Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)

Mid Term Review – UNDP-GEF Full Size Project GEF Project ID: 5405

Mid-Term Review Final Report

July 2018

Project Information Summary

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name:	ling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)	
Project ID:	PIMS ID: 4752	
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	
Countries:	Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam	
Focal Area:	International Waters (GEF-5)	
Strategic Programmes	IW Objective 2: Catalyze multistate cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) while considering climatic variability and change.	
	IW Objective 3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for ecosystem-based joint management of trans-boundary water systems	
Funding Source:	GEF Trust Fund	
Implementing Agency	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	
Executing Agency:	PEMSEA Resource Facility (PRF)	
FINANCIALS		
GEF Project Grant:	10,643,992	
Cofinancing Total:	157,265,467	
Total Cost:	167,909,459	
PROJECT TIMELINE		
PIF submitted to GEF:	16/04/2013	
Project Approved:	26/08/2014	
State Date:	05/09/2014	
Closing Date (Planned): 05/09/2019	

Acknowledgements

The Midterm Review Team acknowledges the support of all who contributed to the review process including national and regional representatives who agreed to provide their insights, and Implementing Agency representatives, who provided valuable comment on the draft Report. Particular thanks are extended to the staff of the PEMSEA Resource Facility, led by Executive Director Ms Aimee Gonzales and Project Coordinator Mr Adrian Ross.

Contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1	Project Description	1
1.2	Purpose and Methodology	2
1.3	Project Progress Summary	4
1.4	Conclusions	5
1.5	Summary of Recommendations	7
2	INTRODUCTION	. 11
2.1	Purpose of the MTR and objectives	. 11
2.2	Scope & Methodology	. 11
2.3	MTR Mission and Data Collection	. 12
2.	3.1 Pre-Mission Planning	. 12
2.	3.2 MTR Mission and Field Visits	. 13
2.4	Limitations of the MTR	. 14
2.5	Structure of the Report	. 14
3	PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT	. 14
3.1	Project Overview	. 14
3.2	Project Context	. 15
3.3	Project Description and Strategy	. 16
3.4	Global Environmental Benefits	. 17
3.5	Project Implementation Arrangements	. 18
3.6	Project timing and milestones	. 20
3.7	Main stakeholders: summary list	. 20
4	FINDINGS	. 21
41	Droject Strategy	21
	Floject Strategy	. 21
4.	L1 Project Design	. 21 . 21
4. 4.	L.2 Results Framework/Logframe	. 21 . 21 . 23
4. 4. 4.2	Project Strategy L.1 Project Design L.2 Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26
4. 4. 4.2 4.2	Project Strategy L.1 Project Design L.2 Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26
4. 4. 4.2 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe. Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results 	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29
4. 4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe. Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool. 	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34
4. 4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective 	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35
4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 3	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe. Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management. 	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36
4.2 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4.3	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool. GEF Tracking Tool. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective Project Implementation and Adaptive Management. Management Arrangements 	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 36
4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4.3 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool GEF Tracking Tool Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 36 . 37
4. 4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe. Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management. Management Arrangements Work planning. Finance and co-finance 	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 36 . 37 . 38
4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4.3 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool. GEF Tracking Tool. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective Project Implementation and Adaptive Management. Management Arrangements Work planning. Finance and co-finance Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems 	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41
4.2 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool GEF Tracking Tool Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective Project Implementation and Adaptive Management Management Arrangements Work planning Finance and co-finance Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems Stakeholder engagement 	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41 . 42
4.2 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool GEF Tracking Tool Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective Project Implementation and Adaptive Management Management Arrangements Work planning Finance and co-finance Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems Stakeholder engagement 	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41 . 42 . 42
4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4	 Project Strategy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results	. 21 . 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41 . 42 . 42 . 43
4.2 4.2 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Design Project Design Results Framework/Logframe	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41 . 42 . 42 . 43 . 43
4.2 4.2 4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	1.1 Project Design 1.2 Results Framework/Logframe	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41 . 42 . 42 . 43 . 43
4.2 4.2 4. 4.2 4. 4.3 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Unitegy Project Design Results Framework/Logframe. Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool. GEF Tracking Tool. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management Management Arrangements Work planning. Finance and co-finance Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems Stakeholder engagement Communications. Sustainability Financial risks to sustainability 	21 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 23 24 35 35 36 33 36 33 36 37 38 41 42 43 43 44
4.2 4.2 4. 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4	 Project Design Project Design Results Framework/Logframe	. 21 . 23 . 26 . 26 . 29 . 34 . 35 . 36 . 37 . 38 . 41 . 42 . 43 . 43 . 43 . 44 . 45
4.2 4.2 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	 Project Design Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results Progress towards outcomes analysis Commentary on Progress Towards Results GEF Tracking Tool GEF Tracking Tool Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	21 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2
4.2 4.2 4. 4.2 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	Project Jurategy 1.1 Project Design 1.2 Results Framework/Logframe	21 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2
4.2 4.2 4. 4.2 4. 4.3 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 5 5 5	Project Strategy 1.1 Project Design 1.2 Results Framework/Logframe	21 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2
4. 4. 4.2 4. 4. 4.3 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.	Project Strategy 1.1 Project Design 1.2 Results Framework/Logframe Progress Towards Results	21 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2

ANNEXES

Annex A	MTR Terms of Reference	53
Annex B	List of Documents Reviewed	77
Annex C	Stakeholders Consulted During MTR Mission	79
Annex D	MTR Evaluation Matrix	85
Annex E	Stakeholder Interview Questions and Templates	89
Annex F	List of Project Stakeholders and Partners	94
Annex G	SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework	97
Annex H	Results Matrix	104
Annex I	MTR Ratings	137
Annex J	UNEG Code of Conduct Agreement	138
Annex K	MTR Report Clearance Form	139
Annex L	Audit Trail of Received Comments on Draft MTR Report (annexed as separate file)	
Annex M	GEF IW Tracking Tool (12/8/13 – Baseline)	
	(annexed as a separate file)	
Annex N	GEF IW Tracking Tool (14/5/18 – Mid-term)	
	(annexed as a separate file)	

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Project Information Table	1
Table 2: MTR ratings and achievement summary table	2
Table 3: Recommendations table	7
Table 4: Project Sites Visited by the MTR Team	. 13
Table 5: ICM Project Implementation Sites	. 18
Table 6: Suggested changes to indicators and targets	. 23
Table 7: Summary of progress towards results ratings	. 26
Table 8: Summary of GEF IW Tracking Tool Ratings	. 34
Table 9: Summary of Funds Available. Source: Project Initiation Report and ProDoc Section III	. 38
Table 10: Annual Work Plan Budgets	. 38
Table 11: Project Expenditure and Budget Planning	. 39
Table 12: Co-financing commitments based on commitment letters from country and non-country partr	ners 40
Table 13: Recommendations of the MTR	. 49

Figure 1: PEMSEA Regional Coordinating Mechanism Organizational Chart	19
Figure 2: Project Management and Organisational Structure	20
Figure 3: Actual expenditure to date and forecast expenditure at project end	39

Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
EAS	East Asian Seas
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
IC	International Consultants
ICM	Integrated Coastal Management
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IRBCAM	Integrated River Basin and Coastal Area Management
IW	International Waters
LME	Large Marine Ecosystem
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PEMSEA	Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia
PRF	PEMSEA Resource Facility
ProDoc	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SDS-EAS	Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Review Team Composition

A team of specialists was formed to conduct the evaluation. It consisted of an institutional, legal and government specialist and a coastal and ocean management specialist. The specialists were recruited to strike an appropriate balance of management and technical skills, shared vision, knowledge of the region, experience with multidisciplinary projects and good communication and interpersonal skills.

Tony Elliott: Team Leader and Institutional, Legal and Governance specialist: Independent consultant with an MSc in Marine Science. Tony has 40 years of experience in research and operational oceanography and the international coordination of tsunami warning and mitigation systems, with 28 years based in the Asia-Pacific region. He has broad experience in the marine sciences, including marine geophysics, physical oceanography, numerical modelling, environmental studies, and coastal zone management. From 2006 to 2016, he worked for the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO as Head of Secretariat for the Intergovernmental Coordination Group for the Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System.

Julian Roberts: Coastal and Ocean Management Expert. With a PhD in international maritime policy, Julian has over 20 years of experience working on a broad range of issues related to marine resource management and ocean governance, particularly in small island states. Julian has extensive experience in developing capacity building activities relating to ocean governance and has published widely on the subject of ocean governance and the blue economy. Julian was formerly a senior advisor and acting director of the Commonwealth Secretariat's Oceans and Natural Resources Advisory Division.

1 Executive Summary

Table 1: Project Information Table

PROJECT NAME:	Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)			
Project ID:	PIMS ID: 4752	GEF Project ID:	5405	
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	Countries:	Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam	
Focal Area:	International Waters (GEF-5)	Project Approved:	26/08/2014	
Strategic	IW Objective 2: State Date:		05/09/2014	
Programmes:	IW Objective 3:			
Funding Source:	GEF Trust Fund	Closing Date (Planned):	05/09/2019	
Implementing United Nations Development Pr Agency Implementing		Programme (UNDP)		
Executing Agency: PEMSEA Resource Facility (PRF)		-)		
FINANCIALS				
GEF Project Grant:	USD 10,643,992	Expenditure to Date:	USD 5,689,321	
Cofinancing Total:	USD 157,265,467			
Total Cost:	USD 167,909,459			

1.1 Project Description

The marine waters of the EAS are showing signs of serious degradation due to human activities. The consequences of this degradation include loss of livelihoods and economic opportunities, loss of natural protection of the coastline and loss of natural habitats for flora and fauna.

Since 2003, the GEF has supported a number of continuous initiatives to support elaboration and implementation of the *Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)*. This continuous support, over the past 15 years, consists of a transition period, a transformation period, and a sustainable operation period. This most recent initiative, approved by GEF in May 2014, is the fourth phase of GEF projects being implemented by UNDP and executed by PRF, representing the "transformation phase" and culminating in the sustainability of PEMSEA as the regional coordinating mechanism for implementation of the SDS-SEA.

The **project objective** is: to catalyse actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and oceanbased economy in the East Asian region. This objective will be achieved through the implementation of the following three interconnected Project components:

In order to achieve the objective, the project's intervention has been organised in three mutually supporting components:

COMPONENT 1 - Partnerships in Coastal and Ocean Governance Enabling a Self-Sustaining, Country-Owned Regional Mechanism Governing the LMEs in the East Asian Region.

COMPONENT 2 - Healthy and Resilient Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Through Conservation-Focused ICM Programs Thereby Increasing Areal Extent of Healthy and Resilient Habitats.

COMPONENT 3 - A Knowledge Platform for Building a Sustainable Ocean-Based Blue Economy.

The project is being implemented at a total of 46 sites in eight countries: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Vietnam.

The expected Global Environmental Benefits generated by the project include:

- 1. Strengthened sub-national/local government capacities to scale up existing ICM activities;
- 2. Strengthened information dissemination and knowledge-sharing capabilities and enhancing investments in capital (both natural and manmade) assets of a sustainable ocean-based blue economy.
- 3. Increased public and private sector investments in activities that contribute to sustainable development and a blue economy at the regional, national and local levels

The socioeconomic benefits and gender mainstreaming will serve to strengthen the impacts of the interventions on the governance and management of the seas of East Asia. There is expected to be a mutually reinforcing effect between and among the objectives of improving the environment, optimizing economic benefits and improving the role of women.

1.2 Purpose and Methodology

The objective of the MTR was to gain an independent analysis of progress towards achieving the envisaged project objective and outcomes. The MTR focused on identifying potential project design problems, evaluating project implementation and adaptive management, assessing progress towards results, and gauging the likelihood that results achieved will be sustained after GEF funding ceases. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the remaining implementation timeframe. The project performance was measured based on the indicators of the project results framework and relevant GEF tracking tools. The MTR was an evidence-based assessment and relied on feedback from persons who have been involved in the design, implementation, and supervision of the project, and also review of available documents and findings obtained during a field mission.

Evaluating Ratings

Evaluation ratings are summarised below in Table 2.

Table 2: MTR ratings and achievement summary table

MEASURE MTR RATING		ACHIEVEMENT DESCRIPTION
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Moderately Satisfactory	All countries are participating in the project to some degree. However, delays in signing countries agreements with some countries have resulted in delays in project implementation. The overall Rating of Moderately Satisfactory reflects the fact that, while progress to date has been significant, delays have prevented progress in some countries. As a result, at this stage, the project is considered unlikely to achieve all the project objectives within the project timeframe.
	Outcome 1 Satisfactory	HQ Agreement and Host Country Agreement provide PRF with continuity required to continue operations.

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

		CSAs signed with China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore - voluntary contributions continue with support to 2018 secured.
		PRF established 14 agreements/implementing arrangements with regional and international organizations.
		Ten countries, two sub-regional sea areas and the regional SOCs will be published and submitted to the EAS Congress/Ministers Forum in November 2018
	Outcome 2	Good progress made on policies/legislations/plans and institutional mechanisms in support of coastal and ocean development in all countries. The development of national sector legislative priorities is progressing in all countries
	Moderately Satisfactory	The establishment of a functional multi-sectoral, institutional coordinating mechanism, however, remains a significant challenge in all countries
		The 3 target countries have started to incorporate SDS-SEA objectives and targets into their MTDPs. The project is expected to engage in the planning processes of the other 5 countries this year.
	Outcome 3	PEMSEA has produced a broad range of innovative knowledge products. These products and services have a strong "value proposition" and should be promoted to other regions.
	Satisfactory	For its long-term sustainability, it is important that the member countries make voluntary contributions.
	Outcome 4 Moderately	The project is on track to achieve 20% ICM coverage of the region's coastline by August 2019. Implementation of other targets, however, is unlikely to be achieved by all countries due to delays in start-up experienced with several countries.
	Satisfactory	The end of project targets for this outcome are very complex which may result in the risk of them not being fully achieved.
	Outcome 5 Moderately Unsatisfactory	Solid progress has been made with respect to this outcome. However, given the time delays in starting some activities under this outcome in all countries, it is considered unlikely that these targets can be achieved within the existing project timeframe.
	Outcome 6	Progress on the pollution reduction and water use/conservation projects in the 7 identified countries is underway but behind schedule.
	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Thailand and Vietnam are unlikely to complete planned project activities within the existing project timeframe.
	Outcome 7 Moderately	While some countries have made good progress with the development of management plans for CCA/DRR while others have not started. No countries are forecast to complete by project end.
	Satisfactory	Very good progress made with respect to adoption of the PSHEM Code with implementation at 7 ports in 3 countries.
	Outcome 8 Highly Satisfactory	Overall, outcome 8 is considered to be on target for completion.
	Outcome 9 Satisfactory	Results are mixed across outcome 9 with not all targets forecast to be achieved with delays in project start-up largely to blame
	Outcome 10 Highly Satisfactory	Overall outcome 10 is progressing well and is on track to be completed at project end.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	Satisfactory	 Project management team is highly efficient and effective. Stakeholder engagement at local government level is key strength and internal project communications with stakeholders has been good. Complexity of project and diverse reporting products has resulted in a fragmented set of output, sub-output and activity reports. Lack of formal tracking and reporting of co-financing makes it difficult to assess the status of co-financing at any stage of the project.
	Moderately Likely	There remain a number of risks to project sustainability, the most significant being ongoing funding to support PFC and in country implementation once the project ends.
Sustainability		Climate change remains a significant risk and a source of considerable uncertainty in terms of long-term impacts and changes to marine and coastal ecosystems.

1.3 Project Progress Summary

Given the complexity and geographic scope of this extensive project, overall the MTR team considers the project to be well managed, with constructive working relationships between the multiple project partners. Overall PEMSEA has made considerable progress and delivered significant results up to the mid-term point of the project. There is strong evidence that provincial and local governments in the participating countries see benefits in ICM, which has translated in a strong update of ICM projects across the region.

PRF is clearly viewed by all country and non-country partners alike as a strong and capable regional organisation and this is reflected in the level of engagement with countries. However, questions remain regarding the overall sustainability of PEMSEA in the absence of firm commitment for financial support from member countries.

Where there has been slow progress, it has been largely due to delays associated with the signing of partner agreements with country and non-country partners, as well as capacity constraints, particularly at the provincial/local level. These aspects have led to a moderate underspend in project funds at the time of the MTR.

Based on the findings of the MTR, it is unlikely that several of the envisaged results will be achieved by the planned closure date of 5th September 2019.

As a result, the MTR team proposes some adjustments to the project, including:

- Revisions to elements of the results framework (output level indicators and targets);
- Improved reporting and tracking of project co-finance commitments and expenditure; and
- Increased focus on monitoring and evaluation, and communications / visibility

Moreover, the MTR team considers that there is a strong case for an extension until 30 September 2019, in order to ensure effective use of funds and progress towards the project's objective and outcomes, for the following reasons:

- There were significant delays in starting up project activities in Thailand and Vietnam. This has impacted the delivery of results against a number of targets.
- While most countries are tracking well against planned expenditure, some countries (i.e. Vietnam, Lao PDR and Thailand) are significantly under-spent. As of April 2018, 53% of the USD 10,643,992

implementation grant had been expended. As a result, it is unlikely that remaining GEF funds will be spent by September 2019.

- Due to project delays, there has been limited progress on the 'testing and demonstration' aspect of the tools and plans that are being put in place in the ICM learning sites, and the sharing of learning experience across national and local governments in the region. This is seen as a critical outcome of this project.
- Several countries have found the establishment of a functional multi-sectoral, institutional coordinating mechanism for ocean and coastal governance and management challenging and would benefit from further time and support to address this need.
- Cambodia would benefit from assistance to establish a national coordinating mechanism for oil spill preparedness and response. Until such a mechanism is set up, the establishment of a sub-regional oil spill contingency plan among the three littoral states is unlikely to be achieved.

1.4 Conclusions

Overall, the MTR team considers the project to be progressing well, with many of the expected results on track to be achieved by the scheduled end of project. However, while all countries are participating in the project to some degree, delays in signing countries agreements with some countries have resulted in delays in project implementation. As a result, the project is considered unlikely to achieve all the project objectives within the project timeframe.

Project Strategy

The project strategy is considered to be comprehensive in scope and highly relevant to the development priorities of the eight country partners, aligns with UNDAF outcomes, and contributes directly to five Sustainable Development Goals. For many of the outcomes, however, the targets are complex and include sub-targets, which makes it difficult to track and evaluate progress towards achieving expected results.

Progress towards results

While good progress has been made in achieving the targets relating to Components 1 and 3, work planning has been affected by start-up delays in most countries. Component 2, being implemented at national and local levels, is most affected, reflect the challenge of implementing a complex project at multiple levels in countries at different stages of development in a politically diverse region. As a result, Component 2 is well behind schedule for fully achieving results by September 2019. However, the MTR team believes that with a time extension of 12 months, most of the targets under Component 2 are achievable.

Progress on <u>Component 1</u>, "Partnerships in Coastal and Ocean Governance Enabling a Self-Sustaining, Country-Owned Regional Mechanism Governing the LMEs in the East Asian Region" has been good and the Outcomes are mostly on track for completion within the project timeframe. Cost-Sharing Agreements have been signed with China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore, securing support up to the end of 2018, and the Third-Party Assessment conducted in 2017 concluded that PEMSEA will be able to continue operating up to 2021 independent of new project funds or voluntary contributions. However, there remains a need to convince country partners that their contributions will provide a good return in terms of technical support, resource mobilisation and SDS-SEA implementation. The MTR Team considers that these contributions are vital to the long-term sustainability of PEMSEA.

<u>Component 2</u> of the project, *"Healthy and resilient marine and coastal ecosystems through conservation-focused ICM programs thereby increasing areal extent of healthy and resilient habitats"* represents the largest proportion of the budget (US\$5,607,870) and is implemented primarily at local/site levels. Significant delays were experienced at project start-up in most countries. As a result, it is unlikely that the

end of project targets will be achieved by any countries, except China, within the scheduled timeframe. Despite this somewhat pessimistic view, many results have been achieved and progress is being made. For example, a significant achievement is that as of the end of 2017, 18% of the region's coastline was covered by an ICM programme and the project is well on track to achieve its 20% coverage target by the 2019.

Very good progress has been made towards achieving the outcomes of <u>Component 3</u>, "A knowledge platform for building a sustainable ocean-based blue economy". The PRF has undertaken a significant amount of work to establish the enabling environment to attract non-donor funding to support ongoing implementation of project results and a number of highly innovative products have been developed. There has been solid engagement with the private sector in several of the project sites, with several notable successes with the establishment of PPPs to support environmental improvement projects and ICM implementation.

Project implementation and adaptive management

The MTR team found that the project management provided by the PRF is highly efficient and effective. Key to this performance is the strong relationship between the country managers and their respective country counterparts, the fast response to enquiries and flexibility to adapt to problems and changing circumstances. However, the project team is considered to be under-resourced, making it vulnerable to departures of key staff.

Despite the lack of gender-related activities and targets in the project design, it should be noted that the evidence from the field visits undertaken by the MTR team indicates a very high level of encouragement of equal representation of women and men in project activities.

Project expenditure appears to be moderately underspent at the time of the MTR, with approximately 53 percent of the budget expended to the end of 2017. This under-expenditure can largely be explained by country-specific expenditure profile differences.

The lack of formal tracking and reporting of co-financing has made it difficult to undertake a rigorous assessment of the status of co-financing at the mid-term of the project and the MTR team is therefore unable to draw any meaningful conclusions regarding this aspect of the project financial management.

Although regular QPRs, PIRs and APRs have been prepared as required, the complexity of the project and diverse reporting products has resulted in a fragmented set of output, sub-output and activity reports that has made it difficult for the MTR team to fully appreciate the extent to which progress towards project targets was being achieved.

A key strength of the project is the engagement of local governments, reinforced through the PNLG. It is evident that the 'bottom up' approach to ICM has led to raised awareness of coastal resource management issues and a strong sense of ownership at local level.

The project has had effective communications with stakeholders at the national level. All the National Focal Points interviewed confirmed that communication with the PRF has been clear, effective and usually timely and felt that they were kept informed about project progress. The PNLG is seen as an important and effective mechanism for communicating with local government partners and encouraging them to take ownership of project outcomes in their areas.

Sustainability

A critical issue relating to the long-term sustainability of PEMSEA relates to ongoing finance. The current governance arrangements for the PRF rely on contributions from the participating countries, yet only China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore are currently making voluntary contributions to the PEMSEA Trust Fund. There appears to be a disconnect between the countries' expectations and aspirations with respect to the long-term viability and their commitment to contribute financially to ensure this happens. The MTR

team believes there is a clear need for a greater financial commitment from each of the participating countries to ensure that the PRF remains a viable partner in the region.

1.5 Summary of Recommendations

The MTR recommendations, outlined in Table 3, are formulated with the aim of improving project effectiveness and enhancing the likelihood that project results will be sustained after GEF funding ceases

Table 3: Recommendations t	table
----------------------------	-------

No.	Issue	Recommendation	Responsible Party
1	Objective and Outcome Targets	Re-assess targets for the Objective and following outcomes to ensure that they are realistic, measureable and achievable by the end of the project:	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility
		Objective	
		it to be more appropriate as an outcome indicator, since it is not considered to be directly related to the stated objective.	
		Outcome 1	
		Review Target 1.3 and assess if signing a Partnership Agreement with YSLME is achievable and if not, either delete this reference or consider amending to "establishing short-term collaborative arrangements with YSLME".	
		Move Target 1.4 to Outcome 9.	
		Outcome 4	
		Move Target 4.5 to Outcome 3.	
		Outcome 5	
		Amend Target 5.1 to read:	
		"Sustainable fisheries-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 1,140 km2 of threatened fishing grounds providing evidence of improved stock management and a reduction in overall fishing effort using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation, with replication of good practices initiated in 4 other threatened fishing grounds."	
		Consider whether Target 5.2 is an appropriate measure for this indicator.	
		Outcome 6	
		Amend Target 6.1 to read:	
		"Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management demonstration projects completed in priority watershed/coastal areas 25,000 km2 as identified in Table 16), providing	

		evidenceofmanagementstrategiesimplementedtoreducelevelsoftargetpollutants (BOD; nutrients; and pathogens) andwaterresourceconservationandusemanagement."Outcome 7ReviewTarget7.1andintroducemetricstoprovideevidencethat it has been achieved, eg.communityawareness-raisingmeetingsheld,evacuationroutesestablished, emergencydrillsconducted.	
2	Project extension	 Develop a proposal to extend the project by (12) months to allow sufficient time to achieve progress towards outcomes in countries that have been delayed in starting implementation of project activities for the following outcomes and targets: <u>Outcome 1</u> To allow for achievement of Target 1.2, "Signed Agreements with Country and Non-Country Partners provide voluntary financing and in-kind commitments to sustain PEMSEA's core operations". To allow for achievement of Target 1.3, "Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA and YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms". <u>Outcome 2</u> To allow for the achievement of Target 2.1 (National coastal and ocean policies) in Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor Leste and Vietnam. To allow for achievement of Target 2.3 (Midterm investment planning) in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Timor Leste. <u>Outcome 4</u> To allow for the completion of SOC reports in Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam (Target 4.2 (25% of local governments implementing ICM programs) in Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam To allow for achievement of Target 4.2 (25% of local governments implementing ICM programs) in Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam To allow for achievement of Target 4.4 (10% improvement in METT of MPA focused ICM pilot 	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility

		demonstration sites) in Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam	
		<u>Outcome 5</u> To allow for achievement of all targets in all countries.	
		Outcome 6 To allow for achievement of Target 6.1 (Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management), in light of the recommendation above to modify the indicator for this target for China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.	
		To allow for achievement of Target 6.2 (Innovative technologies) for Cambodia and Lao PDR.	
		<u>Outcome 7</u> To allow for achievement of Target 7.1	
		(CCA/DRRM-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects) in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.	
		To allow for achievement of Target 7.2 (Sub- regional oil spill contingency planning) in Cambodia, Thailand and Vietnam.	
		Outcome 9	
		National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs) in Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.	
		To allow for the achievement of Target 9.4 (evidenced-based sound policy on ICM) Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Timor Leste.	
3	Project Management	Consider employing additional office back- stopping staff at PEMSEA Resource Facility to support the project country managers, to reduce vulnerability to staff departure and protect against loss of institutional memory.	EAS Partnership Council and PEMSEA Resource Facility
4	Budget re- allocation	Review budget utilisation by country for the remainder of the project to assess whether funds could be re-allocated within the project to make more effective use of the remaining budget, recognising that some countries are unlikely to utilise their full allocation while other countries would benefit from additional funding.	UNDP and PEMSEA Resource Facility

5	Monitoring and Evaluation	Implement a formal reporting and tracking system to allow accurate monitoring of co-finance contributions and expenditure.	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility
6	Monitoring and Evaluation	Implement a harmonised set of reporting tools incorporating all relevant aspects of project progress, not only output achievements, to allow for more consistent and coherent reporting of results.	PEMSEA Resource Facility
7	Monitoring and Evaluation	Organise at least one more site monitoring visit for UNDP and other stakeholders from the participating countries to any of the countries' ICM sites	PEMSEA Resource Facility
8	Financial sustainability	In line with the recommendations of the Third- Party Assessment "Achieving a Self-Sustaining PEMSEA Resource Facility" (2017), member countries of the EAS Partnership Council are recommended to commit to multi-year voluntary contributions by the start of FY2020 to enable the PEMSEA Resource Facility Secretariat to become financially self-sustaining.	EAS Partnership Council
9	Financial sustainability	Consider employing or engaging as a consultant a Business Development specialist at PEMSEA Resource Facility to develop and promote its products and services to stakeholders in the region and beyond.	PEMSEA Resource Facility
10	Financial sustainability	 Develop strategic engagements with: (i) The Economist Global Ocean Initiative to explore opportunities to build private sector partnerships to support investment in the blue economy; and (ii) One or two high profile global businesses to develop a proof of concept pilot project for incorporating oceans sustainability into their corporate sustainability programmes. 	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility

2 Introduction

This report presents the results and findings of the mid-term review (MTR) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded full-size project entitled, *Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)*. The project is being implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) with the PEMSEA¹ Resource Facility (PRF) as the primary Executing Agency. The participating countries are: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.

2.1 Purpose of the MTR and objectives

UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policies require that a mid-term review (MTR) be performed for fullsized projects. An evaluation at the mid-point of the project's cycle is needed to assess the project's progress towards results, monitor implementation and adaptive management to improve outcomes and identify, at an early stage, any risks to the long-term sustainability of the project.

According to the ToR (Annex A), the purpose of this MTR is to provide the project partners (i.e. GEF, UNDP, PRF and the participating country governments) with an independent assessment of the progress made towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and to assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.

Moreover, the MTR will collate and analyse lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during the implementation period, which will inform the second phase of implementation (up to September 2019) of the project. The evaluation will assess the project's design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. In this regard, the MTR will assess the performance of the project against planned results. It will also assess the preliminary indications of potential impact and sustainability of results including the contribution to capacity development and achievement of sustainable development goals.

2.2 Scope & Methodology

In terms of scope, the MTR reviews the actions taken and status of the Project from inception in 2014 through to March 2018. The MTR focusses on progress at the Objective and Outcome levels.

The ToRs for the MTR indicate assessing the progress of the project according to four review criteria, each of which has specific key questions. These criteria, listed below, provide overall direction for an expert-led evaluation to ensure the validity of incoming information and the integrity of results.

- 1. **Project Strategy**: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?
- 2. **Progress towards results**: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?
- 3. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation?
- 4. **Sustainability**: To what extent are there financials, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

¹ Partnerships in Environmental Management of the Seas of East Asia

The MTR has been undertaken following a participatory and consultative approach, ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP, PRF and non-government partners, in order to gather robust information to support analysis of the progress against the four criteria listed above.

2.3 MTR Mission and Data Collection

The MTR team collected evidence through a combination of primary and secondary data sources, as well as both quantitative and qualitative materials.

Desktop study & documents

A detailed analysis of key project documents was used as a primary analysis tool. The analysis examined documents formulated during the preparation and implementation phases of the project (i.e. the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic documents, monitoring reports) as well as technical documents produced within the Project and by other stakeholders/projects. A complete list of all documents consulted is presented Annex B.

Key stakeholder interviews

During the MTR mission, the MTR team undertook a series of interviews with different stakeholders. The interviews were carried out either in person or remotely via Skype or telephone during the MTR mission. The stakeholders interviewed included representatives from governments, project staff, local actors and civil society representatives involved with the Project. In some cases, it was not possible to speak to key stakeholders. Instead, they were provided with a copy of the interview questions and were requested to provide written responses, which were received by the MTR team following the MTR mission.

The MTR team conducted interviews with National Focal Points (or representatives) of six of the eight countries and received written responses from the remaining two, six non-country partner organisations and twenty-three local government stakeholders. A list of stakeholders is attached as Annex C.

To facilitate data gathering, the interviews were semi-structured, being guided by a series of open and semi-open questions tailored to the specific stakeholder role. Emphasis was placed on the thematic areas provided in the ToR, including project strategy, progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management and project sustainability. A copy of the MTR Evaluation Matrix is included as Annex D and copies of the interview questions and templates are attached as Annex E.

Site Visits and Stakeholder Consultation

During the MTR mission the MTR team undertook a series of country-specific site visits, providing the opportunity to meet with and interview national and local stakeholders as well as to visit and observe site-specific project activities in a number of countries.

2.3.1 Pre-Mission Planning

The initial MTR stages involved dialogue between the MTR team, UNDP and PRF counterparts to confirm the objectives, methodology and timeframe for the MTR, as well as to clarify any points of ambiguity relating to the ToR. An initial inception meeting was held between the MTR team and UNDP/PEMSEA officials via Skype on Monday 26th March 2018, to confirm the arrangements and schedule for the data gathering and analysis phase (MTR mission).

A more formal inception meeting was held between 9-11 April 2018 at PRF offices in Manila to introduce the project team members to UNDP, PEMSEA and other stakeholders. The inception meeting provided the MTR team with a comprehensive overview of the SDS-SEA project implementation and progress to date, including both existing achievements and known challenges. The inception meeting also provided the opportunity to finalise the scope of the country/site visits to be undertaken by the MTR team.

2.3.2 MTR Mission and Field Visits

The site visits were undertaken between 15-26 April 2018, with one member of the MTR team visiting Indonesia and Philippines and the other visiting Cambodia and Vietnam, both being accompanied by the respective PRF Country Manager. Consultations were carried out with a range of stakeholders in each country at the national level (National Focal Point), provincial level (Project Management Office) and local/community level (project implementation). Table 4 below lists the project sites visited in each country.

