

BOBLME Project: Revised Logical Framework Analysis — as adopted by the Project Steering committee 4 March 2010.

Global Environment Objective: A healthy ecosystem and sustainability of living resources for the benefit of the coastal populations of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME).

Project Development Objective: To support a series of strategic interventions that would result in and provide critical inputs into the Strategic Action Programme (SAP), whose implementation will lead to enhanced food security and reduced poverty for coastal communities.

INDICATORS	BASELINE ¹	TARGETS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS
<p>A regional SAP establishing priorities for action (policy, legal and institutional reform and investments) to resolve priority transboundary environmental problems in the BOBLME, and endorsed and adopted by the participating governments.</p> <p>Proposed actions in the SAP address the well-being of coastal communities through promoting regional approaches to resolving resource issues and barriers affecting their livelihoods.</p>	<p>Transboundary issues have yet to be identified by the participating countries, and countries have not engaged in a joint SAP development exercise.</p> <p>Formal structures and binding agreements have yet to be established and adopted.</p> <p>National realignment at policy, legislation and management levels essential to embrace a transboundary, ecosystem approach has not occurred.</p>	<p>A regional level transboundary diagnostic analysis completed by the end of Project Year (PY) 3.</p> <p>A SAP developed and endorsed by governments at end of PY5.</p> <p>Stakeholder consultations undertaken over the life of the Project (PY 1-5).</p> <p>Institutional and financial mechanisms spelled out in the SAP (end of PY5) to ensure Programme sustainability beyond the life of the Project.</p>	<p>Minutes and other documentation of PSC, RCU meetings, project work groups, publications of and related to the project, and other materials related to project implementation.</p> <p>Selected interviews across a range of project personnel and key stakeholders.</p> <p>Documentation of stakeholder participation in TDA and SAP development activities.</p>	<p>Risk that pressing domestic economic and social issues will prevent senior national political decision makers to realize the long-term importance of the need to sustainably manage the living marine resources of the BOBLME.</p> <p>Risk that national level political leaders will not see the benefits of regional coordination of efforts to sustainably manage the LMEs and thus will not commit necessary time and resources to the effort.</p>

¹ The Project baseline extends from the beginning of implementation which is April of 2009.

Outcome 1: The institutional and programmatic basis for implementing the SAP has been developed.

INDICATORS	BASELINE ²	TARGETS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS
<p>Updated and revised TDA (from FTDA) based on post-tsunami update and gap analysis.</p> <p>Final Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis to identify environmental concerns and root causes of environmental degradation completed through an effective inter-governmental process and adopted by respective governments.</p> <p>Institutional arrangements agreed to and established for the long-term management of the BOBLME.</p> <p>Recommendations for financial sustainability formulated and endorsed.</p> <p>Regional level SAP completed and adopted.</p> <p>Eight National Action Plans (NAPs) under development.</p> <p>Full-size project proposal for second phase of BOBLME programme (SAP implementation) submitted to the GEF.</p>	<p>FTDA developed but needs post tsunami update and gap analysis.</p> <p>No previous concerted effort at regional level to establish management frameworks consistent with an LME approach.</p> <p>No previously negotiated regional financial sustainability mechanisms in place.</p> <p>National level efforts to identify and commit to actions to address national BOB priorities uneven at best.</p> <p>Eight country reports have been completed but not yet used as inputs to the TDA and SAP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating TDA incorporating post-tsunami environmental studies in PY2. • Gap analysis of existing TDA in PY1. • National technical consultation processes on updated TDA in PY2. • National inter-ministry and stakeholder consultations on updated TDA in PY3. • Finalized and approved TDA in PY3. • Regional institutional and financial analysis completed in PY3. • Regional institutional and financial options consulted Nationally in PY4. • Regional institutional and financial options input to the SAP in PY4. • First draft of Regional SAP in PY3. • Regional SAP team formed in PY3. • SAP consultations commence in PY 4. • SAP finalized in PY4. • National Action Plans drafted in PY 3. • National Action Plans consultations in PY 4. • Full size Phase II BOBLME project proposal completed in PY5. 	<p>Copies of the FTDA, the post-tsunami update, and the gap analysis.</p> <p>Records of national and Stakeholder TDA consultations and interviews with selected stakeholders.</p> <p>Final draft of the TDA.</p> <p>Copy of the Regional Institutional and financial analysis/Interview with author(s).</p> <p>Reports of discussions with Inter-ministry personnel/interviews with selected ministry personnel.</p> <p>Copy of the first draft Regional SAP/Interview with author(s).</p> <p>Interviews with selected members of the regional SAP drafting team.</p> <p>Reports of SAP related consultations/ interviews with selected stakeholders.</p> <p>Final SAP.</p> <p>Reports of Stakeholder consultations re. NAP development.</p> <p>Final draft of full-size project proposal.</p>	<p>Generally, countries may not be willing or able to follow through on necessary provision of personnel and other resources to effectively participate in project/programme implementation.</p> <p>Countries may decide that regionally based institutional arrangements are inconsistent with their national interests.</p> <p>Sufficient political will may not be mobilized to gain high level, eight country endorsement of the SAP.</p> <p>Countries may fail to reach consensus on a sufficiently strong institutional solution capable of ensuring long-term sustainability of the BOBLME Programme.</p>

