

Management Response to Evaluation Report

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION	Project Title	Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in Eastern Indonesia (Fisheries Management Areas 715, 717, and 718)
	GEF ID	9129
EVALUATION INFORMATION	Evaluator Name/ Company Name	PNCI People & Nature Consulting International
	Completion Date	01/31/2024
KEY DATES FOR PROJECT	Agency Approval Date	12/20/2019
	First Disbursement Date	06/30/2020
	Actual Implementation Start Date	WWF: 05/04/2021 CI: 03/15/2018
	Expected (or Actual) Mid-Term Review	01/31/2024
	Expected Completion Date	CI: technically closed on 05/20/22 WWF: 12/31/26
	Expected Financial Closure Date	WWF: 06/30/27
PROJECT BUDGET	Total GEF disbursement through June 30 of the FY (USD) for project that has been in implementation for at least 1 FY	\$4,235,440.93
	Total GEF Project Budget	\$ 6,907,858.93

Management Response Author(s)	Heike Lingertat, Dr. Adipati
Completion Date	09/ 06/2024

Project Management Unit Contact information:

Project Position	Name	E-mail
Project Manager	Adipati Rahmat Gumelar	adipatirahmat@gmail.com
M&E Officer	Ahadar Tuhuteru	ahdar.79@gmail.com
F&A Officer	Yoppy Endano	yoppy.hii@gmail.com
Safeguards Specialist	Faridatun Amalia	faridatunamalia25@gmail.com
GEF Agency local contact	Anton Wijonarno	antonwijonarno@gmail.com

Part I. Quality of the Report

1. How would you rate the quality of this report (Choose one: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU)? Please justify your rating.

Satisfactory:

The midterm review document was well structured and written, comprehensive, and responsive to the TOR. It contained clear and sound recommendations using a comprehensive methodology that included stakeholder interviews. With respect to the provided suggestions, it would have helped if the recommendation section could have been more concise and avoid repetitions in different sections and the consultant also reviewed the annual financial and administrative reports not only the technical reports given the identified financial problems.

2. Any errors or inaccuracies in the final report? Please reference the statement and page number.

No.

Part II. Knowledge Management

1. Any information or assessment surprising or unexpected in this report?

The information and the assessment is quite on point, although some indicators and outcomes have been revised due to the late project start and ensuing changes, particularly with respect to the GEF Core Indicators.

2. Key takeaways:

- a. Future GEF projects (design or implementation): If MMAF executes projects directly it would be helpful if past experiences of such executing arrangements will be shared between different departments of MMAF and from other ministries, so that lessons are drawn for future projects. Efforts should be made to grow the understanding of a project's Theory of Change with relation to ensure that meaningful activities can be prioritized collaboratively to enhance the impact of the project.

The project has two GEF agencies who have legal agreements with different executing agencies which does not support coherence of a project since implementation follows the independent legal agreements. In addition to inadequate alignment and cooperation, the two legally independent project executing partners experienced different time lines of project implementation. Such GEF project structures should be avoided in future GEF projects.

The GEF decision to exclude WWF-Indonesia (an independent organization to WWF-US (GEF Agency)) as executing partner from this project, has resulted in

losing high in-country technical knowledge and excellence and led to challenges in project implementation.

- b. GEF operations or management: Not applicable to PMU
 - c. PMU operations or management: For the first half of the project the PMU had no power at all to execute the project which led to the implementation of inadequate activities and financial mismanagement. This situation improved, the funds, however, continue to be managed by MMAF, and to address the challenge with effective decision-making on resource allocation, there is a significant opportunity to enhance the composition of the PSC by diversifying its membership and include individuals with complementary knowledge and expertise as relevant for scaling up of impact. The PMU has to be further empowered to make decisions relevant to effective and efficient daily operations. While all job descriptions/responsibilities for the project management unit are included in the SOP, MMAF failed to hire the required staff to manage such a complex project. IN addition, the company that hired the PMU did not follow basic HR practice which led to delayed or non-payment of salaries of the PMU staff which resulted in the resignation of the previous project manager. The project would greatly benefit if more PMU staff with relevant technical expertise could be hired.
 - d. Institutional arrangements: Executing arrangements are a unique aspect of the project, causing delays and affecting coordination between the project parties during the early years following GEF CEO approval. The WWF-GEF had recommended expanding and diversifying the composition of the PSC through more technical and stakeholder representation (e.g., local government representatives for the target FMAs and representatives of relevant CSO). More recently, the PSC has been made slightly more diverse, but additional members do not have voting rights and further expansion and diversification for improved adequacy of the PSC is needed.
 - e. Other:
3. Who should receive copies of this terminal evaluation report? OFP Ibu Lakshmi, Bureau of Planning, Bureau of Foreign Cooperation, Secretary General, Secretary of Director General.
4. Other comments:

Part III. Follow-up Actions to Recommendations

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
<i>Specific recommendations listed below</i>	<i>Do you agree/ disagree with the recommendation? What priority would you place on the recommendation (low, medium, high)? Include any specific comments you have.</i>	<i>Indicate what actions should be taken in response to the recommendation. Insert new rows if you list multiple actions.</i>	<i>Indicate the deadline for each action to be completed.</i>	<i>Indicate who must carry out the action.</i>	<i>Progress on this response should be assessed 1x/year. Indicate below if each action is Complete, Partially Complete or Pending.</i>	<i>Provide any comments related to the status of each action.</i>
R1 Broaden awareness and understanding about the relevance of the project with primary (sectoral) and secondary (non-sectoral) stakeholders. This should be considered the main priority of any further work during the first 6 months of 2024 under Component A, and could be best implemented by the PMU leader, supported by a new to be developed strategic communication strategy that includes specifically identified target audiences (see also activity B1.1.1, B1.1.2 and B1.2.1 in the roadmap presented in annex 8).	Yes, agree since coordination was lacking and missing coordination criticized by several partners. High priority because better teamwork between PMU and MMAF needs transparency and trust.	1. Internal meeting of PMU with the National Project Coordinator (NPC) and Technical Coordinator (TC). 2. Coordination meeting of CFI with the Secretariat General of Capture Fisheries (SGCF), Inspectorate General, and different Bureaus. 3. Online Coordination Meeting with	1. January 2024 2. February 2024 3. February-April 2024	Project Manager (PM), KM&M&E Specialist	1. Completed . Satisfactory results. 2. Completed . Satisfactory results 3. Completed . Satisfactory results	All parties within MMAF (NPC, TC, Directorate of Fisheries Resources Management, SGCF, and Bureaus) are welcoming the new coordination approach and are now active in the implementation of the project compared with the earlier approach where only one Directorate was involved in the implementation.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
		Stakeholders outside of MMAF.				
Yes, but the referred outcome indicators and targets have either already changed or are hard to measure. For example the target of seascapes have been already reached before project start and therefore new targets have to be developed (e.g. OECM). The 400.000 tons of fish produced is hard to verify since MMAF doesn't have exact data on fish produced due to missing data collection. To address this the project supports Quota Based Fisheries (QBF) and data collection.	Yes, but the referred outcome indicators and targets have either already changed or are hard to measure. For example the target of seascapes have been already reached before project start and therefore new targets have to be developed (e.g. OECM). The 400.000 tons of fish produced is hard to verify since MMAF doesn't have exact data on fish produced due to missing data collection. To address this the project supports Quota Based Fisheries (QBF) and data collection.	1. Seascapes - open a discussion with the related Directorate on how to improve the management of Indonesian Seascapes and how to add the required METT indicators to the project's Core indicators 2. Develop new targets on Sasi and support establishment of OECM definition in Indonesia. 3. Support the Quota Based Fisheries (QBF) program as one of the new Outcomes within the project.	1 and 2. The coordination meeting should be done within the first 3 month of 2024. 3. The planning of support the QBF should be done within the first three months of 2024.	Project Manager	1 and 2. Completed , with the result if CFI and KKHL agree to implement METT. 3. Completed with PSC and SGCF agreed to the proposal suggested by CFI to support the QBF.	1. Since the target in achieving MPA has already been reached, CFI now focuses on developing a new concept in creating new MPA reserve from the Sasi area, through the OECM methods. 2. METT data will be provided. 2. MMAF has required CFI to support QBF. Therefore more than 30% of 2024 activities were adjusted to support QBF, without changing its Outputs and Targets.
R3 Connect with other similar projects (e.g. as currently being implemented with MMAF for BerIKAN and Oceans, as implemented during recent years by Rare, YKAN and KEHATI, and as related to institutionalization of <i>sasi</i> , or as related to eco-label and seafood certification	Yes. Medium priority	PMU has been coordinating with relevant projects and NGO in order to push the knowledge sharing	February 2024, and every three months as scheduled by	Project Manager	Completed	Through this regular Monitoring and Evaluation Meeting, CFI has coordinated with several projects such as BERIKAN, LAUTRA, FID, etc., and also