COUNTRY	SITE NAME	PROJECT ACTIVITY
	Kampong Smach MFMA, Preah Sihanouk	Mangrove protection
	Province	Fishery improvement project
	Koh Bong Sanloem Fishing Community, Koh	Fishery improvement project
	Rong Archipelago	 Livelihood diversification
Cambodia	Sibanoukville District Preah Sibanouk Province	Pollution control (wastewater treatment)
		 Solid waste management
		 ICM implementation (coastal zoning)
	Sibanoukville Port, Preab Sibanouk Province	Port Health Safety and Environmental
		Management Code
	Taniung Pasir village. Teluknaga Subdistrict.	Mangrove rehabilitation
	Tangerang Regency	
	Patramanggala village, Kemiri Subdistrict	Mangrove rehabilitation
		Livelihood diversification
	Ciletuh-Palabuhanratu Geopark Information	ICM implementation (coastal
	Center, Sukabumi Regency	management)
	Citepus Beach, Palabuhanratu, Sukabumi	Shoreline protection from coastal erosion
	Regency	• DRR (tsunami warning tower, evacuation
Indonesia		signage and routes)
	Cipalabuhan River, Palabuhanratu, Sukabumi	Pollution reduction/waste management
	Regency	_
	Citarik village, Palabuhanratu, Sukambumi	 Community-based solid waste
	Province	management system
	Ciletuh-Palabuhanratu Geopark, Sukabumi	 ICM implementation
	Regency. Visits to: Puncak Gebang, Puncak	 Biodiversity conservation
	Darma, Cimarinjung Waterfall, Sodong	 Community-based tourism
	Waterfall, GeoPark Conservation Museum	
	Batangas International Port	Port Safety, Health and Environmental
	DC ENDO Detensor City, Misite to ICM Dispring	
	PG-ENRO, Balangas City. Visits to ICIVI Planning Division and Patangas Environmental	ICIVI scaling up
	Laboratory	Wetershed menogement and networking
		watershed management and robabilitation
Philippines	Municipal Agriculture Office/Municipal	MDA management
rimppines	Environment and Natural Resources Office	Habitat conservation
	Lobo Municipality	
	Olo Olo Mangrove Forest and Ecopark	Mangrove rehabilitation
		Ecotourism
	Taysan Municipality Offices, Batangas Province.	Watershed management and
		rehabilitation
	An Hoa Lagoon, Quang Nam Province	Mangrove rehabilitation & protection
		Fishery improvement project
NG a tra	Hoi An City (Cham Islands MPA), Quang Nam	• MPA, ICM, IRBM
vietnam	Province	, - ,
	Tho Quang Commune, Da Nang	Fishery improvement project
	Da Nang City	ICM implementation

Table 4: Project Sites Visited by the MTR Team

2.4 Limitations of the MTR

A significant issue that emerged during the planning stage was the overall timing of the MTR. The ToR specified that the review be carried out over a six-month period, between January-July 2018, with the expected date of the full MTR completion being 31 August 2018. In the event, this time frame was put back several months, with the MTR team being contracted in late March with the expectation of submitting the final report by 15 June 2018. A key flow-on effect of this was to change the timing and character of the MTR mission and related stakeholder consultations. In particular, limiting the time available for the MTR team to visit participating countries and comprehensively gather information.

Furthermore, the last-minute cancellation of the visit to China was a disappointing set back since China represents both a significant proportion of the project implementation sites and a significant component of the project achievements to date.

The MTR team did find that, for most country representatives and local project stakeholders, there was not a clear distinction between activities directly related to this phase of the SDS-SEA project, and activities undertaken by PEMSEA prior to the start of the project. For this reason, the level of information obtained directly from countries is less than anticipated. Despite this, these discussions revealed some key themes and messages that were useful in informing the MTR.

Another challenge faced by the MTR team relates to the difficulty of undertaking detailed questioning remotely with stakeholders who's first language is not English. In some cases, this limited the extent of questioning and the level of detail that could be gained through interviews. The MTR has attempted to compensate for this through additional engagement with PRF staff.

As a result, the MTR is based primarily on evidence in written reports associated with the project, clarified / validated through discussions with PRF staff, supplemented, to the extent possible, by discussions with participating country representatives. The MTR team is confident, with these additional measures, that the final report fairly and accurately represents the information available at the time of the MTR.

2.5 Structure of the Report

This MTR Report follows the structure set out in the ToR comprising:

Section 1 – Executive Summary

Section 2 – Introduction to the MTR

Section 3 – Project Description and Background

Section 4 – Findings

Section 5 – Conclusions and Recommendations

The bulk of the information on the midterm status of the project is presented in Section 4.

3 Project Description and Background Context

3.1 Project Overview

The Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) was adopted by 12 East Asian countries in December 2003, during the First East Asian Seas Ministerial Forum. In 2006, Lao PDR and Timor-Leste agreed to adopt and implement the SDS-SEA. The SDS-SEA incorporates the main principles, objectives and action programmes of a number of international and regional instruments and agreements, including the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD),

Agenda 21, the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and a number of conventions associated with the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

Since 2003, the GEF has supported a number of continuous initiatives to support elaboration and implementation of the SDS-SEA including support to mobilize the necessary partnership arrangements, operating mechanisms, intellectual capital, support services and resources for the achievement of the SDS-SEA. This continuous support, over the past 15 years, consists of a transition period, a transformation period, and a sustainable operation period. The previous GEF-supported project (2007-2013) covered the transition period.

In May 2014, the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) approved funding for the project entitled "EAS: Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)" (hereafter "the project") under the Regional EAS: Reducing Pollution and Rebuilding Degraded Marine Resources in the East Asian Seas Through Implementation of Intergovernmental Agreements and Catalyzed Investments (Programme). This GEF-supported project seeks to reduce pollution and rebuild degraded marine resources through scaling up the implementation of the SDS-SEA in Cambodia, PR China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam that share six large marine ecosystems, and related catchment areas.

The project is consistent with the GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies, in particular the International Waters (IW) Strategy Objectives 2 and 3 and their respective outcomes, namely:

- **IW Objective 2**: Catalyze multi-state cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and large marine ecosystems while considering climatic variability and change
- **IW Objective 3:** Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for ecosystem-based joint management of trans-boundary water systems.

3.2 Project Context

The East Asian Seas (EAS) region includes six semi-enclosed and interconnected large marine ecosystems (LMEs), including Yellow Sea, East China Sea, South China Sea, Sulu-Celebes Sea, Indonesian Sea and Gulf of Thailand. Collectively these LMEs occupy a total sea area of 7 million sq. km, a coastline of 234,000 km, and a total watershed area of about 8.6 million sq. km.

The marine waters of the EAS waters support extremely high biological diversity and biologically diverse marine environments, providing a variety of ecological services, such as provision of spawning and nursery grounds for many pelagic fish, home to complex biotic communities. As a result, the coastal and marine ecosystems of the EAS region are central to the development of the economies of the countries which share its resources.

At a global level, overexploitation and poor management of oceans has resulted in heightened food insecurity and diminished economic opportunities for some of the world's poorest people. Countries bordering the SEA face numerous environmental threats; coral reefs, mangroves, sea grasses, wetlands and other coastal habitats which are part of these ecosystems are exposed to varying degrees of pressure and show signs of continuous and serious degradation due to human activities. Water quality in seas, coastal areas and river basins is at risk of serious deterioration due to unsustainable practices and polluting human activities. Of particular concern are the unsustainable exploitation of fish and other living resources, pollution from marine and land-based sources and habitat damage. Climate change has added to these pressures and may also lead to an increase in the cumulative impacts of these factors.

The consequences of these impacts include loss of livelihoods and economic opportunities to fishers, hoteliers and related business, loss of natural protection of the coastline, loss of natural habitats for flora and fauna, as well as loss in recreational opportunities.

The project therefore seeks to demonstrate local-to-global benefits through scaled-up national ICM programs that cover:

- a. The protection and sustainability of coastal and marine ecosystem services
- b. Climate change adaptation and enhanced resilience in the coastal zone
- c. Sustainable fisheries and alternative livelihoods; and
- d. Water conservation and use management/pollution reduction.

3.3 Project Description and Strategy

The project is the fourth phase of GEF projects being implemented by UNDP and executed by PRF, representing the "transformation phase" and culminating in the sustainability of PEMSEA as the regional coordinating mechanism for implementation of the SDS-SEA. It also aims to make a stronger linkage between sustainable development of river basins, coastal and marine areas and local, national and regional investment processes in a "blue economy".

The **project goal** is: to reduce pollution and rebuild degraded marine resources in the East Asian Seas through implementation of intergovernmental agreements and catalysed investments.

The **project objective** is: to catalyse actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and oceanbased economy in the East Asian region. This objective will be achieved through the implementation of the following three interconnected Project components:

In order to achieve the objective, the project's intervention has been organised in three parallel components under which ten outcomes are planned to be achieved:

COMPONENT 1 - Partnerships in Coastal and Ocean Governance Enabling a Self-Sustaining, Country-Owned Regional Mechanism Governing the LMEs in the East Asian Region, focusing on establishing, aligning and strengthening local and national policies and legislation on ocean and coastal governance, as well as integrated river basin and water use/management and integrating these with medium term development plans. Collaborative planning, consensus-building and a number of other initiatives are being supported to this end.

- Outcome 1: A self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region
- **Outcome 2:** National and local governments; adopting and initiating ocean policy, legal instruments, institutional improvements and programs, and mainstreaming SDS-SEA targets into their medium-term development and investment plans
- **Outcome 3**: Innovative financing mechanisms in place for sustained operation of the country-owned, regional coordinating partnership mechanism

COMPONENT 2 - Healthy and Resilient Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Through Conservation-Focused ICM Programs Thereby Increasing Areal Extent of Healthy and Resilient Habitats, implemented primarily at local/site levels, at a number of locations provisionally identified through national stakeholder consultative processes. It features practical, technical interventions using ICM/IRBCAM tools, methods and approaches to reduce threats to ecosystems services in coastal and marine areas.

- **Outcome 4:** Increased areal extent of healthy, resilient habitats (i.e., blue forests), including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other coastal habitats/ areas
- Outcome 5: Improved management of over exploited and depleted fisheries. leading to recovery

- **Outcome 6:** Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency / conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas
- **Outcome 7:** Increased preparedness and capability of coastal communities to respond to natural and manmade hazards

COMPONENT 3 - A Knowledge Platform for Building a Sustainable Ocean-Based Blue Economy, addressing targets related to IW Objective 3, by focussing on active learning, experience sharing and knowledge management in the GEF IW portfolio in the EAS region. Also supporting targeted research and networks to fill scientific and knowledge gaps. It is expected that availability of, and access to, credible scientific and technical knowledge and information will drive political commitments to contribute to prevention of further depletion or degradation of coastal and marine resources.

- **Outcome 8:** Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services
- **Outcome 9:** Regional knowledge sharing platform for ecosystem management established and enabling decision makers to translate policies and strategies into actions
- **Outcome 10:** Program contributed to global learning on scaling up of investments in sustainable coastal and ocean management

3.4 Global Environmental Benefits

The expected Global Environmental Benefits generated by the project include:

- Strengthened sub-national/local government functions and capacities to facilitate investments and changes covering 20 percent of the region's coastline by 2015 through scaling up of the ICM component and the convergence of sectoral initiatives and programs on: (a) climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction; (b) conservation and redress of biological diversity and equitable and sustainable fisheries, including food security and livelihoods; and (c) protection and improvement in water quality and addressing hazards associated development in terms of pollution, water quality degradation and water use mismanagement.
- 2. Strengthened information dissemination and knowledge-sharing capabilities in support of the ICM scaling up initiatives and enhancing investments in capital (both natural and manmade) assets of a sustainable ocean-based blue economy.
- 3. Increased public and private sector investments in enterprises, technologies, practices and services that contribute to sustainable development and a blue economy at the regional, national and local levels

The socioeconomic benefits and gender mainstreaming will serve to strengthen the impacts of the interventions on the governance and management of the seas of East Asia. There is expected to be a mutually reinforcing effect between and among the objectives of improving the environment, optimizing economic benefits and improving the role of women.

The project is being implemented at a total of 46 sites in eight countries: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Vietnam, as listed in Table 5 below.

Country	No. of Project Sites	of ICM Project Sites Cou ect Sites		No. of Project Sites	ICM Project Sites
Cambodia	4	Preah Sihanouk Kampot Kep Koh Kong	Philippines	12	Bataan Batangas Bulacan Cavite Guimaras Macajalar Bay Marinduque Occidental Mindoro Oriental Mindoro Pampanga Romblon Siargao
China	8	Yuhan Changyi Wenzhou Zhanjiang Rudong Zhaoan Zhoushan Sanya	Thailand	4	Chantaburi Trat Rayong Chonburi
Indonesia	6	Sukabumi Regency Bali Province Tangerang Regency Bontang City East Lombok Regency Semarang City	Timor Leste	3	Manatuto Dili Liquica
Lao PDR	3	Champasack Saravan Sekong	Vietnam	6	Danang Hai Phong Kien Giang Quang Nam Quang Ninh Thua Thien Hue

Table 5: ICM Project	Implementation Sites
----------------------	----------------------

3.5 Project Implementation Arrangements

The project is being implemented by UNDP in its capacity as a GEF Implementing Agency, with UNDP Philippines serving as the Principal Project Resident Representative. A Project Cooperation Agreement was signed between PRF and the UNDP in September 2014 which formalized PRF as the Implementing Partner for the project.

Project oversight is provided by the Intergovernmental Session of the EAS Partnership Council, which serves as the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and includes representatives from the eleven PEMSEA Country Partners, UNDP Philippines, and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Marine, Coastal and Island Ecosystems based at the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok, Thailand. The PSC provides advice, guidance and facilitation of scientific, technical, financial and administrative matters related to project implementation. Operational oversight is ensured by UNDP and strategic oversight by the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor.

The PRF is responsible for the coordination of project implementation under the Executive Director, who is the primary responsible authority for the project including its effective management and delivery of expected outputs and outcomes and accountable for financial management. The relationships between

the EAS Partnership Council, the PRF and the implementation of the SDS-SEA project are shown in Figure 1 below.

A full-time Project Manager, reporting to the Executive Director, manages the implementation of the project and ensures that the project is delivered in accordance with the outputs and outcomes listed in the Strategic Results Framework. The following team leaders support project implementation and report to the Project Manager: (a) Regional Partnerships and Governance Team Leader; (b) ICM Specialists/SDS-SEA Implementation Team Leader; (c) Recognition/Certification/Knowledge Management Team Leader; and (d) Professional Services Team Leader. The structure of the project management team and its reporting lines to the Executive Director and EAS Partnership Council are shown in Figure 2 below.



Figure 1: PEMSEA Regional Coordinating Mechanism Organizational Chart

The Project Document lists a large number (38) of non-government partners supporting the implementation of the SDS-SEA programme, providing expert advice and technical assistance. on: coastal policy, legislation and institutional arrangements; water resource conservation, pollution reduction and waste management; climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction; habitat and fisheries management; MPA/MPA networking; biodiversity conservation; alternative livelihood development and sustainability. It is understood that MOAs have been established with each partner detailing the terms of the partnership, areas of collaboration, and roles and responsibilities. Similarly, MOAs have been signed with national agencies and local governments for the implementation of ICM projects and activities within their jurisdiction and areas of competence.



Figure 2: Project Management and Organisational Structure

3.6 Project timing and milestones

Project Milestones			
PIF submitted to GEF:	16 April 2013		
Concept Approved:	01 June 2013		
GEF CEO Endorsement:	05 May 2014		
Project Approved by UNDP for Implementation:	25 August 2014		
Start Date:	5 September 2014		
Project End Date (planned):	5 September 2019		

The Project Identification Form (PIF) was submitted to GEF in April 2013 and the concept was approved in June 2013. There then followed a year-long preparation and consultation phase culminating in the approval in principle of the Project Document by the participating countries, UNDP and the Philippines National Economic Development Agency (NEDA) in June 2014. The CEO of GEF endorsed the project in May 2014 and UNDP approved it for implementation in August 2014. A Project Cooperation Agreement was signed by PEMSEA and UNDP in September 2014 formalising PEMSEA as the implementing partner for the project, and implementation commenced the same month. The implementation period is five years and the project is scheduled to complete in September 2019.

3.7 Main stakeholders: summary list

A significant feature of the SDS-SEA project is the large number of stakeholders involved. This is seen as a major strength of the ICM approach and builds on PEMSEA's experience and existing networks in the region. The following categories of stakeholders have been involved in the project:

- a) Regional level, including regional intergovernmental organizations, and donor and financing agencies;
- b) National level, including national ministries, departments and agencies covering natural resources and environment, agriculture, fisheries, health, education, transportation, energy, tourism, industry, foreign affairs, economic development, and finance; and

- c) Local level, including village/township, municipalities, city, district and provincial governments and their respective national/central government counterparts.
- d) Corporate sector/business community at all three levels

The Stakeholder Involvement Plan in the ProDoc lists the main stakeholder categories and the level of involvement. A full list of stakeholders involved in the project is included in Annex F.

4 Findings

4.1 Project Strategy

4.1.1 Project Design

The project is the fourth phase of GEF projects being implemented by UNDP and executed by PEMSEA. As such, the project builds on the results of the previous phases and is designed to catalyse political commitment, actions and investments to achieve SDS-SEA targets to build a sustainable coastal and oceanbased economy in the East Asian region.

Problem being addressed and underlying assumptions.

The basic premise on which the project is designed is that the coastal and marine ecosystems of the EAS region are central to the development of the economies of the countries that share its resources. However, these ecosystems are under pressure from human activities and show signs of continuous and in some cases serious deterioration. The primary cause for this deterioration is population growth and increasing demand for resources, as more people migrate to coastal areas and cities at an increasing rate. A secondary cause for threats to coastal and marine areas is weak or ineffective governance systems, which allow threats to persist and grow. At the regional level, a complicating factor is that these threats are interrelated and transboundary in nature, highlighting the need for international coordination and cooperation underpinned by strong policy and multi-lateral agreements and conventions.

The ProDoc identifies the major recurring challenges to coastal and marine ecosystems as: land use transformation and sedimentation in coastal and upland areas; land reclamation in coastal and wetland areas; coastal erosion; degradation, destruction and over-exploitation of natural resources including fisheries; marine pollution from land-based and sea-based sources; and climate variation and change including extreme weather events.

The project strategy makes the following underlying assumptions:

- Baseline conditions in the selected areas can be extrapolated with high confidence to other regional seas and lessons learnt can be successfully disseminated.
- Increased awareness and capacity will lead to a change of behaviour with respect to addressing the threats to sustainable coastal and marine management.
- ICM/IRBCAM will gradually become a national priority for stakeholders in the EAS region as knowledge and information is made available.

These assumptions are based on PEMSEA's previous engagement in the region and, in particular, the guidance provided by the EAS Partnership Council, which formulates programme and operational policy for the SDS-SEA. Over the course of a 5-year implementation period in a diverse and dynamic region, it is likely that the assumptions will be challenged. For example, raising awareness and capacity, and making knowledge and information available does not necessarily result in changes in behaviour or national priorities.

Relevance, alignment with country priorities and regional strategies, and lessons learned

Based on interviews with the National Focal Points (NFP) of the eight participating countries, the project strategy is considered to be highly relevant to their country priorities. There are several reasons for this close alignment: firstly, the project is a continuation of the implementation phase of the GEF support and the project was designed in consultation with the participating countries. The 1-year preparation phase following approval of the concept note allowed PEMSEA to consult widely with the countries, resulting in endorsement of the ProDoc and a high level of co-financing commitments. The EAS Partnership Council, which all participating countries except Thailand are members of, coordinates and facilitates policy guidance, reviews and work programmes, approves budgetary allocations and monitors progress, outcomes and impacts of SDS-SEA implementation. The governance structure therefore is established to ensure that the SDS-SEA is designed to address the regional, national and local priorities of the member countries and local governments.

The project aligns with UNDAF outcomes for each of the eight participating countries and contributes directly to UN 2030 Agenda Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 6, 11, 13, 14 and 17.²

The three components and ten outcomes of the project strategy are considered to be effective channels for achieving the overall objective of the project, leading to a self-sustaining, country owned, regional mechanism for managing and sustaining healthy and resilient marine and coastal ecosystems, and developing a knowledge platform for building a sustainable ocean-based Blue Economy.

The Terminal Evaluation report of the preceding SDS-SEA Implementation Phase³ made a number of recommendations of relevance to project design, and these have been taken into account in the ProDoc, ie. "that the PEMSEA continue to emphasize its "bottom up" approach, i.e. its focus on local level, on-theground actions, as a principal means of meeting its expressed Development and Immediate Objectives, and its Outcomes and Outputs", and "that PEMSEA increase its attention to serving as an effective and necessary link between locally driven efforts and policy level personnel in the respective central governments of the participating countries".

Decision-making processes

As this project represents a follow-on phase from of a previous project, many of the primary stakeholders were involved in the lead up to the preparation of the ProDoc. There were a number of different consultation processes including: development of national SDS-SEA implementation plans, development of national level PIFs, meetings of the EAS Partnership Council, national consultations related to ProDoc formulation, consolidation of outputs, activity design and setting of indicators/targets. It is therefore clear that the perspectives of those who could be affected by projects decisions or could affect the outcomes were taken into consideration in the project design process. This conclusion is backed up by the high number of stakeholder interviewees (61%) who confirmed that they were consulted during the design phase.

Gender Issues

The ProDoc does not address gender issues, nor is there project funding for gender-relevant activities, outputs and outcomes. It is understood that as the project was submitted under the GEF-5, it was not an explicit requirement to address gender equality, whereas GEF-6 and later funded projects must include gender-specific outcomes and targets. Despite the lack of gender-related activities and targets in the project design, it should be noted that the evidence from the field visits undertaken by the MTR team

² SDG 6: Clean Water and Sanitation; SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities; SDG 13: Climate Action; SDG 14: Life Below Water; SDG 17: Partnerships for the Goals

³ Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP-GEF Project: "Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)", November 2012

indicates a very high level of encouragement of equal representation of women and men in project activities, with 95% of interviewees responding positively to this question.

4.1.2 Results Framework/Logframe

As part of this midterm review, the MTR team assessed the project Strategic Results Framework (SRF) against "SMART" criteria, to determine whether the indicators and targets were sufficiently specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. With respect to being time-bound, the end targets were designed to be achieved by the end of the 5-year duration project. In this case, each of the targets is considered compliant with the 'time-bound' dimension of SMART criteria. The full SMART analysis is included as Annex G.

The project results framework is comprehensive, with 17 multifaceted indicators having a cumulative total of 35 end-of-project targets, 6 at the objective level, and 29 among the 10 project outcomes, distributed across regional, sub-regional, national and local dimensions.

A total of 41 Outputs are also listed across the 10 project Outcomes, which each have their own targets.

As a general observation, the MTR team notes that, due to the manner in which the SRF was constructed, for many of the outcomes, the relationship between the indicators and targets is unclear. The MTR team has had to interpret the SRF and make assumptions about which targets relate to which indicators. In most cases this was straight forward, but ambiguities remain.

On the basis of this assessment, and commensurate with the findings discussed in section 4.2 below, the MTR team proposes some minor amendments to the indicators/targets. The proposed changes are shown in full in Table 6; in each case a short explanation / rationale is provided.

	Indicator	End of Project Target	Suggested Change and Rationale
Objective	Effectively managed coastal areas through operationalizing zoning schemes/MSP, PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management benefit livelihoods development and reduction in vulnerability to climate change of vulnerable communities	B.1 Improvement in household income of fishery communities by 25% in 10% of households in priority sites B.2 Improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency in 12 highly vulnerable villages B.3 5% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas relocated away from hazard zones B.4 100% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas provided with evacuation routes and safe refuge locations B.5 1,500 households in Cambodia and Lao PDR benefit from improved sanitation and access to safe and reliable water supplies	Delete the Indicator and related Targets. This indicator was added in the inception report. However, the MTR team considers it to be more appropriate as an outcome indicator, since it is not considered to be directly related to the stated objective. Thus the 5 targets are not directly relevant to the objective. Indicator B is replicated under Outcome 4 so its deletion will not impact the Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) since they are captured elsewhere within the SRF. Targets B1-5 do not obviously contribute to the overall objective. Furthermore, they are replicated under several of the Outcomes of the SRF as Outputs (Outcomes 5, 6 & 7). Their deletion will therefore not impact the GEB since they are captured elsewhere within the SRF.

Table 6: Suggested changes to indicators and targets

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

Outcome 1 Outcome 4	Number of agreements signed and initiated with Country and Non- Country Partners, and regional and international organizations, donors and corporate sector Increased proportion of healthy and resilient coastal/watershed habitats with effective and sustainable	 1.4 Regional State of the Oceans and Coasts Report published and disseminated, providing governments and stakeholders with up-to-date information on changes, trends, impacts and benefits of SAP implementation in the EAS region 45 Regional investment platform established and functioning, partnering and catalyzing ICM scaling up and environmental investments in at least 3 ICM/investment sites. 	Move to Outcome 9 – new Target 9.3 Target 1.4 is considered to be SMART, however it is not directly relevant to the outcome or indicator that it refers to. Instead, it is more closely aligned with Indicator 9b. Move to Outcome 3 – new Target 3.3 Target 1.4 is considered to be SMART, however it is not directly relevant to the outcome or indicator that it refers to. Instead, it is more closely aligned with the Indicator 3.
	management systems in place		
Outcome 5	Increased proportion of fishing grounds with reductions in overexploitation of fisheries and improved incomes for fishers' households	5.1 Sustainable fisheries-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 1,140 km ² of threatened fishing grounds providing evidence of improved fish catch (10% improvement in CPUE) stock management and a reduction in overall fishing effort using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation, with replication of good practices initiated in 4 other threatened fishing grounds	Amend Target as indicated The end of project targets for Outcome 5 are specific and should be measureable provided there is a baseline measurement for each target. The suggested amendment reflects the concern that with effective management measures in place CPUE is likely to fall before it can increase. Any increases are unlikely to be seen within the timeframe of this project and therefore are unlikely to be measured. There also needs to be a recognition that, for some fishing villages, fishing effort has reduced to almost zero due to a transfer of livelihoods from fishing to tourism. As a result, it could be very easy to improve CPUE for those fishers remaining while the overall status of the fishery continues to decline. (i.e. less people can catch more fish per fisher) A further amendment to this recommendation is also warranted since the reference to 2,000 km ² was from the original SRF, which was amended to 1,140 km ² during the inception meeting. In terms of Global Environmental Benefit, it is considered that the amended Target will actually improve

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

		5.2 Pilot projects on sustainable/alternative livelihoods for fishers and fishing communities result in 25% household income improvement in 10% of households generating income from non-fishing sources, with replication of supplemental livelihood policies, capacities and incentive programs initiated in 4 other fishing communities	Consider whether this Target is an appropriate measure for this indicator It is questionable whether this Target is a reliable measure of the indicator since fisherfolk are likely to seek alternative sources of employment/income when fishing can't sustain them fully. This suggest that meeting this target could indicate a decrease in the sustainability of fish stocks rather than an improvement, as the indicator aims to measure.
Outcome 6	Increased proportion of priority river basins and coastal areas (i.e., pollution hotspots) with measurable reductions in pollutant discharges and improved water use efficiency / conservation	6.1 Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management demonstration projects completed in priority watershed/coastal areas 25,000 km2 as identified in Table 16), providing evidence of reduced pollutant discharges (20% BOD; 10% to 20% nutrient) management strategies implemented to reduce levels of target pollutants (BOD; nutrients; and pathogens) and water resource conservation and use management	 Amend Target as Indicated Target 6.1 is specific and relevant to the outcome. However, it is questionable if the reduced pollutant discharges can be reliable measured and hence achieved. The proposed amendment to focus less on water quality and more on catchment management mechanisms reflects the following concerns of the MTR team: a) To effectively measure the proposed water quality parameters (BOD, nutrients) will require a catchment-wide monitoring programme with multiple sampling stations on both a temporal and spatial scale. The monitoring capacity and effort currently under the project does not adequately cover this and it is therefore considered that an accurate status of water quality is going to be hard to establish through monitoring. b) There are a high number of variables that could impact BOD and nutrients over time and space. Unless these are adequately managed the target will not be achievable. c) Measureable reductions in large water bodies will take considerably longer than the project timeframe to achieve. Hence, the MTR team believes that a better focus will be on enhanced catchment management to target the sources of these (and other) pollutants. If effectively implemented this approach should not reduce the GEB of the project, and could well enhance them in the long term.

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

Outcome /	Increased	7.1. CCA/DRRM-focused ICM pilot	Review larget 7.1 and introduce
	proportion of	demonstration projects, covering 11	metrics to provide evidence that it
	vulnerable coastal	highly vulnerable coastal	has been achieved, eg. community
	communities with	communities provide evidence	awareness-raising meetings held,
	effective	(number of community awareness-	evacuation routes established,
	preparedness,	raising meetings held, evacuation	emergency drills conducted.
	response and	routes established, emergency drills	
	recovery systems to	conducted etc) of improved	The proposed amendments are aimed
	address natural and	awareness, preparedness and	at identifying evidence that would
	manmade hazards	resiliency to the impacts of climate	make this target measureable
		change, oil spills and other natural	_
		and manmade hazards	
1			

4.2 Progress Towards Results

The MTR team undertook an assessment of the SRF indicators against progress towards end-of-projecttargets at Outcome level. The assessment was based on reported progress available at the time of the MTR. The *Project Progress Towards Results Matrix* was completed in accordance with the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, and is attached as Annex H.

4.2.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis

Table 4, below, presents a summary of the matrix.

It should be stressed that, because the MTR focusses on the outcome level indicators and targets, Table 7 presents a somewhat pessimistic view of the overall project performance, since it does not reflect the achievement and performance rating at the individual target or even output level. Because of this, the MTR team has included a more detailed analysis of the target level completion in the Progress Towards Results Matrix in Annex H, which the MTR team believes presents a more accurate picture of the overall project progress.

Indicator Assessment Key

Achieved at mid-term On target to be achieved Not on target to be achieved

Progress Towards Results	2018 Midterm Level & Assessment	MTR Rating	Justification for Rating
Project Objective		MS	 All countries are participating in the project to some degree. However, delays in signing countries agreements with some countries have resulted in delays in project implementation. The overall Rating of Moderately Satisfactory reflects the fact that, while progress to date has been significant, delays have prevented progress in some countries. At this stage, the project is considered unlikely to achieve all the project objectives within the project timeframe.
Outcome 1		S	 HQ Agreement and Host Country Agreement provide PRF with continuity required to continue operations. Third party assessment recommended country consultations on voluntary contributions. These are ongoing to be completed in Q2 of 2018

Table 7: Summary of progress towards results ratings

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

		 CSAs signed with China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore - voluntary contributions continue with support to 2018 secured. PRF established 14 agreements /implementing arrangements with regional and international organizations.
		future.
		 Ten countries, two sub-regional sea areas and the regional SOCs will be published and submitted to the EAS Congress/Ministers Forum in November 2018
Outcome 2	MS	 Good progress made on policies/legislations/plans and institutional mechanisms in support of coastal and ocean development in all countries. The establishment of a functional multi-sectoral, institutional coordinating mechanism remains a significant challenge in all countries Development of national sector legislative and priorities /ratification of international ocean-related conventions and agreements progressing in all countries The 3 target countries have started to incorporate SDS-SEA objectives and targets into their MTDPs. The project will further engage in the planning processes of the other 5 countries, and among local governments implementing ICM programs. By the end of the project, documentation should be provided for each country, indicating the priorities within each country and the target of the project within each country and the started to provide the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the started to programe the priorities within each country and the started to provide the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the started to provide the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the started to provide the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each country indicating the priorities within each country and the provided for each co
Outcome 3	S	 levels of commitment. For its long-term sustainability it is important that the member
		 countries make voluntary contributions. At the time of the MTR it is unclear whether financial contributions will be realised from all country partners. PEMSEA has produced innovative knowledge products. These products and services have a strong "value proposition" and should be promoted to other regions
Outcome 4	MS	 The project is on track to achieve 20% ICM coverage of the region's coastline by August 2019. Implementation of other targets unlikely to be achieved by all countries due to delays in start-up experienced with several countries. The end of project targets for this outcome are very complex which may result in the risk of them not being fully achieved. Management effectiveness of PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management tools and processes in have been initiated at ICM learning sites in all countries except Thailand and Viet Nam. Hands on capacity development is being achieved across ICM sites through the use of 15 ICM Learning Centers (PNLC).
Outcome 5	MU	 Progress has been made with the conduct of baseline assessment of degraded habitats, fisheries management and fisher household incomes at pilot sites in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, and Timor Leste. Thailand and Viet Nam have not started baseline assessments EAFM management plans and sustainable alternative livelihood programs are being developed in the 6 countries in 2018, and are scheduled to be adopted and initiated in late 2018, early 2019 Given the time delays in starting this activity in all countries it is considered unlikely that these targets can be achieved within the existing project timeframe.

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

Outcome 6	MU	Progress on the pollution reduction and water use/conservation
Outcome o	WIG	 Progress on the pollution reduction and water use/conservation projects in the 7 identified countries is underway but behind
		schedule
		 All countries currently involved in the baseline assessment and
		profiling (excent Thailand & Vietnam)
		 Thailand and Vietnam are unlikely to complete planned project
		activities within the existing project timeframe
		Some environmental quality (nollution) targets are considered
		difficult to quantify and unrealistic within the scope of this project
Outcome 7	MS	13 different communities currently involved in hazard
		identification and mitigation activities
		 Some countries have made good progress with the development
		of management plans for CCA/DRR while others have not started.
		 No countries are forecast to complete by project end.
		 Vietnam behind schedule in assessing risks and vulnerabilities of
		coastal areas threatened by CC and natural and manmade
		disasters.
		• Although progress is being made on a regional oil spill response
		plan, there are ongoing delays resulting from an inability of
		Cambodia to resolve institutional roles and responsibilities.
		 Very good progress made with respect to adoption of the PSHEM
		Code with implementation at 7 ports in 3 countries.
Outcome 8	HS	• PRF has produced a number of innovative knowledge products and
		services.
		 The project has achieved a number of important milestones,
		including: publishing an ICM investment Landscape Report;
		launching an online investment platform; identifying investment
		features in the Seas of East Asia Knowledge Bank.
		 Activities are planned/underway in all priority sites identified in
		the ProDoc.
		 Solid engagement with private sector in several sites, with notable
		successes in establishment of PPPs.
0.1	<u>^</u>	Overall, Outcome 8 is considered to be on target for completion.
Outcome 9	5	 Results are mixed across Outcome 9 with not all targets forecast to be achieved with delaye in project start we level be a highly and
		be achieved with delays in project start-up largely to blame.
		 The project has developed a strong network of regional partners to assist with ICM training (implementation)
		to assist with this targets for environmental menitoring and
		 Achieving the targets for environmental monitoring and contribution of EQUCM professionals projects may be challenging
		given progress to date
Outcome	нс	PRE has participating in a number of IW:Learn activities both at
10		the regional and global level
		 The PEMSEA.ORG and the SEA Knowledge Bank websites are well
		developed and accessible.
		 PRF has started to explore opportunities to collaborate with other
		regions (notably the Caribbean LME+).
		 Considerable scope exists for PRF to engage in outreach to other
		regions, which would benefit significantly from the experience PRF
		has gained.
		 Overall Outcome 10 is progressing well and is on track to be
		completed at project end.