² The Project baseline extends from the beginning of implementation which is April of 2009.

Outcome 2: Regional and sub-Regional collaborative management approaches applied to priority issues, and barriers affecting coastal/marine living natural resources in the BOBLME, and the livelihoods of dependent coastal communities are removed.

INDICATORS	BASELINE ³	TARGETS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS
<p>Learning and adopting best ICM practice benefits coastal communities.</p> <p>Strengthened policy formulation capacity and provision of advice on policy formulation in support of community-based integrated coastal fisheries management (ICM).</p> <p>Regional statistical data protocols developed and data quality and access to data improved.</p> <p>Three fishery management plans (sharks, hilsa, and Indian mackerel) developed and submitted to governments for their consideration.</p> <p>Two bi-national management plans for critical transboundary ecosystems developed and submitted to the respective governments.</p>	<p>No pilot areas to develop community based approaches currently designated.</p> <p>No current focus or capacity for the provision of advice to communities to support community based management.</p> <p>Quality and quantity of country level statistical data on marine issues uneven at best.</p> <p>Regional level analyses of data do not exist.</p> <p>No fishery management plans in existence or being formulated on hilsa and Indian mackerel. National plans of action (NPOAs) for sharks in various stages of development.</p> <p>No regional POA for sharks is available.</p> <p>Joint critical habitat management plans do not available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National pilot areas for disseminating best practices identified in PY2. • Policy analysis and work plan to guide strengthening of national policy formulation in PY2. • Lessons learned report on uptake of pilot areas completed and available in PY4. • Policy formulation capacity component ongoing PY2-4. • Final report on policy formulation capacity building for community based ICM completed at end of PY3. • Regional statistical working group formed and operational in PY2. • Regional statistical protocols developed and available in PY3. • Reports on fisheries data and information produced- ongoing PY1-5. • Three fishery management plans developed and submitted to governments for their consideration in PY 3. • Two bi-national management plans for critical transboundary habitats submitted to respective governments in PY4. 	<p>Reports and other records pertaining to pilot areas and best practices in national pilot areas, policy formulation, formulation of regional statistical protocols, formulation of fishery management plans, and management plans for transboundary ecosystems.</p> <p>Selected interviews with project staff, country representatives and community level and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Interviews with project personnel, other related national and regional project personnel, and country and regional organizations focused on similar activities.</p>	<p>Generally, countries may not be willing or able to follow through on necessary provision of personnel and other resources to effectively participate in project/programme implementation.</p> <p>Risk that country personnel will not find it possible to extend to commit limited time and resources to bi-national or regional efforts.</p> <p>Risk that project sponsored activities resulting in greater level of regional cooperation toward development of regional approached to ecosystem management will not be sustainable post-project.</p>

³ The Project baseline extends from the beginning of implementation which is April of 2009.

