

REPORT OF THE PROJECT INCEPTION WORKSHOP ON

Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+)



**Belize City, Belize
5 - 6 March 2020**

CRFM Secretariat, Belize
2020

CRFM Technical & Advisory Document, No. 2020/01

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

© CRFM 2020
All rights reserved.

Reproduction, dissemination and use of material in this publication for educational or non-commercial purposes are authorized without prior written permission of the CRFM, provided the source is fully acknowledged. No part of this publication may be reproduced, disseminated or used for any commercial purposes or resold without the prior written permission of the CRFM.

Correct Citation:

CRFM 2020. Report of the Project Inception Workshop for Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020. CRFM Technical & Advisory Document, No. 2020/01. 82pp.

ISSN: 1995-1132
ISBN: 978-976-8293-19-0

Published by the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism Secretariat,
Belize & St. Vincent and the Grenadines

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BE: CLME+	CAF/FAO/GEF Project - Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus
BIOPAMA	Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme
CABA	Caribbean Agri-business Association
CAF	Development Bank of Latin America (Corporación Andina de Fomento – Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina -CAF)
CAMMA	Canaries / Anse la Raye Marine Management Area
CANARI	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CAR/RCU	Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit, UN Environment
CARIFICO	Caribbean Fisheries Co-management Project funded by JICA
CBO	Community-based Organization
CCAD	Central American Commission for Environment and Development
CC4FISH	Climate Change Adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector Project
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CLME+ SAP	The Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of the Shared Living Marine Resources of the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem
CNFO	Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organisations
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CRFM	Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism
CROP	Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project
CSO	Civil Society Organization
ECROP	Eastern Caribbean Regional Ocean Policy
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FISH4ACP	EDF 11 Intra-ACP Blue Growth Programme for Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture Value Chains
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GCF	Green Climate Fund

GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIFT	Gender In Fisheries Team
ICM	Interim Coordination Mechanism (of the CLME+ SAP)
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IMTA	Integrated Multi-trophic Aquaculture
INCAVPESCA	Integration of the Value Chain in Fisheries and Aquaculture”
IOC-UNESCO	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (of UNESCO)
IOCARIBE	IOC of UNESCO Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated
IW	International Waters
IW: LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KM	Knowledge Management
LME	Large Marine Ecosystem
MARLAPESCA	Regional Management Plan for the Caribbean Spiny Lobster Fisheries
MCCAP	Marine Conservation and Climate Adaptation
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MMA	Marine Management Area
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MSP	Marine Spatial Planning
NCOCZM	The National Council on Ocean and Coastal Zone Management
OECS	The Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
OSPESCA	Central America Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization
OETS	The Oceans Economy and Trade Strategy
PACA	Pacific Central-American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem
PIF	Project Identification Form
PISCES	Powering Innovations in Civil Society and Enterprises for Sustainability in the Caribbean
PPCR	Pilot Program for Climate Resilience

PPG	Project Preparation Grant
ProDoc	Project Document
PSMA	Port State Measures Agreement
RSS	Regional Security System
SENAN	Panama Coast Guard National Aeronaval Service
SICA	Central American Integration System
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
SMMA	Soufriere Marine Management Area
SOMEE	State of the Marine Environment and Economies
STAR	The System for Transparent Allocation of Resources
SSF	Small-Scale Fisheries
StewardFish	Developing Organizational Capacity for Ecosystem Stewardship and Livelihoods in Caribbean Small-Scale Fisheries
TED	Turtle Excluding Devices
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (also called ECLAC)
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UWI-CERMES	University of the West Indies - Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies
VMS	Vessel Management System
WECAFC	Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>THEME 1: OVERVIEW OF BLUE ECONOMY PROJECT</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Overview of BE: CLME+ Project, including all components and main deliverables</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Supporting Facility I: Roles of CAF and FAO as Implementing Agencies</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Supporting Facility II: Roles of CRFM as Executing Agency</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>PPG Implementation Timetable and GEF deadlines.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>THEME 2: DEVELOPMENT OF COMPONENT 1.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Implementing Cross-Sectoral Marine Spatial Planning.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>& Marine Protected Areas.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Review of Institutional Mechanisms and Implementation/Execution Arrangements for</i> <i>Development of Component 1</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Collaboration with other partners such as CLME+ PCU and SAP ICM, regional and</i> <i>national universities, NGOs (e.g. UWI, CNFO, OSPESCA, etc.).....</i>	<i>28</i>
UNDP/GEF CLME+ PCU and SAP ICM	28
OSPESCA.....	30
CNFO	31
CERMES, UWI.....	31
<i>Overview of MSP work in the Caribbean and presentation of the methodology and tools</i> <i>for development of project component 1, including BE strategies and MPA</i> <i>interventions.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Creating synergies with other projects across the Caribbean</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>THEME 3: DEVELOPMENT OF COMPONENT 2.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Inclusive Sustainable Fisheries Value Chains.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Overview of fisheries value chain analysis and development.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Co-financing aspects for sustainable fisheries value chains-.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Discussion with Participating Countries on the (a) Rationale for the Selection of the</i> <i>Value Chains and areas of intervention (b) Information Requirements /</i> <i>Constraints and (c) Supporting resources</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>National Preparation and Consultation Process.....</i>	<i>43</i>
Barbados	43
Belize	44
Guyana	47

Jamaica.....	47
Panama.....	49
Saint Lucia	51
<i>Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-Scale fisheries</i>	53
THEME 4: GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMPONENT 3	57
<i>Knowledge Management (KM), Communication</i>	57
<i>and Monitoring and Evaluation</i>	57
<i>Gender mainstreaming strategies</i>	57
<i>Key elements of KM, systematization of lessons learnt and experience sharing from</i> <i>project stakeholders</i>	62
<i>Project Communications and Outreach Strategy</i>	63
THEME 5: MONITORING AND EVALUATION ASPECTS	67
CLOSING SESSION	68
<i>Roadmap for PPG Implementation: An Overview and Agreement of an Implementation</i> <i>Schedule</i>	68
<i>Establishment of Support Groups (MSP, MPA, Value Chain): Aims, Objectives and</i> <i>Members</i>	70
<i>Review of Implementation Schedule for PPG</i>	71
<i>Agreement with countries and CRFM on main project design activities and milestones</i> .	71
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	71
APPENDIX I 73	
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	73
APPENDIX II 78	
AGENDA 78	
APPENDIX III	81
STAKEHOLDER MATRIX: PANAMA REVISION	81

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. The Project Inception Workshop for Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), was held on 5-6 March 2020 at the Best Western Plus Biltmore Plaza Hotel in Belize City, Belize.
2. Mr. Peter A. Murray, Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) Secretariat was Master of Ceremonies for the opening ceremony.
3. After the National Anthem and Opening Prayer, Mrs. Luciana Fainstain, Executive of the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF), delivered remarks on behalf of CAF, the lead implementing agency for the 4-year project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). She said that she was delighted to see that a number of women were in attendance at the meeting, due to the fact that the sector tends to be male dominated.
4. The CAF Executive expressed her gratitude to the CRFM and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) that have been collaborating since 2017-2018 to develop the project. She noted that, in addition to the challenges attendant with confronting threats to the marine environment and achieving national objectives for advancing blue economies in the Caribbean, the project posed further challenges in that it serves to bring together 6 countries (Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Panama and Saint Lucia) in a joint endeavour that calls for a very innovative and cross-sectoral approach. The CAF Executive added that despite the challenges, the initiative is exciting and inspiring, because it was designed from a cross-cutting perspective that sustainable development requires, addressing resilience, capacity building, knowledge management, and inclusive and gender-responsive transformation. She concluded that she is looking forward to the strengthened collaboration that the project promised to achieve in realizing its mission.
5. Dr. Yvette Diei-Ouadi, Fishery and Aquaculture Officer, Secretary of Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, noted that the meeting would be critical in advancing the preparation of the BE CLME+ project document (ProDoc). The FAO Representative noted that the regional fisheries body, the FAO WECAFC, has been assisting Member States of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism and Panama (a member of Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola del Istmo Centroamericano - the OSPESCA) in facing the threats and challenges that hamper the effective governance, management and long-term development of the living aquatic resources. The challenges she identified include inadequate governance (including outdated policy and legal frameworks), institutional capacity (human, technical and financial) for monitoring, control and surveillance, climate change and natural disasters, and very limited capacity of actors throughout the value chain to properly engage in sustainable resource management, conservation, and development central to the BE: CLME+ project.
6. The Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC-FAO said that these challenges affect the ability of the beneficiaries to effectively unlock the potential of the sectors and taking advantage of the tremendous opportunity offered by blue economic development and its contribution to food and nutrition security, the livelihoods of coastal communities and national income. She said that the BE: CLME+ project aims to overcome the barriers to achieving national, climate-resilient and sustainable fisheries in blue economies in the Caribbean. The Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC-FAO added that the FAO WECAFC welcomed the opportunity to strengthen

- partnership with CAF, the CRFM, and the GEF operational focal points. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC also underscored the importance of the opportunity presented to strengthen partnerships with the national fisheries authorities represented.
7. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC added that while contributing to the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Sustainable Management of the Shared Living Marine Resources of the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem (the CLME+ SAP), the BE: CLME+ Project will also benefit from building upon and creating synergies with existing projects. She added that there are at least 4 existing projects linked to the components to be implemented under the BE: CLME+, including the StewardFish Project aimed at Developing Organizational Capacity for Ecosystem Stewardship and Livelihoods in Caribbean Small-Scale Fisheries, for which the representative was in attendance at the Project Inception Workshop to share the regional experience and demonstrate how that initiative connects with the BE: CLME+. The other project identified were the Climate Change Adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector Project (CC4FISH), supporting 7 Eastern Caribbean countries in climate change adaptation measures; the Catalyzing Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+), for which Guyana is a country of interest; and the less widely known Intra-ACP Blue growth programme for Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture value chains project (FISH4ACP) commencing in 2020, which relates to the BE: CLME+ component 2 on inclusive value chain development and from which the outputs and products would be useful for the BE: CLME+ initiative in supporting sustainable seafood value chain development.
 8. The importance of the engagement of key stakeholders to the project's success was highlighted by the FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC, who added that the participation of the representatives of all the beneficiary countries in the Inception Workshop was commendable. She thanked the CRFM Secretariat for having succeeded in mobilizing them to provide input during this important stage of the project.
 9. Mr. Milton Haughton, CRFM Executive Director, welcomed participants and thanked the Government of Belize for hosting and facilitating the convening of the workshop and the GEF for its financial commitment to the initiative and for making the workshop possible. He also thanked the project partners: the UN FAO; CAF, a new partner with which the CRFM has been fruitfully engaged over the recent years, as well as the country delegates and national authorities of beneficiary countries which, over the years, have been working very closely with the CRFM Secretariat to put together the project Concept and the Project Identification Form (PIF) for the project and to submit it in time for approval by the GEF. He also acknowledged the presence of the representatives of the participating countries and other key partners which have been supporting the initiative, including the University of the West Indies - Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (UWI-CERMES), OSPESCA, CNFO, and the UNDP/GEF CLME+ Project Coordinating Unit and the CLME+ SAP Interim Coordination Mechanism.
 10. The CRFM Executive Director said that the CRFM was very pleased to see the attention being given to oceans and seas and the harnessing of the economic potential to derive tangible, sustainable benefits to the people of the region. He added that while the traditional ocean-based industries, such as, fishing, tourism and marine transportation, continue to be important and offer opportunities for growth and further contribution to economic development and wealth-creation, it is imperative for the region to seriously venture into other uses such as sustainable development of mariculture, as well as harnessing the renewable energy potential and developing bio-technology (pharmaceuticals

and cosmetics), from the marine biodiversity within areas under the national jurisdictions of States and on the high seas in the area beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ). He noted that blue growth has been progressing and developing rapidly in other parts of the world, in places such as Asia (China and Japan) and Europe, although not in the Caribbean. He added that although the potential for economic growth is tremendous, the risk of damage and degradation are also serious concerns. Therefore, the foundation for building the blue economy is the implementation of regional and national policies and programmes to guide blue growth, which should assign precedence to the protection of the marine environment, and the conservation, sound management and sustainable use of the living marine resources and biodiversity.

11. The CRFM Executive Director noted the progress made in the region in strengthening governance at regional and national levels and in developing and implementing an integrated ecosystems approach to fisheries and marine biodiversity management, including efforts to establish marine protected areas (MPAs) and the protection of coral reefs and the reef fishery. He underscored the need for these efforts to be supported, scaled up and strengthened. He noted the timeliness of the BE: CLME+ project, which aims to promote blue economy development in the Caribbean region through marine spatial planning (MSP) and MPAs, ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF), and the development of sustainable fisheries value chains.
12. He noted that marine spatial planning is a tool to create and establish a more rational organization of the use of marine space and resources, and the interactions between its uses; to balance demands for development with the need to protect the environment and to achieve social and economic objectives in an open and planned way. The CRFM Executive Director pointed out that the project will also address value chain development, by seeking to eliminate waste and discards and transforming existing harvested materials into new products based on market requirements through the application of science, technology and innovations, which are market-driven. He added that the full potential of the ocean economy will not be realized unless challenges such as climate change and ocean acidification, pollution and irresponsible fishing are effectively addressed. Other challenges that confront the region include illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, and the limited understanding of and appreciation for the value of the resources of the oceans and seas. The CRFM Executive Director underscored the need for public education and awareness building so that the people of the region – especially the youth – can better understand the value of the ocean resources and the opportunities growth and development. He urged Member States to look more seriously at the development of aquaculture in the marine environment. And one way forward he said, is considering the development of Integrated Multi-trophic mariculture, an environmentally friendly approach which utilizes by-products from one species, including wastes, as inputs in the form of food and fertilizer for another species.
13. He informed the participants of his recent visit to China in December 2019, to examine their practice of integrated multi-trophic aquaculture; noting however, that due to the problem with the Coronavirus which causes the COVID-19 disease, a trip by a team of experts from China who were to visit the region in February 2020, 2 weeks before the Inception Workshop had been cancelled. The team would have assessed the region's potential and opportunities for integrated multi-trophic mariculture, which beyond having high economic potential also has the potential to restore already degraded ecosystems and fish stocks. He expressed the hope that the collaboration with China can be resumed when the COVID-19 threat is resolved.

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

14. The Executive Director closed by expressing confidence that the region could rise to the challenge in translating the blue growth ideals into actions on the ground, yielding tangible economic and social benefits for the people and countries of the region.
15. Dr. Lennox Gladden, Chief Climate Change Officer, National Climate Change Office, Ministry of Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development, Belize, welcomed the delegates and the organizers of the Inception Workshop, including CAF, FAO, and the CRFM.
16. The Belize Representative noted that on 3 March, World Wildlife Day was celebrated under the theme, “Sustaining all life on Earth.” He lamented that nature is in a battle for survival on account of people’s actions, which raised the question of how humanity can sustain its lifeblood. He noted that the oceans and seas have been a source of wealth for millennia as they link the oceans of the region and the globe. In the Caribbean, the centres of commerce have been developed based on access to the sea, and if properly utilized, this very large ecosystem can contribute to poverty alleviation by creating sustainable livelihoods and providing food and minerals. In relation to his area of work, he also pointed to the importance of oceans and seas in regulating global climate and weather patterns. He went on to emphasize that the marine ecosystem serves as an engine for economic growth, and a vital source of food security.
17. The Belize Representative noted that resources that have not been measured cannot be properly managed, and this was the rationale for the activities scheduled for the 2 days over which the Inception Workshop was being held, in order to help develop the ProDoc to encapsulate national blue economic priorities through the application of marine spatial planning. He added that the MSP tool is instrumental for promoting economic development and the process of applying the MSP would facilitate a better understanding of the needs of stakeholders in the maritime sectors and the ecosystems, allowing the region to counter the progressive degradation of maritime health.
18. The Government of Belize recognized the critical value of the undertaking towards achieving sustainable economic development and improving resilience in the coastal zone, and the tourism and fisheries sectors needed to spur economic growth, providing economic and social benefits to improve the quality of life as envisaged in Belize’s national development policies and plans.
19. The Belize Representative told the delegates that their contributions would be pivotal and he urged them to share their ideas and expertise to enable fruitful engagement over the course of the 2-day Workshop.
20. The Master of Ceremonies noted that 8 March 2020 was to be observed as International Women’s Day and he urged the countries that had not yet submitted their gender focal point information to do so urgently. He thanked the speakers for their interventions and thanked the delegates and observers for attending.
21. At the start of proceedings, the participants introduced themselves. A List of Participants is given at *Appendix I*.
22. The CRFM Executive Director welcomed also the virtual participants connected by GoToMeeting. The participants, including individuals from the Governments of Barbados and Jamaica (GEF focal point), were also invited to introduce themselves.

23. The CRFM Executive Director went on to present the Objectives and Overview of the Workshop Agenda, which had been updated. He recalled that the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) and the PIF for the project were submitted near the end of November 2019. He informed the meeting that the PPG was approved by the GEF and the project document was to be developed over the period March to October 2020. The Inception Workshop was being held to introduce the project and to ensure that the key project partners and participating Member Countries key stakeholders have a good understanding of the objectives, main activities, inputs and baseline information required from countries and stakeholders, and overall work plan to develop the ProDoc.
24. He added that the main purpose of the meeting was to facilitate networking among the workshop participants who have been identified as the main contact persons for the project and to establish common ground on the way forward. The Inception Workshop would also clarify the critical role of the agencies in developing the project document.
25. The CRFM Executive Director underscored that there was a lot of mobilization and work to be done to prepare and ensure the submission of the final ProDoc to the GEF by November 2020 for approval. He added that the partners need the support of participating countries. He emphasized the need for significant data and information from the countries to enable the formulation of a solid and coherent ProDoc and acceptable work plan. He furthermore indicated that the baseline information and clearly defined indicators would be critical. The hope was that the Inception Workshop would enable participants to gain a better understanding of the type of information needed and therefore ensure efficient and smooth development of the Prodoc.
26. The CRFM Executive Director informed that a system for sharing information would be established and the consultants recruited to assist with the project would be reaching out to the countries in the ensuing months. He emphasized the need for timely feedback and submission of data and information from the delegates and other points of contact for the countries.
27. He next presented the workshop agenda (appearing at *Appendix II*) and the elements of the project that were to be discussed. He explained that the information had also been encapsulated in the PIF, which had previously been circulated to the countries and accessible via the Google Drive folder, created for information sharing.
28. With respect to the country presentations (included among the presentations reproduced at *Appendix III*), the CRFM Executive Director explained that they were to provide updates on ongoing activities at the national level that are relevant to the project. They were to provide information on planned or ongoing projects and initiatives related to marine spatial planning, value chains, policy developments, and plans and programmes underway, in order to assist with developing the project baseline. He added that the information would be noted and used by the consultants and partners to guide follow-up actions. The presentations were also uploaded to the shared Google Drive folder.
29. The CRFM Executive Director informed the attendees of notable developments in Jamaica, with the establishment of a new statutory body, the National Fisheries Authority, to assume responsibility for fisheries and aquaculture in place of the Fisheries Division. He noted the significance of the transformation from a central government department to an entity with an arms-length relationship to central government to take over the regulatory, development and research functions for fisheries and aquaculture. He added that this is a trend that other countries, such as Guyana, are interested in pursuing.