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
schemes) to adopt their lessons or to draw additional relevant lessons such as those relevant to marketing of perishable consumer goods for selection of feasible activities that effectively accelerate impact at the project sites. This should be a priority for the PMU leader, and supported systematically by the new to be developed strategic communication strategy (see also activity B1.1.2, B1.2.2 and B3.1.1 in the roadmap in annex 8).		and best practices, in a coordination group facilitated by the Planning Bureau.	the Planning Bureau			managed to improve the project ratings given by Planning Bureau from at risk to on schedule.
R4 Review selection of activities with the following selection criteria: i) do they align with achievement of the project targets i.e. ‘improved management of 5.5 million hectares of seascapes and 400,000 tons of fisheries into sustainable production levels across the project FMAs’, ii) are they based on lessons learned elsewhere/by other similar projects and on feedback from stakeholders already provided during the first half of the project, iii) will their results be measurable relatively quickly to serve as demonstration of the value of EAFM, iv) will results be scalable and sustainable, and v) do they allow for mobilization of significant co-finance. This should be a priority for the PSC and facilitated by the PMU leader.	Yes, very good suggestion. High priority	Review and discussion meeting with MMAF and then with WWF GEF Agency	January 2024	Project Manager	Completed	Changes within CFI, especially the PSC and TC, have a huge impact on the project’s AWPB. Therefore, this meeting was very important to discuss the new proposal of MMAF and explain to the WWF GEF Agency.
R5 Integrate processes to review already provided and new to be provided feedback from beneficiaries (especially community members) more systematically for example by empowering site managers throughout all project management activities. This can be managed by the M&E expert in the PMU in the	Yes, agree. Site managers are the project representatives in the site location, and their coordination with the	A lot of discussions between PM and SM, with a follow-up meeting every time the PM visit	January 2024	Project Manager, KMME Specialist and Site Managers	Completed but ongoing as a lot new issues continuously arise.	A series of meetings and discussions between the PM and SMs has been taking place, with the PM requesting the SM to be more active and confident

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
long term, but a dedicated series of well-facilitated meetings between site managers and local government representatives should be organized during Q1 of 2024 to consider ways that such process can be sustained through already existing ‘institutional’ arrangements such as those regulated for FMA management and other relevant regional economic development planning processes.	local government is vital for the project. High priority	the project location.				and using their authority to push the project’s agenda.
R6 Shift focus and related financial and human resources to component B to improve the project’s progress towards measurable relevant outcomes and results. Note that the focus of work under Component A should also shift towards supporting engagement of other departments of MMAF and other ministries in support of relevant co-financing of enabling conditions to achieve project targets in the project areas. The required budget for the re-focused activities under Component A, however, will therefore be reduced, making it possible to increase resources for work with communities and local government in the project FMAs. This should be a priority for the PSC and facilitated by the PMU leader.	Yes, agree to some extent, as some of Component A has yet to be completed, but a focused effort to reach Component A Outputs has been done. High priority	AWPB of 2024 has been adjusted to support more activities of Component B, rather than Component A.	All in 2024, as 2024 has been targeted to completed all of the Outputs of the Result Framework. 2025 will focus on reaching the Outcomes.	Project Manager	Completed	
R7 Identify and operationalize relevant opportunities to engage local partners and other government agencies to enhance performance of the project towards acceleration of more relevant outcomes towards “improved management of 5.5 million hectares of seascapes and 400,000 tons of fisheries into sustainable production levels across the project FMAs”. This is closely linked to R3 and C2, so it should be part of	Yes, agree, it’s important to review again the list of stakeholders, and analyze which will be most important in reaching the outcomes. Medium priority	Reviewing the Stakeholder Engagement plan (SEP)	Early 2024	Project Manager	Completed	The local government and local communities are the main stakeholders and most relevant for reaching the project’s outputs and outcomes. That's why a Champion who represents each community has been chosen, and together with

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
implementing R1 as it will be especially valuable to align coordination efforts with other departments of MMAF and with other ministries, in support of efficient coastal community development. The PMU and the steering committee should receive additional technical assistance to implement this recommendation, which includes development of a new to be designed communication strategy (see activity B3.1.1 in annex 8).						the local government, the project has been investing in the champions as the agents of change in their community. They have been invited to join trainings, seminars, and exhibitions of their own products. They will continue to lead trainings and be the local model in the villages after the project ends.
C1 Optimize synergy and create interlinkages between interventions planned in this project and those in other programs by MMAF, especially with BerIKAN and Oceans. Significant opportunities may also exist by working with other departments in MMAF, especially those responsible for investment in coastal infrastructure and those responsible for sectoral capacity development and collaborative management. This should receive priority attention during more frequently held PSC meetings and can be further supported through A4 with regards expanding the PSC and improving diversity of PSC membership (both technically – especially related to economic development - as well as through inclusion of different type of members - especially private sector).	Yes, Low priority because projects are not necessarily synced. The team has been in close coordination with the ATSEA team but some other projects are completed (ISLME), while others LAUTRA (Oceans), Blue Halo, etc. are still in development phase. Also only few projects share similarities with CFI.	Monitoring and Evaluation Meeting facilitated by the Planning Bureau	Every 3 months, as the scheduled by the Planning Bureau	Project Manager	Completed and Ongoing	CFI think that the regular monthly meetings facilitated by the Planning Bureau are sufficient to coordinate and collaborate. CFI will also invite MMAF staff from other project at the 2024 Annual Reflection to share CFI project progress, and gather inputs from other projects.
C2 Identify and activate synergies with other actors in the same sector (e.g., private sector, NGOs) and with government agencies for different sectors operating in the same	Yes, Medium priority	PMU will coordinate with Planning Bureau to have a meeting	January-March 2024 (depends on the schedule	Project Manager	Completed and ongoing	