4.2.2 Commentary on Progress Towards Results

Overall the project is progressing well. However, while significant progress has been made in achieving the targets relating to Components 1 and 3, Component 2 is well behind schedule for completion by the end of the project.

At MTR stage, none of the end of project outcomes or indicator targets have been achieved.

Outcome 1: A self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region.

The overall progress on Outcome 1 is considered to be good and nearly all targets are on track for completion by the end of the project. A Headquarters Agreement for PEMSEA was ratified by the Government of Philippines in 2015 and a Host Country Agreement was renewed by DENR in September 2017, thereby providing continuity arrangements for PEMSEA to continue its operations. The Third-Party Assessment completed in June 2017 emphasised the need for financial sustainability independent of project funding, and recommended country consultations on voluntary contributions to sustain PRF's secretariat role. These consultations are ongoing and it is recommended that they are concluded before and reported to the 10th EAS Partnership Council in July 2018. At the time of the MTR, Cost-Sharing Agreements had been signed with China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore with support secured up to 2018.

Up to April 2018, PEMSEA has signed 14 agreements with other partners and collaborators in support of SDS-SEA initiatives and activities, including for example Korea Fisheries Resources Agency, DENR Philippines, IPIECA, and the Marine Biodiversity Institute of RO Korea (MABIK). It has also explored collaborative agreements with regional governance mechanisms such as WCPFC/WPEA and NOWPAP, and international organisations such as IUCN/MFF, the ASEAN Working Group on Water Resources Management (AWGWRM) and FAO. These agreements are important for improving coordination and integration with the SDS-SEA at the regional and international levels and are recognition of PEMSEA's position at the forefront of ocean and coastal management in the EAS region.

The target of reaching a formal agreement with the YSLME Commission has been delayed, as YSLME is currently not prepared to consider external agreements with other regional organisations. It is recommended that PEMSEA amend this target to either remove the reference to YSLME or to focus on developing short term collaborative arrangements with YSLME.

One regional, two sub-regional and 10 national State of the Coasts reports are in their final stages of preparation and will be published and submitted to the EAS Congress/Ministers Forum in November 2018. The SOC reporting system is seen as being a useful tool for communicating the benefits of the project to decision-makers and to gain a better understanding of the issues that need to be addressed at all levels.

Outcome 2: National and local governments; adopting and initiating ocean policy, legal instruments, institutional improvements and programs, and mainstreaming SDS-SEA targets into their medium-term development and investment plans

Good progress has been made towards achieving Targets 2.1 and 2.2, with all countries making progress in drafting or putting in place policies, plans, and/or legislation and institutional mechanisms in support of coastal and ocean development. For example, national policies on ICM have been prepared in Cambodia and Vietnam; China has drafted and submitted a Framework Plan for SDS-SEA Implementation; Indonesia has adopted a regulation on National Sea policy; Timor Leste has prepared a National Ocean Policy and submitted it to the Council of Ministers; Thailand has an Act on Promotion of Marine and Coastal Resources Management; and Lao PDR has developed a national water resource strategy for management of river basins.

Despite this progress, challenges remain in translating draft proposals into policy and legislation and establishing multi-sectoral institutional coordinating mechanisms in some countries. For example, in China,

a major government reorganisation has resulted in the closure of PEMSEA's national focal agency, the State Oceanic Administration. In Timor Leste, national elections have held up the review of the draft National Ocean Policy. In Philippines, changes in the administration have stalled the progress of the ICM Bill.

Although Targets 2.1 and 2.2 are mostly on track for achievement by the end of the project in some countries, it is likely that other countries eg. Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor Leste and Vietnam will require more time to adopt and implement national coastal and ocean policies with supporting legislation and institutional arrangements.

With respect to Target 2.3, the 3 target countries (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam) have started to incorporate SDS-SEA objectives and targets into their national medium-term development and investment plans and PEMSEA will assist with the planning processes of the other 5 countries by the end of the project. PEMSEA is also working closely with local governments through the PNLG, including the eight targeted in Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam. In terms of investment planning, the project will continue to develop and promote investment/knowledge partnerships and further consideration will be given to identifying and partnering with multi-national corporations.

Outcome 3: Innovative financing mechanisms in place for sustained operation of the country-owned, regional coordinating partnership mechanism

Outcome 3 is closely related to Outcome 1 in that it concerns the self-sustainability of PEMSEA, and therefore many of the comments about voluntary contributions from member countries also apply to this outcome. There is a need to convince countries that their contributions to PEMSEA will provide a good return in terms of technical support, resource mobilisation and SDS-SEA implementation. The 2017 Third Party Assessment concluded that PEMSEA will be able to operate up to 2021 independent of new project funds or voluntary contributions. However, this should not be seen as a cause for complacency but rather a window of opportunity to negotiate with member countries on their voluntary contributions and to develop and promote PEMSEA products and services further into the regional and international markets.

PEMSEA is currently implementing projects to the value of approximately \$700,000 in addition to the SDS-SEA project and has developed a pipeline of potential projects with GCF, SIDA, IKI and the Manila Bay Integrated Water Quality Management Plan. Furthermore, PEMSEA products and services are eminently marketable outside the scope of the SDS-SEA project and in different regions of the world. Products such as the ICM Code, ICM System Certification, PSHEMS code and SEA Knowledge Bank and associated training services have a strong "value proposition" that PEMSEA should develop and exploit. It is recommended that PEMSEA hires a business development expert, either as staff or on a consultancy basis, to develop and promote their products and services to stakeholders in the region and beyond.

Overall, Outcome 3 is considered on track to achieve its targets by the end of project with the proviso that member countries agree to make voluntary contributions to a PEMSEA Trust Fund.

Outcome 4: Increased areal extent of healthy, resilient habitats (i.e., blue forests), including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other coastal habitats/ areas

The project is on track to achieve 20% ICM coverage of the region's coastline by 2019 (Target 4.1). ICM programs covered approximately 12% of the region's 234,000 km coastline in June 2013. As of December 2017, ICM coverage was approximately 18% of the region's coastline. Beyond this quantitative target however, it is difficult to assess if all 5 ICM implementation performance indicators are being achieved. This target and Target 4.2 are considered too detailed and should be simplified to ensure that they are coherent, measureable and achievable.

Targets 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 are behind schedule due mainly to significant delays at the start of the project in most countries and are unlikely to be fully achieved by the end of project.

This outcome is focused on local level implementation and represents a considerable investment in time, budget (approximately 50% of the total project budget) and other resources. It is also an outcome that has
experienced many obstacles in implementation, particularly at project start-up in each of the countries. The reasons for the delays are related to changes in political and administrative structures, and problems with budget disbursement. Changes in responsible agencies and political structures have lead to recurring delays in some countries. Implementation has therefore been challenging and the PRF should be commended for the results that have been achieved so far. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the end of project targets for this outcome will be achieved by the scheduled end of project by any country other than China. The targets should therefore be reviewed country-by-country to assess how much time will be required to achieve them and to prioritise those countries that have the best chance of attaining their targets. Consideration should then be given to extending the project for these countries.

Outcome 5: Improved management of over exploited and depleted fisheries leading to recovery

Progress has been made towards Target 5.1 on sustainable fisheries-focused ICM demonstration projects with the conduct of baseline assessment of degraded habitats, fisheries management and fisher household incomes at a number of pilot sites in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, and Timor Leste. (In Lao PDR, value chain analysis for agricultural produce has been conducted in selected villages in Huay Champi). Thailand and Vietnam have not started baseline assessments but are scheduled to start in 2018.

Ecosystem Approach Fisheries Management (EAFM) plans and sustainable alternative livelihood programs are being developed in the 6 countries in 2018 and are scheduled to be adopted and initiated in late 2018, early 2019.

Target 5.2 involves pilot projects on sustainable/alternative livelihoods for fishers and fishing communities. The target in the ProDoc does not specify how many pilot projects are to be implemented but across the 6 countries there are thought to be nearly 30 priority sites of which 14 are in Philippines. Given the time delays in starting this activity in all countries, it is unlikely that the targets of 25% improvement in 10% of households generating income from non-fishing sources can be achieved by the scheduled end of project as it can take time to introduce new approaches to fishers and fishing communities and even more time for them to adapt to them and realise benefits. The project would need to be extended to achieve these targets.

<u>Outcome 6</u>: *Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency / conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas*

IRBCAM activities have been initiated in six of the seven participating countries with a total of 11 site specific projects underway. (Timor Leste is not included in this outcome and Thailand has not yet started). National inception workshops/consultations have been conducted in all countries participating in this outcome with baseline studies being undertaken in five of the participating countries and pilot Projects being initiated in four of the participating countries.

Overall progress on this outcome is considered to be well behind schedule, with Thailand and Vietnam yet to commence activities, due largely to delays in the signing of country agreements and contracts with local authorities. At this stage, it appears that none of the countries under Outcome 6 will fully achieve the targets by the end of the project, and, even with the possibility of an extension, these targets remain ambitious.

A particular issue, with respect to the achievability of Target 6.1 is the measureable quantitative reductions in key water quality parameters (BOD and nutrients). Evidence from at least one country indicates that there are problems with the availability of environmental monitoring data that would help managers to assess the performance of management measures. Furthermore, not all countries currently have access to operational laboratories.

While the implementation of better management practices across watersheds will undoubtedly lead to environmental quality improvements, significant reductions in BOD and nutrients in more densely populated catchments is likely to require significant capital expenditure on new infrastructure. This is beyond the scope of this project and therefore it is considered doubtful that, given the limited resources available and the small number of pilot sites currently active that the specific target reductions can be achieved or measured at all. This suggests there is a need to reassess this target, with a view to developing more achievable and easily measureable targets that are commensurate with the resources and level of effort available to this project.

<u>Outcome 7:</u> Increased preparedness and capability of coastal communities to respond to natural and manmade hazards

The overall progress for Outcome 7 is considered to be good, although progress across the different targets is variable.

In terms of Target 7.1, CCA/DDR activities have been initiated across all seven of the participating countries with activities at a total of 12 sites. It is noted, however, that Vietnam has activities only in Danang and not Kien Gang or Soc Trang, which were the two sites indicated in the revised Table 17 of the ProDoc. A large number of Baseline Assessment and Vulnerability Assessments have been undertaken across these sites reflecting a broad range of coastal hazards. It is clear that these studies and assessments are being used to design a variety of response measures to address the identified vulnerabilities.

One issue the MTR team has noted with respect to this target relates to the lack of any quantitative measure against which to assess target achievement. The target simply requires "improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency to the impacts of climate change, oil spills and other natural and manmade hazards." It is not clear how this can be measured and the MTR team therefore believes that a further revision to this target is warranted.

Target 7.2 has progressed well, although the development of the sub-regional oil spill response plan has been delayed as a result of institutional issues in Cambodia. A number of key oil spill response tools, required to support such a plan have, however, been completed and cooperation continues among the relevant parties to develop the oil spill plan. While the MTR team considers that, once these institutional issues are overcome, this target can be achieved, it is unclear whether this is achievable within the current project timeframe.

Target 7.3 has progressed well, with seven ports in three countries having adopted the PHSEM Code and having completed the Stage 1 Audit. In fact, had the targets for this indicator not been amended at the Inception Meeting, this Target would not have been completed. The revised target, however, is that ports in six participating countries adopt the PHSEM Code.

The MTR team notes that PRF is undertaking a number of advocacy activities to promote the benefits of the PHSEM Code in the region. The MTR team also notes that several of the participating ports are keen to share their own experience and lessons learned with ports in the region.

<u>Outcome 8:</u> Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services

Evidence provided by PRF demonstrates that both Targets 8.1. and 8.2 are progressing well, with activities either planned or well underway in each of the priority sites that were identified in the ProDoc (Table 18) with one additional site being included in Indonesia (Sukabumi Regency).

PRF has undertaken a significant amount of work to establish the enabling environment to attract nondonor funding to support ongoing implementation of project results. A number of highly innovative products have been completed, including: an Investment Landscape Mapping Report, the development of a conceptual Ocean Investment Facility & Fund that PRF is currently seeking to establish; the evaluation of a number of innovative case studies to highlight investment opportunities in the blue economy and a broad range of advocacy and awareness raising among the private sector throughout the region to raise awareness of investment opportunities in the blue economy. There has been solid engagement with the private sector in several of the sites, and several notable successes with the establishment of PPPs to support environmental improvement projects and ICM implementation.

During the MTR visit to Cambodia, the MTR team noted that, while Preah Sihanouk Province has received initial approval from the Ministry of Finance to implement environmental user fees for tourists visiting the Koh Rong Archipelago, the lack of clear guidelines/policies on the implementation of environmental user fees in Cambodia is preventing its implementation. The MTR team further noted that environmental user fees have successfully been applied to the Cham Islands Marine Park in Vietnam and would urge PRF to provide technical assistance to the Government of Cambodia, using experience from Cham Islands to demonstrate implementation mechanisms that could be applied in Cambodia.

Outcome 9: Regional knowledge sharing platform for ecosystem management established and enabling decision makers to translate policies and strategies into actions

The overall progress for Outcome 9 is considered to be extremely good, with the targets largely expected to be achieved by the end of the project. There are, however, a number of areas that are currently behind schedule, that are affecting the overall rating for this outcome.

In terms of Target 9.1 activities have been initiated in all participating countries and are on track for completing in China and Cambodia. Other countries appear unlikely to fully achieve this target within the current project time frame. The MTR team believes, however, that given additional time, this target could be achieved in full.

The MTR notes that, despite some delays, activities under this target have achieved some innovative results, such as the development of the artificial mussel monitoring technology.

In terms of the Target 9.3, relating to SOC reports, all countries have prepared national SOC reports, and a draft regional SOC report has also been prepared. These are all expected to be finalised and launched at the EAS Congress in November 2018.

Target 9.3 is largely on track for completion within the project timeframe. PRF has made good progress on developing the network of accredited ICM Learning Centres, which are actively engaged in capacity development across the region. The PNLG has also been considerably strengthened and is active across the region.

Target 9.4 results are mixed at present, with the overall target unlikely to be achieved within the project timeframe. This is largely a result of delays in several countries (Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Timor Leste) which have not yet commenced project activities.

<u>Outcome 10:</u> Program contributed to global learning on scaling up of investments in sustainable coastal and ocean management

Outcome 10 is progressing well and is on track to be completed at project end. PRF has participating in a number of IW:Learn activities, both at the regional and global level. The development of the PEMSEA.ORG and the SEA Knowledge Bank websites are well developed and accessible. As the SEA Knowledge Bank continues to be developed and populated with additional information, it will be an invaluable data repository and source of information to project partners and non-project organisations alike.

PRF has started to explore opportunities to collaborate with other regional initiatives (notably the Caribbean LME project). However, in the view of the MTR team, PRF seems to not fully appreciate the extent of the results and experience it has achieved across the region. In the view of the MTR team, PRF and the SEA region is well ahead of other regions in terms of the development of this sort of initiative and there is considerable scope for extensive outreach to other regions, which would, in our view, benefit significantly from the experience PRF has gained over the past 20 years or so.

4.2.3 GEF Tracking Tool

The GEF International Waters (IW) tracking tool, relevant for the GEF-5 replenishment cycle, is one of the important M&E tools for the project. The baseline tracking tool outlines a number of process indicators, mostly associated with regional cooperation frameworks and mechanisms.

The GEF International Waters Tracking Tool provided a further input into the MTR. The Review Team was provided with two iterations of the GEF Tracking Tool for the Project:

a) A version prepared during development of the project and included as Annex I of the ProDoc, dated 12/8/2013 (Baseline)

b) A version prepared for the MTR, dated 14/05/2018

Comparison of the Baseline and 2018 versions of the Tracking Tool is presented in Table 8 below and highlighted a number of areas which are summarised below:

Table 8: Summary of GEF IW Tracking Tool Ratings

	PROCESS INDICATORS		
1	Regional legal agreements/cooperative frameworks	3	4
2	Regional management institutions (RMI)	N/A	3
3	(ABNJ only:) Management measures incorporated in the institutional mandates and/or management action frameworks of Global/Regional Management Bodies	N/A	1
4	National Inter-Ministrerial Committees (IMCs)	3	3
5	National/Local reforms	3	3
6	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, <u>including revised</u> (TDA): Agreement on transboundary priorities and root causes	4	4
7	Development of Strategic Action Plan (SAP)	4	4
8	SAP addresses groundwater governance and enhancing conjunctive management of surface and groundwater (as applicable)	N/A	1
9	TDA/SAP addresses Nexus dimensions	4	2
10	Proportion of Countries that have adopted SAP	14/14	14/14
11	Proportion of countries that are implementing specific measures from the SAP (i.e. adopted national policies, laws, budgeted plans)	12/14	13/14
12	SAP implementation finance secured by governments and development partners	3	Not rated
	STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS		
13	Are there mechanisms in place to produce a monitoring report on stress reduction measures?	4	3
14	Stress reduction measurements incorporated by project through improved management of:	2	2
	WATER, ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS INDIC	ATORS	
1	Types of mechanisms and project indicators in place to monitor the environmental status of the waterbody?	3	3
	IW:LEARN INDICATORS		
1	Participation in IW events (GEF IWC, Training, Twinning and other IW:LEARN activities)	3	3
2	Project website (according to IW:LEARN guidelines)	4	3

Process Indicators

- Of the 12 Process indicators, ratings changed for six of the indicators, five remained the same and one (12) was not rated at the mid-term.
- Indicator 1 was upgraded from 3-4 reflecting the fact that the HQ Agreement has now been signed.
- Indicators 2, 3 & 8 were not rated at the Baseline and both received ratings at the mid-term. It is not clear why they were rated as N/A at the Baseline.
- Indicator 9 was rated as 4 at the baseline but only rated as 2 at the mid-term.
- Indicator 11 was rated as 12/14 at the Baseline and rated as 13/14 at the mid-term, reflecting the increase in countries now implementing the SAP.
- Indicator 12 did not receive a rating.

Stress Reduction Indicators

The overall stress reduction indicator has been reduced from 4 at the Baseline to 3 at the mid-term, suggesting that PRF feels that the current monitoring system does not adequately cover all of the project related indicator.

Water, Environment & Socioeconomic Indicators

Only one indicator was rated at the Baseline and the rating did not change at the mid-term.

IW:Learn Indicators

Of the two indicators in this field, one remained the same and one received a lower rating at the mid-term than at the Baseline. However, this appears to be because the TT rating scale was changed between the Baseline and the mid-point, whereas the indicator achievement itself rated has not.

4.2.4 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

In a complex, multi-country, multi-component project of this nature, the barriers to progress vary from country to country and activity to activity. Considering the achievement of the high-level objective, *"to catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region, in accordance with the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)"*, the following remaining barriers can be identified:

 <u>Resources: Time, Funding and PRF staff time.</u> Component 2 of the project (Outcomes 4-7) is behind schedule and many of the targets will not be achieved by the scheduled end of project. This issue needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency to determine which activities require project extensions to achieve the programmed outputs.

There are two aspects to the issue of funding limitations. Firstly, there is a shortage of co-financing at provincial and local government level for marine and coastal management. Secondly, the funding component provided through the project is under-utilised in some countries and is unlikely to be used by the scheduled end of project (eg. Thailand, Lao PDR and Vietnam), while it is fully utilised in other countries that will require further funding to complete their activities (eg. Cambodia). A re-balancing of the budget should be considered to address this issue.

PRF staff time is already fully committed to the project and there does not appear to be any capacity for accelerating implementation, even if it were possible at country/local level. A further observation by the MTR team is that back-stopping is required at the PRF to support the country managers.

- <u>Capacity</u>: The PRF has highlighted that there is limited technical and management capacity of local government staff to scale-up ICM implementation. PEMSEA is addressing this through continuing capacity development of local leaders and technical personnel.
- <u>Coordination</u>: There is limited coordination in some countries and local governments and there are overlapping responsibilities between government agencies.
- <u>Political and Administrative</u>: These barriers have proved to be a major challenge in many countries. For example, strict financial regulations and project review and approval processes, changes in policies and regulations, reorganisations of key agencies and changes in local administration or political leadership have all affected project implementation to some extent. While the PRF has adapted and coped with these barriers, it is likely that they will continue to arise throughout the remainder of the project.

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

4.3.1 Management Arrangements

The project management provided by the PRF is considered to be highly efficient and effective. This is borne out by the very high percentage of stakeholders interviewed who rated the efficiency of the project management team as being excellent (83%) or good (17%). Key to this performance is the strong relationship between the country managers and their respective country counterparts, the fast response to enquiries and flexibility to adapt to problems and changing circumstances.

The responsibilities and reporting lines at the PRF (Figure 2) are clear and decision-making appears to be transparent and timely. The project team meets quarterly to assess project and financial delivery, when all staff are available. It also has a major planning and review session at the beginning of each year, and at mid-term, when two-year workplans and budgets are prepared or updated. In addition to the project manager, the team comprises three country managers, one capacity development team certification/knowledge management team leader, leader, one one sustainable management/investment team leader and one junior staff member. The project team is considered to be "lean" and may be under-resourced, making it vulnerable to departures of key staff. There is a need to have back-stopping staff to support the country managers and to substitute for them in their absence.

Project oversight is provided by the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which includes representatives from the eleven PEMSEA Country Partners, UNDP Philippines Country Office (CO), and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Marine, Coastal and Island Ecosystems. After the project inception meeting in March 2015, the PSC met in July 2016 and July 2017, and is scheduled to meet again in July 2018. The PSC's role is to provide advice, guidance and facilitation of scientific, technical, financial and administrative matters related to project implementation. It also approves the workplan and budget for the year ahead and makes decisions about substantive policy and strategy issues concerning implementation. Overall, the PSC mechanism has been effective in fulfilling its advisory and decision-making role. However, the MTR team could not find any evidence that financial performance had been reported to the PSC on an annual basis, and it is therefore not clear how the PSC can make financial decisions or approve forward workplans and budgets.

UNDP assigned the Philippines Country Office (CO) as the Principal Project Resident Representative (PPRR) for the project, on the basis of its long involvement with implementing the SDS-SEA over four phases, with PRF as implementing agency, going back to 2003. UNDP CO's main role is to co-chair the annual PSC meetings. The UNDP CO also meets PRF annually in January to discuss and approve the Annual Work Plan. These annual planning meetings are largely focused on the contribution of the project to UNDP objectives and targeted deliverables under the Country Program, and less on cross-

project sharing of outputs, experiences, tools and impacts, as well as improved networking and collaboration across projects. The MTR team suggests that UNDP should be more proactive in communication and knowledge-sharing across projects that have a common focus, e.g. sustainable development of coasts and oceans; climate change; and disaster risk reduction.

An additional meeting with PRF was convened in November 2016 to address the issue of Thailand's delayed signing of the Project Document. The PRF country manager for Thailand worked with the national focal agency for over two years to provide the information required by the Thai government, with UNDP's Regional Technical Advisor for Marine, Coastal and Island Ecosystems assisting to facilitate Thailand's eventual signature in July 2017.

UNDP has contracted the Philippines Commission of Audit (COA) to conduct annual audits of technical deliverables and financial performance. PRF has expressed its concern that COA does not have the capacity to review and assess project technical deliverables and has therefore not signed off on the 2017 audit. To address this outstanding issue, the MTR team considers it essential for UNDP CO and PRF to discuss this matter further with a view to resolving PRF's concerns.

4.3.2 Work planning

It is natural that in a project of this complexity and duration that delays will be experienced in some or all components at some stages during implementation. In the case of Component 1 (Outcomes 1-3) there have been some minor delays but at the mid-term all outcomes are on track to be achieved by the end of project, with the possible exception of the proposed agreement with YSLME, which may not be achieved. Component 3 (Outcomes 8-10) also appears to be largely on track for completion by the end of project with the exception of some of the national outputs under Outcome 9. There have been and continue to be significant delays in the implementation of Component 2 (Outcomes 4-7), which jeopardises the delivery of associated outputs and hence the full achievement of all outcomes by the end of project.

The delays experienced in the implementation of Outcomes 4-7 have all been at country level and the causes can be grouped as follows:

- Delays in signing the ProDoc: Thailand, which signed the ProDoc in May 2017
- Delays in establishing MOAs: Lao PDR, Vietnam
- Delays in disbursing funds to project sites due to administrative issues at country/local government level: Indonesia, Vietnam
- Delays due to political changes, changes in agency leadership and national elections: Cambodia, Timor Leste, Vietnam.

Most if not all of these delays are outside the control of the project team and reflect the challenge of implementing a complex project at regional, national and local levels in multiple countries at different stages of development in a politically diverse region. At the time of the MTR, most of the issues causing the delays have been resolved but their legacy is that none of the countries are projected to achieve their implementation targets by the scheduled end of project.

The Strategic Results Framework (SRF) provided in the ProDoc was updated with some minor modifications and approved by the PSC at the project inception meeting in March 2015. Apart from changes to a few baselines and end of project targets, the main change was the inclusion of an additional objective level indicator with associated baseline information and end of project targets. The reason for introducing the additional indicator is not known, but as described in Section 4.1.2, it is only indirectly relevant as an objective indicator and the end of project targets are more appropriate as outcome or output indicators.

The SRF is used by the PRF as a management tool as it is used as the basis for reporting progress in the PIRs, QPRs and APRs. Although the SRF can be broadly considered to be results-based in that there is a logical connection between outcomes and the project objective, there is a lack of clarity in many of the end

of project targets and their relationship to their respective indicators. Specifically, many of the targets are complex and contain combinations of sub-targets, making it difficult to track (and evaluate) progress towards achieving the expected results. The end of project targets should be simplified and linked more directly to their indicators and baseline conditions to make it easier to assess progress in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

4.3.3 Finance and co-finance

Project Financial Management

Financial management of the project operates within PRF's overall corporate and financial management structure and is subject to the PRF Financial Regulations and Rules (Document No. GUI-AFH-001).

The overall Project Budget is summarised in Table 9 below, based on figures included in Section III of the Project Document. However, it is noted that some minor amendments were made to the annual GEF allocation at the Project Inception Meeting. These revised figures are reflected in Table 9.

Furthermore, while Table 6 provides the indicative annual budget allocations approved at the start of the project, PRF prepares an annual work plan (AWP) for each year of the project, which is subject to review and approval by the Project Steering Committee. In some cases, the indicative annual budget figures above were modified during the annual project budget planning cycle and are reflected in the approved AWPs. (Table 10 below).

SOURCE	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	TOTAL
GEF ⁴	2,139,525	2,261,513	2,187,801	2,215,469	1,839,684	10,643,992
Government (In Kind)	23,281,092	27,937,313	24,445,148	19,788,929	20,952,985	116,405,467
Government (Cash)	4,430,000	5,316,000	4,651,500	3,765,500	3,987,000	22,150,000
UNDP	3,230,000	3,876,000	3,391,500	2,745,500	2,907,000	16,150,000
MERIT	500,000	600,000	525,000	425,000	450,000	2,500,000
NOWPAP (In Kind)	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	30,000
NOWPAP (Cash)	30,000					30,000

Table 9: Summary of Funds Available. Source: Project Initiation Report and ProDoc Section III

Table 10: Annual Work Plan Budgets

	YEAR O	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
GEF		2,139,525	2,261,513	2,187,801	2,215,469	1,839,684
AWP Budgets	570,807	2,139,525	2,253,213	2,209,273	2,259,830	(1,211,344)

The project finances have been subject to annual audits, undertaken by the Philippines' Commission on Audit. Three audit reports were made available to the MTR team covering the 2015, 2016 and 2017 calendar years respectively, providing independent verification of the annual expenditure profiles to date.

Overall, the project expenditure appears to be moderately underspent at the time of the MTR, with approximately 53 percent of the budget expended to the end of 2017 (representing approximately 67

⁴ Updated figures taken from the Project Initiation Report (2015)

percent of the project timeline) (see Table 11 below). This under-expenditure can largely be explained by country-specific expenditure profile differences.

The individual country expenditure profiles are illustrated in Figure 3 below, and suggest that, while most countries are tracking well against planned expenditure, some countries (i.e. Vietnam, Lao PDR and Thailand) are significantly under-spent. This under-expenditure is the result of delays experienced with respect to the signing of country agreements with Thailand and Vietnam, as well as project implementation delays in Lao PDR.

Although these country agreements have now been concluded and project activities fully commenced in each of the countries, the MTR team considers it extremely unlikely, based on the expenditure profiles to date, that the countries will be able to fully expend their budget allocation by September 2019. As such, the MTR believes there is a need for action to be taken to address this risk and avoid a significant, project-wide budget under-expenditure.

	Year 0	Year 1 ⁵	Year 2	Year 3 ⁶	Year 4	Year 5	TOTAL
AWP Budget	570,807	2,139,525	2,253,213	2,209,273	2,259,830	1,211,344	10,643,992
Expended	446,662	1,678,834	1,539,263	2,024,562			
Underspent	124,145	460,691	713,950	184,711			
Planned (2018)					2,285,427		
Balance (Aug 2019)						2,669,286	10,643,992

Table 11: Project Expenditure and Budget Planning



Figure 3: Actual expenditure to date and forecast expenditure at project end

⁵ Adjusted expenditure (the expenditure was incurred in 2015, but reimbursed in 2016).

⁶ PEMSEA accounting for 2017, subject to final audit.

Co-finance

The project is subject to significant co-financing. Table 12 below provides a summary of the co-finance commitments made by country and non-country partners, as evidenced by the Commitments Letters included in Annex J to the ProDoc. This is largely in-kind support, although some cash contributions were also pledged.

The MTR team has sought information on the status of these contributions from PRF. However, it appears that no tracking system is in place to monitor and track the extent to which these commitments are realised at the project level.

While PRF appears able to identify specific co-financed activities, the amounts accounted for by PRF represent only a fraction of the total co-financing commitments made by the country partners. Furthermore, when questioned, in some cases PRF were unable to explain how some of the co-finance figures had been arrived at and how the co-financing was being allocated. This was particularly true of the US\$16,500,000 contribution indicated from UNDP.

From the information provided to the MTR team during the MTR mission by the PRF, it does seem clear that the most significant proportion of co-financing is actually provided by local governments supporting the implementation of ICM activities through their annual plans, rather than being provided by the national government entities (or non-government organizations) that signed the co-financing letters at CEO endorsement.

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-finance	Amount Confirmed at CEO	Actual Amount Spent at Stage of Midterm	Actual % of Expected
			Endorsement	Review	Amount
Country Partne	ers				
Cambodia	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	6,160,000		
China	State Oceanic Administration	Cash	20,800,000	(no cash has	
				been	
				transmitted to	
				PEMSEA)	
		In-kind	1,900,000		
Indonesia	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	5,000,000		
Lao PDR	Ministry of Natural Resources	In-kind	2,500,000		
	& Environment				
Philippines	Department of Environment		40,500,000		
	& Natural Resources				
Korea	Ministry of Oceans &	Cash	850,000	557,653	65.6%
	Fisheries				
		In-kind	30,000		
Thailand	Department of Marine &	In-kind	11,489,200		
	Coastal Resources				
	Port Authority of Thailand	In-kind	500,000		
	Chonburi Province	In-kind	19,526,267		
Timor Leste	Ministry of Agriculture &	Cash	500,000	292,820.75	58.6%
	Fisheries				
		In-kind	350,000		
Vietnam	Vietnam Administration of	In-kind	16,300,000		
	Seas & Islands				
Non-Country P	artners				
UNDP		Cash	16,150,000		

Table 12: Co-financing commitments based on commitment letters from country and non-country partners

Midterm Review Report, July 2018

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

UNEP	NOWPAP	In-kind	30,000	(no cash has been transferred to PEMSEA)	
UNEP	NOWPAP	In-kind	30,000		
University of Hong Kong	MERIT	In-kind	2,500,000		
UK Department for International Development	Plymouth Marine Laboratories (PML)	In-kind	1,360,000		
Others?					
Korea	КМІ	In-kind	140,000	140,000	100%
Korea	MOF	In-cash	27,000	27,000	100%
Korea	MABIK	In-cash	25,000	25,000	100%
Korea	КОЕМ	In-cash	23,000	23,000	100%
Korea	KEI	In-cash	8,800	8,800	100%

The lack of formal tracking and reporting of co-financing has made it extremely difficult for the MTR team to undertake a rigorous assessment of the status of co-financing at the mid-term of the project and the team is therefore unable to draw any meaningful conclusions regarding this aspect of the project financial management other than to recommend the need for a more rigorous monitoring and reporting of co-finance expenditure by all co-finance partners.