30. After his presentation, the CRFM Executive Director opened the floor for questions; however, there were none.

THEME 1: OVERVIEW OF BLUE ECONOMY PROJECT

Overview of BE: CLME+ Project, including all components and main deliverables

31. The CRFM Executive Director delivered a PowerPoint presentation which provided more details on the components and deliverables of the BE: CLME+ Project. He started by first addressing the potential impact of COVID-19 on project activities. He noted that two days prior to the Inception Workshop, the Government of Saint Lucia had declared a ban on non-essential travel, and he was encouraged that the representatives from that country were allowed to attend the Inception Workshop, as it signalled the level of importance they have given to the initiative.
32. He furthermore informed the workshop participants that the previous day he had participated in an emergency CARICOM meeting to discuss contingency planning for COVID-19. Heads of Government had attended an emergency meeting the previous Sunday, 1 March 2020, and all the heads of CARICOM organizations met subsequently to be briefed on the developments and the forecast for the coming weeks. He underscored the need for everyone to monitor the situation, as it could affect the implementation of the planned activities under this project. He noted that at least 6 workshops/meetings had been cancelled in the prior week alone due to the fast-changing situation and spread of the coronavirus. He noted that protective measures being taken by countries included travel restrictions, adding that if travel to countries for consultations could not be done due to the emerging public health problem, alternative arrangements for remote consultations would have to be considered, to maintain the activities.
33. The CRFM Executive Director then delivered his presentation providing the project overview. He noted the beneficiary countries, project objectives, budget and funding arrangements, as well as the roles of the project partners identified. He also explained the project components and main outcomes and outputs anticipated.
34. He noted that CAF, the lead GEF implementing agency, established in 1970 had 19 members, including 3 of the participating countries: Barbados, Jamaica and Panama. Trinidad and Tobago, another Member State of CRFM, not involved in the project, is also a member of CAF, while Guyana, another CRFM Member State and participating country in the BE: CLME+, was also engaged in discussions with CAF on membership. The CRFM Executive Director noted that the international development bank had provided funding for national projects in agriculture, energy and other sector in its member countries.
35. The 3 project components he identified were
 - (i) Cross-sectoral Marine Spatial Planning;
 - (ii) Sustainable Fisheries Value Chains; and
 - (iii) Regional Coordination, Project Management, Knowledge Management.
36. He noted that the BE: CLME+ initiative aims to support the development and validation of a regional MSP for ecosystem-based approach to the management of fisheries.
37. In detailing the 3 project components, the CRFM Executive Director noted that the project would help to strengthen the capacity of countries to develop marine spatial plans and establish and more effectively manage marine protected areas.

38. Another aspect of the project highlighted was support for value chain development. The CRFM Executive Director pointed out that there has been a lot of wastage along the value chain but the significant economic benefits that could be derived has been demonstrated through the literature showing potential for wealth creation. The project would support the establishment of key value chains and incorporation into blue economy strategies and marine spatial planning efforts. The initiative would also support the development of new value-added products from existing catches, waste products and underutilized resources. The CRFM Executive Director explained that countries could generate significant economic opportunity through the production of pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, clothing and accessories and other items from fish and seafood that are currently being discarded in the region. He acknowledged that many countries are already exploring potential opportunities but noted, though, that in order to make the most of those opportunities, the unique challenges need to be addressed. The CRFM Executive Director emphasized the need for an enabling environment and policy framework to be in place to facilitate value chain approaches. He additionally underscored the need for value chain development to be inclusive of women, youth, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, and others while enabling gender mainstreaming.
39. The CRFM Executive Director noted that there would be monitoring and evaluation plans and systems in place, and there are to be mid-term and final evaluations to determine the effectiveness of implementation.
40. With respect to knowledge sharing, he explained that the project would foster knowledge sharing between Caribbean countries and organizations and the GEF International Waters (IW) projects in partnership with IW:LEARN – the initiative that has supported the CRFM’s partnership with the Yellow Sea LME Project in collaboration the CLME+ project and the Chinese Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute, examining the practice of Integrated Multi-tropic Aquaculture (IMTA) in China, mentioned during the opening session of the meeting. The CRFM Executive Director said that he was very impressed with the way in which China had utilized science and technology to revive an overfished and degraded marine environment to become a vibrant and healthy marine ecosystem and source of economic activity through aquaculture, fisheries and tourism supporting economic activities and livelihoods for millions of people living on the coast of the Yellow Sea area of China. He added that this could serve as a model for the Caribbean, especially for marine and coastal areas that have been degraded and for fisheries that have been overfished.
41. Mr. Gianluca Gondolini, the FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean, based in the FAO Sub-regional Office located in Barbados, made the next presentation and pointed to the need to build understanding on the alignment with the GEF Focal Areas, namely the International Waters (IW) and Biodiversity (BD) focal areas. He added that 5 of the 6 participating countries had pledged resources from their allocation from the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) for the project. He informed that a lot of attention is paid to the Impact Programs that are integrated and holistic, and also incorporate the marine and coastal environment.
42. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean indicated that although the project does not qualify as an Impact Program, the multi-country blue economy initiative is an example of a comprehensive framework for action , integrating various countries, sectors and stakeholders. He added that the key concepts encompassed global environmental benefits, co-financing, country ownership, stakeholder engagement and results-based management. Furthermore, he pointed to the co-financing mechanism as a means of providing new and additional grant financing to enable the achievement of global environmental benefits.

43. The GEF GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean noted that the GEF-7 cycle 2018-2022 is focused on a more integrated and holistic program; therefore, the contributions should be cross-cutting. He noted that concepts related to climate change and country ownership are integrated using a cross-sectoral approach, and the blue economy model represents a good example of stakeholder collaboration and project accountability.
44. In terms of GEF-7 programming directions and alignment with the BE: CLME+ project scope, he pointed to the two objectives under the focal areas dealing with Biodiversity (allocated a grand total of USD1.4 billion): (i) “Mainstreaming biodiversity across and within productive sectors and production land and seascapes”; and (ii) “Addressing direct drivers to protect habitats and species,” and one objective dealing with International Waters (allocated USD500 million): “Strengthening Blue Economy Opportunities.” He pointed out that International Waters, being global in scope, requires multi-stakeholder input at the sub-regional level from the countries.
45. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean also pointed to the GEF-7 core indicators, outlining expected project performance and the contributions towards change, namely on indicator 2: “Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use”, indicator 7: “Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management, indicator 8: “ Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels, and indicator 11: “ Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment”.
46. He requested that the GEF brochure that has been published on biodiversity strategy under the GEF-7 be included among the materials shared with workshop participants for their information, to increase understanding of the overall framework approach and on the potential synergies across sectors.
47. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean cautioned that it is very important that the focal areas and activities selected by the partners for the multi-country BE: CLME+ initiative are chosen and owned by the participating countries.
48. He recalled that there had been a discussion on catalyzing policy reform to end IUU fishing, under the International Waters focal area and the component on catalyzing sustainable fisheries management; however, there had been discussions with the GEF Secretariat about covering this under a separate project and it was consequently excluded from the scope of the BE: CLME+ project. The elements related to sustainable fisheries and sustainable aquaculture were maintained with the rationale for including strong co-financing support and involvement by the private sector.
49. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean informed that the GEF-Secretariat is supporting new International Waters projects and so continued work to develop projects under this focal area is strongly encouraged. He also noted that the contributions from the STAR allocations are welcome but no longer required for this focal area, as the requirement has been replaced with the blended financing model to strengthen blue economy opportunities.
50. He detailed the STAR allocation that countries have assigned in order to access International Waters competitive funding in GEF-7. The contributions support GEF Biodiversity Focal Areas, BD-1.1 (Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors) and BD-2.7 (Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species). Five of the countries had pledged contributions: Jamaica - \$500,000, Panama

- \$200,000, Belize - \$100,000, Barbados - \$100,000, and Saint Lucia - \$100,000. Guyana had allocated all its STAR allocation prior to the project, as a consequence, there are no further allocations that could be made available for that country from the STAR.
51. In terms of the Project Targets and GEF Core Indicators, the FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean underscored the need for reporting on the quantitative commitments made in order to enable tracking of progress. Two of the critical indicators highlighted are at least 230,000 hectares (ha) of marine protected areas created or expanded (for Jamaica, Belize, Panama, Barbados and Saint Lucia, which provided STAR allocations) and a target of 8,000 female / 80,000 male direct beneficiaries as co-beneficiaries of the investment.
52. Details on the total funds pledged for the BE: CLME+ project were provided: USD 6.2 M (from the GEF Trust Fund), mostly allocated for the IW focal area, plus co-financing of USD 40.2 M, including USD 9 M from national governments through in-kind contributions; USD 25 M from CAF in loan for lines of credit to support the creation of national blue economy sectors and activities; USD 4 M in grant funding from the FAO, and USD 300,000 in cash plus USD 1,899,250 in-kind from the CRFM, as set out in the Approved PIF of December 2019.
53. The GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean pointed to cross-cutting issues, primarily mainstreaming climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact; integrating environmental and social safeguards; streamlining gender aspects and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous communities; the IW:LEARN portal for knowledge management and dissemination (important for component 3 of the project); and stakeholder engagement.

Supporting Facility I: Roles of CAF and FAO as Implementing Agencies

54. Mr. Noel D. Jacobs, Project Development Consultant, Institutional Development & Management Consultants Ltd (ID&M) detailed the roles of CAF and FAO as Implementing Agencies, as detailed in the flowchart included in his PowerPoint presentation, extracted from the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy of 2010. He noted the three levels of the arrangement, the uppermost of which is the GEF Council. The Project Development Consultant explained that the Council is responsible for aspects such as the annual evaluation reports, annual monitoring report and evaluation management response. At the second level are the Agency Evaluation Units, the GEF Secretariat and the Agency Coordinating Units. At the third or operational level, the GEF Implementation Agencies assume responsibility for project and program evaluation reports, monitoring documentation and terminal evaluations. CAF, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and other agencies function at the institutional level.
55. The Project Development Consultant distinguished the reporting relationships and the institutional and operational frameworks. He added that the GEF implementing agencies and the corresponding executing agencies are part of the GEF operational framework, adding that some of the roles had already been identified by the CRFM Executive Director.
56. The Project Development Consultant discussed the roles of the lead implementing agency and the co-implementing agency, including monitoring of the project portfolio, and reporting on results, progress, and lessons learned. CAF and the FAO are the responsible agencies for this level. The CRFM is the executing agency identified at the operational level. The presentation detailed the

functions of the agencies at each level. The Project Development Consultant noted that some of the roles are complementary. He elaborated that keeping the GEF Focal Points informed and sharing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) results are shared responsibilities of both the implementing and executing agency. He explained that this is critical to ensure that the same information is shared at both levels.

57. He asked the participants whether there was anything they felt needed to be added (in the context of the project) to the functions identified. He suggested that the fiduciary responsibility for the GEF resources, which he said is also a responsibility of the GEF Implementing Agency, should be added at the operational level and explicitly stated. He added that co-financing is a shared responsibility at both levels.
58. The Project Development Consultant explained that early during the selection of the implementing agency, the due diligence assessment of the potential executing agency is vital for ensuring compliance with the GEF's fiduciary requirements for resources. He added that the GEF Operational Focal Points are also crucial from the co-financing aspect, which requires input from both the implementing agency and the executing agency.

Supporting Facility II: Roles of CRFM as Executing Agency

59. The CRFM Executive Director explained the role of the CRFM as Executing Agency for the project, noting that all partners that had previously been identified would be collaborating over the ensuing months to develop the project document. The CRFM worked with the co-implementing partners and the participating countries to develop the PIF, and they will continue their collaboration during the PPG phase to develop the final output, which is the project document.
60. The CRFM Executive Director, underscored that the Executing Agency, is generally accountable for the project during the implementation phase, including managing the relationship with national and regional authorities, and implementing partners and stakeholders; providing technical expertise and executing specific activities during project implementation. It is also responsible for setting up the project implementation unit, which will be responsible for the day-to-day coordination of the project. He noted that the CRFM, established in 2002, has significant experience with regional project management, planning, monitoring, knowledge management, reporting, public relations and the other aspects involved in developing and executing regional projects. He added that the CRFM also has in place the fiduciary systems required, given the level of financial and procurement capacity necessary, and they were constantly being updated.
61. He informed the workshop that during the previous week, a former internal auditor in the UN system who had worked with several UN agencies had been recruited and is currently conducting a review of the CRFM's systems (financial, procurement, human resource and operational) and will prepare a report on her findings and recommendations for improvements.
62. The CRFM Executive Director informed that some of the supporting institutional partners from the region may also receive grants to assist them with implementation of specific activity that will be implemented under the project. He underscored the need for those partners (at the national, sub-regional and regional levels) to be identified very clearly during the PPG phase and their expected roles clarified.

63. He noted that among the partners to be included and consulted on the project are Government Ministries or Agencies such as the Fisheries Administrations, the Environment Departments, public sector Planning Agencies; Academic Institutions such as UWI – CERMES, the Marine Sciences Centre, in Mona, Jamaica; and the Department of Agri-Economics & Extension, at St. Augustine (with which the CRFM has been working since 2016 on value chain development); the NGOs, CBOs, and Private Sector organisations such as; the CNFO, National Fisherfolk, CANARI, Wildlife Conservation Society, Oceana; and Fish Processors and Exporters in the region.
64. The CRFM Executive Director underscored the need for inclusion of the private sector particularly for the component dealing with value chain development, to enable deeper understanding of their needs and current situation, and to ensure that actions would be based on requirements that need to be met to move forward.
65. He invited the partners to add anything that he may have omitted that they believe would be important for the consultants.

Discussion

66. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) thanked the presenters for the information shared. He informed that Barbados would like to increase its STAR Allocation from USD 100,000 out of its GEF resources to USD 500,000 initially and up to USD 1 million. He sought advice on the feasibility of doing so in order to report back on the matter.
67. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean said that the announcement by the Barbados Representative is very good news. He noted that there are 2 options that may be explored, and the timing is good, since the project inception stage is a good time to incorporate additional contributions, and other countries were urged to do likewise if they were also interested in increasing their contributions.
68. He explained that they are allowed to increase the project budget up to 5% without having to remit the matter to the GEF Council. This would amount to an additional USD 350,000. However, any increase above that would have to be presented to the Council for approval before it can be applied. This would require a renewed letter of endorsement from the Ministry of Environment of Barbados. Furthermore, the GEF would need to hear from the country on their strategy for utilizing the funds. The proposed change would have to be directed to the lead agency, CAF, and copied to the FAO. The Project Document could be revised to incorporate the change.
69. The Project Development Consultant added that two things need to be considered: (i) that an increase of USD 900,000 in contribution from Barbados would change the ratio of the co-financing, which would have to be considered in the development of the ProDoc; and it would create an asymmetry in the project management costs, as it would require that some of that money be contributed to help meet those additional costs, for which the percentage contribution would increase.
70. The Panama Representative sought clarity on the process of gathering national inputs for the development of the ProDoc. The Project Development Consultant indicated that the intention was for the consultants to visit the countries to meet with government representatives and key stakeholders.
71. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development noted that the management of the consultancy is the role of the CRFM as implementing agency.
72. The Panama Representative expressed the view that although a regional body like OSPESCA represents the point of view of the regional fisher, another entity, such as a government agency or NGO, may have the relevant expertise in marine spatial planning and therefore may be better placed to facilitate national-level engagement on that component for Panama.
73. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development noted the concern and clarified that the identification of key actors at the national level is part of the project development process and therefore the concern would be addressed.
74. The Project Development Consultant agreed, adding that the concern raised by the Panama Representative was the purpose of the intended review of the institutional arrangements. The matrix detailing the institutional arrangements was to be presented later during the workshop to facilitate input from the country representatives, to confirm the key persons and institutions or determine

who should be added or removed, as part of the validation of the table drafted. He indicated that this would be a good juncture for Panama to include additional institutions and agencies it felt needed to be included in the consultations. The Project Development Consultant commended the team for additionally including regional-level actors and inviting their participation in the Inception Workshop.

75. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project commented that in the country-level review, the sectors that need to be engaged would also be considered. He pointed to the development of a Regional Strategy and Action Plan for the Valuation, Protection and Restoration of Key Marine Habitats in the CLME+ through collaboration between the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) and the UN Environment Programme, through the Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (CAR/RCU). A database on Marine Protected Areas was also being developed. He underscored that at the regional level, there were still some players missing and he was happy to contribute towards filling the gaps.
76. The Barbados Representative (Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer) sought clarity on what participating countries would need to do to facilitate country visits.
77. The Project Development Consultant indicated that countries would be consulted on their specific needs, in addition to the input received during that validation exercise to determine the list of actors that should be included during the project formulation process. The specifics of what is needed from the respective institutions during the visits would also be communicated.

PPG Implementation Timetable and GEF deadlines

78. The Project Development Consultant explained that the elements of the timetable had been drawn from the more detailed work plan. The project milestones had been mapped out to correspond with the different sections of the GEF project document that has to be developed, and to ensure that the timelines to be met would enable delivery of the essential elements to feed into a fairly complete project document in time for validation by Member States.
79. The Inception Workshop was the first milestone. The procurement of services of 2 more consultants had already started, and the aim was to finalize that process by the 21 March 2020. The 1st Draft of the ProDoc with Primary Sections Completed is expected by 30 May 2020, and the 2nd Draft or Revised Draft ProDoc with Project Results Framework added by 15 July 2020. The country visits were scheduled to be executed between the delivery of the 1st and 2nd draft, and the inputs obtained during the consultations with countries reflected in the second draft of the document. The Project Development Consultant clarified that the dynamics of how the consultants are to be deployed were not yet decided but would be as soon as the consultants have been engaged.
80. The 2nd draft is to be shared with CAF and FAO for agency review and validation, before further updates. The 3rd draft generated subsequently would include the Annexes. The document is scheduled for completion no later than 21 August 2020.
81. The Project Development Consultant added that the 3rd draft is to be presented to the countries for validation at a Regional Workshop tentatively scheduled for 17-18 September 2020. The final ProDoc should be ready by 15 October 2020, giving time to incorporate feedback from the GEF before completion of the project preparation process by 15 November 2020. All the dates listed are tentative.

Discussion

82. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean sought clarity on whether the dates specified could be adjusted. He added that participants should be informed of the GEF's cancellation policy. He noted that the PIF was approved on 19 December 2019, and there is a 1-year window of opportunity for the final project document to be submitted. He added that although the GEF has become stricter in enforcing this requirement, it may, if justification is made, permit a 6-month extension. He cautioned that after the period of 11 to 18 months ends, the project could be cancelled if the final document is not delivered during the specified timelines.
83. He added in the event that the timeline cannot be met, due to reasons such as *force majeure* or COVID-19, the GEF Focal Points must inform the GEF, providing very sound justification. It was also explained that at the end of the 8th month, the GEF would issue a reminder, and after that period, between 19 August and 19 December, if problems are encountered that would delay the process, it is best for the GEF Focal Points to inform the GEF of the reasons why an extension would be needed.
84. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development affirmed that the timeline presented (spanning 11 months) was sufficient to comply with the 12-month deadline. He reiterated the point made that by month 8 (19 August 2019), a review will need to be undertaken to determine whether delivery of the final project document would be done on time.
85. The CRFM Executive Director underscored the importance of the issue on the table, and he urged that a more conservative approach should be taken to expedite the process where possible, given the unfolding situation with the coronavirus. He added that milestones 2 and 3 – the engagement of the consulting team and the preparation of the first draft of the document, are critical foundational steps in the process, and it was desirable that the momentum be sustained.
86. The Project Development Consultant added that the dates specified are the ultimate latest dates by which the milestones are to be achieved. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development pointed to the need for the risk analysis to take into account COVID-19.
87. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean noted that the GEF Council meetings were scheduled to meet in June and December (and the project document could be finalized in time for the latter Council meeting). He added, though, that there was also the possibility of disruption due to the COVID-19 situation and any associated need for extension could be considered. He underscored the need for planning for the country visits to commence at the inception. He informed that from the FAO, they had already been receiving notification of cancellation of all field missions in the region, and he anticipated that the situation would become complicated.
88. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development recommended that alternatives need to be considered if travel would not be permitted, and the possible impacts needed to be built into the plans and processes.
89. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project agreed with the need to complete the milestones as soon as possible, but underscored the need to ensure that there is coordination and alignment to enable synergies among the various projects – which require adequate allotment of time to accomplish. He emphasized the need to be strategic, adding that if the COVID-19 situation hinders the process, it would be a *force majeure* situation that GEF would understand.

90. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project urged that the spaces need to be provided to ensure that the project complements other projects for optimal delivery. He added that the meeting of the Interim Coordination Mechanism (of which the CRFM and FAO are members) was due to be held 10 days after the Inception Workshop and presented an opportunity that could also be utilized to build synergy. Similar opportunities presented by the CLME+ Steering Committee Meeting were identified, assuming that the COVID-19 situation would not disrupt plans.
91. The Panama Representative sought clarification on the stage at which the consultations were expected to be done in-country. It was explained that the consultants should visit between steps 3 and 4: the completion of the 1st and 2nd drafts (or May-July).
92. The CNFO Representative asked for specific information to be provided on the point at which regional partners would be consulted. The Project Development Consultant explained that the consultations – which are not limited to the in-country visits – would be ongoing through phone, e-mail, Skype and other means. He added that inputs would be welcomed later in the Inception Workshop to refine the matrix of key actors, and a space is also available for inclusion of more regional actors.