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
Indonesian context to mobilize adequate investments to meet the co-financing commitment. Similarly, as for R2, this should be a priority for the PMU leader, and supported by the new to be developed strategic communication strategy (see also activity B1.1.2, B1.2.1, and B1.2.2 in the roadmap in annex 8).		with other relevant Projects.	made by the Planning Bureau)			
C3 Increase internal project coherence through review (confirmation or rejection) of previously identified activities, outputs and component outcomes informed by their quantified/proportional contribution overall targets of “improved management of 5.5 million hectares of seascapes and 400,000 tons of fisheries into sustainable production levels across the project FMAs”. As this is similar to R4. but internal to the PMU team firstly, this should be a priority for the M&E expert in the PMU, in close collaboration with the 3 site managers, and they should be facilitated in this through additional technical assistance in this process to also use it to validate assumptions of the ToC. Following the internal implementation of this recommendation, the outcomes should inform implementation of R.4. during Q1, to improve and finalize the draft AWP of 2024.	Yes, High priority	The KMME Specialist and PM and also SMs will coordinate more closely on how to best reach the project’s outcomes.	January 2024	PM, KMME Specialist SMs	Completed	PM, SMs and KMME Specialist have been in close discussion involving the related local government, and the inputs have been included in the 2024 AWPB
C4 Spend time with core project decision-makers to review the project ToC with its indicators and to verify underlying assumptions to identify new priority activities. This follows C3, and should be led by the PMU leader during the first quarter of 2024 in support of improving and finalizing AWP 2024	Yes, High priority	Previously coordination of PMU with the NPC was lacking due to insufficient support to the MPU	January 2024	PM, NPC, TC	Completed	With corrections in the management capabilities of the PMU, the coordination between the PMU and NPC and TC is highly effective in

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
(see also activity B1.1.1 in the roadmap in annex 8).		in terms of its management capabilities and lacking payment of PMU staff, resulting in the implementation of activities which were not relevant to the project but to the department of the ministry in charge of the project.				designing and monitoring project implementation.
EN1 A facilitated evaluation of the impacts of the executing arrangements on the current state of the project should lead to identification of relevant lessons and recommendations for change, particularly with relevance to the ability of the PMU to make project management decisions. The PSC should lead such evaluation during the first quarter of 2024 with support of WWF-GEF and CI-GEF. Meanwhile, decision-making ability should be enhanced by implementing the already available revised SOP, by accelerating AWP sign-off processes within MMAF for timely preparation of cash-flow agreements, and through some additional changes in project management – as suggested in this MTR report (see also activities under component B in the roadmap in annex 8).	Yes, High priority	The PM has been in close discussion with the NPC and the TC, regarding best way to implement the project and the NPC and TC have agreed to give their full support to the PMU to implement the Project with the required management authority.	January 2024	Project Manager	Completed	Previously the PMU had no authority in managing the Project which has caused several problems including activities not reflecting the objectives of the Project.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
EN2 Enhance more strategic engagement of key individuals of multiple units in MMAF through increasing understanding of priority objectives and improving information flows for effective coordination. This should be a priority for the PMU leader, and supported by the new to be developed strategic communication strategy (see also activities under A1, A2, and A3 in the roadmap in annex 8).	Yes, High priority	The PM has had many discussions on the PSC structure and is in regular discussion with the Planning Bureau (PB), Foreign Cooperation Bureau (FCB), Inspectorate Generale (IG), and Secretariate Generale of Capture Fisheries (SGCF).	Early 2024	Project Manager	Completed and Ongoing	The previous absence of different departments of MMAF (Bureaus, Inspectorate, and Secretary General) in the implementation of the project led to several problems and loss of opportunities for MMAF.
EN3 Enhance awareness of key decision-makers in different MMAF departments about external impediments flowing from direct needs of communities that are not addressed by engaging other sectoral agencies with relevance to rural economic development in Component B. This should be led by the PMU leader, following a rapid internal process to identify key lessons from the first years of project implementation, and a technical exchange of lessons with other technical experts, such as those implementing similar projects (see also R3). Also, a marketing assessment should be done by seafood trade experts.	Yes, High priority	Since late 2023 and early 2024, the PMU has done many coordination meetings with many relevant stakeholders.	Early 2024	Project Manager	Completed	