4.3.4 Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The project Monitoring & Evaluation and Reporting requirements were specified in detail in the Project Document and were discussed, and agreed, at the Project Inception meeting. The major elements include:

- Inception phase: Project inception meeting and subsequent Project Inception Report (2015);
- **Regular progress reporting**: Quarterly and Annual Progress Reports (QPR/APR) are provided regularly to UNDP;
- Annual Project Steering Committee Meetings: The Project Document notes that "Annual monitoring will occur through the Intergovernmental Session of the EAS Partnership Council, which will serve as the Project Steering Committee (PSC". As such, reporting on progress and outstanding issues and discussion of these is undertaken at the PSC meetings, to which PRF submits a Project Implementation Review (PIR). These meetings also provide an opportunity for national updates on progress;
- **Country visits**: PFC staff on country missions provide reports on status of policies, plans, legislation etc in the format of Back-to-Office reports prepared by the Country Managers

The 2015 project inception workshop agreed on the use of these monitoring tools with the project implementing partners. PRF monitors the implementation of project activities and progress through submission of QPRs on a quarterly basis, APRs and PIRs on an annual basis, and annual financial audits,

These requirements appear to have been be fully implemented throughout the project, with copies of all relevant document being provided to the MTR team. The MTR team considers these monitoring tools to be sufficient given the capacity of the PRF to monitor and manage the project activities.

This notwithstanding, the MTR team notes that, at the country-specific level, there does not appear to be any formal progress reporting provided by the country partners, other than presentations delivered at the annual PSC meetings. Although PRF has been subject to an annual independent financial audit, the MTR team could not identify any regular specific reporting of budget performance to either UNDP or the PSC. Financial tracking data was included in the 2014 and 2015 APRs but not in the 2016 and 2017 APRs due to a change in the APR report format in 2016. As such, it is not clear to the MTR team how project financial performance has been tracked and reported to the PSC and UNDP in a consistent manner.

4.3.5 Stakeholder engagement

One of the key features of the project is the strength of the relationships between the PRF and the project stakeholders. As a follow-on project, most of the relationships were established in earlier phases of the SDS-SEA programme and these mature partnerships have been leveraged through a well-developed stakeholder involvement plan. As noted in Section 4.1, PEMSEA adopted a participatory and inclusive approach to project design in line with GEF and UNDP requirements, thus ensuring maximum stakeholder buy-in to the project objectives and outcomes.

Another key strength of the project is the involvement of local governments, reinforced through the PNLG (with over 50 members). The good relationships between local government partners and their respective country managers has already been noted. It is also evident that the 'bottom up' approach to ICM has led to raised awareness of coastal resource management issues and a strong sense of ownership at local level. Sukabumi Regency in Indonesia is an example of a mature ICM implementation site and demonstrates how effective ICM can be at bringing together local stakeholders in a coordinated approach to coastal zone management issues. The Government of Sukambumi Regency originally signed an MOA with PEMSEA in 2003. A Program Management Office (PMO) and Program Coordinating Committee (PCC), with representatives from all local government agencies and relevant NGOs, were established to coordinate ICM activities, supported by PRF. The PCC holds regular monthly meetings to discuss progress and forward planning. The recognition of the Ciletuh-Palabuhanratu Geopark as a Global Geopark by UNESCO in April 2018 is considered to be due, in part, to the success of the Sukabumi ICM programme, particularly its biodiversity component. This is an example of how the project at country level is driven by local issues, and of the direct involvement of local government in decision-making, which is replicated at other sites in the participating countries. PRF can be considered as the catalyst, motivator and technical supporter, but project implementation on the ground is undertaken by the local partners.

4.3.6 Reporting

The MTR team found that the reporting activities as outlined in section 3.3.4 above, were carried out as required. However, although PRF prepares a submits a variety of performance reports, the quality of those reports, is highly variable and there has been a lack of consistency of the reporting parameters throughout the project.

For example:

- the 2016 and 2017 PIRs reported progress against the (modified) End of Project Targets as agreed at the Project Inception Meeting, whereas the draft 2018 PIR (up to 15 April 2018) reported against the Outputs included in the Strategic Results Framework;
- Similarly, the APRs have reported against Outputs and Activities rather than Outcome level Targets; and
- The QPRs and APRs prepared in 2014 and 2015 included summary of financial performance, whereas later QPRs and APRs did not include this information. Furthermore, the format of the QPRs changed during the project making it harder to follow the reporting throughout.

The complexity of the project and diverse reporting products has resulted in a fragmented set of output, sub-output and activity reports that made it difficult for the MTR team to fully appreciate the extent to which progress towards project targets was being achieved.

The MTR team believes that a more harmonised set of reporting tools, incorporating all relevant aspects of project progress (not just output achievement) should have been prepared at the outset and followed throughout the project to allow for a more consistent reporting framework and results.

4.3.7 Communications

The project has had effective communications with stakeholders at the national level. All the National Focal Points (NFP) interviewed confirmed that communication with the PRF has been clear, effective and usually timely, although there were occasional delays when the country managers were very busy. The lines of communication are well understood by the NFPs, who provide feedback to the PRF when appropriate. Some NFPs commented that there was a need for the PRF to engage further at the local level but recognised that language could be a barrier to effective communication. Several NFPs felt that the country managers should visit their countries more often.

One NFP pointed out that one of PEMSEA's strengths was its knowledge management material but that there is a need to popularise this and make it more accessible to a wider audience, down to community level. Some of this information is very technical and preparing material with different levels of technical complexity would be a good way of achieving this wider accessibility. The use of social media was also suggested as means of reaching a wider audience.

All local stakeholders asked about communications (14 out of 23) felt that they were kept informed about project progress. The PNLG is seen as an important and effective mechanism for communicating with local government partners and encouraging them to take ownership of project outcomes in their areas. Furthermore, the EAS Partnership Council meetings provide an annual forum for raising awareness of project activities and outcomes.

The project has produced innovative knowledge products, such as the ICM code, PSHEMS code, SEA Knowledge Bank, investment landscape assessment and SOC reporting, and services such as certification, training/internships, and sustainable business networks. However, these products and services are not well promoted outside the project due to the lack of staff time and the primary focus on project delivery. Although there is a general website for PEMSEA (www.pemsea.org), there is no specific website for the project. This is perhaps understandable as the project feeds directly into the mission, objectives, work and services of PEMSEA. However, it would be useful to have a webpage devoted to the project to share details of national and local partners, activities under implementation, progress and results. The SEA Knowledge Bank e-portal (www.seaknowledgebank.net) is dedicated to sharing and promoting PEMSEA's products and services, and as it continues to be developed it will become an important source of information to project partners and non-project organisations.

4.4 Sustainability

4.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability

By definition, a key objective of this project is to identify and secure sustainable sources of funding to allow for ongoing delivery of project results, following completion of the project. Thus, the future financial sustainability is contingent on the successful outcome of this project, and specifically Outcomes 1, 3 and 8.

During the MTR mission, and discussions with PRF staff and national focal points, it became clear to the MTR team that the following financial risks remain:

Reliance on voluntary financial contributions from member countries.

The current governance arrangements for the PRF rely on voluntary from the participating countries. At this stage, only China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore are making voluntary contributions to the PEMSEA Trust Fund. PRF is undertaking ongoing consultations regarding financial contributions with Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Timor Leste and Vietnam.

During the MTR mission, the MTR team spoke with national focal points from every participating country. It is clear that, without exception, countries have a high level of confidence in PRF's performance and capability and its effectiveness in delivering regional support to the EAS member countries. There is strong support for PRF to continue providing technical support and capacity building services throughout the region. As such, it is clear that countries see a need for PRF's continued presence, as a regional ocean management organisation.

However, when asked about individual country's commitment to provide sustainable finance to support PRF once the project ends, few if any commitments could be made. A number of national focal points did raise concerns about what would happen at the country level once the current level of financial support was no longer available, with some indicating that as much as 50 percent of current activities being undertaken at the national level would cease.

There appears, therefore, to be a disconnect between the countries' expectations and aspirations with respect to the long-term viability and their commitment to contribute financially to ensure this happens.

PRF is clearly aware of the future risks to financial sustainability and there is a clear commitment under this project for PRF to find alternative sources of funding to support future activities. However, without the firm commitment of all member countries to provide ongoing core financial support, the ability for PRF to find other, non-country donors to continue supporting its activities may be compromised.

In the view of the MTR team, there is, therefore, a clear need for a greater financial commitment from each of the participating countries, to ensure that PFC remains a viable partner in the region.

Securing sustainable "blue finance"

As the blue economy develops at the regional and national levels, there is a critical need for engagement with, and investment by, the private sector. The transition from donor-led funding to investment-led funding is a critical enabler to the effective and sustainable development of the blue economy, since this is the only realistic way in which coastal and marine resources can be more effectively and sustainably managed, providing for more secure livelihoods, increased jobs and greater recognition of the real value of coastal and marine ecosystems.

PRF is actively pursuing a number of strategies to address this gap. This is, however, an emerging area at the global and regional level and there is no certainty that these strategies will prove successful.

4.4.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability

Fisheries, aquaculture and other activities supported by coastal and marine ecosystems, continue to generate substantive economic benefits for EAS countries. Sustainable management of fish stocks is important at the national and subnational levels, as multitudes of livelihoods are supported through the extensive supply chains.

One issue that became apparent during visits to Cambodia and Vietnam is that traditional coastal fishing communities are increasingly diversifying into coastal tourism, with some coastal communities transitioning almost entirely away from on coastal fishing to tourism over a very short space of time.

In terms of coastal livelihoods, this presents both opportunities and risks. Opportunities may arise through reduced fishing efforts, thereby allowing stocks to rebuild. A greater focus on coastal tourism may also support efforts to establish coastal marine protected areas.

However, as discussed in more detail under section 4.4.4 below, rapid growth in coastal tourism presents significant environmental risks as well and may undermine the efforts of ICM and related project activities.

This is a risk that countries must be cognisant of due to the rapid scale of tourism-related coastal develop in some countries.

4.4.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

Strengthening sub-regional coastal and ocean governance is one of the main aims of the project, and the numerous joint activities, such as the annual meetings of the EAS Partnership Council and Project Steering Committee, the East Asia Seas Congress, the three-yearly Council of Ministers, and the various Local Government Networks established, have helped forge a long-lasting collaborative sub-regional arrangement. At the national level, and particularly the provincial/local level, the participating countries have established a range of governance mechanisms that are largely self-supporting.

This notwithstanding, the MTR team notes that capacity limitations are the primary reason for progress being slower anticipated at the project inception. This applies particularly to national and provincial/local level project initiatives.

Changes in institutional arrangements, particularly at the national level, are also a cause for delays, but such changes are considered part of the normal cycle for national governments and there is little that can be done to overcome this risk.

Overall, the MTR team believes that the governance and institutional arrangements to oversee ongoing delivery of results and benefits are robust and see no reason why they will not continue.

4.4.4 Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR team has identified a number of environmental risks to sustainability:

Climate change

Of all the threats identified as affecting marine and coastal environments in the SEA region, climate change is likely to have the greatest effect due to the proportion of the population that lives in coastal areas and the vulnerability of many coastal habitats to the various effects relating to climate change and associated changes to the ocean. With respect to islands and coastal areas, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has identified three critical impacts of climate change:

- Sea level rise leading to abandonment of low lying areas, exposure to storm surges, damage to coastal economies and infrastructure.
- Changes in the ocean and coastal marine environment (such as elevated sea surface temperatures, ocean acidification) will disrupt critical ecosystem services, for example coral reefs and fisheries, on which the countries involved in this project depend upon for food and economic development.

Throughout the EAS region, tourism resorts, coastal towns and infrastructure will be at risk, given their location at or near present sea level and their proximity to the coast. Relocation or fortifying coastal infrastructure for coastal protection will become financially burdensome for the Governments, particularly in the smaller outer islands.

Climate change and sea level rise will affect tourism directly and indirectly due to: loss of beaches to erosion and inundation, salinisation of fresh water aquifers, increasing stress on coastal ecosystems, damage to coastal infrastructure from storm events, and the overall loss of amenities.

Certain species of corals are very sensitive to sea water temperature changes. Elevated sea water temperatures (above seasonal maxima) can seriously damage coral ecosystems by bleaching and also impair reproductive functions, and lead to increased mortality. It is expected that mangroves will be more adaptive to climate change by species, as well as local salinity regime and biological interactions. However, coastal land loss and the presence of infrastructure in coastal areas may reduce the natural capacity of mangroves to adapt and migrate landward.

Rapid and unplanned coastal development

Rapid coastal development linked to expanding tourism industry represents a risk to the coastal environments of EAS. During the MTR site visits, the MTR team witnessed, first hand, the extent of coastal tourism development and planned reclamation developments, and some of the challenges of managing the environmental impacts associated with these developments.

Unless coastal developments are managed in accordance with the principles of ICM, uncontrolled pollution, reclamation and development will result in significant pressures to coastal environments.

Biological sustainability

While it is acknowledged that a key focus of Component 2 is on sustainable fisheries management in threatened fishing grounds, ongoing illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing across the region represents a third, significant environment threat to the sustainability of project results. The pressure on fisheries is a result of numerous factors including over harvesting and lack of enforcement. Without effective national management planning, monitoring and enforcement activities, local efforts to rebuild fish stocks will have little effect.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Overall, the MTR team considers the project to be progressing well, with many of the expected results on track to be achieved by the scheduled end of project. However, while all countries are participating in the project to some degree, delays in signing countries agreements with some countries have resulted in delays in project implementation. As a result, the project is considered unlikely to achieve all the project objectives within the project timeframe.

Project Strategy

The project strategy is considered to be comprehensive in scope and highly relevant to the development priorities of the eight country partners, aligns with UNDAF outcomes, and contributes directly to five Sustainable Development Goals. For many of the outcomes, however, the targets are complex and include sub-targets, which makes it difficult to track and evaluate progress towards achieving expected results.

Recommendation 1: *PRF to re-assess targets for the Objective and outcomes listed in Table 6 to ensure that they are realistic, measureable and achievable by the end of the project*

Progress towards results

While good progress has been made in achieving the targets relating to Components 1 and 3, work planning has been affected by start-up delays in most countries. Component 2, being implemented at national and local levels, is most affected, reflect the challenge of implementing a complex project at multiple levels in countries at different stages of development in a politically diverse region. As a result, Component 2 is well behind schedule for fully achieving results by September 2019. However, the MTR team believes that with a time extension of 12 months, most of the targets under Component 2 are achievable.

Progress on <u>Component 1</u>, "Partnerships in Coastal and Ocean Governance Enabling a Self-Sustaining, Country-Owned Regional Mechanism Governing the LMES in the East Asian Region" has been good and the Outcomes are mostly on track for completion within the project timeframe. Cost-Sharing Agreements have been signed with China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore, securing support up to the end of 2018, and the Third-Party Assessment conducted in 2017 concluded that PEMSEA will be able to continue operating up to 2021 independent of new project funds or voluntary contributions. However, there remains a need to convince country partners that their contributions will provide a good return in terms of technical support, resource mobilisation and SDS-SEA implementation. The MTR Team considers that these contributions are vital to the long-term sustainability of PEMSEA.

<u>Component 2</u> of the project, *"Healthy and resilient marine and coastal ecosystems through conservation-focused ICM programs thereby increasing areal extent of healthy and resilient habitats"* represents the largest proportion of the budget (US\$5,607,870) and is implemented primarily at local/site levels. Significant delays were experienced at project start-up in most countries. As a result, it is unlikely that the end of project targets will be achieved by any countries, except China, within the scheduled timeframe. Despite this somewhat pessimistic view, many results have been achieved and progress is being made. For example, a significant achievement is that as of the end of 2017, 18% of the region's coastline was covered by an ICM programme and the project is well on track to achieve its 20% coverage target by the 2019.

Very good progress has been made towards achieving the outcomes of <u>Component 3</u>, "A knowledge platform for building a sustainable ocean-based blue economy". The PRF has undertaken a significant amount of work to establish the enabling environment to attract non-donor funding to support ongoing implementation of project results and a number of highly innovative products have been developed. There has been solid engagement with the private sector in several of the project sites, with several notable successes with the establishment of PPPs to support environmental improvement projects and ICM implementation.

Recommendation 2: PRF to develop a proposal to extend the project by (12) months to allow sufficient time to achieve progress towards outcomes in countries that have been delayed in starting implementation of project activities for the following outcomes and targets

Project implementation and adaptive management

The MTR team found that the project management provided by the PRF is highly efficient and effective. Key to this performance is the strong relationship between the country managers and their respective country counterparts, the fast response to enquiries and flexibility to adapt to problems and changing circumstances. However, the project team is considered to be under-resourced, making it vulnerable to departures of key staff.

Recommendation 3: *PRF to consider employing additional office back-stopping staff to support the project country managers, to reduce vulnerability to staff departure and protect against loss of institutional memory*

Despite the lack of gender-related activities and targets in the project design, it should be noted that the evidence from the field visits undertaken by the MTR team indicates a very high level of encouragement of equal representation of women and men in project activities.

Project expenditure appears to be moderately underspent at the time of the MTR, with approximately 53 percent of the budget expended to the end of 2017. This under-expenditure can largely be explained by country-specific expenditure profile differences.

Recommendation 4: PRF to review budget utilisation by country for the remainder of the project to assess whether funds could be re-allocated within the project to make more effective use of the remaining budget, recognising that some countries are unlikely to utilise their full allocation while other countries would benefit from additional funding.

The lack of formal tracking and reporting of co-financing has made it difficult to undertake a rigorous assessment of the status of co-financing at the mid-term of the project and the MTR team is therefore unable to draw any meaningful conclusions regarding this aspect of the project financial management.

Recommendation 5: *PRF to implement a formal reporting and tracking system to allow accurate monitoring of co-finance contributions and expenditure.*

Although regular QPRs, PIRs and APRs have been prepared as required, the complexity of the project and diverse reporting products has resulted in a fragmented set of output, sub-output and activity reports that has made it difficult for the MTR team to fully appreciate the extent to which progress towards project targets was being achieved.

Recommendation 6: *PRF to implement a harmonised set of reporting tools incorporating all relevant aspects of project progress, not only output achievements, to allow for more consistent and coherent reporting of results.*

A key strength of the project is the engagement of local governments, reinforced through the PNLG. It is evident that the 'bottom up' approach to ICM has led to raised awareness of coastal resource management issues and a strong sense of ownership at local level.

The project has had effective communications with stakeholders at the national level. All the National Focal Points interviewed confirmed that communication with the PRF has been clear, effective and usually timely and felt that they were kept informed about project progress. The PNLG is seen as an important and effective mechanism for communicating with local government partners and encouraging them to take ownership of project outcomes in their areas.

Recommendation 7: *PRF to organise at least one more site monitoring visit for UNDP and other stakeholders from the participating countries to any of the countries' ICM sites*

Only one monitoring visit (to IIo IIO ICM site in Philippines) has been organised in the past three years of the project. It is recommended to arrange at least one further monitoring visit to an ICM site in any of the participating countries. This will be useful to demonstate progress made and share lessons learned with UNDP and other stakeholders.

Sustainability

A critical issue relating to the long-term sustainability of PEMSEA relates to ongoing finance. The current governance arrangements for the PRF rely on contributions from the participating countries, yet only China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore are currently making voluntary contributions to the PEMSEA Trust Fund. There appears to be a disconnect between the countries' expectations and aspirations with respect to the long-term viability and their commitment to contribute financially to ensure this happens. The MTR team believes there is a clear need for a greater financial commitment from each of the participating countries to ensure that the PRF remains a viable partner in the region.

Recommendation 8:	In line with the recommendations of the Third-Party Assessment "Achieving a Self- Sustaining PEMSEA Resource Facility" (2017), member countries of the EAS Partnership Council are recommended to commit to multi-year voluntary contributions by the start of FY2020 to enable the PEMSEA Resource Facility Secretariat to become financially self-sustaining
Recommendation 9:	PRF to consider employing or engaging as a consultant a Business Development

- **Recommendation 9:** PRF to consider employing or engaging as a consultant a Business Development specialist to develop and promote their products and services to stakeholders in the region and beyond.
- **Recommendation 10:** *PRF to develop strategic engagements with:*
 - *(i) The Economist Global Ocean Initiative to explore opportunities to build private sector partnerships to support investment in the blue economy; and*

(ii) one or two high profile global businesses to develop a proof of concept pilot project for incorporating oceans sustainability into their corporate sustainability programmes

5.2 Recommendations

Table 13: Recommendations of the MTR

No.	Issue	Recommendation	Responsible Party
1	Objective and Outcome Targets	Re-assess targets for the Objective and following outcomes to ensure that they are realistic, measureable and achievable by the end of the project:	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility
		Objective Delete Indicator 2 and related Targets 2-6 since it to be more appropriate as an outcome indicator, since it is not considered to be directly related to the stated objective.	
		Outcome 1 Review Target 1.3 and assess if signing a Partnership Agreement with YSLME is achievable and if not, either delete this reference or consider amending to "establishing short-term collaborative arrangements with YSLME".	
		Move Target 1.4 to Outcome 9.	
		Outcome 4	
		Move Target 4.5 to Outcome 3.	
		Outcome 5	
		Amend Target 5.1 to read:	
		"Sustainable fisheries-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 1,140 km2 of threatened fishing grounds providing evidence of improved stock management and a reduction in overall fishing effort using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation, with replication of good practices initiated in 4 other threatened fishing grounds."	
		Consider whether Target 5.2 is an appropriate measure for this indicator.	
		Outcome 6	
		Amend Target 6.1 to read:	
		"Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management demonstration projects completed in priority watershed/coastal areas 25,000 km2 as identified in Table 16), providing evidence of management strategies	

		implemented to reduce levels of target pollutants (BOD; nutrients; and pathogens) and water resource conservation and use management." <u>Outcome 7</u> Review Target 7.1 and introduce metrics to provide evidence that it has been achieved, eg. community awareness-raising meetings held, evacuation routes established, emergency drills	
2	Project extension	Develop a proposal to extend the project by (12) months to allow sufficient time to achieve progress towards outcomes in countries that have been delayed in starting implementation of project activities for the following outcomes and targets: Outcome 1 To allow for achievement of Target 1.2, "Signed Agreements with Country and Non-Country Partners provide voluntary financing and in-kind commitments to sustain PEMSEA's core operations". To allow for achievement of Target 1.3, "Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA and YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms". Outcome 2 To allow for the achievement of Target 2.1 (National coastal and ocean policies) in Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor Leste and Vietnam. To allow for the completion of SOC reports in Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam (Target 4.1c) To allow for achievement of Target 4.2 (25% of local governments implementing ICM programs) in Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam To allow for achievement of Target 4.3 (Conservation focused ICM pilot demonstration projects) in Cambodia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility
		improvement in METT of MPA focused ICM pilot	

		demonstration sites) in Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam	
		Outcome 5 To allow for achievement of all targets in all countries.	
		Outcome 6 To allow for achievement of Target 6.1 (Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management), in light of the recommendation above to modify the indicator for this target for China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.	
		To allow for achievement of Target 6.2 (Innovative technologies) for Cambodia and Lao PDR.	
		Outcome 7	
		To allow for achievement of Target 7.1 (CCA/DRRM-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects) in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.	
		To allow for achievement of Target 7.2 (Sub- regional oil spill contingency planning) in Cambodia, Thailand and Vietnam.	
		Outcome 9	
		To allow for the achievement of Target 9.1 (National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs) in Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.	
		To allow for the achievement of Target 9.4 (evidenced-based sound policy on ICM) Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Timor Leste.	
3	Project Management	Consider employing additional office back- stopping staff at PEMSEA Resource Facility to support the project country managers, to reduce vulnerability to staff departure and protect against loss of institutional memory.	EAS Partnership Council and PEMSEA Resource Facility
4	Budget re- allocation	Review budget utilisation by country for the remainder of the project to assess whether funds could be re-allocated within the project to make more effective use of the remaining budget, recognising that some countries are unlikely to utilise their full allocation while other countries would benefit from additional funding.	UNDP and PEMSEA Resource Facility

5	Monitoring and Evaluation	Implement a formal reporting and tracking system to allow accurate monitoring of co-finance contributions and expenditure.	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility
6	Monitoring and Evaluation	Implement a harmonised set of reporting tools incorporating all relevant aspects of project progress, not only output achievements, to allow for more consistent and coherent reporting of results.	PEMSEA Resource Facility
7	Monitoring and Evaluation	Organise at least one more site monitoring visit for UNDP and other stakeholders from the participating countries to any of the countries' ICM sites	PEMSEA Resource Facility
8	Financial sustainability	In line with the recommendations of the Third- Party Assessment "Achieving a Self-Sustaining PEMSEA Resource Facility" (2017), member countries of the EAS Partnership Council are recommended to commit to multi-year voluntary contributions by the start of FY2020 to enable the PEMSEA Resource Facility Secretariat to become financially self-sustaining.	EAS Partnership Council
9	Financial sustainability	Consider employing or engaging as a consultant a Business Development specialist at PEMSEA Resource Facility to develop and promote its products and services to stakeholders in the region and beyond.	PEMSEA Resource Facility
10	Financial sustainability	 Develop strategic engagements with: (iii) The Economist Global Ocean Initiative to explore opportunities to build private sector partnerships to support investment in the blue economy; and (iv) One or two high profile global businesses to develop a proof of concept pilot project for incorporating oceans sustainability into their corporate sustainability programmes. 	Project Steering Committee and PEMSEA Resource Facility

Annex A

MTR Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review Consultant (International) Institutional, Legal and Governance consultant

Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)*, which is to be undertaken in January 2018. The project started on the Project Document signature date and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document <u>Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects</u>.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The UNDP/GEF/PEMSEA Project on Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) is a GEF project being implemented by UNDP and executed by PEMSEA. The countries bordering the EAS region - Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Philippines, RO Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Vietnam - endorsed the Project. The Project commenced in 2014 and will end in December 2019.

The Project is the fourth phase of the UNDP-GEF projects under the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA)¹. The overall goal of the project is to reduce pollution and rebuild degraded marine resources through scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) in Cambodia, PR China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam that share six large marine ecosystems (LMEs), and related catchment areas. The project covering 2014-2019 represents the "transformation phase" of a series of GEF support, culminating in the sustainability of PEMSEA as the regional coordinating mechanism for implementation of the SDS-SEA. It also makes a stronger linkage between sustainable development of river basins, coastal and marine areas and local, national and regional investment processes in a "blue economy".

The project objective is to catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region.

This objective will be achieved through the implementation of the following three interconnected Project components:

Component 1: PARTNERSHIPS IN COASTAL AND OCEAN GOVERNANCE ENABLING A SELF-SUSTAINING, COUNTRY-OWNED REGIONAL MECHANISM GOVERNING THE LMEs IN THE EAST ASIAN REGION

¹ Pilot phase project (1994-1999): "Marine Pollution Protection and Management of the East Asian Seas Region."; Second phase project (1999-2008): "Building Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia". Third phase project (2008-2014): "Implementation of the SDS-SEA".

- 1. A self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region.
- 2. National and local governments adopt and initiate ocean policy and institutional improvements
- 3. Innovative financing mechanisms in place for sustained operation of the country-owned regional coordinating mechanism

Outputs:

- Signed Agreements with Country and Non-Country Partners on voluntary financing
- Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA with YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms for collaborative planning, coordination and implementation among the respective SAPS, while addressing program sustainability and integration with broader regional cooperation frameworks
- The EAS program monitored, evaluated and reported to stakeholders via Regional State of Coasts and Oceans Report
- Improved national coastal and ocean policies and institutional arrangements for sustainable management
 of priority coastal and marine areas, surrounding watershed and blue economy development initiated in at
 least 6 participating countries
- National sector legislative agenda developed in at least 6 participating countries on ICM, CCA/DRR, integrated land and sea use zoning/marine spatial planning and other innovative regulatory and economic instruments
- SDS-SEA targets incorporated into national and local medium-term development and investment plans in at least 3 participating countries and 8 participating local governments, etc.
- Suite of products, services, funding mechanisms and partnership arrangements adopted and implemented in collaboration with Partners, Sponsoring Organizations, donors and private sector/business community

Component 2: HEALTHY AND RESILIENT MARINE AND COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS THROUGH CONSERVATION-FOCUSED ICM PROGRAMS THEREBY INCREASING AREAL EXTENT OF HEALTHY AND RESILIENT HABITATS

- 1. Increased areal extent of healthy, resilient habitats, including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other coastal habitats
- 2. Improved management of overexploited and depleted fisheries, leading to recovery
- 3. Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency/conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas
- 4. Increased preparedness and capability of coastal communities to respond to natural and manmade hazards
- 5. Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services

Outputs:

- ICM program coverage extended to 25 percent (45,000 km) of the region's coastline, with scaled-up national and local ICM program implementation in 8 participating countries
- Increased proportion of coastal and watershed areas and LMEs have zoning schemes, MSPs, PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management processes in place and functioning effectively as part of ICM programs
- Measurable improvements in the areal extent, health and resiliency of habitats in coastal waters and watershed areas, including biodiversity hotspots and areas-at-risk to climate change
- Strengthened MPAs functioning effectively in priority coastal and marine biodiversity areas, demonstrating improved management effectiveness, sustainability and benefits
- Innovative fisheries management schemes (i.e., ICM/EAFM) developed and implemented using ecosystembased approach to reduce overexploitation in selected threatened fishing grounds

- Reduced stress on coastal fisheries and improved household incomes, with implementation of alternative/ supplemental livelihood policies, capacities and incentive programs in coastal communities
- Reductions of pollutants (e.g., N; P; BOD) measured in priority river basins and coastal areas
- Innovative technologies and good practices in nutrient management and water use conservation demonstrated in priority coastal areas and river basins
- Adaptive management measures implemented in ICM sites to reduce impacts of climate change, improve oil spill preparedness, and strengthen maritime safety measures
- Port Safety Health and Environmental Management (PSHEM) Code adopted as an international standard for voluntary use in ports of participating countries
- Innovative economic and investment mechanisms (e.g., revolving funds, PPP, PES, carbon credits) tested and applied to help participating countries' national and local governments sustain and scale up ICM programs
- Corporations and the business community engaged as partners of local governments in ICM programs

Component 3: A KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM FOR BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE OCEAN-BASED BLUE ECONOMY

- 1. Regional knowledge sharing platform for ecosystem management established and enabling decision makers to translate policies and strategies into actions
- 2. Program contributed to global learning on scaling up investments in sustainable coastal and ocean management

Outputs:

- National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs for ICM sites, coastal seas and priority
 watersheds providing scientific and evidenced-based data on the effectiveness and impacts of management
 interventions and commitments
- State of the Oceans and Coasts Reports published and disseminated by participating countries
- Skills, knowledge and support services of national and sub-national governments enhanced through ICM Communities of Practice, including the PEMSEA Network for Local Governments (PNLG), Regional Task Force/National Task Force (RTF/NTF), etc.
- Evidence-based sound policy on ICM, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (DRR) in priority areas supported by research results on ecosystem modelling, including total allowable nutrient loading, etc.
- One percent of IW budget allocated to the regional knowledge platform to contribute to IWLearn activities, including IWLearn project websites, experience notes and IW Conferences
- Knowledge and best practice in ICM facilitated by outreach to programs promoting sustainable coastal and ocean development in large marine ecosystems of South Asia, South Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, etc.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR Consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports

including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR Consultants are expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the, UNDP Country Office, the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for International Waters, the focal agencies of the eight participating countries, and the PEMSEA Resource Facility.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials' component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR Consultant is expected to conduct a field mission to the countries and selected project sites. Interviews will be held with the government focal agencies per country and as well as other stakeholders.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

DURATION OF WORK

30 days spread over 4 months.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR Consultants will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities and Regional (East Asian Seas) strategies. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see <u>UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in</u> <u>Monitoring & Evaluating Results</u>, 05 Nov 2013.

³ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the <u>UNDP Handbook on Planning</u>, <u>Monitoring and Evaluating for Development</u> <u>Results</u>, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

• If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress
Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF- Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved;
assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target
to be achieved" (red).

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁴	Baseline Level⁵	Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target ⁶	End-of- project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁷	Achievement Rating ⁸	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targ	ets)
---	------

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

⁴ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁶ If available

⁷ Colour code this column only

⁸ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Implementing Partner meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

• Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Implementing Partner and country-partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

• What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk
that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will
be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see
that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder
awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the
Project Implementing Partner on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could
learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

• Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

• Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR Consultants will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁹

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR Consultants should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR Consultants will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards	Objective Achievement	
Results	Rating. (rate o pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1	
	Achievement Rating:	
	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2	
	Achievement Rating:	
	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3	
	Achievement Rating:	
	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

⁹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Project	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementation &		
Adaptive		
Management		c
		0.
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	TIMEFR
		AME

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
November 2017	Application closes
December 2017	Select MTR Consultants
Within 1 week after contract signing	Prep the MTR Consultants (handover of Project Documents)
2 weeks after contract signing	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
Mid-January 2018	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
30 days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
1 day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
15 days	Preparing draft report
5 days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
5 days	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
1 day (June/July 2018)	Presentation to the Project Steering Committee
31 August 2018	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception	MTR Consultants clarify	No later than 2	MTR Consultants submit
	Report	objectives and methods of	weeks before the	to the Commissioning
		Midterm Review	MTR mission	Unit and project
				management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Consultants
				present to project
				management and the
				Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines	Within 3 weeks of	Sent to the
		on content outlined in	the MTR mission	Commissioning Unit,

		Annex B) with annexes		reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Philippines. The commissioning unit will contract the consultants – after review of the selected candidate by UNDP CO - and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the MTR Consultants (if necessary). UNDP CO will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Consultants to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. QUALIFICATIONS

A team of specialists will be formed to conduct the MTR. It will consist of an Institutional, Legal and Governance consultant and a Coastal and Ocean Management consultant. The former will serve as the team leader and will be responsible in consolidating the full report. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Institutional, Legal and Governance Consultant

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- Experience working in the East Asian Region (15%);
- Academic and/or professional background in coastal and ocean governance, preferably with international exposure, and policy and resource and environmental management with a minimum of 15 years relevant experience (20%);
- Detailed knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, with particular emphasis on regional priorities (10%);
- Familiarity with policies, institutions, programmes and operational dynamics of local and national governments in East Asia (10%);
- Professional experience in the application of the ICM approach for sustainable development of coastal and marine resources and environment (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5%);
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%)

Coastal and Ocean Management Consultant

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- A postgraduate degree in marine affairs, environment, economics or relevant field (10%)
- At least 15 years professional experience in the application of the ICM or similar approach for the sustainable development of coastal and marine resources, with working knowledge of relevant international instruments (20%);
- Knowledge of project development, including environmental investments and market-based instruments (10%);
- Experience working in and has knowledge of the East Asian region, with experience in the development and implementation of technical assistance programs in support of human resources development and institutional capacity-building in various aspects of sustainable coastal and ocean development, including in area of biodiversity, fisheries, land-based and marine pollution management, water use management, natural and man-made hazards, and relevant issues (15%);
- Knowledge of trends and markets related to information products and services (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5%);
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%)

The International Consultants, will primarily cover the tasks, but not limited to the following:

- 1. Prepare the MTR Inception Report including a detailed plan of the mission with an interview schedule, evaluation questions and provide it to the UNDP and PRF no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission
- 2. Ensure the conduct of evaluation activities as agreed on with PRF and UNDP; (including visits to/interviews with 8 participating countries)
- 3. Consolidate and analyze data and information gathered during the evaluation;
- 4. Finalize the MTE Report.