THEME 2: DEVELOPMENT OF COMPONENT 1

Implementing Cross-Sectoral Marine Spatial Planning & Marine Protected Areas

Review of Institutional Mechanisms and Implementation/Execution Arrangements for Development of Component 1

93. The Project Development Consultant led the review of the institutional arrangements, setting out the nucleus of participating institutions for further amendments and validation by the countries. He noted that assumptions had been made based on the team's understanding of the project proposal and the perceived work done by the organizations and agencies. He called on the participating countries to provide the needed inputs for refinement of the matrix, if they felt that the alignments projected were not appropriate.
94. (The reference table can be found at pages 36-39 of the BE: CLME+ proposal provided in the Google Drive folder, document name: *GEF7 CAF-FAO_Carib BE PIF_04October2019_Final draft*. The table outlines the stakeholder entity, and describes its perceived participation in project preparation as well as project implementation. The stakeholders listed were categorized as governmental, inter-governmental and civil society organizations, academia, and private sector).
95. The Project Development Consultant noted that in the case of Barbados, the logic used was to first identify the office of the project focal point ministry, the office of the GEF operational focal point ministry, and then technical line ministries, associated entities and organizations.
96. The Project Development Consultant explained that the relevance of the institutions was also clarified. He noted that the GEF Operational Focal Point is key for the validation of the PIF and the CEO Endorsement Request for the project document, and most importantly, the endorsement letter and the co-financing letters.
97. In reviewing the participation of entities listed, the Project Development Consultant called on the country representatives to indicate whether they believed that further information should be included to clarify the roles of the listed entities in the context of the project's implementation. He also urged participants to indicate whether they believed any listed entity should be removed or whether others should be added to the matrix.
98. The Project Development Consultant reviewed the entities listed for Barbados and their relevant roles with respect to project preparation and implementation. With respect to the Customs Department, and the incorporation of surveillance and monitoring of IUU fishing into Customs operations, the Project Development Consultant indicated that this may be removed, as GEF had asked for the IUU issue to be dealt with separately.
99. The Barbados Representative (Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer) informed that the Barbados Coast Guard has been involved in the development of a Maritime Security Strategy through the Regional Security System (RSS). He said that there may be a need to consult them.

100. The Barbados Representative confirmed that the Coast Guard and the RSS should be added to the list.
101. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC sought input from Barbados on the recommendation that the Customs Department should be removed from the list of agencies. She added that in terms of the value chain and trade, the Customs Department plays a significant role. She recommended that rather than linking the agency to an IUU role, the link could be made with respect to other areas of the project. The Barbados Representative agreed that the Customs Department should remain in that context.
102. The Barbados Representative added that he was unsure about the inclusion of the Ministry of Tourism. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC questioned whether the Barbados Representative was objecting to the inclusion of the Ministry of Tourism in the table. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development clarified that it had been included as an information source in the context of the blue economy. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC also pointed to the importance of their inclusion in relation to policy development for the blue economy seascape, alternative livelihoods for fishers, and the proposed maritime museum for the tourism sector to enhance contributions to fisheries development, which she explained fit within the context of the Blue Economy. The UWI-CERMES Representative added that the tourism entity is key not just in the context of the blue economy, but also for marine spatial planning.
103. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project informed that CERMES had been working with the CLME+ to develop an inventory of national inter-sectoral committees in the region (whether they operate formally or informally). He added that given the emphasis on blue economy and MSPs, this represented an opportunity to strengthen national inter-sectoral committees – which GEF had been asking for in each of the projects since they commenced working in International Waters. He added that a lot of work was yet to be done to enable countries to consolidate those links. He recommended engaging directly with inter-sectoral committees wherever they exist.
104. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC noted that in the case of Barbados, the Fisheries Advisory Committee could be added, in light of the recommendation made by the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project. The Barbados Representative agreed that the Committee should be included, as it represents a cross-section of the industry.
105. The CRFM Executive Director shared that one of the things with which he was impressed during his visit to China in early December, was their blue growth strategy / plan that led to the integration of mariculture and tourism. The mariculture operations integrated platforms that enabled tourist and visitors to fish in the aquaculture production area. There were cubicles for people to recreate with their families, and even areas for children to swim and do recreational fishing. The CRFM Executive Director noted that the facilities were accessible to tourists via boat and had become very popular for recreation.
106. The CRFM Executive Director also recalled the study that the CRFM had done a few years prior (*Promoting Regional Trade and Agribusiness Development in the Caribbean: Case Studies on Linking Fisheries to Tourism-Related Markets. CRFM Technical & Advisory Document, No 2016/3*), seeking to strengthen the linkage between tourism and fisheries in the region. One of the case studies looked at Barbados. The study was led by Dr Iris Monnereau with support from the CTA. He added that in looking at blue growth, marine spatial planning, and the ecosystems

approach to fisheries all sectors have to be addressed in a structured and systematic manner, in order to facilitate the linkages between them to create value and opportunities, including opportunities for employment.

107. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator added that competent authorities and institutions (perhaps agencies such as the Ministry of Health and the Bureau of Standards) involved in the value chain aspect also need to be consulted. He furthermore highlighted the need to identify the cross-sectoral arrangements already in existence in the countries, especially as they relate to coastal and marine arrangements, to enable a determination of the mechanisms that could contribute to coordination and collaboration, and monitoring and evaluation. The Project Development Consultant suggested that these may be advisory and planning committees.
108. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) noted that in the context of the value chain (which goes beyond fisheries to include transport and trade, including wholesale and retail), various sectors and entities are involved. He added that there would be need to include a broader array of entities after further thought is given to the institutional framework.
109. The CRFM Executive Director agreed, noting that this was also part of the purpose of the Inception Workshop, to encourage further deliberations on the arrangements and also to solidify communication links to foster better collection and sharing of information, and to improve understanding of information required to put together a good project document. He urged the Barbados Representative to convey any additional inputs and to keep the dialogue going.
110. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean agreed with the need for follow-up to ensure all the actors are included, in line with the project requirement and the commitment by the project implementing partner agencies and executing agency. He also underscored the need for the identification of resources to be provided and the contributions desired from the listed institutions. He also pointed to the need for the co-financing dimension to be assessed.
111. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project drew from the experience of CLME+ in the region in the engagement of and communication with key stakeholders. He underscored the extreme complexity of working with several countries in a context where many regional and sub-regional integration mechanisms have already been established. The effort requires cross-sectoral coordination and building bridges between government and civil society and the private sector, in order to keep everyone duly informed and to achieve the greatest return on investment.
112. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project noted that they had established both principal and alternate focal points for projects, and national focal points for the sub-projects. Inter-governmental organizations, such as the CRFM and FAO, may help to execute project components through their respective focal points, and those agencies may be executing sub-projects for which there are additional focal points. He furthermore noted that there are inter-governmental organizations with an oceans mandates that are very relevant to marine spatial planning and the blue economy, and the countries have liaison persons and focal points for those inter-governmental organizations and multilateral agreements. The challenge, then, is finding a way to keep everybody informed and there needs to be a strategy for effective communication. He cautioned that inadequate communication could lead to duplication of effort, contradictory measures, and regional plans that are not aligned with national plans. He recommended that such challenges could be addressed through the Interim Coordination Mechanism, adding that an effort was being implemented to develop a contacts database to enhance communication.

113. The CRFM Executive Director added that the point was well taken, and the difficulties expressed reflected the complexity of the real world. He added that the lessons learned from other projects would be useful in the development of a strategy for the BE: CLME+ project, which he noted was relatively small, involving only 6 countries as opposed to 30+ countries in the CLME+ project. The CRFM Executive Director added that best practices and available technology would continue to be used to make gains in keeping the respective parties informed. He added that the engagement would be continuous, enabling further inputs from participating countries and continued follow-up either through in-country field visits and/or electronic engagements.
114. The Project Development Consultant then called on the remaining countries to provide their initial feedback.
115. The Belize Representative commented that the preliminary list outlined for Belize was okay.
116. The Guyana Representative noted that the Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Resources should be changed to the Ministry of Agriculture only, as Fisheries is under the Ministry of Agriculture. He also requested the addition of the Maritime Administration Department and the Protected Areas Commission.
117. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC asked whether in light of the oil exploration ventures in Guyana, the Ministry in charge or other relevant institution should be included with respect to the MSP element of the BE: CLME+ project.
118. The Guyana Representative (Environmental Officer) noted that the official agency dealing with oil exploration is the Department of Energy, under the Ministry of the Presidency, but he did not see how they would be involved in this initiative.
119. The Guyana Representative (Chief Fisheries Officer) acknowledged that there have been issues with the use of the marine space, and he recalled that there were objections from the Ministry of Natural Resources to mariculture. The Guyana Representative (Chief Fisheries Officer) said that they would have to verify whether in relation to the MSP element, the right entity would indeed be the Department of Energy, under the Ministry of Presidency, as had been listed. The Guyana Representative (Environmental Officer) added that the Environmental Protection Agency and the Maritime Administration would be pertinent, as the Department of Energy is not the agency that looks at the effects of oil exploration on the environment. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development urged the representatives from Guyana to follow-up on the matter in order to clarify the issue and then update the CRFM.
120. The CRFM Executive Director indicated that the activities related to oil and gas exploration will have an impact on the marine resources, and therefore the best practice is to take all activities into account, looking at the pros and the cons in order to achieve balance and optimize the use of the marine space. He pointed to a scenario where an authority may declare a marine protected area, with limited or restricted fishing and exclude it from oil and gas exploration. On the other hand, other areas may be open. The CRFM Executive Director explained that an MSP, developed with a comprehensive view of the entire marine space, should direct policy decisions on what should and should not be done, as well as where, when and why type of restrictions should apply. He underscored the need to engage stakeholders from all relevant sectors in the dialogue in order to understand and take account of all relevant issues, inform identification of priorities and provide clear policy direction to decision-makers. The essence of the MSP was to reduce conflicts and to

guard against improper use of the marine space, resulting in the degradation and the destruction of the environment.

121. The CRFM Executive Director added that oil and gas may have more powerful economic muscles than fisheries and mariculture; but oil and gas are finite, extractive resources that are potentially detrimental to the living marine resources and environment. A balanced approach with regulated activity could allow the development of oil and gas resources in a way that will not degrade marine ecosystems, and the fisheries and biodiversity that can be available indefinitely through the application of that balanced approach.
122. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator concurred that the entities identified by Guyana should not be excluded, as they all have a role to play in the marine sector due to their impact on policy development and implementation, and the protection of the marine environment. He reiterated the need for all key players to be identified for inclusion.
123. The Jamaica Representative informed that his country had identified the blue economy as one of the central planks of its medium-term strategy for broader economic growth. He added that they cannot leave out any critical agency or sector that can impact on the process. The Jamaica Representative said that the list may not be exhaustive but could be developed after further assessment.
124. The Jamaica Representative reiterated that the Fisheries Division has been replaced by the National Fisheries Authority, which should therefore be the entity named in the matrix. He also recommended the addition of the Maritime Association of Jamaica, and affirmed that the Customs Department had been well placed among the listed agencies for Jamaica. He noted that they were key members of the team examining the Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA). Additionally, he made reference to NGOs and/or agencies supported by the government and requested the addition of the National Council on Ocean and Coastal Zone Management (NCOCZM).
125. The Jamaica Representative undertook to consult his colleagues on other organisations that should be consulted. In reference to IUU fishing, he recommended the addition of the Marine Police. The National Environment and Planning Agency of Jamaica, responsible for the seafloor in the country's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) was also identified for inclusion. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development recommended the addition of the Planning Institute of Jamaica.
126. The Panama Representatives were then invited to provide their feedback. The Coastal and Seas Spaces Planning Department was established under the Ministry of Environment of Panama, and the Coastal and Marine Management Division subsumed under that ministry. Therefore, the removal of that division was requested. They added the Panama Aquatic Resources Authority and the National Aeronaval Service (SENAN) in place of the Panama Coast Guard and clarified the role of the Ministry of the Environment. The inputs from Panama were provided in a summary document, appearing at *Appendix IV*.
127. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC noted that one of the GEF donor countries had recommended that the Maritime Chamber of Commerce of Panama should be added as a key stakeholder.

128. The Panama Representative (Head of the Coastal and Seas Spaces Planning Department) indicated that the Ministry of the Environment is not a part of the body; the Panama Maritime Authority is, and there are concerns regarding jurisdiction, as their focus was more on the Pacific Coast..
129. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean asked whether Fundación MarViva Panamá should also be added. The Panama Representative replied that he had also considered that entity but noted that their focus was also mostly on the Pacific side of the country. He pointed to the need to consult the entity before including them.
130. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist recommended that in line with the commitment for gender mainstreaming, although it is not possible to involve all the mechanisms that address gender, it is important to include some of them. She emphasized that it is not possible to adequately take into account the interests of women without engaging them and strengthening their capacity. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist said that after the gender expert is contracted the individual could create a map of the different entities, identifying also which government entity has the relevant portfolio for building women's advancement policy. Additional stakeholders could be included not just as a source of information but also as a contributing agency.
131. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development affirmed that the CRFM had initiated a gender mainstreaming initiative that was ongoing, and Member States had been tasked to identify gender focal points. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development urged that the linkages with the CRFM initiative could be borne in mind during the discussion. The Project Development Consultant agreed that this would be useful
132. The Saint Lucia Representative (Fisheries Assistant) requested the addition of the Saint Lucia Air and Sea Ports Authority through the Maritime Division, the Soufriere Marine Management Area (SMMA), Saint Lucia National Trust, the Ministry of Tourism, the Saint Lucia National Fisherfolk Organization and the Physical Planning Section of the Ministry of Economic Development, Housing, Urban Renewal, Transport and Civil Aviation, as that division has legal jurisdiction over protected areas.
133. The Saint Lucia Representative (Sustainable Development and Environment Officer) requested the addition of the Department of Economic Development, Transport and Civil Aviation, since the projects are channelled through them, and they would be in charge of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) country work program that include 2 fisheries-related projects. The Saint Lucia Representative also advised that the name of their ministry would need to be amended to say, Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development. In reference to the information included on fisheries policy development, regarding the role of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production, Fisheries, Co-operatives and Rural Development in facilitating and supporting policy related outcomes, the removal of the word "all" was requested as the Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development, has the lead role for oceans and coastal zone management policy.
134. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development noted that Saint Lucia, like other countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), has a National Oceans Governance Team that is to guide fisheries and oceans management in the context of the Eastern Caribbean Regional Ocean Policy (ECROP). He recommended the inclusion of the inter-sectoral National Ocean Governance Team. The Saint Lucia Representative (Sustainable Development and Environment Officer) added that the National Oceans Policy had been drafted, and a strategic plan

- developed. She added that the Team would be a critical entity to engage, as it included all the key players in oceans governance and the blue economy.
135. The Project Development Consultant then requested feedback on the inter-governmental organizations listed.
136. The CRFM Executive Director called for the addition of CARICOM, UN Environment, and UN ECLAC. The Project Development Consultant added the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) would be the UN agency with the portfolio for BE Strategies. The CRFM Executive Director said that UNCTAD had been invited to the Inception Workshop, but they were unable to attend.
137. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project added that the CLME+ SAP Interim Coordination Mechanism is comprised of 8 inter-governmental organizations, some of which had already been listed. Some of the other agencies on the ICM, apart from the FAO-WECAFC, CRFM, the Commission of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and OSPESCA include the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC/IOCARIBE) of UNESCO, the Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCAD), CARICOM and UN Environment. He added that UNECLAC was not a member of the ICM and a tourism-related organization could also be included. He affirmed that there was still scope to include more organizations on the ICM.
138. He also informed that the organizations listed have produced a lot of guidance materials on Marine Spatial Planning in their effort to track MSP progress at the global level, and recommended that a good starting point is for the team to work along with the ICM.
139. The OSPESCA Representative added that for the SICA Countries, it is important to see how methodologies and databases of projects already in operation can be harmonized to develop baselines and reference frameworks that can be shared. The body of work, experiences and products could be consolidated for the Caribbean and could feed into the creation of unified platforms for the proper functioning and management of projects at the regional level.
140. The OSPESCA Representative added that they are working on a new regional project for the Pacific Coast (Gran Ecosistema Marino de la Costa del Pacífico Centroamericano - PACA). He added that if the same methodology is used for these initiatives, it would be possible to establish the baselines that will enable comparisons to track progress at the regional level.
141. The Project Development Consultant expressed that he did not foresee a problem, as the BE Strategies had been well documented. He elaborated that although some will be regional and country-specific, the overarching principles remain applicable. The principles enshrined in the documentation from CAF, UNCTAD and others are the same.
142. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project recalled that there was an initiative that he had not mentioned: the “Blue Economy and Sustainable Management of Ocean Degradation Lab” (the Blue Lab) established by the UNDP Barbados & the OECS Office. A number of scoping studies were being done for some OECS and CARICOM countries. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project said that although all entities did not need to be involved in execution, they may participate in coordination to help achieve synergies.

143. The Panama Representative (Head of the Coastal and Seas Spaces Planning Department) added that two relevant agencies with which Panama had been involved are the Secretariat of the Cartagena Convention operated by the UNEP Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (UNEP-CAR/RCU) and IOCARIBE.
144. The Project Development Consultant then sought feedback on the civil society organizations (CSOs) listed, as well as academic and private sector entities. He asked whether fisherfolk organizations are private sector or CSOs. The CRFM Executive Director said that they could be both, depending on what they do. He pointed out that many fisherfolk organizations are involved in processing and marketing.
145. The Project Development Consultant signalled that this is key, because when the private sector engagement is described in the CEO Endorsement Request, the fisherfolk organizations would have to be mentioned in that section in the private sector context – not in the CSO context. The CRFM Executive Director affirmed that they could legitimately be categorized as both.
146. The Project Development Consultant asked whether there are any other regional-level NGOs that should be included, besides CANARI.
147. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC asked whether a distinction should be made when speaking of UWI and UWI-CERMES, because the UWI entity involved in the FISH4ACP initiative in Guyana is not CERMES. She recommended that the reference should be broader to cover other relevant UWI entities.
148. The CRFM Executive Director concurred that there are other UWI entities with which collaboration are necessary. He recalled his earlier mention of Centre for Marine Sciences at the UWI Mona Campus in Jamaica; and the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, at the UWI St. Augustine campus in Trinidad and Tobago, which has expertise in value chain development both in agriculture and in fisheries and aquaculture. He added that there may be other departments and institutes within UWI that may have an interest in the BE: CLME+ initiative, and recommended that the engagement could be coordinated through CERMES. He recommended that other academic institutions should be included, such as the University of Belize, which has the capability in marine sciences, marine protected areas and various other marine related disciplines; the University of Guyana, the Caribbean Maritime University (CMU) and University of Technology (UTech), Jamaica, and others.
149. The Belize Representative noted that the name of the fisherfolk organization should be the Belize Fishermen Cooperative Association and there is also the Belize Federation of Fishers. He informed that the two fisherfolk organizations and the fishing cooperatives are represented on the Fisheries Advisory Council.
150. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project identified the IUCN BIOPAMA initiative (the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme), as another initiative that may be of interest for building linkages and synergies. He informed that there would be a follow-up to Caribbean BIOPAMA program, so it will be up and running for quite a while. Additionally, it was noted that the World Wildlife Fund had funding designated for marine spatial planning in the North Brazil Shelf, including the area covered by Guyana and Suriname; Conservation International was also working on the North Brazil Shelf in addition to the Nature Conservancy. The Regional

- Coordinator of the CLME+ Project urged the partners to consider the civil society organizations that are active.
151. He added that, in the context of the private sector, if the discussion is about the blue economy and Marine Spatial Planning many other sectors should be engaged beyond fisheries. He observed that only fisheries entities had so far been included in the section of the table.
152. In concluding the presentation, the Project Development Consultant recalled that the only entities from among the list of stakeholders that were not yet mentioned were the last 4. He noted the recommendations that had been made for revising the list, particularly the institutions that were to be considered or added. He reiterated that the countries were being asked to help develop the list based on their country's perspectives. He indicated that an editable Word version would be made available to the participants.
153. Additionally, he noted that a recommendation had been made for the formulation of an inter-sectoral MSP committee. The Project Development Consultant said that after having given some thought to the recommendation, he was of the view that this could be a new output or indicator. He explained that for the purpose of articulating the sustainability portion of the ProDoc, making reference to that inter-sectoral committee for MSP is very important
154. The CRFM Executive Director agreed with the need for the inter-sectoral committee but added that its scope of work should go beyond MSPs to address oceans and marine matters more comprehensively.
155. He indicated that although it could be added as either an output or indicator, including it as an indicator would be better. He added that integrating MSP within the context of an existing inter-sectoral committee would be the preferred approach. The Project Development Consultant sought clarity on whether the mechanism would be operated at a national or regional level. The CRFM Executive Director replied that it would be at the national level, as the Permanent Coordination Mechanism (PCM) for the CLME+ SAP would then serve the function at the regional level.
156. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project recommended that the approach taken by the OECS in the context of the development of MSPs under the Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project (CROP) could be examined, as there might be experiences that could provide guidance.
157. The Project Development Consultant added that there would also be implications for the Policy, Legal and Institutional Frameworks, and there would be the need to identify established inter-sectoral committees at the country level. He noted that in the case of Belize, several acts prescribe multi-sectoral committees, and therefore a review would have to be done country-by-country. He cautioned also that if it were to be included as an indicator, it would not be applied or delivered equally in all 6 countries, because some countries may already have had success.
158. The CRFM Executive Director added that the study done by UWI (a PhD project done under the CLME+ initiative) could provide useful information on the current situation as it relates to the inter-sectoral committees, because the indication was that many of them existed on paper but had not been functioning.
159. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project informed that the products from CERMES (including an inventory of where countries are) are accessible on the CLME+ Hub in the [documents](#)

[library](#). He undertook to provide further information mapping the status in the wider Caribbean, if it was not yet available on the hub.