Outcome 3: Increased understanding of large-scale processes and ecological dynamics and interdependencies characteristic of the BOBLME.				
INDICATORS	BASELINE⁴	TARGETS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS
<p>Agreed to address key data gaps serving as barriers to improving understanding of large-scale oceanographic and ecological processes controlling BOBLME living marine resources.</p> <p>A regional MPA/fish refugia inventory accompanied by a gap analysis, conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>Partnerships established with regional and global environmental programmes and effective sharing of information in improving understanding of BOBLME processes.</p>	<p>There has been no concerted effort to identify and address knowledge gaps re. BOBLME oceanographic and ecological processes, and there are no regional arrangements in place to harmonize scientific and managerial approaches at LME level.</p> <p>MPA activities have been national rather than regional in scope.</p> <p>MPAs generally habitat focused and not used in fisheries resource management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed work plan needed to address key data and information gaps completed in PY2. • Regional MPA/fish refugia action plan completed in PY2. • Creation of partnerships and collaborative work implemented – ongoing PY1-5. 	<p>Reports and other records pertaining to work plans, and implementation activities related to work plans, regional action plan, and creation of partnerships.</p> <p>Selected interviews with project staff, country representatives and community level and other stakeholders connected to MPA activities.</p> <p>Interviews with key personnel from other, related projects and programmes and country and regional organizations focused on similar activities.</p>	<p>Generally, countries may not be willing or able to follow through on necessary provision of personnel and other resources to effectively participate in project/programme implementation.</p>
Outcome 4: Institutional arrangements and processes established to support a collaborative approach to ascertain and monitor ecosystem health of the BOBLME.				
INDICATORS	BASELINE	TARGETS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS
<p>Establishment of agreed to LME based ecosystem health indicators.</p> <p>A set of conclusions and recommendations to participating countries for the harmonization of BOBLME water quality standards.</p> <p>Agreed work plan that would lead to identification of a regional approach to address land-based sources of pollution in the BOBLME.</p>	<p>At present there are no LME wide environmental health indicators.</p> <p>Current pollution mitigation activities, to the extent they exist at all, are focused at national level.</p> <p>There are not currently any regional efforts to harmonize water quality standards in the Bay of Bengal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional report on LME wide environmental health indicators available in PY2. • National consultations on environmental indicators report in PY3. • Final draft of report describing LME wide environmental health indicators available in PY3. • Regional Pollution WG created in PY 2. • Action plan for addressing land-based sources of pollution to governments in PY3. 	<p>Reports and other records pertaining to regional report on LME wide indicators, national consultations on indicators, pollution monitoring and land-based sources of pollution.</p> <p>Selected interviews with project staff, country representatives and community level and other stakeholders connected to activities under this Outcome.</p>	<p>Generally, countries may not be willing or able to follow through on necessary provision of personnel and other resources to effectively participate in project/programme implementation.</p> <p>Risk that countries will see regional standards as involving unacceptable obligations beyond their existing national programs.</p>

⁴ The Project baseline extends from the beginning of implementation which is April of 2009.

Outcome 5: Sufficient institutional capacity established to coordinate regional interventions, monitor project impacts, and disseminate and exchange information

INDICATORS	BASELINE ⁵	TARGETS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS
<p>An RCU is initially staffed and functioning in a temporary location.</p> <p>Process of establishing a permanent location and staffing requirements for the RCU are completed.</p> <p>Recommendations for ensuring an effective and efficient RCU received and acted upon by the Project Steering Committee (PSC).</p> <p>Regional cooperation is promoted through a minimum of five meetings of the PSC.</p> <p>A project monitoring and reporting programme is established and under implementation.</p> <p>A project communications plan is recommended, discussed and approved by the PSC, and under implementation.</p> <p>Project results and lessons learned disseminated.</p>	<p>No project administrative or managerial structures in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial RCU established and functioning at start of PY1. • Final decision on location of RCU by start of PY2. • Recommendations for ensuring an effective and efficient RCU ongoing PY1-5. • Project monitoring programme reviewed and approved by the PSC and under implementation – ongoing from PY2. • Project communications plan reviewed and approved by the PSC and under implementation – ongoing from PY2. • Project results and lessons learned disseminated on ongoing basis, PY1-5. 	<p>Visits to the PCU and interviews with PCU staff, involved FAO staff, PSC members, and selected project stakeholders.</p> <p>Review of administrative records of the RCU, including RCU publications, reports and its web site.</p>	<p>Risk is that the process of moving the temporary RCU to its permanent location will seriously diminish the capacity of the RCU to deliver products in a timely fashion.</p> <p>Risk that the RCU may not be able to function effectively and efficiently if office space, transport requirements and communications are inadequate.</p>

⁵ The Project baseline extends from the beginning of implementation which is April of 2009.