In consultation with the Consultants and as requested, the PRF and UNDP CO will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The Consultants will request PRF to assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders' input in the evaluation draft report.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Consultants will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

Table 6. Payment Schedule

// Innestone

20%	Following submission and acceptance of
	the MTR mission Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the
	1ST draft MTR report
40%	Following submission and approval
	(UNDP CO and IW RTA) of the final MTR
	report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<u>http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs</u>). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

TOR ANNEX A LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE MTR Consultants¹⁰

- 1. PIF
- 2. UNDP Initiation Plan
- 3. UNDP Project Document
- 4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- 5. Project Inception Report
- 6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
- 7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- 8. Audit reports
- 9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
- 10. Oversight mission reports
- 11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
- 12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by the Project
- 13. Project Document and CEO Endorsement
- 14. Annual Reports (Inception Report, 2015 and 2016)
- 15. Quarterly Reports
- 16. APRs/PIRs (2015, 2016, 2017)
- 17. Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings
- 18. Work and Financial Plans (2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹¹

- i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR CO members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table

¹⁰ This list will be updated before MTE as more documents become available.

¹¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
- **2.** Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- **3.** Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
 - Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes

5.

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)

ToR ANNEX B: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology			
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership,						
and the best route towards	s expected results?					
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)			
Progress Towards Results:	To what extent have the exp	ected outcomes and objectiv	es of the project been			
achieved thus far?						
Project Implementation an	d Adaptive Management: Ha	as the project been implement	nted efficiently, cost-			
effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?						
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?						

TOR ANNEX C: MTR RATINGS

_					
Ra	Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)				
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".			
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.			
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.			
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.			
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.			
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.			

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating) Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation Highly 6 systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications - is leading Satisfactory (HS) to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice". Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and 5 Satisfactory (S) effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and Moderately 4 effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some Satisfactory (MS) components requiring remedial action.

	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ra	Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)				
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future			
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review			
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on			
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained			

ToR ANNEX D: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:			
Commissioning Unit			
Name:			
Signature:	Date:		
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor			
Name:			
Signature:	Date:		

ANNEX F: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluato	rs:		
1.	Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.		
2.	Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.		
3.	Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.		
4.	Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.		
5.	Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.		
6.	Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.		
7.	Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.		
	Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form ¹²		
Agreeme	ent to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System		
Name of	Consultant:		
Name of	Consultancy Organization (where relevant):		
I confirm	that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.		
Signed at (place) on date			
Signature	2:		

 $^{^{12}\,}www.undp.org/unegcode of conduct$

TOR ANNEX G EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹³

Opening Page

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR Consultants
- Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual¹⁴)

1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁵)

¹³ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits

¹⁵ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX H: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared b	у
UNDP County Office	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:

Annex I

CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

IA Own Financing Co Financing (Million US \$)		Government (Million US \$)		Other Sources ¹⁶ (Million US \$)		Total Financing (Million US \$)		Total Disbursement (Million US \$)		
Types/Sources	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In Kind										
Non grant										
instruments ¹⁷										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

¹⁶ Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain "Other sources" of co-financing when possible.

 $^{^{\}rm 17}$ Describe "Non-grant instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)

Annex B

List of Documents Reviewed

DOCUMENT	DATE	
Project Documents		
Project Identification Form (PFI)	16/04/2013	
Project Approval Letter	26/08/2014	
Project Document (Signed)	26/08/2014	
Request for CEO Endorsement	23/10/2013	
GEF - STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form	06/05/2013	
GEF Project Review Sheet		
Annual Performance Reviews		
2016 Annual Progress Report		
2017 Annual Progress Report		
2016 Project Implementation Review		
2017 Project Implementation Review		
2018 Project Implementation Review (Draft – up to 15 April 2018)		
Audit Reports		
2015 Project Audit Report		
2016 Project Audit Report		
HACT Financial Audit Report 2016		
Finalized GEF Tracking Tools		
GEF International Waters Tracking Tool	12/08/2013	
Finance & Administration Guidelines		
PEMSEA Resource Facility – Financial Regulations and Rules. Document No. GUI-AFH-001	16/06/2014	
Minutes of Project Steering Committees		
Proceedings of the Project Steering Committee Meeting of the GEF/UNDP/PEMSEA Project on	25/06/2015	
Scaling Up Implementation of the SDS-SEA. Document No. PEMSEA/WP/2015/36		
Proceedings of the Project Steering Committee Meeting of the GEF/UNDP/PEMSEA Project on	24/07/2017	
Scaling Up Implementation of the SDS-SEA. Document No. PEMSEA/WP/2017/39		
GEF/UNDP/PEMSEA Project on Scaling Up the SDS-SEA Implementation – Full Size Project:	25/03/2015	
Project Inception Meeting Report		
Manitaning Danasta		
Wonitoring Reports		
Draiget QA Assessment 2016		
Project QA Assessment 2017		
Project QA Assessment - 2017		
Work and Einancial Dianc		
2014 Appual Work Plan and Pudgot	12/07/2012	
2014 Annual Work Plan and Budget	25/06/2014	
2015 Annual Work Plan and Budget	23/00/2014	
2017 Annual Work Plan and Budget		
2017 Annual Work Plan and Budget		
LINDP Environmental and Social Screening Procedure		

PEMSEA Publications			
ICM Solutions: Participatory Beach Management Results in Improved Tourism in Occheauteal			
Beach, Preah Sihanouk, Cambodia			
ICM Solutions: Leveraging Public-Private Sector Partnerships in ICM Through Corporate Social			
Responsibility (CSR)			
ICM Solutions: Visualizing the Health of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems: Systematic Gathering			
and Use of Data and Information for Effective Planning and Management of Coastal and			
Marine Areas			
ICM Solutions: A Small Venture in Environmental Monitoring Proves a Wise Investment in			
Batangas Province, Philippines			
ICM Solutions: Improving Sanitation Through Community-Based Solid Waste Management:			
Experiences in Cambodia and Lao PDR			
Seas of East Asia Knowledge bank: Applying Knowldeg Management to Scale up Partnership			
Investments for Sustainable Development of Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their			
Coasts			
Integrated Costal Management and Sustainable Development of Coasts and Oceans:			
Investment Landscape Mapping in East Asia	2015		
Blue Economy for Business in East Asia: Towards an Integrated Understanding of Vlue Economy			
– Summary Brief			
SDS-SEA: Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia	2015		
Building a Socialized Model of Domestic Waste Management in Hoi An – GEF Small Grants			
Programme Project Information Note			
Sustainable Wetlands Management in Quang Nam Province, Vietnam – Wetlands Alliance	November		
	2013		
Promoting Integrated River Basin Management of the Vu Gia-Thu Bon River System - Loc Vu	November		
Trung/WWF Fact Sheet	2013		

Annex C

Stakeholders Consulted During the MTR Mission

ORGANISATION	NAME	POSITION		
Project Coordination	and Management			
UNDP	Mr Michael Joseph Jaldon	Programme Associate, UNDP Philippines		
	Dr Jose Padilla	Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP Regional Office		
PEMSEA Resource	Ms Aimee Gonzales	Executive Director		
Facility	Mr Stephen Adrian Ross	Project Coordinator		
	Ms Kathrine Rose Gallardo	PRF Secretariat Coordinator		
	Ms Nancy Bermas- Atrigenio	Senior Country Programme Manager		
	Ms Cristine Ingrid Narcise	Country Programme Manager		
	Ms Daisy Padayao	Country Programme Manager		
	Ms Johanna Diwa-Acallar	Capacity Development Manager		
	Mr Renato Cardinal	Programme Manager, Partnership Applications		
	Mr Ryan Whisnant	Director of Strategic Initiatives		
National/Operationa	l Focal Points			
Cambodia	Mr Long Rithirak	Deputy Director General, MoE		
China	Dr Zhang Zhaohui,	Deputy Director, China-PEMSEA Centre		
Indonesia	Mr Dida Migfar Ridha	Director, Marine and Coastal Degradation and Pollution Control, MEF		
Lao PDR	Dr Inthavy Akkharath	Director General, Department of Water Resources, MONRE		
Philippines	Ms Analiza Teh	Undersecretary/Chief of Staff, DENR		
Thailand	Mr Dhana Yingcharoen	Director, Department of Marine and Coastal Resources, MNRE		
Timor Leste	Mr Mario M. Cabral	SDS-SEA Projector Coordinator		
Vietnam	Ms Nguyen Thanh Thao	Deputy Director, Department of International Cooperation and Science and Technology, Vietnam Administration for Seas and Islands		
Non-Country Partner	rs			
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)	Ms Sheila Vergava			
YSLME	Mr Guo Yinfeng			
WPEAP	Dr Sungkwoh Soh			
PML	Prof. Icarus Allen	Deputy Chief Executive and Chief of Science		
Cambodia Country V	isit	1		
Kampong Smach Fishery Community	Mr. Kie Lar	Sangkat Chief of Fishery Administration Cantonment		
	Mr. Sao Theang	Chief of Fishery Community of Ambu Khmao		
	Mr. Kouy Sari	Chief of Fishery Community of Chrolong		
	Mr. Kong Vitanak	Deputy Governor, PMO Director		

Midterm Review Report, July 2018 Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

ICM Dura in at		
ICM Project	Mar Duels Maral	
Management Office and	Mr. Prak Visai	
Unice and Tochnical Working	Mis. Nay Sally	
Group	Mr. Touch Norn	Chief of Office, Department of Environment
Group	Mr. Tep Sinora	Deputy Director, Department of Environment
	Mr. Sok Chantheoun	Deputy Director, Department of Water Resources and Meteorology
	Mr. Sin Sothanath	Deputy Director, Fishery Administration and Inspection
	Mr. Lim Sran	Vice Chief of Office, Wastewater Unit
		Department of Public Works and Transport
	Mrs. In Chantha	Deputy Director, Department of Tourism
Koh Rong Sanlem	Mr. Lay Thay	Chief of Fishery Community
Fishery Community	Mr. Sok Neth	1st Vice Commune Leader
	Mr. Ngat Savaeun	2nd Vice Commune Leade
Sihanoukville	Dr. Chhun Hong	Deputy Director General of Administration,
Autonomous Port	_	Management
	Mr. Men Chann	Director of Internal Audit
	Mr. May Sam Aun	
Indonesia Country V	isit	
Tangerang Regency	Dr. Komarudin	OIC Regent of Tangerang Regency
	Mr. Herry Wibowo	Head of Fisheries Agency
	Mr. Didin Syamsudin	Head of Bappeda (Planning) Agency
	Mr. Hari Mahardika	Administrator, Fish Fry Center, Fisheries Agency
		ICM Program Coordinator
	Mr. Erwin Mawandy	Bappeda Planning and Infrastructure Division
	Mr. Widodo	Bappeda Planning and Infrastructure Division
	Mr. Haji Lukman	Head, Division of Road and Irrigation, Public Works
		Agency
	Didi Setiardi	Fisheries Agency
	Ms. Erni Nurlaeni	Section Head - Spatial Planning Agency
	Mr. Rahmat Lubis	General Manager, PLTU Lontar Tangerang
Center for Coastal	Dr. Ario Damar	Director
and Marine	Ms. Isdahartati	Technical Staff
Resources Studies,	Mr. Akhmad Solihin	Technical Staff
Bogor Agricultural		
University		
Sukabumi Regency	Mr. Abdul Kodir	Head of Environmental Agency of Sukabumi Regency
	Mr. Rasyad Muhara	Environmental Agency of Sukabumi Regency
	Mr. Tatang Kurniawan	Environmental Agency of Sukabumi Regency
	Mr. Dana Budiman	Head of Tourism Agency of Sukabumi Regency
		General Manager of Ciletuh-Palabuhanratu Geopark
	Mr. Trisda Filtra	Environmental and Spatial Planning Section
		Secretariat of Sukabumi Regency Government
	Ms. Leni Lidyawati	Marine and Fisheries Agency of Sukabumi Regency
	Ms. Aditya Yuniarti	Directorate of Marine and Coastal Degradation and
		Pollution Control, MEF
	Mr. Dadang	Head of the Team for Preservation and Management
	-	of Palabuhanratu Bay Coast
	Ms. Risda Rosipah	Head of Guide Group, TP3TP
	Mr. Endang	Head of PAPSI (Pupuk Alam Alam
	_	Pakidulan Sukabumi/Sukabumi Nature Society Circle)

	Mr. Endang	Head of PAPSI (Pupuk Alam Alam
		Pakidulan Sukabumi/Sukabumi Nature Society Circle)
Philippines Country \	/isit	
Batangas Port	Atty. Leopoldo Biscocho,	Port Manager
	Mr. Restituto Sabellena	
	Mr. Suzie Welges	Environment Specialist
	Mr. Benjie Ilao	
	Mr. Bonald Dionnie D	Field Coordinator, GEE/UNDP SMARTSeas PH Project
	Olivades	
Conservation	Ms Vivienne Padura	
International-		
Philippines		
De La Salle Lipa	Mr. Bernard Lunar	
University	Mr. Jon Errol Sunga	
	Mr. Rommel Briones	
Batangas State	Ms. Lorena Candava, Head	ENR and Planning Section
University		
Provincial	Ms. Mavic Esmas	Head Environmental Laboratory
Government-	Ms. Jovce Faith M. Dijan	Natural Resources Conservation and Solid Waste
Environment and		Managament Division
Natural Resources	Ms. Diven Mercado	Admin Services
Office (Pg-Enro)	Ms. Lerma Balitaan	Admin Services
	Ms. She Perez	ENR and Planning Section
	Mr. Gaudisio Jurly Manalo	Municipal Mayor
Municipality of	Mr. Romulo Catanda	Municipal Agriculture Office (MPA Focal Person)
Lobo	Mr. Perfecto Maestro	Municipal Administrator
Municipality of	Mr. Leomer Arnigo	Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Officer
Taysan		(MENRO)
Vietnam Country Vis	it	
Vietnam	Ms. Nguyen Thanh Thao	Deputy Director, Department of International
Adminsitration for		Cooperation, Science and Technology
Seas and Islands	Ms. Vu Thi Hai Van	
	Mr. Iran Van Hung	
	Mis. Nguyen Hoang Yen	Director
Quang Nam Agency	Mr. Nguyen Luong Tu,	
Or Seas and Islands,	Mr. Tran Nguyen Hien	Опісіаі
Natural Resources	Ma Va Thi Hang Linh	Official Environment Protection Division
and Environment	Mr. Bham Van Quang	
Mangrovo	Mr. Chu Maph Triph	
Rehabilitation		
Program in An Hoa		
Research and	Ms Pham Thi Chin	Director
International		
Cooperation		
Division, Cham		
Islands MPA		

Danang Agency of	Ms. Phan Thi Thu Thuy	Official
Seas and Islands	Ms. Duong Thi Kim	Official
	Ms. Trang Vu Hoang Le	Official
Tho Quang	Mr Lam	Chair
Commune Club for	Mr Dinh	Member
Sustainable	Mr Sau	Member
Development		

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

Annex D

MTR Evaluation Matrix

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Evaluation Criteria: Project Strategy – Key Question "To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route toward expected results?"			
Project DesignDo objectives and outcomes address country prioritiesand regional strategies?Have issues materialized due to incorrect assumptionsor changes to the context to achieving the projectresults as outlined in the Project Document?Were lessons learnt from the precedingimplementation project properly incorporated into theproject design?Are the project activities being carried out and theoutputs being delivered the most effective route toachieving the project's expected results?Have gender issues been integrated into the projectdesign?	Level of coherence between project design and development priorities Participating countries aligned with project concept Perspectives of relevant parties were consulted Recommendations of Implementation phase were incorporated in project design Gender issues considered in project design	PIF, ProDoc, Project Inception Report, UNDAF Outcomes, PIRs, AWPs, quarterly progress reports Interviews with PRF project team, country partners and key stakeholders	Document review Unstructured and structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face.
Results Framework/Logframe Are the project's logframe and results framework indicators SMART? Are the project's objectives and outcomes clear, practical and feasible within the project timeframe? Has progress so far led to beneficial development effects or could it do so in the future (eg. Income generation gender equality, women's empowerment, improved governance)?	Results framework indicators considered SMART Evidence at MTR stage that objectives and outcomes are feasible within project timeframe Evidence at MTR stage that beneficial development effects are being generated	PIF, ProDoc, PIRs, APRs, AWPs QPRs, minutes of PSC meetings. Interview with PRF project team, UNDP, country partners, other key stakeholders	Document review Unstructured and structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology	
Evaluation Criteria: Progress Towards Results – Key Question "To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?"				
Have any outputs programmed to have been delivered by this stage of the project not been achieved and what effect does this have on achievement of outcomes? Have there been any changes to planned activities and outputs, and if so, how was the implementation schedule and budget adapted to accommodate the change(s)? Are there any barriers to achieving project outcomes and objectives during the remainder of the project?	Output delivery status Impact of delays on project implementation Changes to planned activities and outputs Barriers to progress identified	PIRs, APRs, AWPs, QPRs, minutes of PSC meetings Interviews with PRF project team	Document review Unstructured interviews in person	

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology	
Evaluation Criteria: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management – Key Question "Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far?"				
Management Arrangements Is the project management structure operating effectively, producing efficient results and synergies (in terms of reduced transaction costs etc.)? Has the support provided by UNDP been effective and timely? Have any problems been encountered and if so, how have these been rectified?	Project organogram shows clear structure and lines of responsibility Evidence that project management decisions have delivered efficient results	PEMSEA administrative documents, website, ProDoc, PIRs, APRs, AWPs, QPRs, minutes of PSC meetings Interviews with PRF project team, PEMSEA Executive Director, PEMSEA Financial Controller	Document review Unstructured interviews in person	
Work Planning Were any delays encountered in project start up and implementation? What were the causes of the delays and how have these been resolved?	Details of project delays and resolution Results framework/logframe comply with results-based management	QPRs, ARPs, AWPs Interviews with PRF project team, PEMSEA Executive Director, PEMSEA Financial Controller	Document review Unstructured interviews in person.	

Are work-planning processes based on results-based management and is the results framework/logframe being used as a management tool? Have any changes been made to it since project start? Have any problems or delays been encountered in the transfer of funds from UNDP and if so, how has this affected project implementation?	Timeline of transfer of funds against project budget requirements		
Finance and co-finance Are appropriate financial controls in place that allow management to make informed budget decisions and allow for the timely flow of funds? Have changes been made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and if so, are these appropriate and relevant to the revisions? Has pledged co-financing materialized? If not, what are the reasons behind the co-financing not materializing or falling short of targets? Is PEMSEA meeting with all co-financing partners regularly to align financial priorities and annual work plans?	Demonstrable financial control and due diligence Budget variation orders approved Details of co-financing received against co-financing pledged Meetings/communications between PEMSEA and co-financing partners	PIRs, QPRs, APRs, AWPs, minutes of PSC meetings Interviews with PRF project team, PEMSEA Executive Director, PEMSEA Financial Controller	Document review Unstructured interviews in person.
Project Level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation? Are there sufficient resources allocated for monitoring and evaluation and are these being used effectively?	Timely and meaningful monitoring of project activities result in adaptive management measures Funding and resource allocation for M&E	ProDoc, PIRs, APRs, QPRs, AWPs Interviews with PRF project team, PEMSEA Financial Controller	Document review Unstructured interviews in person.

Stakeholder Engagement Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with stakeholders? Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in decision-making to support efficient and effective implementation? To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards the achievement of objectives?	Partnership agreements with implementing partners and other key stakeholders National and local governments remain committed to the project objectives Stakeholder ownership and public awareness	ProDoc, project inception report, minutes of PSC meetings, EAS Partnership Council meeting report Interviews with National Focal Points	Document review Structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face
Have adaptive management changes been reported by project management and shared with the project board and other key stakeholders? Have GEF reporting requirements been undertaken by the PRF and country partners?	changes to Project Board and other key stakeholders Reports submitted to GEF by PRF and country partners, as required	GEF Tracking Tool	Document review
<u>Communications</u> Has communication between the PRF and the stakeholders been clear, effective and timely? What external outreach and public awareness campaigns have been conducted and have these been effective?	Regular, timely and effective communication between PRF and stakeholders Public awareness promotion and outreach campaign	Project correspondence file, responses from stakeholders logged. Public awareness and outreach publications, PEMSEA website Interviews with PRF project team, National Focal Points and other stakeholders	Document review Unstructured and structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology	
Evaluation Criteria: Sustainability – Key Question "To what extent are there financials, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?"				
Financial Risks to Sustainability What financial and economic resources are likely to be available once the GEF assistance ends?	Commitment/pledges/intentions of country partners to invest in cash and/or in kind Mechanisms established to attract investment from public and private sectors, income generating activities and market transformations	Interviews with PEMSEA Executive Director, PRF project team. Interviews with National Focal Points	Unstructured interviews in person Structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face.	
Socio-economic Risk to Sustainability Does the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership)? Can the project strategies effectively be incorporated/mainstreamed into future planning? What is the risk that that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to sustain the project outcomes/benefits?	Ownership of project outcomes by country partners. Risk assessment of foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership.	ProDoc, project inception report, PIRs, APRs, QPRs, AWPs Interviews with National Focal Points and other key stakeholders. Interviews with PEMSEA Executive Director, PRF project team.	Document review Unstructured and structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face.	

			1
Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability Are there legal frameworks, policies and governance structures in place and are these sufficient to sustain project outcomes and benefits? Has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? Has the project achieved stakeholders' (including government stakeholders') consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date?	Legal frameworks, policies and governance structures established to sustain project outcomes and benefits Institutional capacity developed for self-sufficiency at country level Course of action on project activities after the project's closure agreed by stakeholders	ProDoc, project progress reports and publications, minutes of PSC meetings, EAS Partnership Council meeting report Interviews with National Focal Points, government and non-government partners and other key stakeholders	Document review Structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face.
Environmental Risks to Sustainability Are there environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders?	Risk assessment of environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results	PIF, ProDoc, project inception report, PIRs, QPRs, APRs, minutes of PSC meetings Interviews with PRF project team, National Focal Points and other stakeholders	Document review Unstructured and structured interviews by phone, Skype or face to face.

Annex E

Stakeholder Interview Questions and Templates

a. National Focal Point Questionnaire

Country:	Date/time:	
Name of Respondent:	Interviewer:	

Na	ational Focal Point Questionnaire	
Pr	oject Benefits and Results	
1.	Was the project design in line with national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?	•
2.	Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
3.	What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented in <country> to date?</country>	•
4.	How has the project helped to develop the capacity of <country> to continue the project activities after the close of the project?</country>	•

Pr	oject Achievability	
5.	How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results to date?	•
6.	Were any unforeseen delays experienced during project start up?	•
7.	How achievable do you think the project results are in <country> within the time remaining for the project?</country>	•
8.	Could improvements be made to make delivery more effective?	•
9.	What barriers have you identified to achieving the outcomes and objectives of the project?	•

10.	To what extent has the involvement of local partners contributed to the success of	
	the site-specific projects?	

Project Management Arrangements	
11. Has communication between PEMSEA and <country> been clear, effective and on time?</country>	•
12. Do you provide feedback to PEMSEA when you receive communications from them?	•
13. Are you aware of who at PEMSEA you should be communicating with regarding project management?	•
14. Does PEMSEA share the annual Project Implementation Reviews with you and do you have an opportunity to provide feedback?	•
15. How well do you think PEMSEA has communicated the project to countries and local project partners? Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Sustainability	
16. What does <country> expect to happen at the end of the current project to sustain the project results?</country>	•
17. How important is it to <country> that the programme continues after September 2019?</country>	•
18. How relevant is PEMSEA to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
19. What could <country> do to make to ensure that results continue after September 2019?</country>	•
20. What could <country> do to make to ensure that PEMSEA continues after September 2019?</country>	•

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

b. Non-Country Partners Questionnaire

Non-Country Partner:	Date/time:	
Name of Respondent:	Interviewer:	

Non-Country Partner Questionnaire		
Project Benefits and Results		
1.	How familiar are you with the PEMSEA project?	•
2.	Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
3.	What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented in to	•
	date?	

Project Achievability		
4.	How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results to date?	•
5.	Were any unforeseen delays experienced during project start up?	•
6.	Could improvements be made to make delivery more effective?	•

Project Management Arrangements		
7.	Has communication between PEMSEA and <partner> been clear, effective and on time?</partner>	•
8.	Do you provide feedback to PEMSEA when you receive communications from them?	•
9.	How well do you think PEMSEA has communicated the project to countries and local project partners? Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) PIMS ID: 4752

Sustainability	
10. What does <partner> expect to happen at the end of the current project to sustain the project results?</partner>	•
11. How relevant is PEMSEA to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
12. How do you see your relationship with PEMSEA continuing after the project end?	•

c. Local Stakeholder Questionnaire

Country/Project Site:	Date/time:	
Name of Respondent:	Interviewer:	

No	on-Country Partner Questionnaire	
Local Benefits and Results		
1.	How would you rate your knowledge about the project? (H/M/L)	•
2.	How important do you think this project is, and why? (Very/moderately/less)	•
3.	Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
4.	What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented to date. [eg. PSHEM code for ports]	•
5.	Is equal representation and participation of women and men in project activities encouraged? Please elaborate.	•

Pr	ogress Towards Results	
6.	How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results so far in your area? (Excellent/Good/Poor)	•
7.	Were any delays experienced during project start up? Have you experienced any other problems?	•
8.	How achievable do you think the project results are in your area within the time remaining for the project? $(H/M/L)$	•

9.	What improvements could be made to make delivery more effective?	•

Project Management Arrangements	
10. How do you rate PEMSEAs' Project management, communications, efficiency & general administration: (Excellent/Adequate/Poor). Please elaborate	•
11. Have you been kept informed about the progress of the project? (Y/N)	•
12. How well do you think PEMSEA has communicated the project to local project partners?	•
13. Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Sustainability	
14. How has the project helped to develop capacity to continue the project activities after the close of the project?	•
15. How important is it to you that the programme continues after September 2019? [for higher level interviewees]	•
16. Do you plan to continue with the activities after the programme finishes in September 2019? (Y/N)	•
17. How important is PEMSEA to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
18. How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results so far in your area? (Excellent/Good/Poor)	•

General Feedback	
19. Please list 1 or 2 major strengths of the project	•
20. Please list any major weaknesses	•
21. What are the lessons learnt to date?	•
22. What message would you like conveyed in the MTR?	•

Annex F

List of Partners and stakeholders (Excluding ICM Site Partners)

Country	Cambodia (Focal Point: Ministry of Environment)									
Partners (and	China (Focal Point: State Oceanic Administration)									
Members of the	• DPR Korea (Focal Point: General Bureau for Cooperation with International Organizations)									
council)	 Indonesia (Focal Point: Ministry of Environment and Forestry) 									
,	Japan (Focal Point: Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism)									
	Lao PDR (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)									
	Philippines (Focal Point: Department of Environment and Natural Resources)									
	RO Korea (Focal Point: Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries)									
	Singapore (Focal Point: Ministry of the Environment and Water Resources)									
	Timor Leste (Focal Point: Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries)									
	Vietnam (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)									
Collaborating Countries	 Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)- Signatory to Projec t on Scaling up SDS-SEA but not a full Country Partner vet 									
	 Malaysia (not a full Country Partner vet but is supporting/participating in several PEMSEA i 									
	nitiatives including the National and Local SOC reporting system									
	• Myanmar (included in the countries for the IRBM project being developed with UNDP)									
Non-Country	Asean Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)									
Partners (and	Coastal Management Center (CMC)									
Nembers of the	Conservation International (CI) Philippines									
Council)	International Environmental Management of Enclosed Coastal Seas Center (EMECS)									
,	 Philippines (Focal Point: Department of Environment and Natural Resources) RO Korea (Focal Point: Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries) Singapore (Focal Point: Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries) Timor Leste (Focal Point: Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries) Vietnam (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand (Focal Point: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment) Thailand and Local SOC reporting system Myanmar (included in the countries for the IRBM project being developed with UNDP) Asean Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) Coastal Management Center (CMC) Coastal Management Center (CMC) Conservation International (CI) Philippines International Environmental Management of Enclosed Coastal Seas Center (EMECS) UNEP Global Programme of Action (UNEP/GPA) IIOC Sub-Commission for the Western Pacific (IOC-Westpac) International Ocean Institute (IOI) International Ocean Institute (KEI) Korea Environment Institute (KEI) Korea Institute o									
	IIOC Sub-Commission for the Western Pacific (IOC-Westpac)									
	International Ocean Institute (IOI)									
	International Union for the Conservation of Nature - Asia Regional Office									
	• (IUCN)									
	Korea Environment Institute (KEI)									
	 Korea Institute of Ocean Science And Technology (KIOST) 									
	Korea Maritime Institute (KMI)									
	Korea Environment Management Corporation (KOEM)									
	Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea (MABIK)									
	The Ocean Policy Research Institute (OPRI)									
	Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP)									
	Oil Spill Response (OSR)									
	Plymouth Marine Laboratory (PML)									
	PNLG For Sustainable Coastal Development									
	UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP)									
	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)									
	UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea LLM Project (YSLME)									
PNLG Associate	Coastal and Ocean Management Institute, Xiamen University, China									
members	First Institute of Oceanography, State Oceanic Administration, China									
PEMSEA Network	Regional Centers of Excellence									
Centers	1. Centre for Marine Environmental Research and Innovative Technology									
	(MERIT) – Hong Kong									

	2. Marine Science Institute – University of the Philippines
	(UP-MSI) - Philippines
	ICM Learning Centers
	1 Roval University of Phnom Penh (RUPP) - Cambodia
	2. Xiamen University - China
	3. Zheijang University- China
	4. Kim II Sung University - DPR Korea
	5. Center for Coastal and Marine Resources Studies (PKSPL)- Bogor Agricultural University (BAU)
	- Indonesia
	6. Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Sciences - Diponegoro University (UNDIP) - Indonesia
	7. Center for Sustainable Development - Udayana University (CSFD-UNUD) - Indonesia
	8. De La Salle University Lipa (DLSL) - Philippines
	9. University of the Philippines Visayas (UPV) - Philippines
	10. Xavier University-Ateneo de Cagayan (XU) - Philippines
	11. Burapha University (BUU) - Thailand
	12. Prince of Songkla University (PSU) - Thailand
	13. Oriental University of Timor Leste (UNITAL) - Timor Leste
	14. University of Timor Leste (UNTL) - Timor Leste
Ports (Involved in	15. Danang University (DO) - Vietnam
PSHEMS)	- Dort of Potongoo
	Port of Batangas
	Port of Cagayan de Oro
	Port of General Santos
	Thailand
	Bangkok Port, Port Authority of Thailand
	Laem Chabang Port, Port Authority of Thailand
	Cambodia
	Phnom Penh Autonomous Port
	Sihanoukville Autonomous Port
	Malaysia
	 Port of Tanjung Pelepas
Collaborators/Sta	The Economist Intelligence Unit
keholders	Closed Loop Ocean
Related to	Althelia Ecosphere
Investments	Credit Suisse
	Encourage Capital
	ARCOWA
	World Ocean Council
	Manila Water Company Inc.
	Meliomar Inc.
	Philippine Association of Crab Processors, Inc.
	Holcim Indonesia
	Petron

	PT Badak NGL, Indonesia
	Smart Communications
	Dongtion Park
	• ESKAYA
	Batangas Coastal Resource Management Foundation
Collaborators	YSLME
(other	WCPFC
subregional/regi	Sulu-Sulawesi
funding agencies.	• ATSEA
etc)	COBSEA
	ASEAN-GIZ
	The World Bank
	• ADB
	• CTI
	CCRES
	Conservation International
	• EEPSEA
	World Fish
	SEAFDEC
	UN ISDR
	• WRI
	UNEP
	• FAO
	FAO-BOBLME
	UMCES
	ECOFISH
	NPARKS Singapore
	Tetra Tech Ard Inc., Philippine Branch
	The University of Wollongong
	Silvestrum Climate Associates LLC
	MIMA Malaysia
	Thailand Environment Institute

Annex G

SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework

SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Objective)							
Objective: To catalyze actions and invest and marine ecosystem services and bu accordance with the Sustainable Deve	Objective: To catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region, in accordance with the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA).						
		MTR SMART analys					
Indicator	End-of-Project target	S	м	Α	R	T	
A. Number of participating countries and local governments that have mainstreamed SDS- SEA/ICM programs into their respective development and investment plans Same as Indicator 2b?	A.1 Three (3) participating national governments (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam) and eight (8) local governments (Preah Sihanouk and Koh Kong, Cambodia; Dongying and Fangchenggang China; Sukabumi and Tomini Bay, Indonesia; Guimaras and Pampanga, Philippines; Soc Trang and Thua Thien Hue, Vietnam) have mainstreamed SDS-SEA/ICM programs into their respective development and investment plans to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean based blue economy						
B. Effectively managed coastal areas through operationalizing zoning	B.1 Improvement in household income of fishery communities by 25% in 10% of households in priority sites						
schemes/MSP, PAs/MPAs, EAFM IRBCAM and other management	B.2 Improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency in 12 highly vulnerable villages						
benefit livelihoods development and reduction in vulnerability to climate	B.3 5% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas relocated away from hazard zones						
	B.4 100% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas provided with evacuation routes and safe refuge locations						
Inis indicator was added in the inception report. Is it relevant to the objective?	B.5 1,500 households in Cambodia and Lao PDR benefit from improved sanitation and access to safe and reliable water supplies						
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achieva	ble, Relevant, Time-Bound						

Green: SMART criteria compliant; Yellow: partly compliant with SMART criteria; Red: not compliant with SMART criteria

The end of project targets for indicator A are considered to be generally SMART, although it is questionable if the target is fully achievable within the timeframe of the project, largely because it is dependent on the 3 national and 8 local governments to mainstream SDS-SEA/ICM into their development and investment plans and is therefore outside the control of the project. Indicator B is more appropriate as an outcome or output indicator and is only indirectly related to the stated objective. Thus the 5 targets are not directly relevant to the objective. Targets B.1, B.2 and B.3 are ambitious within the timeframe of the project and target B.4 is considered to be almost impossible to achieve, as does target B.5. Target B.2 is not sufficiently specified because improvement in awareness, preparedness and resilience is not defined, ie. awareness, preparedness and resilience of what? For this reason, it cannot be easily measured. Similarly, targets B.3 and B.4 will be difficult to measure.