160. The Guyana Representative said that in the project document (PIF), more ministries were included, and he wondered whether certain portions had been extracted for the presentation delivered at the Inception Workshop. The Project Development Consultant indicated that the table had been updated, and what had been projected was from a previous version of the PIF.
161. The CRFM Executive Director noted that the engagement with participants had revealed several other relevant institutions and initiatives that were underway, and it would be useful to get a comprehensive view of them. He recalled that the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project had highlighted the challenge of achieving effective coordination.
162. The CRFM Executive Director noted that there were 8 initiatives that the CRFM had been involved with that had not been mentioned formally, although some were mentioned during the discussions. They include the Marine Sub-Component of the Regional Track of the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR); the CARIFICO projects funded by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) – the first project concluded in 2018, and the follow-up CARIFICO II project developed in 2019, is now getting started; the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) MPA Project; the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) funded data collection and management project; the Government of Canada / UNDP Gender Mainstreaming in Fisheries Project; the EDF funded Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Program, supporting value chain development; the ongoing collaboration for capacity building with the United Nations University Fisheries Training Programme, which had worked along with the CRFM to offer 2 value chain development workshops involving government and private sector organizations engaged in fish processing and export; and ongoing cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), looking at marine environmental management and Sargassum using nuclear and isotopic techniques. The CRFM Executive Director urged that the additional information on ongoing projects of relevance be made available to the project partners in the ensuing weeks.
163. The Project Development Consultant pointed to the need to determine the level of relevance and impact of each of the agencies identified, as following the typical governance structure of GEF projects, the outcome could be a regional steering committee and multiple technical advisory committees. He added that the members are typically drawn from the agencies listed, but a criteria would be needed to decide which should be on the regional committee and which should sit on the advisory committees.
164. The CRFM Executive Director added that there are some institutions that are involved in several projects and initiatives, and the significant level of commonality observed should be taken into account in deciding on the institutional and governance arrangements for this project. In reference to the point raised by the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project on the need for long-term sustainability, the CRFM Executive Director stressed that it is extremely important for new initiatives, projects, and proposals to be embedded as much as possible in existing institutions that are going to continue and mainstream the knowledge and innovations into existing processes, so that they are integrated into ongoing policy processes and activities both at the national and regional levels.

165. The Project Development Consultant pointed to the need to also consider the ability of agencies to fund their participation, as this is also an issue for participation in steering committee meetings if the intent is to have physical committee meetings.
166. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project recommended also that a determination needed to be made on which entities need to be engaged and which need only to be kept informed.
167. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project furthermore cautioned that convening steering committee meetings may be much more difficult for the BE: CLME+ project than anticipated. He added that the CLME+ Project has utilized the meetings of the regional governance bodies (such as the CRFM and WECAFC) to engage stakeholders through those fora instead of convening steering committee meetings that would incur additional costs. He added that the composition might be too heterogeneous to enable meaningful engagement on substantive matters, noting though that since the BE: CLME+ involved only 6 countries, it may be different. He recommended that an appropriate solution, applicable to the project, would have to be considered.
168. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) noted that tourism and offshore oil and gas had been mentioned in some of the earlier discussions, as well as telecommunications cables on the sea floor and shipping – representing the multi-sectoral aspects of the blue economy, marine spatial planning, and the fisheries value chain. He asked whether the scenario envisioned was the engagement of the actors in discussions on the multi-sectoral issues or whether it would be more efficient to rally around some of the big issues like offshore oil and gas, such as the case of Guyana where they are reaping benefits. He added that Barbados was also looking at developing offshore oil and gas.
169. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) acknowledged the need for an ecosystems-based approach for the blue economy to ensure environmental sustainability, but added that economic viability for sustainable development cannot be achieved if it is not generating revenue, so the business aspect cannot be ignored. The Barbados Representative added that the economists or personnel from the Ministries of Finance are often left out of the conversation, and the focus tends to be on technical experts in the environmental and social fields. He said that this begged the question of the level at which those with expertise in economics would be engaged. Furthermore, he recalled comments made by the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project on economies of scale and the issues attendant with that. He added, though, that from a fisheries perspective that means bigger catch, which can lead to overexploitation; therefore balance is key.
170. The Barbados Representative said that his query was made to reflect upon whether the matter should be approached on the basis of the issues or by the relevant agencies, or a combination of both. The Project Development Consultant agreed that the recommendation made a lot of sense.
171. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean commented that the discussion on the institutional arrangements presented a very good occasion to put the information together in order to revise the table included in the PIF. He agreed on the need to map the institutions based on their levels, and for a determination on whether to invite their direct participation. He also pointed to the need for identifying the key contribution they would make to the project. This would be important in helping to determine the resources that would be available at the institutional level, and to help clarify their expectations of the project.

172. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean also reiterated the need to clarify the co-financing arrangements and to ensure effective collaborative among the institutions. He added that the presentation made on the CLME+ Project provided a framework within the concept of the CLME+ SAP with a timeframe up to 2025. He recommended that some actors could be included as indirect beneficiaries to avert challenges that could arise with inter-agency coordination. He asked what provisions were in place to ensure regular updates of the CLME+ portal to provide a reliable reference. He noted that the BE: CLME+ would be contributing to the portal and also the project would benefit from the information on the portal.
173. Furthermore, the FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean highlighted the need to consider how the achievements from other initiatives could be scaled up for the countries under the GEF7 / BE: CLME+ or how the project would integrate the outputs of other initiatives. He pointed out that investments would enable the blue economy to catalyse other processes, and the GCF could be another investor.

Collaboration with other partners such as CLME+ PCU and SAP ICM, regional and national universities, NGOs (e.g. UWI, CNFO, OSPESCA, etc.)

UNDP/GEF CLME+ PCU and SAP ICM

174. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project made a presentation which focused on the linkages with the CLME+ initiative, noting that it was the wider context within which the CAF-FAO-CRFM BE: CLME+ Project came into being.
175. The GEF 7 International Waters Focal Area was highlighted as an important dimension contributing to Strategic Objective 1: Strengthening Blue Economy opportunities, which includes strategic action, through healthy coastal and marine ecosystems; sustainable fisheries management; and reducing pollution in the marine environments. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project pointed out that the CLME+ SAP had provided the impetus for major investments in the areas identified for strategic action over the next 10 years.
176. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project explained that alignment with the endorsed strategic action programs in the region was important for projects to obtain financing under GEF 7 International Waters. He urged that as the partners work towards the ProDoc, that a concerted effort be made to consistently make the linkages with the CLME+ SAP, endorsed by 26 countries in the region.
177. Another GEF requirement is that the project should be coordinated with institutions responsible for regionally-agreed frameworks. The Interim Coordinating Mechanism (ICM) was identified as one such entity.
178. Although the GEF also has a requirement for knowledge management, the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project said that if the countries were to individually work on knowledge management, by the end of the project, a lot of products may be created which could disappear, resulting in loss of knowledge. He added that it would be better for the countries to jointly develop knowledge management tools that would be owned by the region, and that would more importantly

survive the individual projects. He proposed that this should be the way forward in the context of BE: CLME+.

179. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project presented a timeline of the CLME+ initiative, noting that although the 5-year CLME+ Project was slated to conclude in 2020, the BE: CLME+ would help to give continuity to the CLME+ SAP. He noted, though, that the BE: CLME+ covers only 6 of the 26 countries, and so it represents only one initiative within a very complex and comprehensive framework for SAP implementation. He added that a follow up for the main CLME+ project was also being developed, and several other project would be brought on-stream to contribute towards SAP implementation.
180. Having several projects built around the CLME+ SAP then requires partnerships characterized by the establishment of bridges to facilitate communication and to promote effective delivery in order to avoid duplication of efforts. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project recommended that a joint documents library for region should be utilized rather than having a documents library developed for each project. He underscored the need for tools that would serve a more broad-based, regional purpose.
181. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project said that all the various projects should have a place under the “SAP Umbrella”, so that they can fill in the gaps and work together. He went on to list several projects for which linkages could be made to the CLME+ SAP.
182. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project recalled the discussion at the 2019 Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) conference on blue economy on the challenges of economies of scale. He explained that if islands try on an individual level to grow the blue economy, they might not achieve the economies of scale critical for success. In the context of the BE: CLME+, it may be difficult to achieve economies of scale, since the countries are spread out, but other BE projects in the region may offer an opportunity to explore that possibility. He reiterated the importance for the BE: CLME+ to seek to build the necessary linkages and synergies through coordination.
183. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project urged that the transboundary issues highlighted in the CLME+ SAP – pollution, habitat degradation and unsustainable fisheries, in the context of a changing climate – need to be addressed to achieve the benefits envisioned, such as sustainable ocean-based or blue economic growth, sustainable livelihoods, peace and the prevention of conflict.
184. He presented a map of the CLME+ region, and explained that it covers 26 countries plus 18 overseas territories. He added that the LME concept is a good scientific concept for applying the ecosystem-based approach to fisheries. However, political decisions are not limited to the boundaries of the LME but are constrained by the mandate given to regional organizations. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project demonstrated the linkages with fisheries agencies such as WECAFC, the CRFM, and the Secretariat for the Cartagena Convention. He added that BE: CLME+ should seek to interface with the relevant conventions that also apply to the region and where organizations have received mandates from their Member States.
185. According to the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project, the CLME+ SAP entails a proposal to build and strengthen a multi-level nested regional framework for integrated ocean governance. He presented a simplified model demonstrating the partnerships of sub-regional geopolitical integration mechanisms, regional fisheries bodies, and regional seas entities that comprise the

Interim Coordination Mechanism – the precursor body to the Permanent Coordination Mechanism for ocean governance envisioned to solidify the CLME+ partnership.

186. There is also the need for consistency, alignment and coordination in policies, processes and programs, to build the kind of confidence that would attract investors. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project explained that the ICM is a test mechanism, financed by the CLME+ project, and the hope was that the region would approve the establishment of the PCM at the 4th Steering Committee Meeting slated for the end of April 2020. The model for the PCM, including core and complementary functions, is included in the PowerPoint presentation reproduced in *Appendix III*.
187. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project informed the meeting of the creation of a common knowledge management platform for the CLME+ Initiative through which the knowledge management aspect of the BE: CLME+ project could be supported. The CLME+ Hub (clmeplus.org) was still being developed to encompass a projects database, a documents library, a contacts database (to include information for project focal points), a meeting calendar, a SAP M&E status tracking portal, State of the Marine Environment and Economies (SOMEE) reports, and geospatial tools, including a Caribbean Marine Atlas and information on the status of marine spatial plans in the region.
188. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project said that the site was intended to serve all the organizations, projects, and countries in the region. The site was still being populated with content. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project informed that a profile had already been created on the hub for IW:LEARN. There is also a profile page showing information on the participating countries for the BE: CLME+ initiative.

OSPESCA

189. The OSPESCA Representative presented an overview of ongoing projects in the Central American region. He also informed that research had been ongoing with the support of Mexico, FAO and OSPESCA. The organization had also benefited from south-south cooperation programs. He also noted the 1st Blue Economy Forum at The Fisheries Ports, as well as efforts to support the development of the Regional Blue Growth Strategy.
190. With respect to value chain development, the OSPESCA Representative informed that the Pelagic-Demersal Fisheries Value Chain Regional Plan of Action had been produced for four SICA countries: Panama, Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador. The Integration of the Value Chain in Fisheries and Aquaculture (INCAVPESCA) project was due to commence in March 2020, with the participation of Belize, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador.
191. He noted that an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management was being integrated in the context of Plans, Good Practice Manuals, South-South Cooperation, and Cross-sectoral Cooperation through alliances with CCAD-OSPESCA and CRFM-FAO-OSPESCA partnerships. The OSPESCA Representative noted the development of two critical plans: the Plan Regional de Manejo de la Pesquera de la Langosta Espinosa del Caribe (*Parnulirus argus*) or MARPLESCA, and the regional plan for the conservation of sharks (La Plan de Acción para la Conservación y Ordenación de los Tiburones en Centroamérica).

192. The OSPESCA Representative highlighted initiatives in the SICA region that could be enhanced through applying the valuable tools for an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management presented at the Inception Workshop. Important regional initiatives identified were the previously mentioned PACA initiative (translated Towards Joint Integrated, Ecosystem-based Management of the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem), and other national-level initiatives to develop area-based management regimes, such as: Marine Responsible Fisheries Areas in Costa Rica; Fisheries Recovery Zones in Honduras; and co-management area for responsible fishing in Panama. The Pacific Americas Marine Planning Initiative was to be piloted in Panama, as well as Mexico, Costa Rica and Ecuador. Another important pilot initiative which the OSPESCA Representative mentioned was the billfish conservation project for the Pacific.
193. The OSPESCA Representative showcased the CLIMA PESCA tool, which enables fishers to access information and alerts via their mobile devices on the impacts of climate change on the sector.
194. The OSPESCA Representative also mentioned the development of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Integration Policy 2015 – 2025. The policy’s relevance was underscored, as it seeks to support the sustainable use of hydro-biological and aquaculture resources, while strengthening the framework for coordination and harmonization within the Central American Integration System.

CNFO

195. The CNFO Representative introduced the organization to the participants, detailing the nature of its membership from among 17 CRFM countries, as well as its mission, vision and strategic directions. She noted that their vision was based on the ecosystem-based approach to fisheries, while the strategic directions encapsulate that vision.
196. In terms of ongoing projects most relevant to the organization and the countries participating in the BE: CLME+, the CNFO Representative highlighted the CC4FISH, StewardFish, and the Powering Innovations in Civil Society and Enterprises for Sustainability in the Caribbean (PISCES) project. She did not elaborate, as these projects had been detailed by the FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator, in his presentation on Creating Synergies with Other Projects Across the Caribbean.
197. Her focus was on a new project – “Promoting fisher-led Implementation of the Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF) Guidelines in the Caribbean Region” – for which the CNFO had sought and obtained funding from the FAO for implementation of the SSF Guidelines across 17 participating states. The CNFO Representative informed that they had received their first disbursement in February 2020. The total funding for the project is an estimated US\$100,000, and the first scheduled activity was a regional meeting planned for April/May 2020 to build awareness on the SSF Guidelines. The project also aims to promote the implementation of the Caribbean Community Common Fisheries Policy and the International Year of Artisanal Fisheries and Aquaculture (2022).
198. The CNFO Representative expressed the hope that they would receive further funding to do advocacy work at the national level in at least 2 pilot countries.

CERMES, UWI

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

199. The Barbados-based Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (CERMES) had been identified by the CRFM Executive Director as the main entity through which the BE: CLME+ team would coordinate with the University of the West Indies and other relevant UWI institutions.
200. The CERMES Representative provided an overview of the structure and function of CERMES, as well as its Natural Resource and Environmental Management graduate level program.
201. The CERMES Representative then detailed 14 relevant projects that have been ongoing, as well as 4 pipeline projects, and 2 proposals being formulated – a total of 20 initiatives that involve CERMES.
202. During her brief presentation, she highlighted the less known and most recent imitative already in progress: “Adapting to a new reality: Managing responses to influxes of sargassum seaweed in the Eastern Caribbean as ecosystem hazards and opportunities,” funded by the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF), through its Ecosystem-based Adaptation Facility. The CERMES Representative noted that the project included 5 Eastern Caribbean partners.

Overview of MSP work in the Caribbean and presentation of the methodology and tools for development of project component 1, including BE strategies and MPA interventions

203. Mr. Andrew Hume, IW/MSP Consultant delivered his presentation virtually. He underscored that the current phase of the project entailed project design and not implementation, and the focus is on creating the right design and framework, including the budget, to ensure the project’s success over the next few years.
204. He summarized the overall objective of Component 1, including the intended outcomes and budget. He emphasized that GEF is particularly keen on supporting marine spatial planning, to advance implementation of BE Strategies.
205. The Consultant noted that the marine protected areas development is being funded also from the Biodiversity STAR allocation from the 5 countries to benefit from the project dimension (with only Guyana excluded).
206. The Consultant also provided details on the project’s targets and expected outputs. He explained that the project framework in the PIF should not be vastly changed in the ProDoc. He added, though, that there is flexibility to ensure that the outputs align with the country baselines and speak to the priorities. Furthermore, he recommended that updates should be done to reflect progress made on ongoing activities to ensure relevance and that the overall objectives are met.
207. After presenting outcome 1.1, the Consultant stressed that the goal over the next couple of months, is to identify the national and regional level priorities, adding that the specific outputs will connect as the specific project activities are designed.
208. With respect to outcome 1.2, the Consultant noted that the focus is to advance the ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management through the creation or expansion of MPAs or another form of effective area-based management measure. He added that there is attention from GEF on meeting

- Aichi targets for expansion of protected areas. The GEF sees the BE: CLME+ project as supporting those efforts.
209. The Consultant asserted that MSP is a tool for implementing BE Strategies, whereas MPAs are a tool for promoting an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management, as informed by the MSP. He explained that there is connectivity among all the various outputs.
210. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development noted that a number of countries in the region had signed on to the CBF, but it was very challenging for the countries to develop it. He went on to urge that, to every extent possible, the sustainable financing direction should allow consistency with and synergies with existing funding mechanisms such as the CBF.
211. The CRFM Executive Director elaborated that there are ongoing initiatives in the region looking at sustainable financing, including the CDB's sustainable financing initiative looking at blue economy. He added that even with respect to a component of the CLME+, there has been work done and support provided for sustainable financing under the Permanent Policy Coordinating Mechanism going forward. He added that the BE: CLME+ needs to be informed by and congruent with those ongoing activities.
212. The Consultant agreed that this is true of almost every one of the outputs, and there should be (based on GEF incremental cost reasoning) some level of engagement already on the topics, and the goal over the ensuing 10 months would be to identify the ongoing initiatives and opportunities to build upon the baselines to achieve national and regional goals.
213. The Consultant added that there is recognition that under component 2, which focuses on seafood value chains, opportunities for the creation of new economic opportunities would be supported, and there could be opportunities to enhance linkages in that respect as well. Marine spatial planning would enable better data-driven understanding of the context.
214. The project's focal areas and core indicators were reviewed. The Consultant explained that the biodiversity funding of US\$1 million was being drawn from the countries' STAR allocation, and the countries should focus on activities related to biodiversity that should be happening at the national and not the regional level. He added, though, that national activities should support the regional level activities.
215. The distinction between project targets and GEF core indicators was also clarified. The Consultant explained that project targets were developed to communicate to the GEF what are the expected project deliverables. Those commitments are for the formulation of comprehensive MSPs for 5 countries and national blue economy strategies in place and/or updated for all 6 participating countries. He noted that the target for MSPs excludes Saint Lucia because it had already been working to develop its plan under the CROP initiative funded by the World Bank.
216. The Consultant explained that the Core Indicator values that appeared in red were to be determined over the ensuing months. He highlighted GEF Core Indicator IW-8 for which the value for the "Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels" had been set at 45,000 mt. The Consultant explained that this is a very rough estimated that needed to be refined for presentation to the GEF in the ProDoc, and it would be tracked throughout the life of the project. Additionally, the estimated 230,000 hectares for MPAs would be revisited and refined based on