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
EN4 Identify opportunities to reduce obstacles to private sector investment in the small-scale fisheries sector by addressing regulatory barriers through strategic activities in Component A more directly. This can be led by the PMU supported by colleagues from the World Bank who implemented various studies during preparation of LAUTRA on the investment landscape for coastal communities, and who have additional knowledge relevant to this need. (See for example information summarized in annex 6).	Yes, medium priority	CFI focuses on supporting policy and regulations.	Early 2024	Project Manager	Ongoing	The real barrier for the private sectors to grow in remote fisheries communities does not lay in regulatory barriers but in communications barriers which the local government could address if it would be sufficiently funded. The project analyzed the supply chain and found out that it had to build a bridge between the PS and communities. It developed MoUs between them so that they could cooperate and grow.
EN5 Put more focus and weight on strategies and activities that result in delivery of the priority outcomes or impacts identified in the project design. This should consider amongst other things, the identification of the type(s) of fisheries for each of the target FMA's that can contribute most effectively to the target of 400,000 tons of fish at sustainable levels and should be facilitated by the PMU leader as part of revisiting the ToC and implementing C3 and R4. (see also B1.1.1 in annex 8).	Yes, High priority	In 2024, the project has successfully started the baseline data collection for small pelagic, demersal, mud crab, and endangered species in all project locations (South East Maluku, Wondama, East Seram, Biak, Ambon, and Kaimana).	May 2024	Project Manager	Completed	Due to several challenges, the baseline data for CFI target species had yet to be done. Therefore the impact of the project could not be measured for all its activities.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
EN6 Adjust indicators (e.g., adding project specific indicators at the objective level, add indicators to enable measuring progress more frequently in support of adaptive management and change indicators that are not useful, or require huge resources to monitor) to guide enhanced ability of project implementors to review the adequacy of change towards expected results and impact at the scale that corresponds with the significant size of the financial investment ~ 70 million USD equivalent. This is part of improving the M&E framework and needs to consider objectives for component D, particularly with relation to monitoring by fishers and other beneficiaries. This should be a priority led by the M&E expert and supported with additional technical assistance during Q1 of 2024. (See also B1.1.1 in annex 8).	Yes, High priority	The required GEF Core indicators will be updated.	February 24	PM in coordination with the WWFGEF Agency	Ongoing	The new or revised indicators needs to be supported by accurate data and justifications. The PMU has been in coordination with several Directorate such as the PSDI, KKHL and PDK.
EN7 Ensure that feedback on the relevance of project activities from working closely with stakeholders – including private sector actors -, is used more immediately for adaptive management. This is relevant particularly to the sustainability of providing ‘institutional’ support for managing <i>sasi</i> and other co-management systems. During the first quarter of 2024, the M&E expert of the PMU should prioritize review and drawing of lessons from information already collected during the first years of the project. Going forward, a more systematic approach to M&E should be	Yes, Medium priority	Coordination with relevant stakeholders, especially the beneficiaries of each activities is very important. The PMU developed various methods of communication with stakeholders, especially the	January 2024	PM, KMME Specialist SMs	Ongoing	The PMU has learned that adaptive management is important to be implemented during the project implementation. PMU always accompanies each of activities to guarantee that each activities are done the way it was planned in the AWPB. Especially activities that contribute to reaching the

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
applied, led by the M&E expert of the PMU in close collaboration with the site managers, to review feedback by project beneficiaries after each activity, and to prepare clear summaries, in the form of lessons learned, to be considered on a monthly basis by the entire PMU, and on a quarterly basis by the PSC and local government agencies in the target FMAs. This is to be supported by a new to be developed communication strategy (see also activity B1.2.1 in the roadmap in annex 8).		communities. Including regular monitoring and evaluation of ongoing activities.				Outcomes and CFI best practices, such as the Sasi Co-Management and Sasi Label.
EN8 Include more other government agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community stakeholders in the implementation of project interventions under component B. This must be facilitated by the PMU leader and followed up with preparation of contractual arrangements by the project finance manager as part of the finalization of the AWP. See also EF4.	Yes, High priority	The PMU has established regular coordination with several NGO's who are running similar projects in Indonesia, such as ATSEA, LAUTRA, BERIKAN, and also coordinates with the GEF Focal Point in MOE. CFI also has a partnership with BRIN, several Universities, and NGO (ISPIKANI).	January 2024	Project Manager	Ongoing	In 2023, the number of stakeholders were about 21 (without communities), this number increase to 24 stakeholders in 2024.
EF1 Discuss the need with PSC members to shift budget allocations between cost categories, reducing the relatively large portion for travel and meetings, and increasing the portion for PMU salaries and adequate internal and external expertise. This should	Yes, High priority	Two more staff has been added to the PMU, a Project Secretary and the Financial	January 2024	Project Manager	Not yet discussed	