SMART Analy	sis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)
	sis of strategic nesards frame work (

Outcome 1: A self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region.

Indicator	or End-of-Project target		MTR SMAR			T analysis		
		S	М	Α	R	Т		
	1.1 Host Country Agreement ratified by the Government of the Philippines providing PEMSEA and its officers and staff with immunities and privileges that facilitate effective and efficient operations							
	1.2 Signed Agreements with Country and Non- Country Partners provide voluntary financing and in-kind commitments to sustain PEMSEA's core operations							
 Number of agreements signed and initiated with Country and Non- Country Partners, and regional and international organizations, donors and corporate sector 	1.3 Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA and YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms result in collaborative planning, coordination and implementation among the respective SAPs, while addressing program sustainability and integration with broader regional cooperation frameworks							
	frameworks 1.4 Regional State of the Oceans and Coasts Report published and disseminated, providing governments and stakeholders with up-to-date information on changes, trends, impacts and benefits of SAP implementation in the EAS region							
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound Green: SMART criteria compliant: Yellow: partly compliant with SMART criteria: Red: not compliant with SMART criteria								

The end of project targets for Outcome 1 are considered to be mostly SMART. However, target 1.2 could be more specific about the Country and Non-Country Partners that Agreements will be signed with to sustain PEMSEA's core operations. Target 1.3 is more specific about the regional organisations that Partnership Agreements will be signed with. Target 1.4 is considered to be SMART, however it is not directly relevant to the outcome or indicator that it refers to.

SMART Ar	SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)							
Outcome 2: National and local governme	Outcome 2: National and local governments; adopting and initiating ocean policy, legal instruments, institutional							
improvements and mainstreaming SDS	S-SEA targets into their medium- term development and investm	ent p	olans					
Indicator End-of-Project target		Μ	MTR SMART analys					
		S	м	Α	R	Т		
2a. Number of countries adopting coastal and ocean policy, and implementing national SDS-SEA	2.1 National coastal and ocean policies and institutional arrangements in place in 6 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam), providing the platform and management framework for national programs focused on integrated management of priority coastal and marine areas, surrounding watersheds and blue economy development							
implementation plans, including supporting legislation and institutional arrangement	2.2 Legislative National sector agenda and priorities developed in 6 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines and Vietnam) for the purpose of aligning sector-based regulatory and economic instruments with national coastal and ocean policy, as well as ratifying international ocean-related conventions and agreements							

2b. Number of countries mainstreaming national SDS-SEA/ICM programs into development and investment plans	 2.3 SDS-SEA targets incorporated into national and local medium-term development and investment plans in at least 3 participating countries (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam) and 8 participating local governments (Preah Sihanouk and Koh Kong, Cambodia; Dongying and Fangchenggang China; Sukabumi and Tomini Bay, Indonesia; Guimaras and Pampanga, Philippines; Soc Trang and Thua Thien Hue, Vietnam), covering ICM programs encompassing CCA/DRR, biodiversity conservation and management, sustainable fisheries, water supply, conservation and use management, pollution reduction, etc., in priority coastal areas. 					
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound						

The targets for Outcome 2 are considered to be SMART. However, as with target A.1, it is questionable if the targets can be fully achieved within the timeframe of the project, because it is dependent on the national and local governments to mainstream SDS-SEA/ICM into their development and investment plans and is therefore outside the control of the project.

SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)							
Outcome 3: Innovative financing mechanisms in place for sustained operation of the country-owned, regional coordinating partnership mechanism							
Indicator	End-of-Project target	MTR SMART analysis					
		S	Μ	Α	R	Т	
3.Percentage of PEMSEA's operational funding covered by sustainable financing mechanisms and partnership arrangements	 3.1 Suite of products, services, funding mechanisms (ICM and special skills training and technical assistance services; ICM, PSHEMS and CSR recognition system; PEMSEA Trust Fund) and partnership arrangements (MOA/MOU/CSA, PPP, CSR) adopted and implemented in collaboration with PEMSEA Partners, non- partner governments, Sponsoring Organizations, donors and private sector/business community, providing sustainable funding for 100% of PEMSEA's operation. 3.2 PEMSEAs outreach services being provided to non-Partner countries covering capacity development and technical assistance in support of improved coastal and ocean governance and the development of national ICM programs 						
SMART: Specific Measurable Achievable Pelevant Time Pound							
Green: SMART criteria compliant; Yellow: partly compliant with SMART criteria; Red: not compliant with SMART criteria							

The end of project targets for Outcome 3 are considered to be SMART. Target 3.1 is ambitious but is considered to be achievable provided that partnership arrangements are adopted and implemented, particularly with the PEMSEA member countries. Although very important for the sustainability of PEMSEA, target 3.2 is not directly relevant to the subject outcome because it does not have a financial component.

	SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)					
Outcome 4: Increased areal extent of healthy, resilient habitats (i.e., blue forests), including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other coastal habitats/ areas						
dicator	End-of-Project target	M	ITR SI	MAR	ſ ana	lysis
		S	м	Α	R	Т
dicator creased proportion of healthy and esilient coastal/watershed habitats ith effective and sustainable nanagement systems in place	 End-of-Project target 4.1 ICM program coverage extended to more than 20 percent (45,000 km) of the region's coastline, with: a) local government institutional arrangements and coordinating mechanisms in place; b) coastal strategies/coastal strategy implementation plans adopted, legitimized and being implemented; c) SOC or related M&E systems established; d) local and/or national governments committing human and financial resources and related investments to implement the coastal strategies; and e) capacity building programs/training of ICM managers and practitioners developed and initiated 4.2 25% of local governments implementing ICM programs provide evidence of: a) improved management effectiveness, sustainability and benefits from CUZ/MSP and other relevant management tools and processes, for healthy and resilient ecosystem products and services and addressing CCA and DRR; b) harmonize access to marine space by established economic sectors; c) assess costs and benefits in order to clearly understand socio-economic and ecological trade-offs; and d) extend governance principles to be more inclusive of weaker, disadvantaged sectors, addressing issues of tenure and user-based access rights. 4.3 Conservation- focused ICM pilot demonstration projects result in measureable improvements in the areal extent, health and resiliency of habitats (e.g., 910 ha of blue forests)_and replication of good practices initiated in 10 other sites including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other habitats, in coastal waters and watershed areas including biodiversity hotspots and areas-at- risk to climate change 4.4 MPA-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects at priority sites result in measurable improvement (10%) in management and networking effectiveness using METT indicators, and replication of good practices initiated in 10 other locally managed marine areas/MPAs 4.5.Regional investment platform established and functioning, partnering and catalyzing ICM scaling up and<!--</td--><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>r ana</td><td></td>				r ana	
	environmental investments in at least 3 ICM/investment sites					

Although end of project targets 4.1 and 4.2 for Outcome 4 contain quantitative targets, the lack of specificity in the sub-conditions for the targets means that it will be difficult to measure if the targets have been achieved. It would be better to either reduce the number of sub-conditions or itemise them separately. Target 4.5 is more relevant to Outcome 3.

SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)											
Outcome 5: Improved management of over exploited and depleted fisheries. leading to recovery											
Indicator	End-of-Project target				MTR SMART analysis						
		S	Μ	Α	R	Т					
5.Increased proportion of fishing grounds with reductions in overexploitation of fisheries and improved incomes for fishers' households	 5.1. Sustainable fisheries-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 2,000 km² of threatened fishing grounds providing evidence of improved fish catch (10% improvement in CPUE) using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation, with replication of good practices initiated in 4 other threatened fishing grounds 5.2 Pilot projects on sustainable/alternative livelihoods for fishers and fishing communities result in 25% household income improvement in 10% of households generating income from non-fishing sources, with replication of supplemental livelihood policies, capacities and incentive programs initiated in 4 other fishing communities 										
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound											

Green: SMART criteria compliant; Yellow: partly compliant with SMART criteria; Red: not compliant with SMART criteria

The end of project targets for Outcome 5 are specific and should be measureable provided there is a baseline measurement for each target. However, it is questionable if the targets can be achieved within the timeframe of the project as it can take time to introduce new approaches to fishers and fishing communities and more time for them to adapt to them and realise benefits. The MTR will look for signs that the project is on track to achieve these targets (Section.4.2.2).

SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)							
Outcome 6: Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency / conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas						n	
Indicator	End-of-Project target	MTR SMART analysi			lysis		
		S	м	Α	R	Т	
6. Increased proportion of priority river basins and coastal areas (i.e., pollution hotspots) with measurable reductions in pollutant discharges and improved water use efficiency / conservation	 6.1. Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management demonstration projects completed in priority watershed/coastal areas 25,000 km2 as identified in Table 16), providing evidence of reduced pollutant discharges (20% BOD; 10% to 20% nutrient) and water resource conservation and use management 						
	6.2 Innovative technologies and good practices in nutrient management and water use conservation demonstrated in priority coastal areas and river basins, with replication of good practices initiated in 6 other priority river basin and coastal areas						
SMART: Specific. Measurable. Achievable. Relevant. Time-Bound							

Green: SMART criteria compliant; Yellow: partly compliant with SMART criteria; Red: not compliant with SMART criteria

Target 6.1 is specific and relevant to the outcome. However, it is questionable if the reduced pollutant discharges can be reliably measured and hence achieved. Although Target 6.2 relevant to the outcome and indicator, it is quite generic and it is not clear how it can me measured or what evidence will be used to judge if it has been achieved.

Outcome 7: Increased preparedness a	nd capability of coastal communities to respond to natural and m	anm	ade ł	nazar	ds				
Indicator	End-of-Project target	MTR SMART analys							
		S	М	Α	R	Т			
7a. Increased proportion of vulnerable coastal communities with effective preparedness, response and recovery systems	7.1. CCA/DRRM-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 11 highly vulnerable coastal communities provide evidence of improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency to the impacts of climate change, oil spills and other natural and manmade hazards			?					
to address natural and manmade hazards	7.2 A subregional oil spill contingency plan is developed and adopted by the 3 littoral States in the Gulf of Thailand								
7b. Number of international ports in participating countries achieving , expanding PSHEMS recognition	 7.3.Port safety, health and environmental management (PSHEM) code adopted as an international standard for voluntary use in ports of 6 participating countries (Cambodia; Indonesia, Philippines; Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) 				??				

The indicators and targets for outcome 7 are considered to be generally SMART. It is not clear how evidence of improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency will be measured and therefore how it will be judged to have been achieved. The relevance of indicator 7b and target 7.3 to the subject outcome is not clear.

SMART Analysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)							
Outcome 8: Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services						ie	
Indicator	End-of-Project target		TR SM	analysis			
		S	М	Α	R	Т	
8 Number of priority sites testing, adopting and implementing innovative economic and investment mechanisms within ICM frameworks and processes of local governments	8.1. Innovative economic and investment mechanisms (e.g., revolving funds, PPP, PES, carbon credits) tested and applied to help 8 local governments sustain and scale up ICM programs and investments						
	8.2 Corporations and the business community engaged as partners of 4 local governments in ICM programs and investments in blue economy						
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound Green: SMART criteria compliant; Yellow: partly compliant with SMART criteria; Red: not compliant with SMART criteria							

The indicator and targets for outcome 8 are considered to be SMART.
SMART An	alysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)					
Outcome 9: Regional knowledge sharing	platform for ecosystem management established and enabling	decis	sion r	nake	rs to	
translate policies and strategies into ac	ctions`					
Indicator	End-of-Project target	Μ	TR SI	MART	l ana	lysis
		S	М	Α	R	T
9a. Number of collaborative knowledge sharing initiatives among regional programs	9.1 National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs for ICM sites, coastal seas and priority watersheds provide scientific data and evidence-based data on the effectiveness and impacts of management interventions and commitments					
9b. Increased proportion of national and local governments implementing ICM programs with environmental monitoring	9.2 Skills, knowledge and support services of national and sub-national governments enhanced through ICM Communities of Practice, including the PEMSEA Network of Local Governments (PNLG), Regional Task Force/National Task Forces (RTF/NTF), etc					
programs and SOC reporting systems	9.3 State of Coasts reports published and disseminated by all participating countries					
9c. Improved access to capacity development/training and education opportunities and technical assistance for SDS- SEA/ICM implementation						
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achieval Green: SMART criteria compliant; Yellc	ble, Relevant, Time-Bound w: partly compliant with SMART criteria; Red: not compliant wit	h SIV	IART	crite	ria	

Target 9.1 does not appear to be directly relevant to indicator 9a or the subject outcome. Nor is it particularly specific and it is not clear how it will be measured and therefore if it can be achieved. Although target 9.2 is relevant, it lacks specificity as a target and it is not clear how it will be measured. Target 9.4 is not specific and does not appear to be directly relevant to indicator 9c.

SMART A	nalysis of Strategic Results Framework (Project Outcome)								
Outcome 10: Program contributed to glo	bal learning onscaling up of investments in sustainable coastal an	nd oc	:ean i	mana	agem	nent			
Indicator	End-of-Project target	MTR SMART analysis							
		S	м	Α	R	Т			
10a.Number of collaborative/joint initiatives between IW Learn and PEMSEA	10.1. One percent of IW budget committed to the regional knowledge platform to contribute to IWLearn activities, including IWLearn project websites, experience notes and IW Conferences.								
10b. Number of assessment reports or ICM program development from outreach and exploratory activities	10.2 Knowledge and best practice in ICM facilitated by outreach to programs promoting sustainable coastal and ocean development in large marine ecosystems of South Asia, South Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, etc								
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achieva Green: SMART criteria compliant: Yell	ble, Relevant, Time-Bound ow: partly compliant with SMART criteria: Red: not compliant wit	h SIV	1ART	crite	ria				

The indicator and targets for outcome 10 are considered to be SMART.

Annex H

Results Matrix

Indicator Assessment Key

Achieved at mid-term	On target to be achieved	Not on target to be achieved

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING				
OBJECTIVE: To ca coastal and ocea	OBJECTIVE: To catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region, in accordance with the sustainable development strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA).										
A. Percentage of participating countries and local governments that have mainstreamed SDS-SEA/ICM programs into their respective development and investment plans	 SDS-SEA regional strategy and 5-year Regional SDS-SEA Implementation Plan adopted by the EAS Partnership Council (2012) 5-year National SDS- SEA/ICM Implementation Plans developed in 7 countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) and adopted and mainstreamed into the investment plans in one country 	 Revised Draft SDS-SEA Implementation Plan 2018- 2022 submitted to 21st Executive Committee meeting (April 2018) for review; revised plan will be disseminated to Partners for review and input; final version of the SDS-SEA IP 2018-2022 will be endorsed to the 10th EAS Partnership Council Meeting in July 2018. Following the adoption of the updated SDS-SEA in 2015 and based on the Review of SDS- SEA Implementation 2003- 2015, PEMSEA developed the SDS-SEA Implementation Plan 2018-2022 and has undergone review in the following meetings. 	A1) Three (3) participating national governments (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam) and eight (8) local governments (Preah Sihanouk and Koh Kong, Cambodia; Dongying and Fangchenggang China; Sukabumi and Tomini Bay, Indonesia; Guimaras and Pampanga, Philippines; Soc Trang and Thua Thien Hue, Vietnam) have mainstreamed SDS-SEA/ICM programs into their respective development and investment plans to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean based blue economy			MS	 All countries are participating in the project to some degree. However, delays in signing countries agreements with some countries have resulted in delays in project implementation. The overall Rating of Satisfactory reflects the fact that, while progress to date has been significant, delays have prevented progress in some countries. At this stage, the project is considered 				

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
	(China) and two local governments (Chonburi, Thailand; Xiamen, China).	 The Framework Plan reviewed at 19th Executive Committee Meeting (April 2017) Draft Plan reviewed by 9th EAS Partnership Council Meeting (July 2017) The Plan includes information based on collaborative planning with all PEMSEA Country and Non-Country Partners. Following the regional SDS-SEA Implementation Plan 					unlikely to achieve all the project objectives within the project timeframe.
B. Effectively managed coastal areas through operationalizing zoning schemes/MSP, PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management benefit livelihoods development and reduction in vulnerability to climate change of vulnerable communities	 Coastal populations/househo lds in the selected communities are heavily reliant on fisheries; limited information available on household incomes Sporadic conservation-focused livelihood programs implemented in some sites. 	 Scoping/baseline and risk/vulnerability assessment reports completed in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Pilippines and Timor Leste. EAFM/sustainable fisheries management plan completed in Macajalar Bay (Philippines); Feasibility Report of Income Increase of Fishermen in Lianyungang (China) Value chain Analysis for Agricultural Produce report completed in Houay Champi, Champasak (Lao PDR) Alternative Livelihood Assessment report in Manatuto and Suco Vaviquinia, Timor Leste 	 B1) Improvement in household income of fishery communities by 25% in 10% of households in priority sites B2) Improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency in 12 highly vulnerable villages B3) 5% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas relocated away from hazard zones B4) 100% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas provided with evacuation routes and safe refuge locations B5) 1,500 households in Cambodia and Lao PDR benefit from improved sanitation and 				 Scoping/baseline and risk/vulnerability assessment reports completed in 5 countries 13 different communities are currently included in activities focussed around hazard identification and mitigation. Countries have made good progress with the development of management plans for CCA/DRR Some countries have not started work and no countries are

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING			
		 Report on management options for reducing vunerability and increasing resiliency completed in Dongying,China 	access to safe and reliable water supplies				forecast to complete by project end			
COMPONENT 1: PARTNERSHIPS IN COASTAL AND OCEAN GOVERNANCE										
Outcome 1: A se impacts of climation	elf-sustaining, country-owr te change on coastal popul	ned, regional mechanism governing ations in the East Asian Seas region	and managing LMEs and coastal w	aters, rebuilding	and sustaining ec	osystems s	ervices and reducing the			
Number of agreements signed and initiated with Country and Non-Country Partners, and regional and international organizations, donors and	 Haikou Partnership Agreement signed in 2006 establishing PEMSEA as a regional partnership mechanism Host Country Agreement signed between PEMSEA and the Government of the Philippines (July 	 Head Quarters Agreement (HQA) ratified by the Government of Philippines in 2015 Host Country Agreement in support of ratified HQA renewed with DENR in September 2017 	1.1) Host Country Agreement ratified by the Government of the Philippines providing PEMSEA and its officers and staff with immunities and privileges that facilitate effective and efficient operation			S	• The Headquarters Agreement and Host Country Agreement provide PEMSEA with the continuity required to continue operations			
corporate sector	 Cost-Sharing Agreements have been signed and operationalized with 3 PEMSEA Partner Countries (China, Japan and RO Korea) 	 Cost-Sharing Agreements with China, Japan, RO Korea, Singapore signed and voluntary contributions continuing. Support for 2015-2018 secured Philippine contribution as host to PEMSEA office continuing (facilities and utilities). Annual support from Timor 	1.2) Signed Agreements with Country and Non-Country Partners provide voluntary financing and in-kind commitments to sustain PEMSEA's core operations				 Country voluntary contributions (in kind and in cash) are important to the self- sustainability of PEMSEA's core operations. Third party 			
	PEMSEA Resource Facility Secretariat Services	 Annual support from Timor Leste continuing and funds utilized in support of activities in Timor Leste. 					assessment of PEMSEA's sustainability recommended			

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
	 The Government of the Philippines has signed a 10-year agreement (2007- 2017) providing office building and amenities for the PEMSEA 	 Third Party Assessment recommended voluntary commitments from all member countries. EAS Council decision July 2017 to conduct exploratory and consultative meetings with Members. 					country consultations on voluntary contributions. These are ongoing and are expected to be completed in the 2nd quarter of 2018
	 Resource Facility operation. The Government of Timor Leste is providing in-cash support to the PEMSEA Resource Facility in order to conduct training and other capacity development activities in the country. An MOU was signed between PEMSEA and the GEF/UNDP YSLME Project to facilitate cooperation across projects. 	 From 2016-2018, agreements signed with 14 partners and collaborators in support of SDS- SEA activities. 					• CSAs signed with China, Japan, RO Korea and Singapore and voluntary contributions are continuing with support up to 2018 secured
		 Agreement pending with YSLME. MOAs signed with: IPIECA, WCPFC/WPEA, SOA, MOF/ROK, MABIK, CI, WOC, R20 Regions of Climate Action, KMI, IUCN/MFF, AWGWRM, FAO, PML 	1.3) Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA and YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms result in collaborative planning, coordination and implementation among the respective SAPs, while addressing program sustainability and integration				• PEMSEA has established 14 agreements /implementing arrangements with regional and international organizations. Other agreements are pending with YSLME and CTI-CFF.
			with broader regional cooperation frameworks.				• A long-term agreement with YSLME is unlikely to proceed for due to the reconstitution of the YSLMEa nd its establishment of its formal Commission.

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 Regional SOC report was drafted taking into consideration inputs from various regional organizations as well as inputs from 10 national SOC reports and 3 sub- regional SOCs) 	1.4) Regional State of the Oceans and Coasts Report published and disseminated, providing governments and stakeholders with up-to-date information on changes, trends, impacts and benefits of SAP implementation in the EAS region.				• Ten countries, two sub-regional sea areas and the regional SOCs are in their final stages of preparation and will be published and submitted to the EAS Congress/Ministers Forum in November 2018
Outcome 2: Nation their medium-terms	onal and local government m development and inves	s; adopting and initiating ocean poli tment plans	cy, legal instruments, institutional i	improvements an	d programs, and	mainstream	ning SDS-SEA targets into
Number of countries adopting coastal and ocean policy, and implementing national SDS- SEA implementation plans, including supporting legislation and institutional arrangements	 Coastal and ocean policy and legal instruments in place in 2 Partner countries (Japan, RO Korea), and under development in 6 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam) 	 Coastal and ocean policies and institutional arrangements have been progressed in all countries. Cambodia: Draft national ICM policy prepared China: National Marine Eco- Civilization Implementation Plan and 13th five-year Development plan adopted. Indonesia: Presidential Regulation No. 16/2017 on National Sea Policy signed. Lao PDR: National Water Resource Strategy and Water Resources Action Plan for management of river basins. Timor Leste: Draft National Ocean Policy (NOP) prepared. Adoption is pending due to elections in Timor Leste 	2.1) National coastal and ocean policies and institutional arrangements in place in 6 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam), providing the platform and management framework for national programs focused on integrated management of priority coastal and marine areas, surrounding watersheds and blue economy development.			MS	 Good progress has been made on drafting or putting in place policies/legislations/p lans and institutional mechanisms in support of coastal and ocean development in 7 out of the 8 countries. National policies on ICM have been prepared in Cambodia and Vietnam. China has adopted a 5 year development plan. Indonesia has signed a regulation on National Sea policy.

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 Thailand: National Act on Promotion of Marine and Coastal Resources Management, B.E. 2558 (2015) Vietnam: National ICM Action Plan to implement the National ICM Strategy to 2020 and Vision to 2030 approved by the Prime Minister. 		(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		 Timor Leste has drafted a National Ocean Policy. Thailand has an Act on Promotion of Marine and Coastal Resouirces Management. Lao PDR has a national strategy for management of river basins. The establishment of a functional multi- sectoral, institutional coordinating mechanism for ocean and coastal governance and management remains a significant challenge to the project in all countries
		 National sector legislation agendas have been developed or have been initiated in China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam: China: Ocean-related Legislation Review report submitted. 	2.2) Legislative National sector agenda and priorities developed in 6 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines and Vietnam) for the purpose of aligning sector-based regulatory and economic instruments with national coastal and ocean policy, as well as ratifying international ocean-related conventions and agreements				• Development of national sector legislative agendas and priorities and ratification of international ocean- related conventions and agreements is progressing in all countries

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
				(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		
		 Indonesia: Desktop compilation of ocean-related and sectoral legislations initiated. Lao PDR: Water Law approved by the National Assembly Philippines:; ICM Bill refiled at the 17th Congress House Bill No. 5672 (May 2017). Thailand: Implementation of the National Act on Promotion of Marine and Coastal Resources Management B.E. 2558 (2015) Timor Leste: Review of ocean- related policies initiated as part of the development of the National Ocean Policy. Vietnam: The Law on Marine and Islands Resources and Environment took effect in July 2016 Accession/ratification of international conventions related to the environment and oceans: World Heritage Convention (Timor Leste- ratified, 2016) Nagoya Protocol (China acceded 2016, Japan accepted 2016, and RO Korea ratified 2017) 					 The Philippine ICM Bill has been affected by change in Philippine Administration, but has been refiled in May 2017 under House Bill 5672 giving it a better chance of being deliberated on at the House of Representatives PEMSEA countries (Timor Leste, Japan, RO Korea, Thailand, Brunei Darussalam) have acceded to or ratififed international conventions and agreements relating to the environment and oceans.
		ratified 2016, Japan accepted					

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		2016, and Thailand acceded 2017)					
Number of countries mainstreaming national SDS- SEA/ICM programs into development and investment plans	 5-year national SDS- SEA/ICM Implementation Plans developed in 6 countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam), and adopted and mainstreamed into the investment plans in one country (China) and two local governments (Xiamen, China; Chonburi, Thailand) 	 Country consultations or collaborative planning on SDS- SEA and ICM implementation conducted in 8 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) Demonstration business cases developed, eg. Seaweed farming, grouper aquaculture, yellowfin tuna Investment features in the Seas of East Asia Knowledge Bank developed Reports on the Blue Economy and ICM investment landscape prepared Capacity building workshops conducted on Investing in Blue Economy; Catalyzing Blue Economy Investments and Catalyzing Investments in SDG 14; 10 National SOC briefs presented at the Regional Blue Economy Forum: Lao PDR developing a State of River Basin report. 	2.3) SDS-SEA targets incorporated into national and local medium-term development and investment plans in at least 3 participating countries (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam) and 8 participating local governments (Preah Sihanouk and Koh Kong, Cambodia; Dongying and Fangchenggang China; Sukabumi and Tomini Bay, Indonesia; Guimaras and Pampanga, Philippines; Soc Trang and Thua Thien Hue, Vietnam), covering ICM programs encompassing CCA/DRR, biodiversity conservation and management, sustainable fisheries, water supply, conservation and use management, pollution reduction, etc., in priority coastal areas.				 The 3 target countries have started to incorporate SDS-SEA objectives and targets into their medium- term development plans. The project will further engage in the planning processes of the other 5 countries, and among local governments implementing ICM programs. By the end of the project, documentation should be provided for each country, indicating the priorities within each country and the levels of commitment. The project will continue to develop and promote investment/knowledg e partnerships and further consideration will be given to

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING identifying and
							partnering with mutli-national corporations.
Outcome 3: Inr	ovative financing mechan	isms in place for sustained operatio	n of the country-owned, regional co	oordinating partn	ership mechanisr	n	
Percentage of PEMSEA's operational funding covered by sustainable financing mechanisms and partnership arrangements	 PEMSEA Sustainable Financing Plan and Road Map adopted and initiated PEMSEA's PSHEMS, ICM and CSR recognition systems under development / refinement Several project proposals conceptualized / drafted for funding agencies with national and local governments, Non- Country Partners Concept paper/guideline for PEMSEA outreach services prepared and submitted to EAS Partnership Council 	 Third Party Assessment on PEMSEA's Sustainability concluded that PEMSEA will be able to operate up to 2021 independent of voluntary contributions and new project funds. Country consultations on voluntary contributions initiated in February 2018 and expected to be completed by June 2018 PEMSEA products and services ICM trainings, CS/CSIP and specialized trainings including SOC, IIMS, PSHEMS, Baseline/Risk/ Vulnerability Assessments ICM Code and ICM System Certification and corresponding advocacy plan, as well as governance arrangements approved by 8th EAS Partnership Council. ICM Manager Certification Handbook drafted. 	3.1) Suite of products, services, funding mechanisms (ICM and special skills training and technical assistance services; ICM, PSHEMS and CSR recognition system; PEMSEA Trust Fund) and partnership arrangements (MOA/MOU/CSA, PPP, CSR) adopted and implemented in collaboration with PEMSEA Partners, non- partner governments, Sponsoring Organizations, donors and private sector/business community, providing sustainable funding for 100% of PEMSEA's operation.			S	 It is encouraging that the Third Party concluded that PEMSEA will be able to operate up to 2021 independent of new project funds or voluntary contributions. However, for its long- term sustainability it is important that the member countries make voluntary contributions. At the time of the MTR it is unclear whether financial contributions will be realised from all country partners. It is strongly recommended that the country consultations are completed before the 10th EAS Partnership

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 15 Local Governments received ICM Level 1 certification in 2015 PEMSEA Training Modules SOC guide, ICM and Coastal Use Zoning Manuals undergoing final technical review and editing prior to publication 97 trainings and workshops conducted between 2014 and 2017 Develop and finance flagship projects 5 projects totalling about \$700k are being implemented Projects are in the pipeline with GCF, SIDA, IKI, Manila Bay Integrated Water Quality Management Plan. Concept documents on innovative economic investment mechanisms have been developed by PEMSEA with international experts. 					Council meeting in July 2018

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
				ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)		
		 2017 PEMSEA's strategic communications plan developed to strengthen PEMSEA's outreach and promotion EAS Congress 2015 drew over 800 participants. Social media campaign and regional photo contest around World Oceans Day in June 2016 Outreach video on PEMSEA's Youth and Small Grant Program Two IW Learn activities underway 	3.2) PEMSEAs outreach services being provided to non-Partner countries covering capacity development and technical assistance in support of improved coastal and ocean governance and the development of national ICM programs.				 PEMSEA has produced innovative knowledge products (ICM Code; PSHEMS Code; SEA Knowledge Bank; investment landscape assessment; SOC reporting; etc.) and services (certification; on-line investment, training/internships; sustainable business network; etc.). These products and services have a strong "value proposition" and should be promoted to other regions
COMPONENT 2:	- HEALTHY AND RESILIEN	T MARINE AND COASTAL ECOSYSTE	MS				
Outcome 4: Incr	eased areal extent of hea	thy, resilient habitats (i.e., blue fore	ests), including mangroves, coral re	efs, sea grass and	other coastal hal	bitats/ area	5
Increased proportion of healthy and resilient coastal/watersh ed habitats with effective and sustainable management	 About 12% (27,245 km) of region's coastline covered by ICM programs Capacity needs assessment partially conducted in 2 countries (Lao PDR and Timor Leste) 	 By end of 2017, there are >100 existing ICM sites covering 18% of the region's coastline. Total of 46 project sites in the 8 participating countries. Project Management Office (PMO) or coordinating office operational in existing sites All scoping studies in project countries completed 	4.1) ICM program coverage extended to 20 percent (45,000 km) of the region's coastline, with: a) local government institutional arrangements and coordinating mechanisms in place; b) coastal strategies/coastal strategy implementation plans adopted, legitimized and being implemented; c) SOC or related			MS	 The project is on track to achieve 20% ICM coverage of the region's coastline by August 2019. Implementation of other targets unlikely to be achieved by all countries due to delays in start up

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF-	2019 END OF	MID-TERM	MID-TERM	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION
				ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	NATING	TORRATING
systems in place	 National program or plan of action covering coastal habitat restoration and management including biodiversity conservation in place in 6 countries (Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) and partially in one (China) Sub-national / local action plans or management programs support targets in habitat restoration and management partially in all 8 participating countries Indicative baseline data for new ICM sites prepared, and will be validated / expanded during inception phase 	 ICM capacity enabling/technical support services and networks National ICM training and workshops have been conducted in Cambodia, Philippines, Thailand and Timor Leste. Cambodia: Training on project development and management for 3 PMOs in Cambodia and on financial management for Kompot PMO staff conducted. China: Project contract signed with China-PEMSEA Sustainable Coastal Management Cooperation Center. Indonesia: ICM Learning Center in Bogor developing the ICM scaling up programs in the ICM learning sites; CSFD-UNUD designated as ICM Learning Center and contracted to provide technical support in Bali; ICM Coordinator of Tangerang Regency completed the traineeship program at the PRF Lao PDR: Work planning with DWR to identify priority activities for 2017-2018 conducted Philippines: Third-party assessment of ICM plans and 	M&E systems established; d) local and/or national governments committing human and financial resources and related investments to implement the coastal strategies; and e) capacity building programs/training of ICM managers and practitioners developed and initiated				experienced with several countries • The end of project targets for this outcome are very complex which may result in the risk of them not being fully achieved