- further consultations with the countries, and that would also be tracked over time. The indicator on gender is more applicable to the value chain component of the project, the Consultant noted.
217. The baselines for each of the countries was reviewed, as presented in the PIF. The Consultant noted that the summaries do not specifically mention the development of new MPAs. He added that this was due to the concept of MPA creation and the concept of ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management, informed by the MSP. The Consultant underscored that this was a common theme. During the presentation, the Consultant focused on the text appearing in red.
218. After reviewing the country baselines, the potential linkages with relevant ongoing initiatives were identified. With respect to the CROP, the Consultant noted that the focus there (with respect to building upon existing work being done in Saint Lucia) was on developing BE strategies and updating the existing work focused on the blue economy, as well as further recommendations for additional governance and management. He added that this may influence ongoing sustainable financing initiatives or inform future sustainable planning from the perspective of value creation for seafood in the blue economy.
219. The Consultant noted that the information provided had been drawn from the PIF, collected through the baseline assessments in which the countries had been asked to participate. That led to the identification of the project's proposed priorities.
220. The Consultant sought feedback from the participants on whether there were any major disagreements or inaccuracies in relation to the information that had been presented.
221. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) noted that in the national context, they make reference to Marine Management Areas (MMAs) and not MPAs. He asked whether those would still be recognized in the context of the project indicator defined. The Consultant affirmed that it is absolutely appropriate to have national interpretations of marine protected areas. He clarified that the indicator identified (in relation to output 1.2.1) does stress "other effective area-based conservation measures," so they do not have to consider MPAs in the strictest sense. The goal, he said, is to look at the application of additional measures for fisheries by marine spatial planning with a data-driven approach. The Consultant added that this could be achieved through different kinds of spatial or even temporal management.
222. The CAF Representative asked how the figure for the indicator on co-beneficiaries had been calculated, and why the percentage of women was merely 10% of the number of men. She also asked if there would be an opportunity to discuss the matter. The Consultant indicated that the figure represented a very crude estimate and he did not understand how it was derived. He indicated also that his understanding from the GEF was that the indicator was to be updated and refined. The CRFM Executive Director concurred that this was the best available estimate, which along with other similarly ballpark figures estimated for other metrics, such as fish production, would need to be validated and refined during the PPG stage.
223. The Project Development Consultant added that the baseline had been derived from the CRFM's 2016 Statistics and Information Report. The total number of fishers and ratio by sex were assessed, and extrapolated to the number of households. He added that the figures need to be validated.
224. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project sought clarification on the support to be provided to Saint Lucia under the BE: CLME+ project to its MSP. He noted that there had already been a

- commitment from the World Bank via a follow-up initiative, and he was wondering what consideration had been given to avoid duplication of efforts.
225. The Consultant noted that they had already been in preliminary discussion with the World Bank team and the OECS, to get a better understanding of their initiative and to ensure consistency with the CROP. He added that adjustments would have to be made in response to CROP's future work, and based on the timing of when the funding under the GEF initiative would become available.
226. The Barbados Representative (Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer) sought clarification on the meaning of the phrase "number of shared water ecosystems..." (section F, item 7 in the PIF). The Consultant explained that the GEF IW has an overall focal area aimed at supporting regional collaboration on transboundary waters and that is a core goal. He added that this represents a corporate indicator for the overall focal area. However, in the context of the BE: CLME+, being looked at from a multi-country level, there are no shared water ecosystems. They are collectively working towards a regional effort, but it is not the same as a coastal country or a terrestrial watershed. He clarified that there is no expectation in the context of the BE: CLME+ that countries would be working towards that kind of transboundary watershed management goals.
227. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean asked whether the GEF would accept downward adjustments in the indicators; for example, in the case of BE Strategies where it may be determined that less countries would need project support to develop those strategies. He furthermore sought comments on the type of contributions that IW:LEARN could make to the project, particularly in relation to component 3 on knowledge management.
228. The Consultant replied that all of the core indicators are understood by the GEF to be an estimate and should be updated to reflect more realistic figures once the project is fully designed. If the MSP or BE dimensions change based on the realities in the countries, that would be appropriate. He added that if the numbers change very significantly, there may be need to go back to the GEF, but that would have to be discussed.
229. In relation to IW:LEARN, which supports GEF's IW focal area, he noted that the network is managed by several GEF agencies, including UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, IOC, and it is tasked to facilitate knowledge sharing across all the GEF IW projects. The Consultant explained that the GEF requests an allocation from each project of roughly 1% for participation in IW:LEARN activities so that there is a critical mass of projects that are always working towards sharing knowledge. One associated indicator that could be tracked could be the development of a static site on the IW:LEARN portal. IW:LEARN benefits include participation in the biennial IW:LEARN conference. Deliverables include policy briefs, lessons and experience notes. The Consultant added that the countries have already engaged through CLME in IW:LEARN, so it should not be foreign to them.
230. The Consultant noted that with respect to the World Bank-financed CROP Initiative, due to conclude in December 2021, it is nearing mid-term and the expected mid-term review could help to inform the BE: CLME+. He pointed to the need to align and harmonize work as much as possible so that project deliverables are consistent.
231. With respect to the concluding CLME+ project, the final evaluation was pending. The Consultant said that he looked forward to the collaboration and to gaining lessons learned as well as recommendations to inform the design of the BE: CMLE+. The Consultant added that the two

- projects he had identified should be most instrumental in informing the design of the BE: CLME+ project.
232. He informed that comments had been received from GEF Council Members that are relevant to the project design. There were also some queries for further information or requests for clarity on certain points. The presenter highlighted the major queries and recommendations for improvements or greater emphasis in red.
233. The development of the MSP should be considered as a stakeholder-driven process, particularly considering the cross-sectoral nature of the process, the Consultant emphasized.
234. In further discussing his general suggestions on BE and MSP Methodology, he emphasized the need for alignment with CROP for compatibility, including data types/layers, software, and deliverables, such as the Regional MSP that CROP is aiming to produce.
235. The Consultant said that he was not sure why the GEF IW had asked them to avoid UNCTAD Blue BioTrade concept, which he recalled was part of the original proposal. The focus, he said, should be on advancing appropriate BE strategies, for which the FAO and CRFM are able to provide guidance. Emphasis has also been placed on the need to build upon ongoing national and regional directives—rather than reinventing the wheel—in order to ensure regional consistency and compatibility.
236. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development sought clarify on whether the intended reference to CROP was at the regional level in the context of the OECS sub-region or in the context of the wide Caribbean region or large marine ecosystems (LME). He pointed out that the region that CROP refers to is the OECS region.
237. The Consultant apologized if it had appeared that he was suggesting that CROP should be informing the non-OECS countries. In reference to the GEF caution against the use of UNCTAD's BioTrade approach, the Consultant reiterated that he did not know the reason.

Creating synergies with other projects across the Caribbean

238. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator emphasized that the BE: CLME+ project would be building upon the outputs of previously implemented projects as well as ongoing projects supporting regional and national marine coastal spatial plans for the OECS sub-region. He added that the project is closely aligned with the Eastern Caribbean Regional Ocean Policy (ECROP).
239. Alignments with the GEF-funded Climate Change Adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector (CC4FISH) Project were also highlighted. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator indicated that Saint Lucia has also been a beneficiary of this initiative. He explained that the CC4FISH initiative can make an important contribution to the effort to develop BE Strategies in the BE: CLME+, due to its focus on the integration of climate change adaptation into fisheries policies and ecosystems-based management plans.
240. The third project highlighted was the StewardFish project. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator noted that all the BE: CLME+ participating countries except for Panama are also included in the StewardFish project. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator informed that the

third component of the project recognizes that there is a lot of work being done in terms of the socio-economic and value chain aspects of fisheries, but the lessons learned and the best practices are not being actively captured. Therefore, the project would attempt to bridge that gap. He pointed out that there is a link with the value chain component of the BE: CLME+ project, as the StewardFish Project would crystalize exemplary practices that could be integrated in the BE: CLME+ initiative.

241. He added that the StewardFish Project would also be seeking to identify issues confronting stakeholders along the value chain, and supporting the sector in overcoming them. Furthermore, the project focuses on the inclusion of women along the value chain as well as building their leadership capacity.
242. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator informed that the project's monitoring and evaluation component seeks to identify appropriate multi-sectoral mechanisms, aligning with the plans in the BE: CLME+ to identify cross-sectoral mechanisms, ensuring that fisherfolk as key stakeholders would be included and engaged in the monitoring process, so that they can benefit from the lessons learned.
243. Another relevant initiative identified was the EU-funded PISCES, being implemented by CANARI and due to conclude in 2020. The project recognizes that the best practices being developed by the fisheries sector (fisherfolk organizations, community-based organizations and others actively engaged in MPA governance and management) are not being captured and shared. The project supports the identification, capture and sharing of the innovations, providing a link with the BE: CLME+ dealing with creating new MPAs or expanding existing ones with more fisher involvement. The project also recognizes that along the value chain, there are Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), but there is inadequate investment; so the project facilitates connections between them and potential investors who may be able to help them to develop their capacity.
244. The final initiative discussed was the FISH4ACP project which involve Guyana and the Dominican Republic in the Caribbean. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator noted that the project was about to commence, so by the time the BE: CLME+ initiative comes on-stream, the lessons learned from the value chain aspects of the FISH4ACP could be carried over to the BE: CLME+ initiative.
245. The details of the various projects are included in the PowerPoint presentations appearing in *Appendix III*.

THEME 3: DEVELOPMENT OF COMPONENT 2

Inclusive Sustainable Fisheries Value Chains

Overview of fisheries value chain analysis and development

246. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC discussed Fisheries Value Chain Analysis and Development within the Perspective of the Blue Economy Project, noting that the importance of the initiative commencing when it did was that it would benefit from other FAO-implemented projects, particularly the FISH4ACP Project, of which Guyana is a beneficiary. The project has been built on a comprehensive and robust methodology that combines many decades of experience in sustainable food value chain development, and the Value Chain Analysis for Development (VC4AD) initiative, funded by the European Union. This, she said, enabled the upgrade of the methodology to be compliant with the Sustainable Development Goals. The upgraded methodology was to be piloted and validated.
247. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC said that a standardized methodology across FAO and the EU will be ready for newly piloted initiatives and could be scaled-up within the Blue Economy Project.
248. She noted that the methodology enables a functional analysis of the value chain. The approach furthermore addresses the economic, social and environment dimensions of the system. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC affirmed that the ultimate aim is to gain income. She noted that the end market is important since that is where value is determined. Opportunities are identified at the market level and then a determination is made on how to capitalize on the opportunity by making improvements along the stages of the value chain. The process also entails mapping of the value chain actors, and the flow of the value chain.
249. The importance of undertaking a sustainability assessment was also underscored. This looks at the commercial or fiscal viability along the value chain. The value chain analysis also looks at inclusiveness, in terms of how the benefits are distributed along the value chain, how the costs are created, and how poverty is tackled throughout the value chain. In terms of gender equity, the emphasis is on women's economic empowerment and access to resources as well as decent work.
250. In discussing the environmental aspects, or the ecological footprint, she also noted opportunities to optimize the value chain by deriving usable products from things that would normally be discarded. Another important dimension is stocktaking on whether enough of the target species is available for value chain development.
251. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC explained that there are 4 layers that constitute the value chain: the core value chain (actors), the support providers (inputs and services), the enabling environment (societal), and the natural environment.
252. The analysis also serves to identify concrete and feasible opportunities to reduce or remove operational inefficiencies, social costs or the ecological footprint, or to increase economic, social or environmental benefits.

- 253. Transparency was also identified as a factor. She noted that there are vertical linkages, such as the fisher selling to the market stores, and horizontal linkages, such as those between fisherfolk organizations. She added that the extent of transparency across these linkages determine the dynamic of the governance structure. This is another dimension considered during the value chain analysis.
- 254. Business development support providers for value chain actors were also highlighted, due to their essential role in facilitating value creation. This can be in the form of financial services, gear provision, bait, as well as laboratory services to ensure the traceability of the products.
- 255. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC explained that the comprehensive methodology will give a better understanding of the current value chain within the Caribbean, and particularly the fisheries sector of the 6 participating countries for the BE: CLME+ Project. She made reference to the case of the tuna value chain in Barbados and opportunities for value chain expansion.
- 256. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC also noted that the factors that had been identified would be analysed through the combined methodology incorporating the FAO value chain analysis, focusing on the technical and economic aspects, and the EU value chain development methodology, focusing on the social profile. She expressed the hope that this would be utilized over the course of 2021-2022 within the context of the BE: CLME+ project.

Co-financing aspects for sustainable fisheries value chains-

- 257. The Project Development Consultant addressed financing in relation to CAF's contribution and opportunities for the private sector. He indicated that within CAF, this would fall under the area of Green Finance and under Blue BioTrade even though the agency would not want it to be viewed as a BioTrade initiative from a financing and co-financing perspective.
- 258. He added that in relation to the outputs and the products that would be derived from the value chain analysis, which is where the most opportunities lie for CAF co-financing, the agency would likely make Green Financing available for implementation of the value chain elements. He affirmed that CAF invests in creating an enabling environment for the value chain, in addition to branding, marketing and distribution.
- 259. The Project Development Specialist noted that the agency has a bias for investments in SMEs. They would build capacity and make significant financing available through a pipeline for SMEs along the value chain. The financing would be channelled through national-level financial institutions, which would enable access through an application-based process to the CAF-financed facility.
- 260. The Project Development Consultant noted that CAF has traditionally funded initiatives to support the production of coffee, cacao/chocolate, sugar cane, ornamental flowers and other agricultural products, but they have launched their biodiversity strategy which has a marine component to it. Fisheries, food processing and value addition for fisheries products are elements that could qualify for financing. He added that the scale of operations that would be eligible for support should be given attention, as the focus has been on Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs). The construction of a large processing plant to push branded products into the market or one that is

financed with long-term debt of 30-40 years may not be deemed to be an SME. These are issues that could be dealt with later, he recommended.

- 261. The PIF includes US\$25 million in co-financing from CAF. The Project Development Consultant explained that the funds would be channelled into a credit line for replicating and upscaling the project results in order to create an enabling environment for value chain development; building capacity of SMEs to make the best use of the opportunities along the value chain.
- 262. The Project Development Consultant noted that in the context of the BE: CLME+, there would be opportunities for investment in value chain development for SMEs. He cautioned that if the opportunities are not clearly defined while conducting the value chain analysis it could represent a lost opportunity for stakeholders, and if CAF is approached for financing, it would ask for an assessment showing the prefeasibility of the value chain.
- 263. He added that care will need to be taken during the project design phase in describing private sector engagement to ensure that activities are included in the context of the outputs and the indicators that would produce baseline information needed to facilitate value chain credit lines. He added that the analysis also has to point in that direction.
- 264. A Fisheries Value Chain Consultant was being engaged to provide technical expertise to the BE: CLME+ Project.

Discussion with Participating Countries on the (a) Rationale for the Selection of the Value Chains and areas of intervention (b) Information Requirements / Constraints and (c) Supporting resources

- 265. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) asked whether, as part of the analysis, since the focus is on SMEs, consideration was given to the usual requirement placed by financial institutions for applicants to submit market research information, detailing whether the proposed product is what the consumer base will want and to give an idea of the quality to be delivered, including packaging details. He added that typical start-up businesses can fail within the first 1 to 2 years, so there is a need to ensure that the venture is viable and can not only generate income but create employment opportunities as well.
- 266. The Project Development Consultant agreed, adding that it even goes beyond that as the support to SME's will also have to include an incubation period. He added that experience has shown that even if both support for the development of business plans and financing are provided, but the "handholding" support is not provided during the incubation period, the failure rate is very high. If the project is to be impactful, it has to go that far.
- 267. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC added that when the value chain analysis is done, a business case would be made to demonstrate viability from all aspects – environmentally, socially and economically. Furthermore, investment from the private sector would complement the credit line to be made available by CAF. She said that this is the reason why there was great optimism over the FISH4ACP Project, which will commence with Guyana.
- 268. The Belize Representative informed that in late 2019, Belize had completed an oceans economy strategy, with support from UNCTAD, looking at mapping the value chains for the marine fisheries sector and seafood processing. He suggested that the model has elements that could be used as

- examples. A financing mechanism needed to be put in place in order to support the development of the value chain, he added. He also recommended that the agencies that assisted Belize could also be included as partners for the BE: CLME+ project. The Project Development Consultant indicated that this had been integrated in the project document.
269. The CRFM Executive Director affirmed that the value chain approach will reveal what is viable and what isn't, starting with a good understanding of the markets. In relation to the co-financing of \$25 million from CAF to support commercial investment, he noted that there were two concerns: The first is that some of the participating countries are not members of CAF and so it was unclear whether those non-members could access CAF financing. Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Panama are members. The second concern is that the funds are disbursed through local lending institutions, with which relationships would have to be established. The CRFM Executive Director added that if private sector operators can get access to the concessionary financing to be made available under this project, it could support diversification of the fisheries and addition of new products to existing lines.
270. The CRFM Executive Director indicated that UNCTAD had been invited to participate in the Inception Workshop, and they had been engaged in initial conversations with the CRFM and CAF, which led to the BE: CLME+ project and the initiative from which Belize and Barbados had been benefiting. The reason why the UNCTAD Representative could not attend the Inception Workshop was that he was in Barbados providing support for the development of their Blue Growth Strategy.
271. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development noted that the Oceans Economy and Trade Strategy is linked to the value chain concept, and he had questioned why GEF International Waters had not taken up that OETS approach, in light of the need expressed to achieve synergies with related initiatives.
272. In response to queries on how the CAF credit line would work, the Project Development Consultant clarified that it would be primarily dependent on the risk analysis and then on specific agreements developed between CAF and the countries.
273. The Jamaica Representative noted that development of the value chain approach in the Jamaica fisheries sector is still nascent and needs support. He added that players in the sector would want to take advantage but the capacity and requirements need to be strengthened. With regard to the presentation made by FAO, he sought clarity on the allocation of the US\$6.2 grant from GEF, against the backdrop of the overall allocation of US\$46.2 million and the US\$4 million+ allocation for the International Waters aspect.
274. The Project Development Consultant explained that the funds were allocated from two focal areas: International Waters and Biodiversity. He explained that the US\$4 million+ had been allocated under International Waters, while the other portion had been allocated under Biodiversity. This merely reflected the two sources in the GEF that the resources were coming from.
275. The CRFM Executive Director also noted that there was also the Marine Spatial Planning and Marine Protected Areas component, which is larger than the value chain. He elaborated that the initial submission made to the GEF had been significantly revised during the process of developing the PIF and the initial proposal had different balance with less focus on biodiversity and more on sustainable use and management of fisheries and promoting what the CRFM had called at the time the Blue BioTrade, based on the definition from UNCTAD, which really promotes Blue Growth.

The modification was made after the proposal was subjected to various reviews. Nonetheless, they were able to maintain a significant portion of the activities geared towards supporting livelihoods such as fisheries value chain activities – although most of that had been previously called Blue BioTrade. The concept of Blue BioTrade is not one that is used by the GEF, but they could relate to value chain and its development. Another change was that the investments that had been proposed to address IUU fishing had been significantly reduced.

276. The CRFM Executive Director urged that what Jamaica and other countries need to do, to maximize benefits, is to ensure that they have a clear program and priorities in developing viable value chains to optimize benefits to stakeholders and protect the resource base. He underscored the importance of engaging the private sector and stakeholders on the ground, to foster greater understanding of what they need to develop their businesses and take advantage of opportunities where they exist. The project would provide support for the analyses that will engage experts on value chains and fisheries economics to provide the technical guidance required. The analysis should give an indication of where investments can be made and what investments are needed, with a focus on the potential of marine species and aquaculture. The CRFM Executive Director assured that the consultants would reach out to stakeholders from the countries (including the participants and the relevant people on the ground) in performing the value chain analysis.
277. He added that some of the work has already been done in countries, such as Belize and Barbados, and the initiative could build upon work done by the CRFM and the United Nations University - Fisheries Training Programme in collaboration with UWI St. Augustine, Caribbean Fisheries Training and Development Institute in Trinidad and Tobago, and Caribbean Agri-business Association (CABA), which could be a valuable private sector partner.
278. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator noted that there are a number of projects using different methodologies for value chains. He mentioned a recent value chain assessment done by Belize. He recommended that an effort should be made to gather the existing knowledge to build synergies for the project, from development to implementation. In reference to the FISH4ACP initiative, being implemented in Guyana, the intent was to look at the most effective means of building capacity in the region. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator added that the University of Guyana might also be involved in the FISH4ACP. The University's Agriculture Department had been contacted, as well as UWI St. Augustine and CANARI. The aim was to ensure that the benefits are spread across the region in support of related work, thereby supporting capacity development in the region.
279. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator also referred to innovation in financing for SMEs. With reference to the PISCES Project, one of the objectives was to facilitate connections between small-scale operators, who cannot readily get financing, and potential investors. He pointed to the need to glean the lessons learned from other initiatives.
280. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean offered clarification on the point raised by Jamaica on the structure of the co-financing. He explained the contributions from the various co-financing sources and eligibility requirements for financing, including the CAF US\$25 million loan to make lines of credit available; the FAO grant of US\$4 million to be made available to some countries for specified activities; and US\$9 million in kind from countries. He demonstrated, using the budget table, how the funds are allocated across focal areas. A total of US\$23 million has been allocated for Marine Spatial Planning and Marine Protected Areas; US\$11 million for value chain development; and roughly US\$4 million for biodiversity.