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
follow a facilitated meeting to determine the size and composition of an adequate implementation team with a focus on increasing staff at each of the target FMAs (See also B2.1.1 and B4.1.1 in annex 8).		Assistant. However to increase the salaries can only be done by MMAF.				
EF2 Start monitoring intended changes in behavior towards expected results instead of number of participants to meetings and trainings. For example, information to review progress and draw lessons on inclusion of women in decision-making processes or monitoring activities, beyond lists of meeting participants segregated by gender will be highly relevant. This should be guided by an improved M&E system, to be developed during the first quarter of 2024 by the M&E expert in the PMU in close coordination with the site managers and supported with additional technical assistance. It would be useful to consider levers for behavior change identified by Rare as part of the process to more incorporate meaningful indicators in an adjusted results framework. (See also activity B1.1.2 and B4.1.2 in the roadmap in annex 8).	Yes, High priority	New approach to study beneficiaries behavior has yet to be developed. The PMU will study the new approach made by RARE to learn new approach.	Early 2024	KMME Specialist , Project Manager, SG Specialist	Not yet implemented	The project still uses traditional approach in monitoring progress and studying lesson learned from implemented activities. New approach could be useful
EF3 Prioritize actions that generate early evidence of the project outcomes for acceleration of impact and change across the target FMAs and review progress more frequently with a larger group of stakeholders. For example, these would be actions that increase the capacity of local communities to evaluate the effect of their fishing activities on the state of the fishery, and actions that address external impediments to shifting towards better fishing practices. This is linked	Yes, Medium priority	Since end of 2023 the PMU has shifted its priorities in working on activities to reach the final outcomes for each Components A, B, and D, and also some of its Sub	January 2024	Project Manager	Ongoing	This project was delayed because of Covid and some other management issues. Reaching its fourth year of implementation of activities with the no-cost extension, the PMU has to focus activities to achieve all the result of the project.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
to C3, R4, EN5 and EN6 and best facilitated through additional technical assistance.		Components. Most of the Outputs will reach 100% by the end of 2024.				
EF4 PMU should help MMAF during the first quarter of 2024, to identify which type of actions by which type of actors may demonstrate results/wins against measurable targets in achievable timelines, to avoid wasting time on strategies that depend too much on external factors beyond the sphere of influence of MMAF. This should be guided by improved understanding about relevance of certain fisheries regards their annual production, so that significant progress towards the target of 400,000 tons of fish under improved management will become evident soonest. This follows C2, C3 and is similar as R7.	Yes, High priority	After the changes that allow the MPU to manage the project more independently, it looked at synergies between the MMAF Priority Program and the project targets. The improved management of fisheries has been in line with QBF which is a success for the project and MMAF.	January	Project Manager	Ongoing	The targets of 400.000 tons of fish under improved management and the improvement of conservation area management, are well beyond the Directorate of SDI, or even DG of Capture Fisheries. That's why the role of PSC is very important in noticing this, that CFI actually can contribute to reach the target.
EF5 Identify actions for which interoperability with other MMAF units and the coherence of interventions with other government agencies is high. This should be led by the TC in close coordination with the PMU leader. It should inform EF4 and is part of C3.	Yes, Medium priority	The PMU has been already in close coordination with other Directorates within MMAF because most of the Components were under the authority of Directorates outsidess SDI.	January 2024	Project Manager	Completed	Most of the subject of Output and Outcomes for each Component are not the authority of the Directorate of SDI or even DJPT (DGCF), s a close coordination is crucial.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
EF6 Increase the size of the executing team in line with the full size of the project investment (~ 70 million USD equivalent). Generally, effective teams should not exceed 7 members, however, this does not mean that the PMU may only include 5-7 members. For example, at each FMA, especially in support of a shift of resources to accelerate implementation of component B, local teams should ideally also include 5-7 members. This implies a minimum of $7 + 3 \times 5 = 22$ fully dedicated team members for this project. (See also B4.1.1 in annex 8). This should be a priority for a PSC meeting (see also activities under component B in the roadmap in annex 8).	Yes, High priority	Two additional staff have been added to the PMU. Given the workload and responsibilities of the PM it should be re-evaluated to add a technical staff to reduce his work load and improve effectiveness.	January 2024	Project Manager	Completed , but needs to be re-evaluated.	While the workload of the different staff of the PMU has been reviewed and evaluated (all has been done during the MTR), the load and responsibilities of the PM has stayed very high and wide. This is because the task of the PM is not only to coordinate with 20++ stakeholders, but also communities. Heavy bureaucracy and different requests from within MMAF adds to the complexities.
EF7 Re-focus effort by senior team members starting in Q2 of 2024 on central level engagement interventions under component A, to ensure co-finance commitments as well as policy pathways to scale and sustainability. This should be informed by C3 and C4 and involves strengthening the PMU team at the central level through additional relevant staff and improving the value of the PSC to project delivery (e.g. see also C1). Identification of policy pathways should be done in the new to be developed communication strategy, for which additional technical assistance will be required.	Yes, Low priority	The 2023 AWPB has 108 activities, while the 2024 has 98 activities. It's too much, and each and every activities has to be monitored to make sure that its supporting the target Outcomes. So, it quite hard to be able to monitor the activity if the Senior Team of the PMU has to stay at the Central Govt. While	January 2024	Project Manager	Ongoing	Since the load of activity each months is very high (15-20+ activity) The Project Manager has mostly stayed in the Central office, to make sure a well coordinate project management, and its working. But a few activities has shown difficulties, with the implementing partner (East Seram, West Papua, ISPIKANI) could not fulfill the target hoped and the financial report sometimes a disaster. And the other Senior PMU also failed to solve the problem, so its up