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 programs in 17 regions comprising 66 coastal provinces conducted; Guimaras ICM Code Level 2 workshop conducted Timor Leste: National Training Workshop on ICM, baseline assessment, risk/vulnerability assessment, risk/vulnerability assessment conducted in Dili; Training workshop on CS/CSIP preparation conducted Manatuto, Liquica and Dili Vietnam: National Task Force and ICM expert conduct national orientation workshop on the application of SOC and IIMS in ICM in 14 priority coastal provinces in Vietnam National SOCs under development in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Timor Leste, Thailand, and Vietnam. Lao PDR developing a State of River Basin report. 					
		 12 PNLC members trained on institutional and professional capacity to conduct Ocean Health Index assessments International Training Program on Marine Ecosystem Valuation and Spatial Management Tools conducted. 	4.2) 25% of local governments implementing ICM programs provide evidence of: a) improved management effectiveness, sustainability and benefits from CUZ/MSP and other relevant management tools and processes, for healthy and resilient ecosystem				• Management effectiveness of PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management tools and processes in have been initiated at ICM learning sites in all countries except

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		,		ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)		
		 Cambodia: Local training on baseline assessment for solid waste management in Koh Kong conducted; Baseline assessment reports drafted for: Prek Thnout, Kampot; Khemrak Phumin, Koh Kong; KR/KR Sanlem Preah Sihanouk; Initial assessment of saltwater intrusion in Kep Province conducted. Lao PDR: Initial scoping, planning and data gathering for the development of Water Use Fee Guideline conducted. Philippines: Application of Marxan-Z Model to develop the marine spatial plan for the Verde Island Passage with technical support from KMI and CI Philippines Thailand: Burapha University monitoring heavy metal levels in aquaculture and beach areas Timor Leste: Representatives from ICM Learning Centers participated in training on marine ecosystem services and marine spatial planning 	products and services and addressing CCA and DRR; b) harmonize access to marine space by established economic sectors; c) assess costs and benefits in order to clearly understand socio-economic and ecological trade-offs; and d) extend governance principles to be more inclusive of weaker, disadvantaged sectors, addressing issues of tenure and user-based access rights.				Thailand and Viet Nam, which are behind schedule due to administrative delays • Hands on capacity development is being achieved across ICM sites through the use of 15 ICM Learning Centers (PNLC), in collaboration with the PEMSEA Network of Local Governments (PNLG), non-country partners, and others
		 Cambodia: Marine suitability analysis conducted in Prek Thnout by KMI; seagrass assessment conducted in Prek Thnout; Economic valuation of 	4.3) Conservation-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects result in measureable improvements in the areal extent, health and resiliency of				• Some progress has been made towards this target at the time of the MTR in all countries in all

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 mangrove areas in Prek Kampong Smach conducted; China: Baseline assessment of physical, biological, hydrological, chemical aspects of coastal areas for rehabilitation Chinese Tamarix completed; Planting of seedings of the species in Shangdong Changyi Special Marine Ecological Protected Area Philippines: Mangrove mapping and primary productivity assessment of mangrove forest in Batangas Province conducted; Baseline assessment conducted on the status of coastal habitats (coral reefs, seagrass, mangroves) in Pamanculan and Tumalintinan Point MPAs in Guimaras. Timor Leste: Baseline information and priorities/needs related to the conservation area in Lamsana; 	habitats (e.g., 1,000 ha of blue forests), and replication of good practices initiated in 10 other sites including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other habitats, in coastal waters and watershed areas including biodiversity hotspots and areas- at-risk to climate change				countries except Thailand and Vietnam. However, the extent of this progress in quantitative terms is unclear from the PIR and other project reports and it is considered unlikely that the target will be met for all countries by the end of the project.
		 Cambodia: Review of METT rating for Koh Rong Island; Draft METT assessment report for Kampong Smach, Preah Sihanouk developed; Stakeholder validation workshop for the METT scores conducted 	4.4) MPA-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects at priority sites result in measurable improvement (10%) in management and networking effectiveness using METT indicators, and replication of good practices initiated in 8				 Management Effectiveness of MPAs of 5 PEMSEA ICM Sites conducted in China; Baseline and risk vulnerability assessments conducted in 3 coastal provinces in

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
				(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		
		 China: MPA management training workshops conducted; Management Effectiveness of MPAs of 5 ICM Sites: Indonesia: Baseline assessment at 2 MPA sites in Bali and Bontang City supported; workshop on MPA management conducted in Bontang City; Philippines: Initiatives at Verde Island Passage: (a) VIP MPA and Law Enforcement Network (LEN) Collaborative Planning Workshop organized (b) 2nd MPA and LEN Workshop conducted, VIP Management Board and VIP Strategic Plan conducted; (c) MOU on the Verde Island Passage Marine Protected Area Network and Law Enforcement Network signed by the 5 provincial governments in the VIP, national agencies and partner institutions, including PEMSEA Timor Leste: Risk/vulnerability assessment completed for the MPA in Atauro Island; METT assessment conducted as part of baseline assessment; Consultations for preparation of coastal strategy for Dili and implementation plan for pilot 	other locally managed marine areas/MPAs.				Cambodia, in 5 sites in Indonesia, 3 sites in Timor Leste, and initiated in 3 sites in, Philippines; Management Effectiveness of MPAs of 5 PEMSEA ICM Sites in China prepared. • Pending items include: baseline assessments, rehabilitation of habitats and METT ratings for MPAs targeted for 2018

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING			
Outcome 5: Im	Outcome 5: Improved management of over exploited and depleted fisheries. leading to recovery									
Increased proportion of fishing grounds with reductions in overexploitatio n of fisheries and improved incomes for fishers' households	 National programs or plans of action that cover food security and livelihood management including fisheries and aquaculture in place in 4 countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam), and partially in place in 4 others (China, Lao PDR, Philippines, Timor-Leste) Sub-national / local action plans / management programs on food security and livelihood management, including fisheries and aquaculture, partially in place in all 8 participating countries Some fisheries management activities ongoing, but fragmented and limited to small geographic areas Some livelihood development activities 	 Cambodia: Baseline data gathering initiated for Koh Rong and Koh Rong Sanlem; MFMA Management Plan for Koh Rong Archipelago developed China: Draft Baseline Assessment Report on Coastal Ecosystem Health of Haizhou Bay; Draft Development Report on Artificial Reef and Marine Ranching: Draft Feasibility Report of Income Increase of Fishermen in Lianyungang; Review and assessment of existing MFMA Management Plan conducted for Haizhou Bay; Monitoring program of EAFM in Lianyungang designed. First study to assess fishery resources and ecological environment to collect baseline data associated with deployment of first batch of 5,560 artificial reefs. Indonesia: East Lombok Regency: baseline assessment of habitats and resources/ fisheries in Jor Bay conducted. Review and updating of the current fisheries management plan for Jor Bay 	5.1) Sustainable fisheries- focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 2,000 km2 of threatened fishing grounds providing evidence of improved fish catch (10% improvement in CPUE) using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation, with replication of good practices initiated in 4 other threatened fishing grounds.			MU	 Progress has been made with the conduct of baseline assessment of degraded habitats, fisheries management and fisher household incomes at pilot sites in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, and Timor Leste. Thailand and Viet Nam have not started baseline assessments EAFM management plans and sustainable alternative livelihood programs are being developed in the 6 countries in 2018, and are scheduled to be adopted and initiated in late 2018, early 2019 Pending items include: the social preparation/assessm ent for sustainable livelihood in 1 site in Philippines; Baseline 			

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
	are ongoing, but fragmented and limited to small geographic areas Indicative baseline data for new ICM sites prepared, and will be validated / expanded during inception phase	 Philippines: Updating of the Macajalar Bay Ecological Profile initiated focusing on fisheries and MPA management; ECOFISH Project Summit for Verde Island Passage conducted Thailand: DPSIR and SWOT analysis and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) conducted in Trat Province Timor Leste: Risk/vulnerability assessment of fisheries completed in pilot sites in Manatuto and Liquica Vietnam: Quang Nam, replication of the best management practices from the Wetlands Alliance Program in fisheries co-management in Tam Hai Commune. Nui Thanh 		ASSESSIVENT (TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		 assessment of habitats and resources/ fisheries in Jor Bay East Lombok Regency still being developed. Socio- economic assessment of fisher households in the Philippines to be implemented in 2018 in Macajalar Bay. Related work in Thailand and Vietnam to commence in 2018 No countries are forecast to complete the activities or achieve the end of project targets by project end.
		 District Cambodia: Socio-economic and ecological baseline assessment in Koh Rong Sanlem; Livelihood assessment in Koh Rong and Koh Rong Sanlem China: Questionnaire surveys in Lianyungang to collect baseline of the social economic status of fishermen who will be affected by the EAFM project in Haizhou Bay. 	5.2) Pilot projects on sustainable/alternative livelihoods for fishers and fishing communities result in 25% household income improvement in 10% of households generating income from non-fishing sources, with replication of supplemental livelihood policies, capacities and incentive				• Given the time delays in starting this activity in all countries it is considered unlikely that these targets can be achieved within the timeframe of the project, and it is recommended that the quantitative

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 Indonesia:. Baseline assessment of priority sites for alternative livelihood development to support Tangerang and Sukabumi Lao PDR: Household surveys conducted in 3 sub-basins covering 10% of the household populations; value chain analysis for agricultural produce in selected villages conducted; Village fund improved in selected priority villages to provide additional sources of income for villagers to be used for environmental- friendly livelihood. Philippines: Socioeconomic and ecological impacts of closed fishing season in Balayan Bay, Batangas under the ECOFISH Project Timor Leste: Proposed alternative livelihood activities identified by village officials in Suco Maabat and Suco Vaviquinia; Baseline assessment report for fisheries pilot sites in Manatuto and Liquica submitted 	programs initiated in 4 other fishing communities				targets should be reviewed.

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING				
Outcome 6: Red	Dutcome 6: Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency / conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas										
Increased proportion of priority river basins and coastal areas (i.e., pollution hotspots) with measurable reductions in pollutant discharges and improved water use efficiency / conservation.	 IRBCAM developed/tested in Pasig River-Laguna Lake- Manila Bay, Jakarta Bay-Ciliwung River, Bohai Sea National program or action plan for water supply / use / river basin management partially in place in 3 countries (China, Philippines, Timor Leste) and fully in place in four (Indonesia, Lao PDR, Thailand, Vietnam) Local level action plans or management programs for water supply / use / river basin management programs for water supply / use / river basin management partially in place in all 8 countries National program or plan of action that covers pollution reduction and waste management in place in place in 4 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, 	 National IRBM workshops conducted in Cambodia, Philippines, IRBCAM Inception workshops/consultations undertaken in Lao PDR, Cambodia, Philippines, Vietnam and Indonesia IRBCAM pilot projects initiated in Cambodia (Kampong River), Philippines (Imus River), Indonesia (Cipalabuhan River and Cipanyairan River in Palabuhanratu Sub-district and Badung River in Bali) Baseline assessment of pollution loading initiated or undertaken in Cambodia (Sihanoukville Municipality), Indonesia (Citepus River and Badung River) Baseline assessment conducted of water supply us in Lao PDR (Sedone Riverbasin) Operationalisation of the Sihanoukville Environmental Laboratory (Cambodia) initiated PRF is working on a parallel GEF/UNDP project, in collaboration with ASEAN Member States, focusing on 	6.1) Pilot integrated river basin and coastal area management demonstration projects completed in priority watershed/coastal areas 25,000 km2 as identified in Table 16), providing evidence of reduced pollutant discharges (20% BOD; 10% to 20% nutrient) and water resource conservation and use management.			MU	 Progress on the pollution reduction and water use/conservation projects in the 7 identified countries is underway but behind schedule, due largely to capacity constraints and lack of financial resources. All countries are currently involved in the baseline assessment and profiling, with the exception of Thailand and Viet Nam. The project has not started in these two countries at present due to the delays in signing the country agreements. It seems highly unlikely that Thailand and Vietnam will be able to complete planned project activities within the 				

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
	Thailand) and partially in place in three	IRBM and the source-to-sea continuum					existing project timeframe.
	 (Philippines, Timor Leste, Vietnam) Sub-national / local action plans or management programs support targets in pollution reduction and waste management partially 						 Some of the specific environmental quality (pollution) targets are considered difficult to quantify and considered unrealistic The improved considered targets for
	in place in all 8 countries.	 Orientation training on the application of nutrient load model and development of pollution reduction opportunity analysis for Manila Bay organized and conducted (October 2016) Training workshop on water quality monitoring and analysis organized and conducted in collaboration with MOF in Busan, RO Korea Collaboration with UP-MSI (Nutrient Model for the Manila Bay Watershed) and WRI (Pollution Reduction Opportunity Analysis) on the development of two innovative modeling tools for TAPL and strategic investments Completed Community-based solid waste management baseline assessment study for 	6.2) Innovative technologies and good practices in nutrient management and water use conservation demonstrated in priority coastal areas and river basins, with replication of good practices initiated in 6 other priority river basin and coastal areas				sanitation targets for Cambodia and Lao PDR would require further investment that is beyond the scope of this project

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 Phum Pir, Krong and Khemerak Phumin (Koh Kong Province, Cambodia) Conducted DPSIR, SWOT analysis and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) in Rayong Province (Thaliand) Developed pollution management program through mapping and inventory of pollution sources for Quang Ninh and Hai Phong (Vietnam) Initiated development of hydrological model for Sedone River Basin (Lao PDR) 					
Outcome 7: Incre	eased preparedness and ca	pability of coastal communities to r	espond to natural and manmade h	azard			

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
Increased proportion of vulnerable coastal communities with effective preparedness, response and recovery systems to address natural and manmade hazards	 National program or plan for CCA in place in 8 countries National program or plan for DRRM in place in all countries except Cambodia Local level programs or plans of action for CCA partially in place in 7 countries, completely in one (Vietnam) Local level programs or plans of action for DRRM partially in place in 7 countries, completely in one (Vietnam) One VA conducted (Cambodia) 	 Various vulnerability assessments undertaken addressing a range of coastal risks (such as: coastal erosion, sea level rise and other climate change risks) in China (Dongying City), Indonesia (Semaranga City and Loji Village, Sukabumi), Thailand (Saensuk), Timor Leste (Suco Vaviquinia, Liquica) Completed field survey on saltwater intrusion in Angkoul Village, Kep Province (Cambodia) and prepared report on assessment of saltwater intrusion/salinization Options for preparedness emergency response and EWS (2017) Emergency command center prepared for Dongying City (China) Developed an integrated climate change strategy has been prepared and incorporated in the long-term and medium-term development plans and long- term spatial plan for Semaranga City (Indonesia) Undertook assessments of HAB and heavy metal pollution in coastal waters of Saensuk Municipality (Thailand). 	7.1) CCA/DRRM-focused ICM pilot demonstration projects, covering 11 highly vulnerable coastal communities provide evidence of improved awareness, preparedness and resiliency to the impacts of climate change, oil spills and other natural and manmade hazards			MS	 13 different communities are currently included in activities focussed around hazard identification and mitigation. Viet Nam is behind schedule in assessing risks and vulnerabilities of coastal areas threatened by CC and natural and manmade disasters Other countries have made good progress with the development of management plans for CCA/DRR Some countries have not started work and no countries are forecast to complete by project end Some of the targets are difficult to quantify and considered unrealistic – specifically those relating to relocation and evaluation plans.

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF-	2019 END OF	MID-TERM	MID-TERM	MTR	
		REPORTED	PROJECT TARGET	ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT	RATING	FOR RATING
		 Lao PDR - Initiated GEF/UNDP Small Grants Projects on mangrove rehabilitation and protection initiated to improve coastal protection in Suco Ulmera, Bazartete Subdistrict and ecological farming practices to prevent coastal erosion and marine ecosystem degradation in Suco Vatuvou, Maubara Subdistrict 					
		 Conducted training Workshop on Developing the Sub regional Oil Spill Contingency Plan and Guidelines in the Use of Chemical Dispersants in the GoT (November 2017) Conducted sub-regional Training Workshop on Developing the Sub regional Oil Spill Contingency Plan and 	7.2) A subregional oil spill contingency plan is developed and adopted by the 3 littoral States in the Gulf of Thailand.				 While cooperation in oil spill response in the Gulf of Thailand has led to a number of positive results, there are ongoing delays resulting from an inability of Cambodia to resolve institutional roles and

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		 Guidelines on the Use of Chemical Dispersants in the GoT with country and non- country partners Conducted 10th Sub regional Meeting on the Implementation of the Framework Programme for Joint Oil Spill Preparedness and Response in the GoT (November 2016) 					responsibilities with respect to oil spill response command and control arrangements
Number of international ports in participating countries achieving / expanding PSHEMS recognition	 PSHEMS recognition achieved in 3 international ports (Bangkok, Laemchabang, Tangjong Pelepas) 	 Sihanoukville and Phnom Penh ports (Cambodia) have both completed Stage 1 Audits with Sihanoukville preparing for Stage 2 Audit with a view to Certification in 201. Recognition Certificates issued to Port of Batangas and Port of General Santos (Philippines). Recognition Surveillance Audit conducted at Laem Chabang Port and Bangkok Port (Thaliand) ICM case studies for the PSHEMS implementation have been for Bangkok Port and Laem Chabang Port 	7.3) Port safety, health and environmental management (PSHEM) code adopted as an international standard for voluntary use in ports of 6 participating countries (Cambodia; Indonesia, Philippines; Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam).				 Very good progress has been made with respect to the adoption of the PSHEM Code with implementation at 7 ports in 3 countries (Cambodia, Philippines and Thailand). The target was increased from ports in 3 countries (as included in the ProDoc) to ports in 6 countries at the Project Inception Meeting

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING				
COMPONENT 3: A KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM FOR BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE OCEAN-BASED BLUE ECONOMY											
Outcome 8: Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services											
Number of priority sites testing, adopting and implementing innovative economic and investment mechanisms within ICM frameworks and processes of local governments	 Government policies / regulations facilitate investment by the business sector in sustainable development of the coastal and marine economy partially in 3 countries (China, Timor Leste, Vietnam) and fully in 3 countries (Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand) CSR Road Map drafted with focus on Philippines Evaluation of PPP experience undertaken with recommendations provided Case study on Bataan Coastal Care Foundation 	 300+ potential investment needs/opportunities within UNDP/GEF project identified The following reports / concept documents on innovative financing mechanisms developed: (a) ICM investment Landscape Report (b) Report Strategic Blue Carbon Opportunities in the SEA, (c) Options paper for developing an "ICM bond" in East Asia for debt financing of SDS-SEA activities MOU with the World Ocean Council signed (WOC is developing an Ocean Investment Platform) Partnerships agreement being explored with IUCN and Coral Triangle Center on engaging the private sector on joint blue economy activities Ongoing communication with members of East Asian Seas Sustainable Business Network on ICM activities in the region 	8.1) Innovative economic and investment mechanisms (e.g., revolving funds, PPP, PES, carbon credits) tested and applied to help 8 local governments sustain and scale up ICM programs and investments.			HS	 PEMSEA has produced a number of innovative knowledge products (e.g ICM Code; PSHEMS Code; SOC reporting; etc.) and services (e.g. certification) Further work is required to promote these products The project has achieved a number of important milestones, including: publishing an ICM investment Landscape Report; launching an online investment platform; identifying investment features in the Seas of East Asia Knowledge Bank (SEAKB) The project has developed a number 				

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
				ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)		
		 Launched East Asian Seas Sustainable Business Network (2015) PEMSEA Sustainable Business Award Handbook drafted Case study prepared on Leveraging Public-Private Sector Partnerships in ICM through CSR Identification of ICM site with potentially bankable investment projects in solid waste / low-carbon, MPA/ecotourism, wastewater and sustainable fisheries & aquaculture ongoing with initial ICM sites identified for potential investments in waste management and low-carbon (Philippines, Indonesia, Timor Leste, Thailand), and marine protection / eco-tourism (Indonesia, Cambodia, Philippines, Vietnam) Cambodia: Ministry of Finance has authorized the Provincial Government of Preah Sihanouk to implement the Environmental User's Fee in KR and KR Sanlem Business models and demonstration business cases developed for: seaweeds farming (Philippines); sustainable tuna fishery 	8.2) Corporations and the business community engaged as partners of 4 local governments in ICM programs and investments in blue economy.				of demonstration business cases, e.g., seaweed farming, grouper aquaculture, yellowfin tuna and forged partnerships to develop investment cases for sustainable aquaculture, ocean plastics, wastewater and marine protection / tourism • Outcome 8 is considered to be on target for completion

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
		(Vietnam); hatchery-based grouper aquaculture (Indonesia) potential application					
Outcome 9: Regi	onal knowledge sharing pla	atform for ecosystem management	established and enabling decision r	nakers to transla	te policies and str	ategies into	actions
Number of collaborative knowledge sharing initiatives among regional programs	 National communications program for knowledge sharing in place in 3 countries (Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam) and partially in place in 3 others (China, Indonesia, Lao PDR) > 600 individuals trained up to 2012 National level ICM training programs partially in place in 7 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) Sub-national monitoring and reporting systems on ICM effectiveness partially in place in 7 countries (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) 	 The Beta version of the SEA Knowledge Bank (SEA KB) e- library/knowledge portal is fully operational including PNLG SAP Tracking System) and the completion of investment features. PEMSEA.org website ongoing improvement providing coverage and access to information on SDS-SEA implementation and links to Partners From a baseline of 29 local government members in 2011, PNLG now includes 48 members Annual PNLG Forums conducted: Sanya, China (2017), Ansan RO Korea (2016), Danang, Vietnam (2015), Sepang, Malaysia (2014). Initial efforts to designate 2 new Regional Centers of Excellence to provide expert advice and scientific support to countries and their partners on specific issues (CCA/DRR, 	9.1) National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs for ICM sites, coastal seas and priority watersheds provide scientific data and evidence-based data on the effectiveness and impacts of management interventions and commitments			S	 Forecast results are mixed across the different outputs with not all outputs forecast to be completed Delays in project start-up are partly to blame as the targets should be achievable within the original project timeframe The issue for environmental monitoring appears to be particularly challenging for some countries

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
				(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		
Increased proportion of national and local governments implementing ICM programs with environmental monitoring programs and SOC reporting systems	 National monitoring and reporting system in place in 3 countries (China, Thailand, Vietnam) and partially in place in 3 countries (Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines) 6 PEMSEA ICM Learning Centers operational Some relevant university level training courses in place in 7 countries (China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam) ICM professional certification system under development PNLG membership at 29 (with 2 associate members) Two RCOEs (Hong Kong and Philippines) established > 100 RTF / NTF individuals engaged up to 2012 XWOW conducted successfully in 2013 Fourth Ministerial Forum and EAS 	 governance, water security, fisheries) Initiated discussions with Kyoto University (Japan) with a view to them becoming an RCOE for disaster risk reduction EAS Congress 2015 and 5th Ministerial Forum completed in 2015 and MOA on Hosting of EAS Congress 2018 signed by DENR Philippines; preparation for EAS Congress 2018 and 6th Ministerial Forum ongoing. IRBM Framework for Sedone (Lao PDR) developed as part of riverbasin management Burapha University (BUU) and Saensuk Municipality (Thailand) signed an MOA for collaboration on environmental monitoring in Bangsaen Beach. BUU developing 'artificial mussel' technology for heavy metal monitoring, implemented in collaboration with Hong Kong University Operationalization of the Sihanoukville Environment and Provincial Government Preah Sihanouk 30 participants from ICM sites across China have participated in ICM Orientation and Training 	9.2) Skills, knowledge and support services of national and sub-national governments enhanced through ICM Communities of Practice, including the PEMSEA Network of Local Governments (PNLG), Regional Task Force/National Task Forces (RTF/NTF), etc.				• The project has developed a strong network of regional partners to assist with ICM training and implementation

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (TARGET)	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT (OUTCOME)	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
si (; • T le c a	Congress conducted successfully in Korea (2012) • Two national leadership forums conducted (Indonesia and Vietnam)	 Workshops covering: ICM orientation, SOC reporting, CS/CSIP MPA projects initiated at 3 ICM sites Sangguniang Panlalawigan (Batangas Province, Philippines) has agreed to upgrade the Batangas Environment Laboratory to allow for analysis of sediments and biota for trace metals and trace organics Planning for the construction of a provincial environmental monitoring laboratory to be sited at Cavite State University has been initiated 	0.2) State of Coaste reports				
		 To that National Soc Teports - (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Philippines, RO Korea, Singapore, Timor Leste, Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia) and State of River Basin Report for Lao PDR - have been prepared and were presented at the Regional Blue Economy Forum in November 2017. These reports are now being finalized for launching at EAS Congress 2018 Draft Regional SOC report developed and presented at the Regional Blue Economy forum in November 2017. The 	published and disseminated by all participating countries				Reports have been prepared and will be finalised well before the end of the project

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MID-TERM LEVEL &	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
				(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		
		report is being finalized for					
		publication and launching at					
		the EAS Congress					
Improved		15 ICM Learning Centers have	9.4) Evidence-based sound policy				
access to		now been accredited as part of	on ICM, climate change				
capacity		the PNLC and are providing	adaptation and disaster risk				
development/tr		technical assistance to ICM	reduction (DRR) in priority areas				
adjucation		sites off various icivi and	acosystem modelling including				
opportunities		trainings (workshops and	total allowable nutrient loading				
and technical		facilitate knowledge sharing	economic valuation of				
assistance for		among agencies institutions	ecosystem services, and macro-				
SDS-SEA/ICM		projects	scale zoning of vulnerable				
implementation		 PNLCs have participated in 	coastal and watershed areas				
		various capacity building					
		activities including: (a) Nutrient					
		Load Model workshop and					
		Pollution Reduction					
		Opportunity Analysis worksho;					
		(b) Regional Training Workshop					
		on Ecosystems Valuation and					
		Marine Spatial Planning in					
		Busan, Korea; (c) Ocean Health					
		Index workshop					
		 Facilitated selection and 					
		participation of three young					
		fellows, one from PNLC					
		(UNITAL) and two from PRF to					
		the Leadership for					
		United Nations University					
		ICM Manager Certification					
		Framework prepared and being					
		nilot tested before full					
		launched at FAS Congress 2018					

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF-	2019 END OF	MID-TERM	MID-TERM	MTR	JUSTIFICATION
		REPORTED)	PROJECT TARGET	LEVEL &	LEVEL &	RATING	FOR RATING
				ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT		
				(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		
		 SOC guide, ICM and Coastal 					
		Use Zoning Manuals all					
		completed final review with a					
		view to publication in Q2 2018.					
		Further manuals on IIMS and					
		CS/CSIP to be finalized in Q4 of					
		2018 • Special skills trainings					
		• Special skills trainings					
		develop/strengthen ICM					
		training programs and provide					
		on-the ground capacity					
		development and support					
		services to implement ICM					
		programs. This has included					
		translation of training modules					
		into local languages					
Outcome 10: Pro	ogram contributed to globa	al learning on scaling up of investme	ents in sustainable coastal and ocea	n management			
					1	1	Γ
Number of	 PEMSEA 	 PRF has launched the SEA 	10.1) One percent of IW budget			HS	 Both the
collaborative/jo	representatives	Knowledge Bank (SEAKB), in	committed to the regional				PEMSEA.ORG and the
int initiatives	participating regularly	collaboration with IW:LEARN	knowledge platform to				SEAKnowledge Bank
between IW	in GEF IW Biennial	and continues to promote the	contribute to IWLearn activities,				websites are
Learn and	conference	KB at relevant regional fora	Including IwLearn project				comprehensive
PEIVISEA	PEIVISEA Website linked to IM/Learn	Further activities underway	Websites, experience notes and				sharing and
	website	with twiteam on cross regional	Tw comerences.				dissemination of
	Regional KM programs	Large Marine Ecosystem					material
	on coastal and ocean	project					
	management lacking	•					
	strategy, coordination						
	and sustainability						
	across IW projects,						

INDICATOR	2013 BASELINE LEVEL	2017 LEVEL OF 3 RD PIR (SELF- REPORTED)	2019 END OF PROJECT TARGET	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MID-TERM LEVEL & ASSESSMENT	MTR RATING	JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING
Number of assessment reports on ICM program development from outreach and exploratory activities	regional organizations and programs • Limited outreach activities with non- PEMSEA countries and no strategy or approach to developing such services	 Regional Training of Trainers workshop for NOWPAP country members' on planning, development, and implementation of SD programs for coasts and oceans PEMSEA participated in various international and regional environment and ocean- related events, including (a) the first UN Ocean Conference (2017) (b) Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fisheries Bodies on Accelerating Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (2016) and (c) Regional Ocean Leadership Roundtable on Ocean Investment (v 2017) 	10.2) Knowledge and best practice in ICM facilitated by outreach to programs promoting sustainable coastal and ocean development in large marine ecosystems of South Asia, South Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, etc	(TARGET)	(OUTCOME)		Two activities have been initiated with IW Learn on Inter Collaborative Opportunities (ICOs) for cross regional partnership with the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem project.
		2017)					

Annex I

MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results				
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice"		
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings		
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings		
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings		
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets		
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets		

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management				
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice"		
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action		
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action		
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action		
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management		
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management		

Ratings for Sustainability				
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future		
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review		
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on		
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained		

Annex J

UNEG Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators:

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/ or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultants: Tony Elliott / Julian Roberts

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed on 20 May 2018

Tony Elliott

Julian Roberts
Annex K

MTR Report Clearance Form

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit:	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor:	
Name:	-
Signature:	Date:

Annex L - Audit Trail of Received Comments on Draft MTR Report

Author	#	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR Report	MTR Response and Action Taken
UNDP	1.	The MTR report included recommendations to delete and change indicators/targets in the results framework. These proposed changes should be very carefully reviewed by the CO, RTA, Project Board, etc. as changes to the results framework should not result in the downgrading of outcomes. If there is an agreement to any downgrading of global environmental benefits we would have to approach the GEF for approval and we want to avoid having to do that. Other types of changes would need approval by the PTA (such as correcting objective-level indicator baseline and non GEB target values if these were incorrectly calculated or incomplete in the project document; refinement/streamlining/ simplification/addition/ removal of outcome-level indicators if these changes will <u>not</u> have a significant impact on the project objective or scope (i.e. global environmental benefits)	Note that these recommendations are based on the revised SRF that was adopted at the Project Inception Meeting. The MTR team does not consider that its recommendations to delete and/or change certain indicators/targets in the results framework will result in any downgrading of outcomes or Global Environmental Benefits and, in some cases, the GEBs may actually be enhanced. The rationale for recommending these changes is explained for each case below, and Table 6 of the MTR report has been updated to include these explanations. Objective: The Specific Targets 2-6 do not obviously contribute to the achievement of Indicator 2. Indicator B is replicated under Outcome 4 so its deletion will not impact the Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) since they are captured elsewhere within the SRF. If this is a concern, an option would be to replace the existing Indicator under Outcome 4 with this Indicator, which is considered to be more specific and targeted. Targets B2-5 do not obviously contribute to the overall objective. Furthermore, they are replicated under several of the Outcomes of the SRF as Outputs (Outcomes 5,6 & 7). Their deletion will therefore not impact the GEB since they are captured elsewhere within the SRF.

	Outcome 1
	This proposal reflects the concern that it seems unlikely that PRF will be able to sign a Partnership Agreement due to political issues within YSLME. This should not stop PRF engagement and partnering with YSLME, which it should strive to do. However, maintaining a target that has almost no chance of being met, through no fault of PRF's does not make sense.
	As long as PRF continues to engage with YSLME in a proactive manner, there should be no impact on GEB.
	Outcome 5
	The suggested amendment to the wording of Outcome 5 reflects the concern that with effective management measures in place CPUE is likely to fall before it can increase. Any increases are unlikely to be seen within the timeframe of this project and therefore are unlikely to be measured.
	There also needs to be a recognition that, for some fishing villages, fishing effort has reduced to almost zero due to a transfer of livelihoods from fishing to tourism. As a result, it could be very easy to improve CPUE for those fishers remaining while the overall status of the fishery continues to decline. (i.e. less people can catch more fish per fisher)
	A further amendment to this recommendation is also warranted since the reference to 2,000 km2 was from the original PRF, which was amended to 1,140 km2 during the inception meeting.
	In terms of Global Environmental Benefit, it is considered that the amended Target will actually improve benefits rather than reduce them.