National Preparation and Consultation Process

281. Representatives of the participating countries—Barbados, Belize, Jamaica, Guyana, Saint Lucia, and Panama—delivered country presentations.

Barbados

282. The Barbados Representative (Coastal Planner) informed the meeting of the establishment of a new ministry dedicated to the Blue Economy: The Ministry of Maritime Affairs and the Blue Economy, and they had been for the past 2 years under the administration responsible for that new ministry. The Ministry's aim is to manage marine resources / ecosystems within the context of promoting a sustainable blue economy. He added that this would involve marine spatial planning and an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management. The country was in the process of updating its management and conservation instruments. New legislation was in the pipeline, and international conventions related to the management of the marine space were also being integrated into the national framework.
283. The Barbados Representative noted that the Coastal Zone Management Unit (of which he is an officer) was in the process of developing its coastal zone management plan and the coastal zone management act, with supporting regulations. He added that one of the main focuses of the reform is to mainstream climate change adaptation and disaster risk management into integrated coastal zone management policy.
284. The existing legislation speaks of beach protection and coral reef protection, and the text would incorporate mangroves and seagrass beds as specific ecosystems that require attention, laying the foundation for further work in those respects.
285. The Barbados Representative explained that there are several economic interests operating within Barbados' EEZ. He informed that Barbados had been once again exploring the feasibility of ferries and water taxis. In addition to fisheries, there were also telecommunications fiber-optic cables running from Guyana to Barbados, and offshore oil and gas. The Barbados Representative informed that the country had been issuing blocks for oil exploration. An agreement had been signed with Trinidad and Tobago a few weeks prior. He added that the country was also investigating the possibility of venturing into the production of green energy utilizing offshore wind turbines and technology to harness wave energy. Offshore wind farms seemed to be the most feasible.
286. The Barbados Representative underscored that these developments highlighted the need (more than ever before) for marine spatial planning given the broad scope of investment opportunities that can yield revenue from the marine space.
287. The Barbados Representative informed that the country has one designated Marine Protected Area: the Folkstone Marine Park (220 ha), located on the island's west coast. The proposal is to increase coverage to approximately 600 hectares, with designation as an MMA. A second MMA (Carlisle Bay Marine Recreational Park) has been identified on the south coast of the island. Both are

featured in the island's physical development plan, and the intent was to expand the reach and the management of those areas.

288. The critical need for a sustainable financial mechanism to support MMAs was also highlighted, along with the importance of enhancements in data and information, capacity development, technology development, and institutional strengthening. The importance of properly managing each stage of the fisheries value chain through an ecosystem-based approach to management was also emphasized. In terms of capacity development, the Barbados Representative underscored the need for competencies and relevant training to empower stakeholders to help build out the various stages of the fisheries value chain in a manner that addresses poverty and gender issues.
289. The Barbados Representative (Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer) added that the country could benefit from the BE: CLME+ project in many ways. He noted that the ongoing reform initiatives being led under the new Ministry, were happening at an important juncture.

Belize

290. The Belize Representative noted that although Belize lacks an MSP, it did publish a Coastal Zone Management Plan in 2016 that incorporated 9 zones. He added that the plan is available online.
291. The Belize Representative informed that the Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute was chairing the Marine Spatial Data Working Group of the Belize National Spatial Data Infrastructure launched in 2019.
292. In terms of Blue Economy Strategies, he noted that Belize had developed its Oceans Economy and Trade Strategy, with support from UNCTAD. The stakeholder validation had been concluded in December 2019. The aims of the strategy (aligned with the Belize Trade Policy 2019-2030), is to increase the capacity of fishers for the sustainable harvest of commercially important deep slope fish species; and to add value to commercially targeted species to access niche markets and to develop and implement smart marketing approaches for fishery products.
293. The Belize Representative also informed that Belize was developing its Maritime Economy Plan for coastal and marine areas, through the Commonwealth Marine Economies Programme. Initial consultations were held in 2019, and the hope was that in 2020 the plan would be finalized.
294. In relation to the status of MPAs, the Belize Representative indicated that Belize had already exceeded the Convention on Biological Diversity Aichi Target 11, with respect to marine areas, as it had more than the desired 10 percent of coastal and marine areas under protected status. He informed that MPAs represented 36.1% of protected areas in Belize, representing a coverage of 21.7% of marine areas. The replenishment zone (previously called no-take areas) accounted for 7.9%. The goal was to increase the coverage of replenishment zones to 16.2%, in line with the target for the Replenishment Zone Initiative.
295. He informed that a World Bank project was to conclude in September 2020, after which the zones should be legislated. He also said that the World Bank has a policy that fishers displaced by such initiatives must be compensated, so the issue was being addressed through the World Bank.

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

296. The report on the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Program (BIOPAMA) - Protected Areas Management Effectiveness 2019-2020 was expected by mid-June 2020.
297. After 10 years of efforts to put in place new fisheries legislation, the Fisheries Resources Act 2020 was recently enacted on 14 February 2020. The Belize Representative said that the law is consistent with regional and international legal and voluntary instruments and had the support of the FAO's legal office, OSPESCA and CRFM. Belize's framework applies an ecosystem approach to fisheries management.
298. The new legislation makes provision not just for MMAs but also for creating Inland Water Reserves, and it furthermore considers a framework for co-management agreements with partners. The National Protected Areas Act in Belize covered marine protected areas generally, but the Fisheries Act specifically covers Marine Protected Area and Inland Water Reserves. The newly enacted Fisheries legislation also includes an improved Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) mechanism to combat IUU fishing, with stiffer fines and penalties. Provisions are made for Port State Measures, although Belize has not yet become a party to the PSMA.
299. The Belize Representative said that the hope was that a ministerial agreement would also be penned through OSPESCA on Port State Measures.
300. In terms of decision-making processes, stakeholder input is facilitated through the Fisheries Advisory Council. The body includes representation from 4 fisherfolk organizations.
301. Through a separate engagement, the Project Development Consultant had assisted Belize with developing its 5-year Fisheries Policy, Strategy & Action Plan.
302. Belize has also made efforts to advance the assessment of the Fisheries Value Chains. Under Oceans Economy and Trade Strategy, the Fisheries Improvement Program has been piloted with the National Fishermen's Cooperative Society Limited, with support from The Nature Conservancy.
303. The country is also part of the Seafood Traceability System initiative being implemented by OSPESCA, in addition to the INCAVPESCA project, focusing on the integration of value chains in Fisheries and Aquaculture (funded with US\$1.5 Million from the Republic of China on Taiwan), involving Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. The Taiwan-funded initiative (to focus on diversification and technology development, the generation of information for decision making, and strengthening of regional governance) spans 2 years, and the inaugural meeting for the initiative was slated for the week following the BE: CLME+ Inception Workshop.
304. Belize has also been a beneficiary of the Marine Conservation and Climate Adaptation (MCCAP) Project (implemented in 2015 and concluding in September 2020). The 5-year project was implemented by the World Bank and funded by the Adaptation Fund grant of US\$5.53 million. The project objective is "to implement priority ecosystem-based marine conservation and climate adaptation measures to strengthen the climate resilience of the Belize Barrier Reef System." The four components of the project are (i) improving the protection regime of marine and coastal ecosystems; (ii) promoting viable alternative livelihoods for affected users of the reef in the areas impacted by project activities (with a focus on 3 main MPAs); (iii) raising awareness and building capacity; and (iv) Project Management, Monitoring and Assessment.

305. The Belize Representative undertook to share the new Fisheries Legislation with the participants. He informed that there are provisions that stakeholders must be consulted and engaged; therefore, fisherfolk are the primary ones that will be engaged, whether it is for developing a management plan for fisheries, creating marine reserves, de-reserving areas, creating special management areas, and the like.

Discussion

306. The CRFM Executive Director thanked the country delegates and undertook to make all the submitted documentation available to the other participants via the Google Drive folder. He took the opportunity to remind participants to share any useful and relevant reports, documents, policies, legislation and regulations, noting that they would also be helpful for the consultants engaged to develop the ProDoc.
307. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project noted that one of the issues with projects is that countries are tasked 10 times to do the same thing. Therefore, he urged that the CLME+ Hub be used to make the shared documentation available, perhaps in about 2 weeks. The CRFM Executive Director added that information management was an important aspect that was to be addressed later in the workshop.
308. The Belize Representative noted that he had found it challenging to access legislative documentation from other countries while they were developing the Belize legislation, which should not have been hard to access, even if they are older versions or in draft form.
309. The CRFM Executive Director recalled that in 2019, the Ministerial Council had mandated that legislation from all Member States should be made available to the CRFM Secretariat for access by other Member States. It was in light of that decision that Belize was being asked to provide the newly enacted legislation to the CRFM Secretariat.
310. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development noted also that the website of the CRFM houses a portal for an online bibliographic database, which had recently been developed under the Flyingfish Project with the support of the Fisheries and Resources Monitoring System, and recommended that the portal could also be used to house the documents.
311. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project added that one way to avoid duplication of efforts—and to ensure that non-CRFM countries and CRFM countries all have access to relevant documentation beyond the organizational level—is to utilize the CLME+ Hub for sharing.

Guyana

312. The Guyana Representative (Chief Fisheries Officer) delivered an oral presentation and committed to providing a one-page summary of his presentation to the CRFM. He noted that the blue economy strategy does not involve only fisheries. He added that this is a new concept for them, so the BE: CLME+ Project will be far-reaching in helping the country to kick-start the process of blue growth.
313. The Guyana Representative clarified that MPAs do not fall under the mandate of the Fisheries Authority. They are under the purview of the Protected Areas Commission. The country has committed to designating 10 percent of its EEZ as MPAs, and a project to support this had commenced earlier in 2020. At the time, there were no designated marine protected areas.
314. The marine space has been opened to multiple uses, beyond fisheries. The Guyana Representative noted that offshore oil blocks had been issued. A no-objection letter from the Fisheries Authority is required for exploratory works to proceed. Other activities in the marine space include the laying down of sub-marine cables. The Fisheries Authority would also be consulted to determine whether the cables pass through any of the fishing areas. If they do, removal and/or compensation would be negotiated.
315. He added that the industrial seabob shrimp fishery is the best monitored and controlled fishery in Guyana. The management approach takes into account ecosystems and endangered and threatened species. Nets are fitted with turtle excluding devices (TEDs) and by-catch reduction devices, which are incorporated into the vessel management system (VMS). The main legislation is the Fisheries Act of 2002. The marine legislation had been updated to include the by-catch reduction devices, the TEDs and VMS, which are mandatory for trawling vessels.
316. The Guyana Representative noted that Guyana was the only CARICOM country chosen for a value chain EDF funded FISH4ACP project, scheduled to commence later in 2020.
317. The Guyana Representative informed that the country had been included in the EU-funded project titled, “Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean project.” The project was initially to span 4 years but will be concluded earlier, in 2020. The Guyana Representative noted that there were challenges experienced early in the project cycle, and there was no further funding to accomplish what would remain pending due to the initial delays.

Jamaica

318. The Jamaica Representative presented an overview of the island’s demographics and the country’s fisheries sector. The country documented approximately 23,000 registered fishers and 4,000 licensed fishers; 7,200 registered fishing vessels, approximately 5,000 of them having been licensed. Additionally, there were an estimated 300 fish farmers in the aquaculture sector.
319. He informed that the sector encompasses (i) fish capture (including commercial, sport and recreational; a large artisanal section; and a smaller but economically more valuable industrial segment – important for lobster, conch and more recently sea cucumber), and (ii) fish culture (comprised of the food fish and ornamental fish sections that produce tilapia, marine shrimp, ornamental fish and mangrove oysters).

320. He elaborated on the two major segments of the fisheries sector: the artisanal and industrial components. Additionally, it was noted that there were large aquaculture operations, including a conglomerate that operates a contract farmer system across an area of over 100 acres with a parent farm and satellite farms. They produce seed-stock that are supplied to contractors; and own and operate a feed processing plant, relevant to the value chain.
321. The Jamaica Representative noted that the reef fishery is considered to be fully or over-exploited. He noted that the country's aquaculture sector was largely pond-based and marine shrimp production was being done in earthen ponds. He recommended that the technology being utilized in China should be considered. The country was exporting tilapia products to the USA and Europe.
322. In terms of the country's legal framework, the Jamaica Representative noted that the commencement of the Fishing Industry Act in June 2018 had significantly changed the landscape by repealing the Fishing Industry Act of 1975. He explained that the new Act gave them the flexibility to better govern the fisheries space and to also look at the integration of regional and national activities, policies and emerging concerns. It enabled renewed focus on commercial viability and compliance mechanisms by making provisions for the National Fisheries Authority to have in place compliance and enforcement teams. It furthermore strengthened governance through an advisory council and a separate appeals tribunal, both independent of the Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Fisheries, and so it should not be under political influence. Provision was also made for a Fisheries Board of Management to report directly to the Minister.
323. The Jamaica Representative also referred to other relevant legislation listed in the presentation annexed.
324. The Jamaica Representative detailed 2 relevant national-level donor-funded projects. The first was the US\$4.875M/ JA\$624M PPCR project, funded by the World Bank to increase the adoption of climate resilient practices among targeted fishing and fish farming communities in Jamaica. The project was being implemented by the Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture & Fisheries/ National Fisheries Authority over the period 2019-2024.
325. The Jamaica Representative explained that one of the critical elements of the project addressed the provision of alternative livelihoods to compensate for the adverse economic impacts of reef fishery overexploitation. He added that under that project, they expected to see improvements in the governance arrangements for fishers, capacity building, research, and strengthened enforcement to address problems associated with IUU fishing.
326. The Fisheries Licensing and Registration System Project was the second project being implemented by the Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture & Fisheries and the National Fisheries Authority. Funded by the IDB under the PPRC Project, the initiative budgeted at US\$1.2M (to be matched with an almost equivalent amount of JA\$156M) commenced in 2018. The objective was to create an operational integrated licensing and registration information system, utilizing modern Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to capture data, manage it, and provide timely, accurate permits, licenses and reports. The project, expected to conclude in 2023, was deemed to be vital in strengthening their work with marine police, Customs, the Coast Guard, in terms of seamlessly providing information over ICT systems.
327. Further monetary support for the sustainable management and development of the fisheries sector in Jamaica came via the Fisheries Management and Development Fund, established through the

Conch (Export Levy) Act of 2009, making provision for a levy (“cess”) on conch revenues. The Jamaica Representative noted that the fund is important for the maintenance of the country’s Special Fishery Conservation Areas (MPAs) of which the Government of Jamaica supports seven (7) of the 18 such areas. He informed that in excess of JA\$300 million had been spent to support the 7 government-managed Special Fishery Conservation Areas.

328. The Jamaica Representative recalled that the country’s Prime Minister had committed at the United Nations Oceans Conference held in 2017 to increase the area of archipelagic waters designated as marine protected areas by an estimated 2% by the end of 2019. The Jamaica Representative informed that the designation was to be applied in the Pedro Cays area, where a portion had already been designated. The proposal entailed the addition of another 882 square kilometres of protected area in that location, although to achieve the 2% target, the addition of only 240 square kilometres more was needed.
329. The PowerPoint includes a map showing the Jamaica Fish Sanctuaries, covering roughly 20,000 square kilometres of the archipelagic waters (or about 9%). The Jamaica Representative said that this coverage could be doubled in another 3 to 4 years, but that depends on the availability of resources.
330. He emphasized the need for authorities to look more closely at spatial planning in a more dedicated way, while considering the available resources. The presentation by Jamaica is at Appendix III.
331. The CRFM Executive Director added that the fish sanctuaries referenced by the Jamaica Representative are marine protected areas that fisheries authorities began to establish during the 1980s.

Panama

332. The Panama Representative (Climate Change Analyst) provided an overview of facts relevant to Panama’s Caribbean Coast, Blue Economy Strategies, Status of MPAs, Fisheries Management and the Policy, Regulatory Institutional Framework for MPAs, MSP and Sustainable Fisheries Management.
333. The Panama Representative noted that 82% of the districts have coastal areas, and a greater diversity of ethnic groups are located on the Caribbean side of the country. Primary marine economic activities identified were artisanal fisheries, tourism and vessel transit from Colon on the Caribbean side through the Panama Canal to the Pacific side of the country.
334. The Panama Representative (Head of the Coastal and Seas Spaces Planning Department) discussed the country’s Blue Economy Strategies, and the relevant indicators for aquaculture, ports and tourism. The new indicators for the blue economy aim to build understanding of how much the country invests in Education and Research (including specialized degrees up to the graduate level), Sustainable Fishing, and Sustainable Ports. Another key indicator category looks at water quality and protected areas, including the relevant marine ecosystems and habitats.
335. The Panama Representative noted that there is less information available for the Caribbean side than the Pacific, therefore there is limited understanding of the situation on the Caribbean side of the country.

336. In reference to Marine Protected Areas, the coverage in the Atlantic was estimated at 841.91 square kilometres. The Panama Representative informed that they are working on creating a new MPA in 2020 and increasing the area of coverage of the Bastimentos Island National Park. Panama increased the coverage of MPAs substantially between 2013 and 2015.
337. Other strategies to enhance the blue economy in Panama include: strengthening responsiveness to the sector and improving inter-institutional coordination for the sustainable development of fishing and aquaculture; improving information analysis; enabling more participatory management; and exercising better control over the use of and access to fishing and aquaculture resources.
338. The strategy also aims to enhance the benefits achieved from fishery and aquaculture production, based on improvements in quality, diversification, innovation and traceability in the value chain.
339. On the topic of Policy, Regulatory Institutional Framework for MPA's, MSP and Sustainable Fisheries Management, the Panama Representative informed that they were hoping to commence a consultancy in June 2020 to develop a national oceans policy. He added that Panama was due to host the eighth Our Ocean Conference in 2021.
340. He also provided an overview of capacity building initiatives, including training provided through MSPglobal (www.mspglobal.org), a joint initiative by UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC-UNESCO) and the European Commission's Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries aimed at developing new international guidelines on Maritime Spatial Planning.
341. The Panama Representative also informed that new fisheries legislation was in the pipeline and expected to be finalized later in 2020.
342. In concluding, he noted that for Panama, the concept of Marine Spatial Planning cannot be focused on one sector or on aspects pertinent only to fisheries management but on all sectors and activities in the marine environment.
343. He also urged consideration of the language used for communication (Spanish being the primary language used by most nationals) and issues related to the engagement of the indigenous peoples of Panama (and the need to get formal approval from leaders to secure support and compliance, even with nationally promulgated laws).

Saint Lucia

344. The Saint Lucia Representative noted that while the country had not fully undertaken a holistic approach to marine spatial planning, they have seen the establishment of the Soufriere Marine Management Area (or SMMA, established in 1995), which could be viewed as a partial marine spatial management plan. She added that Saint Lucia had been involved in the MSP feasibility study done under the CROP project.
345. The Saint Lucia Representative informed that the country had approximately 19 declared Marine reserves, including coral reefs, beaches and mangroves. The Canaries / Anse la Raye Marine Management Area (CAMMA) was established as an extension of the SMMA, designated under the Fisheries Act as a Local Fisheries Management Area. She noted that the designation of CAMMA was done through a highly consultative process that involved various stakeholders. Additionally, the Pointe Sable Environmental Protection Area, which includes the 2 largest mangrove systems, offshore islands, coral reefs and beaches, was established in the 2007 and is managed by the Saint Lucia National Trust.
346. The Saint Lucia Representative went on to list relevant legislation, plans and policies, such as Saint Lucia's National Adaptation Plan, the Sectoral Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan for the Fisheries Sector, and the Draft Policy on Fisheries (just concluded in December 2019).
347. With respect to relevant projects of which Saint Lucia was a beneficiary, the Saint Lucia Representative noted that in 2019, significant strides were made through the CC4FISH project to examine the value chain for the pelagic fisheries (with specific focus on dolphinfish and tuna). This had not yet been completed. Several other national-level donor-funded projects were detailed. (See country presentation in *Appendix III*).
348. The Saint Lucia Representative noted that she had also been designated as the National Focal Point for both the GEF/FAO – StewardFish project (2018 – 2021) and the JICA-CARIFICO 2 Project (2019-2024).