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
		communications and hardships dealing with Local Govt is a lot of times, need the Senior Member.				to the PM to solve it. And as for now, those problem has been solved by the PM, but at the cost of more work and burden for the PM.
EF8 Strengthen the local teams in the target areas by recruiting additional team members and improved ability to mobilize funding for implementation of approved activities, and contract mainly local partners from local government agencies, local universities, local NGOs and local knowledge institutes. This follows EF5 and EF6 amongst others.	Yes, Medium priority	This recommendation has been addressed by selecting Champions from each project site. This champions (all women) are the project's best promoters pushing CFI targets within the project sites. This approach works very well and is accepted in the communities.	January 2024	Project Manager	Completed needs to be monitored	
EF9 Improve coordination and information flow among the project partners by improving knowledge management systems and processes, as originally designed under component D. Consider to outsource this part of the project, following creation of a new communication strategy. See also EN7.	Yes, Medium priority	The project will support the development of a knowledge management system.	January 2024	Project Manager	Ongoing	The PM and the KMME Specialist have taken many steps to have an open, transparent and good coordination between stakeholders, such as using WhatsApp groups, regular meetings, and Local Champions.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
EF10 Refocus responsibilities and empower different people to lead and progress interventions for the different components: i) senior staff in the PMU work with the central government under component A, ii) the site-based staff and local partners lead work under component B, and iii) outsource a systematic approach to knowledge management and sharing to a relevant Indonesian agency or institution for component D.	No	The PMU disagree, and think that this kinds of separation will cause discoordination and delay the project progress, since all Components should work on together, especially since some of the outputs has been fully reach.	January 2024	Project Manager	Need to be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency first	We have to see the Component A, B and D as a whole of CFI targets, that's why separation of PMU, pushing the SM (especially since all of them always need directions from the PM), and outsource Component D to other parties would backtrack the progress. We believe the current system is working, and only needs more preparation to ensure that for 2025, the workload is not as high as 2023-2024, and maintain the good relation and trust with the stakeholders.
S1 Similar as IA1, identify and initiate pathways to scale and sustainability of the project results. This should be led by the PMU leader, and should be facilitated by additional technical assistance during the first quarter of 2024. (See activity B1.1.1, B1.1.2 and B3.1.1 in the roadmap in annex 8).	Yes, Medium priority	PMU and the MMAF will discuss and identify pathways to increase the project sustainability.	January 2024	Project Manager	Need to be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency	The biggest problem within the project is to cooperate with the everchanging higher ranking officials, such as the Director General of Capture Fisheries (PSC Co-chair), the Inspectorate General, and the Head of many institutions in the Site Locations.
S2 Start tracking major factors that impact the success and sustainability of results, in particular related to preferred sustainable	Yes, Medium priority	Regular discussions on M&E (technical,	January	Project Manager	Ongoing	The PMU has been working toward this efforts since 2023 and came up with the