		Outcome 6
		The proposed amendment to focus less on water quality and more on catchment management mechanisms reflects the following concerns:
		a)To effectively measure the proposed water quality parameters (BOD, nutrients) will require a catchment- wide monitoring programme with multiple sampling stations on both a temporal and spatial scale. The monitoring capacity and effort currently under the project does not adequately cover this and it is therefore considered that an accurate status of water quality is going to be hard to establish through monitoring.
		b)There are a high number of variables that could impact BOD and nutrients over time and space. Unless these are adequately managed the target will not be achievable.
		c) Measureable reductions in large water bodies will take considerably longer than the project timeframe to achieve.
		Hence, it is felt that a better focus will be on enhanced catchment management to target the sources of these (and other) pollutants. If effectively implemented this approach should not reduce the GEB of the projects, and could well enhance them in the long term.
		Outcome 7
		The proposed amendments are aimed at identifying evidence that would make this Target measureable.
2.	The Recommendations table should indicate who the recommendation is addressed to or who would be accountable for actions to the recommendations	Responsible Party column added to the Table of Recommendations.
3.	On Management Arrangements – Please discuss the role of UNDP and PEMSEA	Interviews with UNDP CO Programme Associate and PRF Project Manager conducted and section 4.3.1 of the MTR report updated to include a review of UNDP's management arrangements
4.	The following should be added to the Annexes:	

5.	 Signed MTR final report clearance form Annexed in a separate file: Audit Trail from received comments on draft MTR report Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (secure from PEMSEA) UNDP CO requests consideration that in the recommendations on the Monitoring a line would include - PEMSEA to organize actual site monitoring visits by UNDP and other stakeholders. (Contributing Countries). Over the past 3 years of project implementation we have had only 1 site visit (to Iloilo, Philippines ICM site) and it would be recommended that PEMSEA organize at least one more to any of the actuate ICM Sites 	 MTR final report clearance form provided as Annex K Audit trail (this form) provided as separate file GEF IW tracking tool (as of 12/8/13 and 14/05/18) provided as separate files Additional Recommendation 7 added to section 5.1 and Table 13: "PRF to organise at least one more site monitoring visit for UNDP and other stakeholders from the participating countries to any of the countries' ICM sites"
6.	On item 4.3.6 Reporting please check timelines as your example mentioned 2018 PIR, but 2018 PIR has only started this month.	Relevant text in section 4.3.6 amended to read: "draft 2018 PIR (up to 15 April 2018)" Reference in Annex B also amended as above.

Annex M - GEF IW Tracking Tool (12/8/13 – Baseline)

THURONMENT	GEF International Waters Tracking Tool					
NOTE:		[GEF Project ID:	GEF Implementing Agency:
Please address all boxes	colored blue				5405 Project Title: Scaling up Implementation of the Sustainab SEA)	UNDP le Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-
Select GEF Replenishment:	GEF-5				GEF Allocation (\$USD): 10,643,992	Countries: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam
				PROCES	SS INDICATORS	
	Select project's is appropriate j	Operational Pro for a given indice	ogram(s), Strateg ator then select	gic Program(s), "Multiple" from	or objective(s) below. If multiple OP/SP/Obj the dropdown list:	
	OP/SP/Obj 2		_			
Indicators		Scroll down m	enu of ratings		Notes:	Ratings 1 = No legal agreement/cooperation framework in place
Regional legal agreements and cooperation frameworks	3				Eight (8) PEMSEA Country Partners signed the Agreement Recognizing PEMSEA's International Legal Personality in November 2009. A Headquarters Agreement was signed between the Government of the Philippines and PEMSEA in July 2012. The agreement is currently undergoing a ratification process, and is expected to be ratified by the Philippines Senate in the first quarter of 2014.	 2 = Regional legal agreement negotiated but not yet signed 3 = Countries signed legal agreement 4 = Legal agreement ratified and entered into force
Regional management institutions (RMI)	N/A				PEMSEA is a partnership mechanism, and all contributions to the RMI are on a voluntary basis. There are no "dues". PEMSEA was formally established as the regional coordinating mechanism for the implementation of the SDS-SEA by the Haikou Partnership Agreement in 2006. The PEMSEA Resource Facility was then established as the PEMSEA Secretariat and one of the four major operating mechanisms of PEMSEA. Three countries are currently supporting the PRF Secretariat Services (China: Japan; RO Korea) with contributions of approximately USD350,000-USD400,000 per year, depending on currency exchange rates. The Philippine Government is providing office facilities, including amenities (electricity, water, &security costs), Timor Leste is contributing 100,000USD annually, while other countries provide co-financing to project implementation in their respective countries and ICM sites.	1 = No RMI in place 2 = RMI established but functioning with limited effectiveness, < 50% countries contributing dues 3 = RMI established and functioning, >50% of countries contributing dues 4 = RMI in place, fully functioning and fully sustained by at or near 100% country contributions
Management measures in ABNI incorporated in Global/Regional Management Organizations (RMI) institutional/ management frameworks	N/A				The geographical scope of the PEMSEA programme includes the six Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia. PEMSEA implements the SDS-SEA, with objectives, targets, activities and programs at the regional, subregional, national and local levels. However, ABNJ is not identified as a specific objective of PEMSEA or its regional strategy.	1 = No management measures in ABN in (RMI) institutional/ management frameworks 2 = Management measures in ABN designed but not formally adopted by project participants 3 = Management measures in ABN formally adopted by project participants but not incorporated in RMI institutional/management frameworks 4 = Management measures in ABN fully incorporated in RMI institutional/ management frameworks

National Inter-Ministry Committees (IMCs)	3		Cambodia, DPR Korea, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, RO Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam have established interim national interagency arrangements/committees. The 5-year regional SDS-SEA Implementation Plan, which was adopted by countries in July 2012, targets the institutionalization of IMCs in at least 6 PEMSEA countries. The project will help to facilitate this process.	 1 = No IMCs established 2 = IMCs established and functioning, < 50% countries participating 3 = IMCs established and functioning, > 50% countries participating 4 = IMCs established, functioning and formalized thru legal and/or institutional arrangements, in most participating countries
National/Local reforms	3		Since 2003, 9 out of 12 PEMSEA participating countries have initiated the development and/or in the process of adopting and implementing their respective national and coastal policies. Countries have also enacted more than 80 legislations directly supporting the implementation of the SDS-SEA (i.e., laws supporting ICM implementation and coastal and ocean governance in Indonesia, Japan and ROK). The 5-year regional SDS-SEA Implementation Plan, which was adopted by countries in July 2012, targets the adoption of national coastal and ocean policies and supporting legislation in at least 6 PEMSEA countries. The project will help to facilitate this process.	 1 = No national/local reforms drafted 2 = National/local reforms drafted but not yet adopted 3 = National/legal reform adopted with technical/enforcement mechanism in place 4 = National/ legal reforms implemented
Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA): Agreement on transboundary priorities and root causes	4		The SDS-SEA and Putrajaya Declaration identify transboundary priorities and root causes, as agreed by countries, although no formal TDA was undertaken during the GEF project. Situational Analysis on East Asia's LIME's highlighted in the Project Document provide key information on the status and key issues in the LMEs of the region. The East Asian Seas Stocktaking Review also provided key information on the EAS coastal and ocean environment and management. The Regional Review of the Implementation of the SDS-SEA provides information on the status of the region and remaining/emerging challenges, which are also updated and presented in the Project Document	 1 = No progress on TDA 2 = Priority TB issues identified and agreed on but based on limited effect information; inadequate root cause analysis 3 = Priority TB issues agreed on based on solid baseline effect info; root cause analysis is inadequate 4 = Regional agreement on priority TB issues drawn from valid effect baseline, immediate and root causes properly determined
Revised Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)/Strategic Action Program (SAP) including Climatic Variability and Change considerations	4		The SDS-SEA, with specific reinforcement by the Manila Declaration on Strengthening the Implementation of Integrated Coastal Management for Sustainable Development and Climate Change Adaptation in the Seas of East Asia Region, includes Climate Change and Variability considerations. The Project Document devotes specific outcomes, outputs and activities to address natural and human- made hazards and disasters, and will integrate vulnerability assessment within its current risk assessment framework. Analytical approaches and tools will be mainstreamed into national and local policy and investment planning processes.	1 = No revised TDA or SAP 2 = TDA updated to incorporate climate variability and change 3 = revised SAP prepared including Climatic Variability and Change 4 = SAP including Climatic Variability and Change adopted by all involved countries

TDA based on multi- national, interdisciplinary technical and scientific (MNITS) activities	N/A				As noted in item 6	1 = TDA does not include technical annex based on MNITS actives 2 = MNITS committee established and contributed to the TDA development 3 = TDA includes technical annex, documenting data and analysis being collected 4 = TDA includes technical annex posted IWLEARN and based on MNITS committee inputs
Development of Strategic Action Plan (SAP)	4				The SDS-SEA serves as the regional framework of action. The SDS-SEA Regional 5-Year Implementation Plan (2012-2016) was adopted by the PEMSEA Country Partners in July 2012. It will be reviewed and updated as part of the current project.	1 = No development of SAP 2 = SAP developed addressing key TB concerns spatially 3 = SAP developed and adopted by ministers 4 = Adoption of SAP into National Action Plans (NAPs)
Proportion of Countries that have adopted SAP	14/14		The SDS-SEA was adopted by the following countries Brunei, Cambodia, China,DPRK, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Philippines, ROK, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam	Number of countries adopted SAP / total number of countries - e.g. 3 countries adopted /10 total countries in project, so 3/10		
Proportion of countries that are implementing specific measures from the SAP (i.e. adopted national policies, laws, budgeted plans)	12/14				Currently, the following countries are involved in the SDS-SEA implementation: Cambodia, China, DPRK, Indonesia, Japan, Lao, Philippines, ROK, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.	Number of countries implementing adopted SAP / total number of countries - e.g 3 countries implementing /10 total countries in project, so 3/10
Incorporation of (SAP, etc.) priorities with clear commitments and time frames into CAS, PRSPs, UN Frameworks, UNDAF, key agency strategic documents including financial commitments and time frames, etc	3				National 5-year SDS-SEA/ICM implementation plans with coastal and ocean governance objectives and targets adopted and initiated in China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam, RO Korea, Japan and Singapore. Countries will mainstream the objectives and targets of the plans into their national development and investment plans, as part of the assistance facilitated by the project.	1 = No progress 2 = Limited progress, very generic with no specific agency/government(s) commitments 3 = Priorities specifically incorporated into some national development/assistance frameworks with clear agency/government(s) commitments and time frames for achievement 4 = Majority of national development/assistance frameworks have incorporated priorities with clear agency/government(s) commitments and time frames for achievement

Local investment #2	5	At least a 1,000 ha increase in the areal extent of healthy, resilient coastal and marine habitats (i.e., coral reefs; mangroves, sea grass; sea weed) at identified conservation- focused ICM sites (functional scaling up) (Table 12) At least a 10% improvement in the METT ratings of MPAs and locally managed marine areas (LMMAs) at identified conservation-focused ICM sites (Table 13)	For the new GEF project, monitoring of marine protected areas will provide information on a) improved management effectiveness using the MPA METT (including measure of hectares of marine / coastal area); and b) biophysical indicators (e.g. % change in hard coral cover etc). These metrics will be applied in at a number of priority ICM sites. Baseline will be established during inception (reference Table 13 of ProDoc).
Local investment #3	6	At least 2,000 km2 of threatened fishing grounds covered by ICM/EAFM management plans (Table 14) with a measured increase in CPUE of 10% for important fish species	The new GEF project will apply EAFM focused ICM programs in selected priority fishing grounds. The metric will be in any combination of fish biomass, density, catch per unit effort, with baseline determined at project inception (refer to Table 14 of ProDoc)
Local investment #4	8	More than 1,500 households in coastal and watetshed areas in Cambodia and Lao PDR (Table 16) benefit from improved sanitation (i.e., elimination of raw sewage discharges; BOD reduction 20 MT/annum) and access to safe and reliable water supplies using improved technologies, operations and good management practices consistent with socio-economic and financial implications	The new GEF project will apply access to improved sanitation and water use and conservation measures at selected ICM priority sites. The metrics considered will include number of households benefiting from access to these improved services. Baseline and metric will be established at project inception (reference Table 16 of ProDoc).

Local investment #5	10	At least 10% of fisher households in identified coastal communities (Table 15) benefit from sustainable alternative livelihood programs At least 25% increase in household income in fishers' households with functional alternative livelihood programs (Table 15)	The new GEF project will support development of alternative / sustainable livelihoods in selected priority coastal communities. The metrics will include increase in number of fishers / households engaging in alternate /sustainable livelihoods, as well as changes in fisher/household income. This will be against a baseline established during project inception (reference Table 15 of the ProDoc)				
Local investment #6	16	DRRM plans, early warning systems and capable institutional mechanisms in place and functioning in coastal areas that are vulnerable to natural and/or manmade hazards (Table 17) 5% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas relocated away from hazard zones 100% of households in highly vulnerable coastal areas provided with evacuation routes and safe refuge locations	The new GEF project will strengthen capacity and preparedness for natural and human-made hazards in selected priority ICM sites. The metrics will be completion of DRRM plans, institutional mechanisms in place, capacitated and operation, early warning systems, percentage of highly vulnerable households relocated, and percentage of households will access to excavation routes and safe refuge. Baseline will be established at project inception (refer to Table 17 of ProDoc)				
	NOTE: an update commencement	IOTE: an updated version will be submitted following the Project Inception Workshop (i.e., within 3 months of ommencement of the project).					

WATER, ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS Indicators						
Indicators	Scroll down menu of ra	tings	Ratings			
Are there mechanisms and project indicators in place to monitor the environmental and socioeconomic status of the waterbody?	3	PEMSEA has established a State of Coasts reporting system, which measures status, changes and trends in coastal and marine areas, where ICM is being implemented. There are 39 indicators used, which cover governance, environmental and socioeconomic issues.	 1 = No mechanisms in place 2 = Some national/regional monitoring mechanisms, but they do not satisfy the project related indicators. 3 = Monitoring mechanisms in place for some of the project related indicators 4 = Mechanisms in place for project related indicators and sustainable for long-term monitoring 			
	IW:LEA	ARN Indicators				
Indicators	Scroll down menu of ra	tings	Ratings			
Participation in IW events (GEF IWC, Community of Practice (COP), IW:LEARN)	3	Participated in the GEF Biennial International Waters Conference (conference and exhibit. PEMSEA organizes regional events as a contribution to IW Learn objectives and targets, including the triennial EAS Congress, which includes an international conference, Youth Forum, international exhibition and Ministerial Forum, among others. The new GEF project anticipates participation in GEF IW events, including collaboration in organising 2 regional workshops / seminars.	 1 = No participation 2 = Documentation of minimum 1 event or limited COP participation 3 = Strong participation in COPs and in IWC 4 = Presentations with booth participation and hosting of staff/twinning 			
Project website (according to IW:LEARN guidelines)	4	Beyond the IW:Learn Guidelines, the PEMSEA website has streamlined design built on top of a future-proof content management system (Drupal). Includes four microsites, a secure online payment system, integrated online bookstore and an online library catalog. PEMSEA website included in the Top 5 of the IW: Wonderful Outstanding Web (WOW) award completion in 2011. The new GEF project, in its knowledge management activities, will strengthen the existing website, and expand the extent of reach of communities of practice.	1 = No project website 2 = Website not in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, not regularly updated 3 = Website in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, not regularly updated 4 = Website in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, regularly updated			
		Date Completed:	12/8/2013			

Annex N - GEF IW Tracking Tool (14/05/2018)

			ool		
	NOTE: Please address all hoves	colored blue		GEF Project ID: 5406	GEF Implementing Agency: UNDP Contact Person: Jose Padilla
				Project Title and name of Program if app Sustainable Development Strategy for th	licable: Sclaing up the Implementation of the e Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)
	Select GEF Replenishment:	GEF-5		GEF Allocation (\$USD): 10,643,992	Countries: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam
Α			IW GEF 6 CO	ORE INDICATORS	
	Enhanced Water-Food-Ener	gy-Ecosystems se	ecurity and conjunctive management of surface and	d groundwater	# of Basins
	Reduced nutrient pollution	and hypoxia (in	GEF-eligible LMEs)		LME name: South China Sea; Gulf of Thailand; East China Sea; Yellow Sea; Indonesian Seas; Sulu- Sulawesi Sea
	Length of Coastline in GEF-e preventing further loss and	eligible Large Mar degradation in m	ine Ecosystems under ICM (in GEF-eligible Large M lost significant marine protected areas (ha)	arine Ecosystems) AND Contribute to	227,701 km (exclusive of islands in Cambodia, China, DPR Korea, Japan, Malaysia, RO Korea and Viatnam)
	-Globally over-exploited fish	neries moved to	more sustainable levels		% (by volume)
В			PROCESS	S INDICATORS	
		Select project's OP/SP/Obj is ap	Operational Program(s), Strategic Program(s), ppropriate for a given indicator then select "Mu	or objective(s) below. If multiple ltiple" from the dropdown list:	
	Indicators		Scroll down menu of ratings	Notes:	Ratings
1	Regional legal agreements/cooperative frameworks		4	the Agreement Recognizing PEMSEA's International Legal Personality in November 2009. A Headquarters Agreement was signed between the Government of the Philippines and PEMSEA in July 2012, and was ratified by the Philippines Senate in	 1 = No legal agreement/cooperation framework in place 2 = Regional legal agreement negotiated but not yet signed 3 = Countries signed legal agreement 4 = Legal agreement ratified and entered into force
2	Regional management institutions (RMI)		3	PEMSEA is a partnership mechanism, and all contributions to the RMI are on a voluntary basis. There are no mandatory dues. At present, 6 Partner Countries are providing voluntary contributions annually to support the operation of the PEMSEA Resource Facility, namely: China, Japan, Philippines, RO Korea, Singapore, and Timor Leste. Total contributions are approximately US\$ 600,000 per year, depending on the currency exchange rates. Other countries provide co-financing to project implementation in their respective countries and at ICM sites.	 1 = No RMI in place 2 = RMI established but functioning with limited effectiveness, < 50% countries contributing dues 3 = RMI established and functioning, >50% of countries contributing dues 4 = RMI in place, fully functioning andcore functions fully sustained by at or near 100% country contributions or other sustainable revenues of the RMI
3	(ABNJ only:) Management measures incorporated in the institutional mandates and/or management action frameworks of Global/Regional Management Bodies		1	The geographical scope of PEMSEA program includes six LMEs of East Asia. PEMSEA implements the SDS-SEA, with objectives, targets, activities and programs at the regional, subregional, national and local levels. However, ABNJ is not indentified in the specific objective of the SDS-SEA.	 1 = No relevant management measures in ABNJ in Global/Regional Management Body 2 = Management measures in ABNJ designed but not formally adopted 3 = Management measures in ABNJ formally adopted by Global/Regional Management Body 4 = Implementation of management measures in ABNJ being regularly by Global/Regional Management Body
4	National Inter-Ministrerial Committees (IMCs)		3	Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam have established national Inter-Ministry Committees. RO Korea, Singapore, and Timor Leste have established interim national interagency committees. The 5-year regional SDS-SEA Implementation Plan 2018-2022 (approval pending) targets institutionalization of IMCs in all PEMSEA countries. The project will help facilitate this process.	 1 = No IMCs established 2 = IMCs established and functioning, < 50% countries participating 3 = IMCs established and functioning, > 50% countries participating 4 = IMCs established, functioning and formalized thru legal and/or institutional arrangements, in most participating countries
5	National/Local reforms		3	China, Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam have national polices and/or legislation for the management of their coastal and marine areas. Philippines has national policy and is in the process of adopting national legislation. Timor Leste has drafted a national ocean policy and its adoption is pending. Lao PDR has national policy and legislation covering water resource management. The SDS-SEA Implementation Plan 2018-2022 (adoption pending) targets all PEMSEA countries with national policy and supporting legislation. The project will	 1 = No national/local policies or revision drafted 2 = National/ local policies drafted but not yet adopted 3 = National/legal policies adopted with technical/enforcement mechanism in place 4 = National/ legal policies implemented

6	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, <u>including revised</u> (TDA): Agreement on transboundary priorities and root causes	4	The SDS-SEA and Putrajaya Declaration identify transboundary priorities and root causes, as agreed by countries, although no formal TDA was undertaken during the pilot phase of the project. The East Asian Seas stocktaking review and the Regional Review of SDS-SEA implementation 2003-2015	 1 = No progress on TDA 2 = Priority TB issues identified and agreed on but based on limited effect information; inadequate root cause analysis 3 = Priority TB issues agreed on based on solid baseline effect info; root cause analysis is inadequate 4 = Regional agreement on priority TB issues drawn from
7	Development of Strategic Action Plan (SAP)	4	The SDS-SEA, which was adopted in 2003, was reviewed, updated and approved by Ministers during the Ministerial Forum 2015. The updated version of the SDS-SEA includes a new strategy and action program that is focused on reducing the impacts of climate change and natural and man-made hazards, particularly on ocean and coastal ecosystems and coastal communities. The SDS-SEA 2015 objectives covering climate change adaptation/mitigation, disaster risk reduction, pollution reduction/waste management and biodiversity conservation and management plans and sectoral SAPs (climate change; biodiversity). The project will help countries develop 5-year implementation plans to accelerate the implementation of actions in these three focus areas.	1 = No development of SAP 2 = SAP developed, including clear targets, commitments and time frames addressing key TB concerns spatially 3a = SAP signed on ministerial level (no clear targets); 3b = SAP with clear targets signed on ministerial level 4 = Adoption of SAP into National Action Plans (NAPs) and/or SAP commitments incorporated within national sectoral plans
8	SAP addresses groundwater governance and enhancing conjunctive management of surface and groundwater (as applicable)	1	as noted in item 6	 1 = N/A TDA/SAP consider role of groundwater qualitatively; no relevant action needs identfied in SAP 3 = TDA/SAP analyze role of groundwater on national and transboundary levels and identifies need for additional information & knowledge in SAP (as applicable) 4 = TDA/SAP fully recognize role of groundwater for development and identifies governance and managements needs adequately in SAP
9	TDA/SAP addresses Nexus dimensions	2	The Sustain, Preserve and Protect strategies and action programs of the SDS-SEA 2015 refer to the water-food-energy nexus in a qualitative manner. The Protect strategy promotes actions to address the impacts of land-based activities within the framework of integrated coastal and watershed management, including protection of rivers, lakes, and tributaries, and promotion of good management practices in land and water uses.	1= TDA/SAP does not consider Water-Food-Energy- ecosystems nexus 2 = TDA/SAP addresses Nexus dimensions qualitatively but identified actions are not aligned with analysis 3 = TDA/SAP makes an effort to specify and estimate Nexus synergies and trade-offs in prioritization of investments; 4 = Water-Food-Energy-Ecosystem Nexus fully recognized as providing benefits for cooperation and investments identified and prioritized accordingly
10	Proportion of Countries that have adopted SAP	14/14	Eleven (11) PEMSEA Partner Countries have adopted the SDS-SEA 2015. In addition, Brunei, Thailand, and Malaysia adopted SDS- SEA 2003.	Number of countries adopted SAP / total number of countries - e.g 3 countries adopted /10 total countries in project, so 3/10
11	Proportion of countries that are implementing specific measures from the SAP (i.e. adopted national policies, laws, budgeted plans)	13/14	At present, only Brunei is not implementing specific measures from the SAP.	Number of countries implementing adopted SAP / total number of countries - e.g 3 countries implementing /10 total countries in project, so 3/10
12	SAP implementaion finance secured by governments and development partners		Can't answer this question. The SAP is a long term commitment of 10 years or more i.e, beyond the planning and budgeting processes of governments.	 SAP implementation finance secured for: Only GEF and co-finance; 25 % 30 % 4 = > 50 % of total estimated SAP implementation costs

STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS

	Indicators		Scroll down menu of rati	ngs	Ratings
13	Types of mechanisms in place to produce a monitoring report on stress reduction measures?		3	Regional SOC reporting system set up and currently being implemented in 10 countries and at the regional level. National and regional SOC reports will be submitted to the Ministerial Forum in November 2018.	 1 = No mechanisms in place to monitor/report change 2 = Some national/regional monitoring mechanisms, but they do not satisfy the project related indicators. 3 = monitoring mechanisms in place for some of the project related indicators 4 = Mechanisms in place and sustainable for long-term monitoring
14	Stress reduction measurements incorporated by project through improved	Choose Management Mechanism from list below:	Please specify the area or length of coastline out of total area identifie (e.g. 10,000/100	currently under improved management d by project below 0,000 Ha):	Management Mechanisms: 1 = Integrated Water Resource Management (watershed, lakes, aquifers) 2 = Integrated Coastal Management 3 = Marine Spatial Planning
	management of:	2	Length of coastline (as of December 201	17): approximately 40,000/227,701	4 = Marine Protected areas

		Please specify the types of technologies and measures impleme nted in demo i nvestments (Column D) and their	respective results (Column I):			
		Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:			
		4 4 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored	892 ha. increase in areal extent of healthy, resilient coastal and marine habitats			
		 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 				
	Local investment #1	 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 				
		 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 				
		17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20= Other - please specify in box below				
		Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Damaged mangroves/coastal vegetation rehabilitation in China (80 ha), Indonesia (30 ha), Philippines (50 ha), Timor Leste (20 ha), Vietnam (500 ha); seagrass protection/conservation in Cambodia (200ha)				
		Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:			
		1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied	10% improvement in METT ratings of MPAs and locally management marine areas (LMMAs) at identified conservation-focused ICM sites (Table 13)			
15		6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved				
	Local investment #2	10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected				
		14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19 = Integrated Coastal Management (Ha)				
		20= Other - please specify in box below Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Baseline METT ratings conducted at MPA/CMMA sites in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor leste and Vietnam. Plans for improving management effectiveness under development in all countries, targeting implementation in 2018, and case study preparation in 2019.				
		Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:			
		1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 6 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied	At least 1,140 km2 of threatened fuishing grounds covered by ICM/EAFM management plans (Table 14) with measured increase of 10% for important fish species			
	Local investment #3	 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 	25% household income improvement in 10% of households generating income from non-fishing sources (Table 15)			
		11 = Calchment protection measures - na under improved calchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction				
		 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20= Other - please specify in how below 				
		Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Baseline assessments completed at priority fishing grounds in C underway in Indonesia. EAFM mamagement plans developed and initiated in China and Vietnam. Socio-econ communities in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippinens, and Timor Leste. Alternative livelihood opport PDR, and Timor Leste	ambodia, China, Philippines, Thailand, and Timor Leste, and omic assessment of fisher households conducted in fisher unities assessed in fisher communities Cambodia, China, Lao			
		NOTE: If the project has more than three local investments, please fill out the Annex A found in the worksheet tabs below.				

D		WATER, ENVIRONMENTAL & S	OCIOECONOMIC STATUS In	Idicators
	Indicators	Scroll down menu of ratir	ngs	Ratings
16	Number of national/regional/global policies, legislationn, plans and strategies that incorporate gender dimensions	N/A		
17	Number of women and men as direct beneficiares of project activities	N/A		
18	Number of civil society stakeholders/participant s engaged in TDA/SAP development (gender disaggregated)	N/A		
19	Types of mechanisms and project indicators in place to monitor the environmental status of the waterbody?	3	PEMSEA has established a State of Coasts reporting system, which measures status, changes and trends in coastal and marine areas, where ICM is being implemented. There are 39 indicators used, which cover governance, environmental and socio- economic issues.	 1 = No mechanisms in place 2 = Some national/regional monitoring mechanisms, but they do not satisfy the project related indicators. 3 = Monitoring mechanisms in place for some of the project related indicators 4 = Mechanisms in place for project related indicators and sustainable for long-term monitoring
E		IW:LEAF	RN Indicators	
	Indicators	Scroll down menu of ratin	ngs	Ratings
20	Participation in IW events (GEF IWC, Training, Twinning and other IW:LEARN activities)	3	PEMSEA participated in IW:LEARN Conference in Sri Lanka (May 2016) and South Africa (Nov 2017).	 1 = No participation 2 = Documentation of minimum 1 event or limited Twinning participation 3 = Strong participation in training/twinning and in IWC 4 = Country participation in IWC, and submission of atleast one Results & one Experience Note
21	Project website (according to IW:LEARN guidelines)	3	PEMSEA and IW Learn collaborated in the design and development of a regional EAS KM platform, with linkages to the IW Learn global KM platform.	 1 = No project website 2 = Website not in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, not regularly updated 3 = Website in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, and regularly updated 4 = Website in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, and

Date Completed:

14/05/2018

updated 4 = Website in line with IW:LEARN guidelines, and contributing spatial and other data to IWLEARN.net



GEF IW Tracking Tool -Annex A: Additional Local Investments

	Please	specify the types o	of technologies and measures implemented in local investments (Column D) and their respective	results (Column I):
			Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:
		8	1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied	1,100 households in priority coastal and watershed areas in Cambodia and Lao PDR (Table 16) benefit from improved sanitation and access to safe and reliable water supplies
			 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 	
			9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management	
	Local investment #4		12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to avuifer. <i>Kelb</i> (waar reduction	
			15 – Fondation reduction to aquiners - kg/na/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 – Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 – Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha)	
			19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20= Other - please specify in box below	
		Briefly describe in level; validation v waste manage Phumin conducte initiated fo	vestment in a 100 words or less: Lao PDR: Focus group discussion and survey jor 15 villages con workshop conducted on improvements in water supply accessibility and security. Cambodia: Dra ement in Khemrak Phumin developed; validation workshop on baseline assessment report on so rd; Final baseline assessment report on solid waste management in Khemrak Phumin completed or Sihanoukville Municipality using simple models for pollutant loading, secondary data analysis	ducted on the water uses at the village if baseline assessment report on solid lid waste management in Khemrak ; Liquid waste baseline data gathering and stakeholder consultations
			Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:
		20	 Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 	DRRM enhancement
			5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved	
15			9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management	
	Local investment #5		12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to avuifer - ke/ha/war reduction	
			16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha)	
		Briefly describe in coastal areas the	(20- Other - please specify in box below westment in a 100 words or less: DRRM plans, early warning systems and capable institutional r at are vulnerable to natural and/or manmade hazard (Table 17). Risk/vulnerability assessments China, Indonesia, Thailand and Timor Leste. Assessment of resiliency and response mechan	nechanisms in place and functioning in nechanisms in place and functioning in completed at ICM sites in Cambodia, iisms underway.
			Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:
		1	1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Arriculture pollution reduction practices - ba of practices: estimate of N P & BOD kg/yr	25,000 km2 of priority river basins/coastal areas covered by ICM /IWRM plans (Table 16)
			 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 	
			7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # negative provided atternative livelihoods	
	Local investment #6		11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected	
			14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Interrated Water Resource Management (Ha)	

	19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20= Other - please specify in box below		
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Prioority river basins and coastal areas confirmed in Cambodi Vietnam. Riiver basin profiles completed; draft pilot project proposals/work plans p	a, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, and repared.	
	Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:	
Local investment #7	1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/ha/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19 = Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20 = Other - please specify in box below		
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:		
	Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) [1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:	
	2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques		
Local investment #8	8 = Water use efficiency measures - m ³ /yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m ³ /ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m ³ /yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Magnend Augustan (MAR)		
	14 - Wahageu Aquier Recharge (WAR) - Wohne 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20= Other - please specify in hax below		
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:		
	Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction below:	
	1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques		
Local investment #9	 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m³/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m³/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m³/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection. 		
	14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19 = Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) 20 = Other - please specify in box below		

	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:	
	Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value o
	1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N. P & BOD (kg/yr)	respective stress reduction b
	2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr	
	3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr	
	4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored	
	5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied	
	6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in field size	
	8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved	
	9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved	
	10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods	
Local investment #10	11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management	
	$12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected$	
	14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume	
	15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction	
	16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area	
	17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector	
	18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha)	
	20= Other - please specify in box below	
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:	
	Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction b
	1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr)	
	2 = 1 ndustrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = 4 ariculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N P & BOD kg/yr	
	4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored	
	5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied	
	6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size	
	7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques	
	8 = water use efficiency measures - m ^A 3/yr water saved	
	10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods	
	11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management	
Local investment #11	12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved	
	13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected	
	14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAK) - Volume	
	16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area	
	17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector	
	18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha)	
	19= Integrated Coastal Management (Ha)	
	20= Uther - please specify in pox below	
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:	
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:	
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less:	
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five)	Please enter amount/value or respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr)	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 3 = Stress Reduction wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 4 = Stress Reduction wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress Reduction wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress Reduction wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress Reduction wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress Reduction Measurements (Stress Reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress Reduction Measurements (Stress Reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress Reduction Measurements (Stress Reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 5 = Stress	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Bestored habitat including watehold - ha catored	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland. MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimated kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved	Please enter amount/value a respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/ha/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved	Please enter amount/value a respective stress reduction b
	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/ha/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ba under improved catchment management	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m ³ /yr water saved	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - ha onder improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m^3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m3/yr water saved 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - ha of provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/ha/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Mount of S lawarand fram charge incore cate	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/ha/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha)	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 13 = Aquifer recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19 = Integrated Coastal Management (Ha)	Please enter amount/value c respective stress reduction b
Local investment #12	Briefly describe investment in a 100 words or less: Stress Reduction Measurements (Choose up to five) 1 = Municipal wastewater pollution reduction - N, P & BOD (kg/yr) 2 = Industrial wastewater pollution reduction - pollutant; estimated kg/yr 3 = Agriculture pollution reduction practices - ha of practices; estimate of N, P & BOD kg/yr 4 = Restored habitat, including wetlands - ha restored 5 = Conserved/protected wetland, MPAs, and fish refugia habitat - ha applied 6 = Reduced fishing pressure - tons/yr reduction; % reduction in fleet size 7 = Improved use of fish gear/techniques - % vessels applying improved gear/techniques 8 = Water use efficiency measures - m^3/yr water saved 9 = Improved irrigation practices - m^3/ha/yr water saved 10 = Alternative livelihoods introduced - # people provided alternative livelihoods 11 = Catchment protection measures - ha under improved catchment management 12 = Aquifer pumping reduction - m3/yr water saved 13 = Aquifer recharge area protection - ha protected 14 = Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) - volume 15 = Pollution reduction to aquifers - kg/ha/year reduction 16 = Invasive species reduction - ha and/or #'s of targeted area 17 = Amount of \$ leveraged from private sector 18 = Integrated Water Resource Management (Ha) 19 = Integrated Coastal Management (Ha) <tr< td=""><td>Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction b</td></tr<>	Please enter amount/value of respective stress reduction b