Discussion

349. The Project Development Consultant advised that when countries seek to expand the baseline within the project document, more information would be needed on each of the items presented. The budget, the objectives, the timeline, the profiles of ongoing or concluded projects, as well as the differentiation of the donor-funded baseline from the government-funded baseline needed to be elaborated. He added that the information would be reviewed, after which the consultants would communicate the gaps to be filled.
350. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean asked the Jamaica Representative whether there was a document or assessment that provided information on the assertion he had made during the country presentation that the fisheries was deemed to be fully or over-exploited.
351. For Panama, he pointed to two areas of interest. Regarding the indigenous groups in Panama, he asked whether there was a way to quantify the amount of direct beneficiaries anticipated under the BE: CLME+ in that country, as well as in other participating states, namely Guyana and Belize.

He added that since Panama is more advanced in marine spatial planning, it may be useful to have more information about the Panama experience, not just the methodology but also the tools employed in the process. He urged them to make available what they have, so that it could be shared via Google Drive to inform development of the project baseline.

352. The Jamaica Representative replied that the status had been determined from internal reports. He added that the information could be compiled and shared.
353. The CRFM Executive Director noted that in the case of Jamaica, there had been a long history of challenges going back over 30 years. He added that there was relevant research going back more than three decades documenting the state of the fisheries and marine ecosystems from the 1960s, 70s and onward that provides a clear picture with respect to the coral reefs and related fisheries in most cases.
354. The Panama Representative (Head of the Coastal and Seas Spaces Planning Department) indicated that the demographic information on the indigenous population dates back to 2010, but a census was due to be carried out later in 2020, so the actual numbers may be available at the end of the year. He reiterated concerns over the potential difficulty in engaging the indigenous community due to the cultural dynamics and requirements for receiving their approval, and also the language barrier, as they communicate primarily in their native language and not in Spanish. He indicated that there would be need for support from an intermediary to approach the indigenous leaders and he expressed the hope that the BE: CLME+ Project would enhance their ability to work along with the indigenous community.
355. With respect to the MSP, the Panama Representative indicated that they hope to adopt further policies and a protocol later in 2020. He added that they were planning to undertake 2 initiatives in the short-term that would enable them to obtain more information on specific marine protected areas to help establish baselines.
356. Furthermore, the Panama Representative expressed the need for support from an organization that could serve as a neutral broker to support the development of the MSP in a manner that would be cross-cutting for the sectors with interest in the Blue Economy.
357. The Panama Representative (Climate Change Analyst) clarified that creating protected areas within areas populated by indigenous communities was complex and added that those areas are under less pressure and are consequently far better preserved. The Panama Representative also indicated that the areas under consideration for additional protection did not include areas occupied by the indigenous people.

Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-Scale fisheries

358. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC gave participants an overview of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF) in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication. She sought to provide clarity in the context of comments that had been made earlier in the meeting in reference to the manner in which the project would engage indigenous communities, how women would benefit, and the mainstreaming of small-scale fisheries into the project.
359. The guidelines speak to the fact that sustainable livelihoods and sustainable fisheries go hand in hand – meaning that the right to fish goes with the responsibility to fish in a sustainable manner.
360. She recalled that the CRFM was involved in the participatory process through which the FAO facilitated the development of the SSF Guidelines.
361. She added that the SSF Guidelines were integral to another process leading to the development of the Protocol on Small-scale fisheries developed for CRFM Member States – a voluntary protocol which encapsulates most of the SSF Guidelines.
362. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC reviewed the three parts of the Guidelines: the Introductory section, setting out the guiding principles and relationship with other international instruments; the section addressing responsible fisheries and sustainable development, including value chain, post-harvest and trade, gender equality, and disaster risks and climate change; and the final section focused on ensuring an enabling environment and support for implementation, including information, research and communication, and capacity development. The 5 thematic areas identified under part II were also reviewed.
363. She noted the critical linkage made between sustainable fisheries and postharvest, and cautioned that if one component of the project is not properly implemented, it would impact on other project components. Similarly, if the value chain actors do not reap the desired benefits from the business engagement, the subsequent coping strategies employed along other places in the value chain may be detrimental to sustainable fisheries.
364. In concluding, the FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC highlighted the important areas of interest within the BE: CLME+ project in the context of the SSF Guidelines. They include focusing on the intricate connections to realize the blue economy opportunities; engaging the civil society, and ensuring the fishers and fish workers are the main drivers of change for sustainable and ecosystem-based approaches; as well as giving specific attention to indigenous groups, women and vulnerable communities.

Discussion

365. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development recalled that at the Eighth Special Meeting of the Ministerial Council of the CRFM held 11 October 2018 in Barbados, the Council had issued a policy statement on gender, youth and decent work mandating that “...international and national norms regarding issues pertaining to gender, youth, and decent work be adhered to, and be incorporated into all CRFM policies, protocols, programmes, and plans.”

366. He emphasized that there is a lot of work that has been done in relation to the vulnerable youth population of the region, and particularly male youth, in addition to ministerial declarations and other observations.
367. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator added that pro-poor policies need to be considered. He cautioned that the socio-economic challenges could be exacerbated if climate change adaptation is not adequately addressed. He furthermore urged that care needs to be taken to ensure that the actions implemented to address climate change do not further disrupt the communities but are cohesive with pro-poor interventions to avoid further marginalization.
368. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean added that there is also need to ensure that people who are genuinely indigenous are included in the targets, and attention needs to be paid to the required safeguards in relation to free, prior and informed consent for indigenous peoples that may be identified among the 88,000 direct project beneficiaries.
369. He additionally pointed to the commitment that the 6 countries will mainstream the SSF Guidelines, as specified in the project targets. He asked what deliverable would be used to demonstrate that the target is met. He also asked whether the means of verification would be a policy or another core documentation.
370. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project shared an important lesson learned during the development of the CLME+SAP, which is largely focused on governmental action, triggering protests from civil society which decried that its voice had not been heard in the development of the CLME+ SAP. This led to the development of the People Managing Oceans strategy for civil society engagement in the CLME+ SAP implementation. He urged that since the BE: CLME+ Project falls under the CLME+ SAP umbrella and would contribute to SAP implementation, it would be beneficial to explore potential linkages.
371. The Panama Representative asked what the strategy would be to obtain buy-in from fishers in relation to marine protected areas expansion, as those in his country have responded to such initiatives with demands for financial incentives. He shared the Ecuador experience, pointing to the incentive given to fishers there through the allocation of an area tied to sustainable development commitments and best practices. He added that fishers may not cooperate if they do not see short-term benefits.
372. The CNFO Representative commented on the need to hear from the fishers' organization on the matter of the SSF Guidelines. She expressed appreciation for the presentation given and the gesture made in putting the matter at the forefront of the initiative. She expressed concern that the case studies reviewed by them did not indicate that the marine spatial planning and the designation of MPAs still do not favour small-scale fishers as the larger players dominate across countries. The CNFO Representative pointed to the case of Indonesia, where small-scale fishers had agreed to the MSP model, which also mandated considerations for inclusiveness on gender and provisions for consultations. The stipulations had been met. Nonetheless, the law gave power to the Minister to make changes through regulations, and this permitted the entry of a gold mining company. The CNFO Representative added that the rights of small-scale fishers are often pushed aside to accommodate the more affluent and influential actors.
373. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development recommended, in reply to Panama's intervention, that in developing the project further, consideration would have to be given to

- concerns about obtaining fisher buy-in. Although the strategy could not yet be decided, the consultative process would provide a channel for those concerns to be conveyed to the consultants, so that they can be addressed in the development of relevant aspects of the project.
374. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator pointed to the need for an appropriate mechanism for engagement during the consultative process, and determining what inter-sectoral committees or mechanisms would facilitate stakeholder participation. He furthermore pointed to the need for promoting participatory governance to ensure engagement with all key stakeholders throughout the process.
375. The CRFM Executive Director affirmed that in many countries, legal and policy reforms are needed to formally recognize and apply the principles expressed: including the consultative decision-making process, participatory rights of specific groups and sub-groups and equity. He added that until they are enshrined in law, the risk remained that voluntary commitments based simply on administrative measures could be overturned or set aside by decision-makers. Therefore, the SSF Guidelines remained foundational to advancing the processes. He encouraged continued efforts to implement policies, legislation, and regulations consistent with the guidelines and recognizing the special needs of small-scale fishers and fishing communities.
376. The CRFM Executive Director underscored that there remained opportunities for the partners to slowly make collective advancements on several fronts, to put in place the policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms, to develop the value chain, and to support SME operations.
377. He added that practical empowerment and capacity building will be required, as well as access to finances, land, and other vital resources. The need for preserving and managing resources to ensure that they are sustainable in a participatory and transparent manner based on co-management approached was also stressed.
378. The CRFM Executive Director cautioned that it is often easy to draw from the experiences of people from other parts of the world, but noted that there is a risk that the real issues and problem on the ground in the region could be missed and inappropriate solution pursued. In the case of the Caribbean region, although there are issues relevant to women and indigenous groups, there is a need to be guided by the local gender-related research and developments. He noted, for example, that there is a crisis confronting young males in the region, and they are among the most vulnerable groups. He pointed out that for several years, 70-80 percent of the university graduates in the region are females and many of the males are dropping out of high school early and become engaged in anti-social activities, including becoming gang members. He emphasized the need for these real gender related issues to be addressed rather than narrowly focus on women issues.
379. The Project Development Consultant noted that a question posed by the FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean had not been answered; that is, how will it be demonstrated to the GEF that the SSF Guidelines would be addressed? He said that there are practical ways of doing so, and all the elements don't need to be embraced immediately. He provided two examples for linking the SSF to the indicators: one could represent the number of MSPs that reflect the elements and principles of the guidelines, and the other could represent the number of management plans that have been revised to better reflect the principles and the guidelines for small-scale fisheries.
380. The CRFM Executive Director noted that there are numbers given for disaggregation by sex; and he asked whether a similar disaggregation could be done in reference to small-scale fishers, and a

determination made of the baseline. The Project Development Consultant said that the mainstreaming could take many dimensions, and the due diligence needs to be done to determine what is suitable under the circumstances.

381. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean stressed the need for the proper classification of indigenous peoples, if there are such populations in the participating countries. The CRFM Executive Director affirmed that there are indigenous groups in Belize, Guyana and Panama, although there is some level of debate on the issue in some jurisdictions. He urged that national authorities be engaged on the groups recognized as indigenous.
382. The Panama Representative said that there are two nationally recognized groups in his country, and their cultures are totally different. He added that there is the need to measure the risk of engagement, and to consider the need for the project to be approved by local leaders to garner their support.
383. The Belize Representative added that Belize does have indigenous fishers, but 98 percent of small-scale fishers are licensed and they all enjoy equal opportunity, regardless of their status. He agreed that the baselines need to be established. OSPESCA had been engaged in a survey of its Member Countries to determine the current situation.
384. The Panama Representatives reiterated the difficulties that could be experienced in engaging the indigenous populations, and the need to reach them through their local leaders for engagement. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist replied that the problem was not unique to Panama, as working with indigenous populations is generally a challenge because of their internal systems, rules and regulations, and they may understandably have a suspicion, because of the events of history, that the intent is to colonize them.

THEME 4: GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMPONENT 3

Knowledge Management (KM), Communication and Monitoring and Evaluation

Gender mainstreaming strategies

385. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist explained that the GEF requires the inclusion of indigenous peoples and the observation of special safeguards. She added that an assessment first needs to be made to determine whether the situation warrants special measures for inclusion and, if not, to justify why their representatives do not need to be engaged in the planning process.
386. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist added that the demographic data for quantification of the potential beneficiaries in Panama and other countries that have indigenous populations, does not have to entail an extrapolation of the entire population but it may focus on the population directly linked to the targeted areas for interventions. She added that the information may come from alternative assessments.
387. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist informed that during the 7th replenishment period, the GEF had decided to adopt a new Policy on Gender Mainstreaming that requires gender analysis and gender action plans for all of the projects; and to pursue a Do-Good instead of Do-No-Harm approach. The approach had been taken because the projects that mentioned gender mainstreaming had not been producing meaningful results. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist stressed that GEF is going beyond projects being gender sensitive but demanding better results by improving the lives of people, and specifically of women.
388. She explained that the responsibility goes beyond excluding women from economic opportunities and development, or the risk of exposing them to more vulnerabilities or violent situations; but extends to making use of each opportunity presented by the project to impact on gender relations.
389. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist explained that gender mainstreaming is a broad vision on how things should be done, entailing both a strategy and a methodology aimed at improving the quality of projects and policies, ensuring more efficient allocation of resources, increasing well-being for both women and men, and creating a more socially-fair and sustainable society.
390. The GEF 7 Gender Mainstreaming Policy's conceptual framework reveals four critical gaps that have been highlighted as areas of attention for GEF projects – the first of which is unequal visibility of current and potential contribution to the economy and to development. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist reiterated the concern that she had expressed earlier in the Inception Workshop, regarding the ratio of male and female beneficiaries: 80,000 males and 8,000 females. She noted that the number of females amounted to only 10% of the amount of males estimated as direct project beneficiaries. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist added that the explanation provided indicated that this was based on the estimated number of women fishing. She noted, though, that women have been involved at various levels across the value chain.

391. Citing the FAO's High Level Panel of Experts, 2014, she noted that, "Worldwide, around 56 million women work in the fishing industry, which represents almost half of the 120 million people that work in the catch sector and its value chain." She added that statistics are not usually collected on activities beyond actual fishing.
392. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist urged that emphasis, therefore, needs to be placed on the activities in which women are actually engaged across the continuum, before a fisher ventures out to sea (including mending nets) and after the fisher returns with the catch that is later processed.
393. Further information provided by the CAF Executive - Gender Specialist indicated that women account for 85% of the workforce engaged in gutting, canning, and other processing tasks. She added that if this kind of contribution were to be taken into account, the figures provided for the project's female beneficiaries could be substantially updated. She underscored the need to improve on the statistics, to ensure greater visibility of women's contribution to the sector and more adequate inclusion for targeted interventions. She urged that building statistics, collecting information around women's activities, must be integrated into the knowledge management strategy for the project.
394. Other gender gaps that GEF projects are expected to scrutinize are: access to and control of natural resources; unbalanced participation and decision making in environmental planning and governance; and uneven access to socio-economic benefits and services, since women are often in unpaid positions.
395. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist noted that when production is scaled up, women tend to lose access to fish that they use to feed their families, as well as associated income. She urged that the project should consider also the access of women to economic benefits from the sector, and particularly how to ensure they are paid directly.
396. Furthermore, she noted that women's participation in economic activity could be encouraged by the provision of childcare services and providing that support would change the practical reality. She noted that at times, when husbands in certain communities refuse to have their wives participate in meetings, negotiations would need to be made with husbands in order to enable greater participation by those women in the decision-making process. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist noted the risk in certain circumstances of unintentionally reinforcing biased gender relations and even violent relations. She, therefore, underscored the need for balanced interventions.
397. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist explained that the mainstreaming strategy entails producing a gender analysis and a diagnosis, looking at things like access to income, autonomy, and other indicators that should be integrated into the logical framework of the project matrix. She furthermore pointed to the need for a budget to be earmarked – not necessarily on women's issues but on targeting them to help ensure their participation. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist added that efforts to achieve greater participation of women without an earmarked budget have generally failed.
398. The final part of the strategy outlined, in line with the "do good/do no harm" principle, was the analysis of gender risks and opportunities, to achieve mitigation, adaptation and/or change.

399. Another issue she raised is how women view themselves as workers, and the tendency for women to be pushed into unpaid positions. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist underscored the need for care to be taken, to ensure that the food security is not threatened and their access and income are not lost. Women need to overcome a lot of obstacles to participate effectively and substantially.
400. Proposed solutions were outlined, including utilizing funds from the earmarked budget to provide childcare services in support of women invited to participate in trainings and consultations; providing transportation; and paying a per diem or participation fee. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist cautioned that the cause of women cannot be championed from behind desks but there is the need to go to them to consult them on the proposed solutions and what they need to ensure effectiveness and relevance.
401. In concluding, the CAF Executive - Gender Specialist underscored the need for women's voices to be heard. The strategies should be targeted for the benefit of the vulnerable and invisible. She said that women are marginalized, poor women are marginalized even more, and women among ethnic minorities are marginalized to an even greater extent.

Discussion

402. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development said that caution must be observed in presuming that generalities that apply to other parts of the world apply in the case in question.
403. He pointed to a newly published research – [*Valuing invisible catches: Estimating the global contribution by women to small-scale marine capture fisheries production*](#) – by Sarah Harper *et al* from the University of British Columbia, released on 4 March 2020, noting estimates of contributions made globally by women to small-scale marine capture fisheries (just for the harvest sector). He informed that the study had found that the participation rate in the Caribbean was 0.10 -- translating to 305,700 women actively involved in the harvesting, landing an average catch of about 19,000 mt for the period 2005-2014, a range of 12,000 mt to 25,000 mt, and a landed value of USD 46 million at 2010 real USD valued today at about USD 67 million. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development reiterated that the presumptions made regarding women's participation did not apply in the case of the Caribbean. He added that the team should be going into the project with an open mind, to determine what exists rather than what is presumed to be the case because it is so in Africa or Asia.
404. The CNFO Representative noted the need highlighted by the CAF Executive - Gender Specialist for change in how women in the industry are perceived, and also women's perception of themselves. She added that the dynamics depend on culture. In some parts of the world, the cultural norms dictate that women will remain at home and not participate in the industry.
405. The CNFO Representative recalled that when she first joined the sector, she heard claims, similar to those communicated by the CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development, even from Fisheries Administrators in the region, that there is no bias against women's participation in the sector. However, the CNFO had learned, on the occasion of the Women in Fisheries Forum convened in Belize by MCCAP, the Wildlife Conservation Society and the Belize Fisheries Department, that there are similar gender dynamics in the Hispanic fishing communities where women are expected to stay at home and men control the finances, including making purchases for

- the household. She recommended that the issue should be analysed across cultures that exist within countries.
406. Another issue which the CNFO Representative recalled coming out of the forum was the minimum wage. Women in the value chain were also not being considered, and the female processors from the cooperatives who attended the meeting brought many issues to the fore. One issue was that women were being paid BZD 3.50 (USD 1.75) an hour only for days worked. The employment is seasonal, and they could not survive on those wages. The CNFO Representative said that this is a very critical issue requiring attention.
407. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator added that within the Caribbean, there has been a recognition over the recent years that more information ought to be gathered on gender in fisheries. He recalled the establishment of the Gender In Fisheries Team (GIFT), a research group led by UWI- CERMES, which he said had been tasked with putting together a body of work based on research and other activities. He noted that the CNFO Representative is part of the GIFT. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator added that there is a body of work being developed to get a better appreciation for women in the fisheries value chain. He noted that in the past the tendency was to focus on the harvesting sector, without looking at post-harvest and along the value chain.
408. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator informed that under the StewardFish project, gender analyses are to be done in at least 4 countries, and training material refined to ensure that women are adequately catered for with a view of also preparing them for positions of leadership. He added that the CRFM has also been spearheading a project for gender mainstreaming. He underscored that virtually all ongoing projects have been paying some attention to gender and so there is already a body of work from which the BE: CLME+ could benefit.
409. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project underscored that in line with the GEF's stipulations for projects, all projects require a gender analysis. He urged that the information should be shared in order to build upon work already done and the information could be made available on the CLME+ Hub.
410. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development reiterated that the CRFM's Ministerial Council had mandated in 2018 that "...international and national norms regarding issues pertaining to gender, youth, and decent work be adhered to, and be incorporated into all CRFM policies, protocols, programmes, and plans." He noted that CRFM has been leading an initiative called, the Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Fisheries in the Caribbean, and recalled the point raised on the first day of the Inception Workshop regarding the issues confronting young males in the Caribbean.
411. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development informed that there is a body of work indicating that the situation is most problematic for young men, but there is an equal body of work that suggests otherwise. The CRFM was aiming, in the context of its gender initiative, to get a clearer picture of the true situation. He agreed that the gender dynamics are linked to culture. He concurred with the matter that had been raised by the CNFO Representative, regarding the very strong patrifocal nature of the Hispanic community in Belize highlighted in the context of the Women in Fisheries Forum, but noted that in the Eastern Caribbean countries, families appear to be more matrifocal.

