three workshops with 10 participants each, and one international consultant for 6 weeks at \$20,000 plus costs; services at national level would be contracted for implementation of identified actions necessary.

Outcome 6: To coordinate project activities and ensure full national participation in the project, national tuna/stakeholder associations will be established in two countries and their activities initially supported from GEF funds and co-financing (AusAID cash), , diminishing over time as they become self –funding (two associations and their activities)

Outcome 7: Knowledge management systems will be established to ensure information gained and lessons learned from the project will be made fully available to all stakeholders (one media and communications consultant 6 weeks, \$15,000 plus costs). The preparation of tuna management plans in two countries and revision of an existing plan in another (supported by co-financing and technical assistance as required) will provide additional focus for this activity (one management plan consultant, 4 weeks, \$10,000 plus costs).

NOTE ON PROJECT MANAGEMENT

An inception meeting and final project meeting (to assure integration of project results within effective participation in WCPFC activity) will be supported with GEF and WCPFC funds in the 1st and final year respectively (two meetings with 20 participants).

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established at the Inception Meeting.

The PSC will then meet in the frame of other project meetings.

- Project management will be achieved via a part –time Project Coordinator initially, WCPFC staff members and national coordinators.
- WCPFC in-kind co-funding of 110,000 USD will be provided for project support/coordination as needed, and cash co-financing will also be provided by WCPFC and ACIAR (\$85,000)

In-kind support will be documented and confirmed during project implementation. This will demonstrate the complete integration of the project in WCPFC's program.

Note to Travel Budget:

GEF funds will only be used to support travel in relation to the field work, monitoring and evaluation meetings and necessary meetings for the delivery of outcomes. The GEF travel budget will be supplemented through the cash-contribution of the WCPFC and other co-financing .