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
behavior change for fisheries that could contribute adequately to the project targets of “improved management of 5.5 million hectares of seascapes and 400,000 tons of fisheries into sustainable production levels across the project FMAs”. For example, information on the impact of inclusion of women in decision-making processes or monitoring activities, could provide useful lessons. This should be guided by an improved M&E system, to be developed during the first quarter of 2024 by the M&E expert in the PMU in close coordination with the site managers and supported with additional technical assistance. (See activity B4.1.1 in the roadmap in annex 8).		administrative and financial) have been held a lot of times within the PMU. The KMME has in close coordination not only with Project manager and Site Managers, but with TC and even NPC now. Also with all the Local Government. To ensure that we all have the same purpose and know what have to be done to reach the success and sustainability of the projects and the welfare of communities in the Site Locations.				solution of including women as local Champions. They are invited to many of the PMU activities outside their districts. They know the project best and understand that this project goals is important and relevant for their own mission to success.
S3 Identify and initiate a strategy for engagement of stakeholders beyond the sector, in order that other existing financial, economic, social, environmental, and institutional capacities can complement those from the fisheries sector. This should be a priority for the PMU leader during the first quarter of 2024, and result in a new	No	The project runs for one more year and needs to focus on its objectives and outcomes. Social, environmental, and economic aspects	January	Project Manager	Ongoing	This recommendation could be still useful for an integrated approach to know of new issues and new aspects that might affect the project.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
communication strategy. This should be facilitated by additional technical assistance (see also R1).		are being addressed by the project.				
A1 Develop or add competencies required to engage with actors and decision-makers in fields beyond fisheries and environment. These include skills to motivate engagement and investment by actors who are mostly external to the sector, but who can help with scaling of project impacts, such as commercial and impact investors or agencies responsible for community development. The work undertaken by the World Bank in Indonesia as part of the global CFI is relevant here. This is linked to EF6 and A4 and will involve expanding the implementation team and working with adequate technical assistance providers.	Yes Low Priority	The project includes support for small business and will incorporate the lessons learnt from the WB child project.	January	Project Manager	Completed	
A2 Invest in additional support for strategic communications of project impacts to increase the value of reports for adaptive management, sharing of lessons learned, but especially to strengthen relation management with other types of government agencies and investors relevant for the SSF sector. The work undertaken by the World Bank in Indonesia as part of the global CFI is relevant here. This is linked to EF6 and A4.	Yes, Low priority	The project has started to focus on strategic communication, to share the lesson learned, best practices, and results.	January	Project Manager	Ongoing	Some results have been communicated through the Global Knowledge Product of the Global CFI Program such as the Sasi Label and Sasi Co-Management. Products made by women groups have been shown at exhibitions with great success. The food products such as fish snacks are being distributed at MMAF.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
A3 Shift responsibility of the PMU from the need to be directly engaged with work that would deliver the desired results to one of orchestrating a more complex process across multiple institutional elements to deliver impact. This means that the Jakarta-based PMU staff would refocus on work that supports mobilization of relevant co-financing, and sub-contract some of the other responsibilities, for example those for Component D.	Yes, High priority	The monitoring of the ongoing activities in the site locations needs to be done by the PMU itself, to ensure that the activities delivering the expected results. While sub-contracting is not a known method within MMAF, if we use it, it needs more funds (decrease the other portions) and won't guarantee the results.	January	Project Manager	Need to be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency	CFI Project is located in eastern Indonesia, which has a very different social characteristics and hard to have a stable communication, that could make the coordination with Local Government or the Sub Contractors going as expected. Even MMAF that implement the activities by themselves is often did not deliver the results expected by the PMU, and causing the activity to be inoptimal, and making the followup activity halted.
A4 Develop and expand the PSC to enable consideration and mobilization of a more holistic package of strategic interventions. Increase the frequency, relevance and quality of information provided to the PSC, to support more frequent reflection by individual PSC members as well as through guided meetings on progress and relevance of the activities. This is linked to EF7 provided that expansion of the PSC includes decision-makers or advisors relevant to private sector investment and allocation of public funding.	Yes, High priority		January	Project Manager	Ongoing	Communication with PSC is quite complicated, as the PSC members are high-ranking officials that do not want to communicate with the PM only with NPC (Director level), or TC (Sub Director). The ever-changing PSC members makes the situation not easier.

Specific Recommendations	Response and Priority	Response Actions	Timeframe	Person or Office Responsible	Tracking Status	Comments
A5 Following on project experience, as part of discussing lessons related to experience with the executing arrangements, the PSC should re-consider MMAF's role in supporting livelihood projects in favor of other ways to enhance small enterprise development through partnerships with 'service providers. Informed by outcomes of R7 and C3 amongst others, this may include things like developing a small network of impact investment partners that may serve a growing number of communities and locations across the geographic scope of the project. MMAF could oversee the work done by these 'service partners' ensuring relevant links to conservation and sustainable fisheries outcomes and the shared vision of MMAF and the GEF.	No	The project focus is quite clear as its mentioned in the Indicators and Outcomes, and connecting with the investment partner to support the projects livelihood is not needed.				