412. He agreed with the recommendation made by the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project that the information on the matter needs to be shared and examined more closely.
413. The Panama Representative informed that the country had adopted a Women's Agenda, and over the past years, there has been an increase in the number of women candidates. He agreed to the need for the region to share information and strategies for engaging traditional groups that hold different gender ideals.
414. The CRFM Executive Director affirmed the need for the parties to recognize that gender remains a sensitive issue requiring a scientific approach, guided by evidence in making interventions. He added that significant progress has been made in the Caribbean in addressing gender issues.
415. The CRFM Executive Director noted that about 50 percent or more of the leaders of the Fisheries administrations in the region were women, and in some government administrations the senior scientific and administrative officers are all or mainly women. He added that in some jurisdictions, women own the assets and employ the men who go fishing – dimensions that he said are often missed when the issue is debated.
416. He noted that a few years ago (in 2015) the person recognized as Fisher of the Year in Belize was a woman, recognizing her contributions in fishing and marketing over more than 5 decades. Fisherman is no longer the predominant term used in the Caribbean; instead, fishers or fisherfolk are used in discussions. He also noted that the head of the CNFO is a woman.
417. The CRFM Executive Director acknowledged though, that despite the advancements, there are still issues to be tackled to achieve equity and equality.
418. On the other hand, he cautioned that depending on how the information is presented, there could be resistance, as was seen when the CRFM tried to get ministerial approval for a gender policy for the region. The reaction was that the policy did not reflect the region's reality but appeared to some persons to be the machinations of women trying to dominate.
419. The CRFM Executive Director explained that the CRFM's approach was to take a broader look at gender, as the problem arises when gender is used as a cover to push women's issues rather than dealing with both sexes and issues of equity and equal opportunity. He added that in some cases the criticism is valid.
420. The CRFM Executive Director emphasized that the reality is that there are some issues affecting women, some issues affecting men, and some issues affecting youth that need to be proactively addressed and resolved in order to provide equal opportunity for all Caribbean people in all processes and decision-making, in access to the natural resources, access to financing and promoting inclusive, equitable economic growth and sustainable development.
421. The region's weakness in the documentation and analysis of the information, as well as the dissemination of the relevant information was highlighted. The CRFM Executive Director urged that consideration needed to be given more systematically to understand and address the gender gaps that exist, and to better document the impacts that decisions have on women versus men, to determine where differences exist, and how best to solve inequality and discrimination. He urged for that approach to be taken in the context of the activities and decisions, so that improvements

can be made in documenting the information, in order to build understanding of the dynamics that exist.

422. The Project Development Consultant declared that within the context of the project, a gender analysis will have to be done, not just for fisheries but in the broader blue economy context, including tourism and other sectors. He added that the CDB's gender analyses done during 2016-2018 for all CARICOM countries could be a good starting baseline. The Project Development Consultant explained that the analyses would be relevant because they are not fisheries-specific but are economy-specific and national in coverage.
423. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist apologized if the information presented seemed inappropriate, but she explained that the information presented had been gathered from different areas – Africa, Asia, Australia and Latin America – to reflect the realities that women face around the globe. She reiterated the concern raised regarding the ratio of project beneficiaries by sex, which reflected that only 10% of direct beneficiaries would be women.
424. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist concurred on the need to go beyond women's issues, considering also the need to incorporate the new masculinities relevant to young men. She cautioned against tokenism, adding that not because certain women are in places of power means that the gender issues have been resolved.

Key elements of KM, systematization of lessons learnt and experience sharing from project stakeholders

425. The Project Development Consultant emphasized that having a system for knowledge management, consistent with GEF Knowledge Strategy, is vital at the outset of the project. He underscored the need for systems and processes that would enable easier access to the relevant information. He recommended that the physical meetings planned could be used to address this need.
426. Furthermore, the Project Development Consultant noted that context needs to be provided within that system for the key performance indicators and systematization of the project results. He added that the Caribbean Online / Virtual Project model could be looked at. Utilizing opportunities for building upon other structures that already exist was also recommended.
427. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project noted that a knowledge management plan had been developed by the project management unit for the CLME+, and there was no need to develop a new regime for this project.
428. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean affirmed that GEF initiatives always have a knowledge management component. He added that US\$670,000 in grant funding had been committed for the BE: CLME+ project, with an additional US\$3.8 million in co-financing. He emphasized the need to manage the expectations, as well as the need to be clear and concrete in detailing the achievements desired.
429. The Panama Representative queried how the KM and audit processes would be managed. He also pointed to the need to guard against the loss of institutional memory. The Project Development Consultant informed that the audit process would be informed by the outputs of the KM strategy.

- 430. The OSPESCA Representative probed whether it was manageable to pursue the consolidation of the knowledge management structures that already exist, as they would have already developed relevant content.
- 431. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project reiterated his recommendation that the CLME+ hub could be utilized. He noted that although IW:LEARN provides a platform, it is much wider in scope, as it serves the global public, and additionally, its products are focused on GEF initiatives only. He added that information from other donors are needed for the Caribbean. Furthermore, the possibility of having a design that could be cloned for the Pacific was affirmed.
- 432. The Project Development Consultant indicated that the articulation of the knowledge management component of the project would have to change significantly to reflect the vision of the project to achieve consolidation in collaboration with partners.
- 433. The CRFM Executive Director indicated that knowledge management is a requirement of the project and the critical thing is to build upon the frameworks that already exist. He underscored that knowledge management has been one of the weaknesses in the Caribbean region overall. He noted that it is generally difficult to access information and collaborative effort is needed to address the problem.
- 434. He pointed to the experience coming out of ACP FISH II program, and the fact that there was no system in place to manage the significant body of knowledge generated under that initiative after its conclusion. The CRFM Executive Director underscored that the need for sustainable and secure arrangements to ensure the establishment of a robust, accessible platform that is managed in a manner that would be properly maintained and kept current.

Project Communications and Outreach Strategy

- 435. Stakeholder engagement is deemed to be a vital element of the project. The Project Development Consultant explained that although stakeholder engagement during the design phase was being discussed, there would need to be an annex to the project document to describe stakeholder engagement during project implementation.
- 436. He reviewed the proposed engagements according to the timeline presented, beginning with the Inception Meeting. He added that there is at least one monthly virtual meeting planned for the project team, the main agencies and the participating countries.
- 437. He added that there will be ongoing electronic communication, especially in attempting to gather the needed baseline information. The Project Development Consultant noted that for most donor-funded projects, countries have difficulty providing the government-funded baseline. He explained that the information needed is the total recurrent expenditures made by the government on activities related to the project. In the case of protected areas management, the baseline information on government expenditure should account for the amount of money that the government is spending on protected areas management. Other relevant estimates would look at how much the government is spending on fisheries research, enforcement and awareness. This, he explained, would enable them to separate the government-funded baseline from the donor-funded baseline. This could be

- done by extracting from the approved government budget the amounts for the line items relevant to the project, the Project Development Consultant recommended.
438. He informed the participants that there would also be one-on-one meetings and focus group sessions with the technical consultants – including the marine spatial planning and fisheries value chain experts.
439. The Project Development Consultant also indicated that the participating countries would be engaged to review and provide feedback on the draft project document, for which there are expected to be 3 drafts before the final document is ready. He elaborated that the countries would be asked to:
- a. Review the country specific activities, especially under biodiversity, being funded with country-specific investment from the STAR allocations and provide feedback on the drafts; and
 - b. Participate in the validation workshop after the production of the third draft to resolve any pending issues emanating from the reviews.
440. The Project Development Consultant said that the GEF would also review the document and may have country-specific questions for clarification. The queries may also be generic or component-specific as opposed to being country-specific.
441. The Project Development Consultant urged the participants to indicate if they believe that another engagement mechanism apart from those mentioned should be pursued.
442. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean asked the Project Development Consultant to provide clarification on the monthly virtual meetings, and to indicate the platform that would be utilized – whether it would be done via Skype or some other interface. He also sought clarification on the plan to ensure ongoing communications, and queried whether questionnaires would be utilized to capture some of the critical points before the field visits.
443. The Project Development Consultant indicated that his perspective on the virtual meetings was that they would involve at least the PPG team, the three agencies – CAF, FAO, and the CRFM, which would engage in ongoing meetings with the countries, and the topic of focus may vary. He underscored that the intent was to ensure that there would be permanent and ongoing communication between the countries and the team, as required, via Skype, e-mail or whatever means the countries prefer. He expressed uncertainty over the usefulness of utilizing a questionnaire.
444. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development observed that what had been presented was the engagement mechanism for the countries involved in the project. He noted that the item also referred to an outreach strategy. He sought clarity on what that strategy entails.
445. The Project Development Consultant explained that the current phase is focused on the development of the project document, and a comprehensive engagement strategy (to include outreach) would be included in the ProDoc for the implementation phase. He elaborated that the institutional arrangements, the technical advisory and steering committees, the theme specific committees will be the primary engagement platforms for the major institutions. These would be

- detailed in the description of the institutional arrangements for the project and in the stakeholder engagement strategy, which will be the new annex to the ProDoc, as per GEF's new policy. He reiterated that the engagement should include all the co-executors, all the beneficiaries, all the information sources, all resource persons, and all persons who would be on the project technical advisory and steering committees. Training sessions would also provide an avenue for engagement.
446. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development affirmed that he understood all that; however, his specific query had to do with whether there would be any efforts to address outreach and visibility during the project development stage, as opposed to stakeholder engagement, which he emphasized are not the same thing.
447. The CRFM Executive Director replied that those would have to be developed through consultation in the process of developing the ProDoc over the ensuing months, and it is a requirement that has to be met. He clarified that the CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development was seeking information on the content and trying to ascertain if there are details on the elements of that outreach strategy. He added that this would be fleshed out during the process of consultation.
448. The CRFM Executive Director recommended that the outreach strategy should include targeted press releases and media interviews on the initiative not only at the time of the workshops but throughout the PPG and implementation phases to achieve visibility and support for the project. He cautioned, though, that care needs to be taken with the messaging. He also pointed to the need for stakeholders, senior officials, and policymakers/ministers to be kept informed and engaged with targeted information.
449. The informal communication that the partners had with the GEF during the PIF development phase was cited by the CRFM Executive Director as a valuable engagement path that should be maintained during the ProDoc development to also keep them abreast and get guidance. He recommended that this should also be incorporated in the plan.
450. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator agreed with the recommendations regarding outreach and visibility. He recommended that news releases could be strategically released when project milestones are achieved. He also agreed with the recommendation on maintaining informal communication with the GEF, as it did prove useful during the development of the PIF to receive informal feedback.
451. On the matter of engaging key agencies and other key stakeholders at the national level, the FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator highlighted the need to encourage coordinated interactions at the regional and national levels. He also recognized that the country representatives may have time constraints due to other commitments. He urged that all the key contact information for focal points and the relevant players in other government ministries should be obtained to enable effective engagement and interactions across the network.
452. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project noted that many people are still not fully aware of the Strategic Action Programme and the Interim Coordination Mechanism. He added that the partners have a stake in raising the profile of the CLME+ SAP and the ICM, and so he requested that a few paragraphs that contextualize the project could be included at the end of future news releases, indicating that the BE: CLME+ contributes to the implementation of the CLME+ SAP.

453. On the issue of the communication and engagement mechanisms, the Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project conveyed that there was an indication from the Secretariat of the Cartagena Convention that they would have liked to be engaged. He noted that the Secretariat had been working to develop strategies and action plans, and they have also been doing capacity building on MPAs and other work related to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife. He pointed to the need to expand the group of stakeholders for engagement, adding that the ICM would be a good mechanism to achieve that.
454. The Project Development Consultant affirmed that the project's communication component is the knowledge management component. He added that the KM component has to be adjusted to achieve the desired outputs and outcomes. If the agreement was to include press releases, then those would be included under that component.
455. The CRFM Executive Director agreed, and indicated that a project of the magnitude of the BE: CLME+ an outreach and visibility strategy is critical. He emphasized the need for that element of the project to be adequately fleshed out in the ProDoc. The CRFM Executive Director added that the necessary allocation needed to be made for that also. He indicated that the lessons learned under the CLME+ initiative are important in this regard.
456. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project noted that they had initially begun with the idea that they needed a communications strategy, but it later became clear that what they needed was a knowledge management strategy. The concept of the communications experts that had been engaged did not align with what the project needed to achieve. Subsequently, they received help through IW:LEARN, which brought on an advisor to assist. The Regional Coordinator of the CLME+ Project explained that communications and knowledge management are two different but complementary concepts aimed at achieving different objectives.
457. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development stressed that both communications and knowledge management can be integrated into the ProDoc. He added that all nuances (including outreach and visibility) need to be captured, and wide dissemination is also needed.

THEME 5: MONITORING AND EVALUATION ASPECTS

458. The Project Development Consultant noted that the project's results framework—which includes the baseline, mid-term targets and end of project targets—will have dual functions. He added that the challenge is often the baseline, and if the information available from the countries does not enable the definition of the baseline, it could present some difficulties. He cautioned against placing the baseline at zero for convenience and underscored the need for greater effort to define it. He also noted that the PIF contained some preliminary targets.
459. The need to develop more realistic targets utilizing inputs received during consultation with participating countries was emphasized. The Project Development Consultant also urged countries to review the information and assess their country situation. For example, on the MSP target, an indication should be given of whether one exists. Information provided by the countries would help with defining a realistic target and quantifying it. The countries need to be satisfied that the political and technical processes would enable achievement of the targets within the lifespan of the project. Table B in the PIF (Indicative Project Description Summary) contains the targets, some of which have not yet been quantified.
460. The Project Development Consultant said that having to engage a researcher could divert funds that could be utilized for the MSPs. He explained that the targets detailed are preliminary and additional targets could be added, if desired.
461. The Project Development Consultant pointed to the development of the project's theory of change that would entail assessments of the assumptions, drivers, and the underlying conditions to deliver the targets. This may reveal the need to revisit and adjust the indicators. He explained that the Theory of Change describes the logical pathways from activities to outputs and impact. He pointed to the Theory of Change Model included in the UNEP FINAL MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT: Advancing the Nagoya Protocol in Countries of the Caribbean Region (GFL/5060-2711-4E67), for the period 15 February 2016 to 30 June 2017. The Project Development Consultant, who had authored the report, explained that the project struggled to deliver upon indicators that were not suited for the context, and the results framework had to be drastically revamped with new indicators.
462. The Project Development Consultant explained that the information in Table B would be utilized to map out the steps and processes required to realize the outcomes and achieve the overall impact of the project. If the drivers and assumptions are true, in theory, they should lead to the desired results. He urged that a concerted effort needs to be made to ensure that the results framework and the indicators proposed are realistic and achievable.

Discussion

463. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean commented that although the explanation provided was clear, the example of the Theory of Change provided was complex, and he recommended a more simplified diagram for the BE: CLME+ project that could be developed from a template. The Project Development Consultant explained that the results framework must address two levels of indicators: the Core Indicators of the GEF and the Project Indicators.

464. The CNFO Representative questioned why target 4 called for “At least 8 countries mainstreaming FAO’s small-scale fisheries guidelines and related policies into the value chain,” when there were only 6 participating countries. It was clarified that this was an error as the target should have made reference to 6 and not 8 countries.

CLOSING SESSION

Roadmap for PPG Implementation: An Overview and Agreement of an Implementation Schedule

465. The CRFM Executive Director recalled that the Project Development Consultant had presented the roadmap the previous day, and the participants were being asked to revisit it and recommend any changes deemed necessary.
466. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development reminded the participants that the dates presented represented the worst-case scenario and that there had been agreement that there would be an attempt to be earlier, if possible.
467. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean recommended the individual country visits should be added to the milestones, with specified dates to enable better planning by the countries, the agencies and the consultants.
468. The CRFM Executive Director also recommended the incorporation of contingency planning and risk management due to the Covid-19 caused by the novel coronavirus and the forecast of regional experts that the situation would worsen in the Caribbean in the ensuing weeks continuing into April and May. He noted that cases were already emerging across the region due to movement of people from affected countries to the Caribbean.
469. He added that consideration ought to be given to the manner in which the parties would function if travel was restricted, including the possibly use of remote communications and consultations in advancing the project. He noted that there could be serious implications for consultants and partners who needed to travel, as people may get trapped and quarantined for 2-3 weeks, or even longer, due to measures that are being taken by various countries. The CRFM Executive Director urged participants to consider whether in the likely event that travel and field visits are disrupted, whether a path could still be found to keep the momentum going even at a reduced level.
470. The Project Development Consultant expressed the view that the GEF would understand if there are challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The CRFM Executive Director noted that in the case of the problems with implementing a mission from China to the Caribbean that was being supported by IW:LEARN and other partners, the opportunity was lost because IW:LEARN was unable to roll over the funds into a new period. He noted that the project had to be cancelled before the global pandemic was declared. He cautioned that the problems could have adverse impacts on the release of funds.
471. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development recommended that including a clear statement recognizing the potential impacts of the COVID-19 and the implementation of measures to minimize the impacts would provide a safeguard.

472. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean underscored the need for GEF Focal Points to be continuously informed of the evolution of the PPG, especially in the event that an extension will need to be sought for submission of the ProDoc. The Project Development Consultant indicated that this was already encapsulated in the engagement strategy. He further added that there would also be a Project Liaison designated either from each country.
473. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean added that there are two key persons for GEF projects: the operational focal point responsible for the day-to-day work, and the political focal point responsible for the policy or strategic direction with respect to the use of the STAR Allocation. They could be drawn from the same or separate ministries.
474. The Project Development Consultant emphasized that steps 3 to 8 are dependent on the consultants that were yet to be engaged. The CRFM Executive Director said that the hiring needed to take place as soon as possible in order to move the process forward, and that had to be the priority step following the Inception Workshop. He expressed uncertainty that 21 March would be realistic timeline for the recruitment of the remaining consultants but expressed optimism that the team should be in place by the end of March 2020.
475. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean agreed that the aim was to have the entire team in place by the end of March. He added that the value chain specialist was to be engaged, and Andrew Hume, who had made a presentation during the first day of the Inception Workshop, had been engaged as an IW:MSP Specialist. He indicated that the GEF and CAF had also agreed on the need to engage an environmental social safeguard specialist. He also informed that a 3-person permanent team of officers would be supporting the consultants during the PPG phase.
476. The FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Officer / Secretary WECAFC noted the routine 15-day FAO timeline after the engagement to organize travel mission would mean an estimated commencement date of 15 April 2020. She questioned whether this could be specified in the roadmap as a tentative date, assuming that the COVID-19 situation remains under control. She recommended that it would be most cost effective and better for the host countries to have the consultants travel to the countries together.
477. The CRFM Executive Director stressed that a coordinated approach was ideal, but recognizing the constraints, if that would not be possible, then the partners should proceed the best way they can. He added though that the details could be worked out after the persons for the team are engaged to enable their participation in the discussion. The CRFM, FAO and CAF would collaborate to determine the best arrangements.
478. The Project Development Consultant added that he had different views on how the consultations should be held and he did not agree that group deployment was necessarily the best approach, based on many projects he has designed. He added that cost is not an issue from the CAF consultant side.
479. The CRFM Executive Director highlighted the need for input during the project preparation phase from a gender specialist, since the expertise was not available during the development of the PIF. The CAF Executive - Gender Specialist indicated that the gender specialist to be engaged in the ensuing weeks should also be conducting field visits.

480. The FAO GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean offered that an expert on indigenous peoples should also be identified, to inform on the aspect of seeking free, prior and informed consent, which is important for 3 of the countries: Belize, Guyana and Panama.
481. The CRFM Executive Director replied that there is the need to proceed cautiously and to ensure that the effort would be targeted at addressing a real problem. He added that he was not aware that in the case of Guyana or Belize that issues related to indigenous peoples access in blue growth matters is substantial. He added that in the case of Guyana, most indigenous communities live and operate in the interior and are not operating in the marine areas.
482. The CRFM Executive Director added that the comments and suggestions would be taken into account, and an analysis would need to be done to document the situation and the extent of it to guide intervention.
483. The CAF Executive / Gender Specialist pointed to the value of including a local specialist on language and culture in the Terms of Reference of the environmental social safeguard specialist.

Establishment of Support Groups (MSP, MPA, Value Chain): Aims, Objectives and Members

484. The CRFM Executive Director explained that the purpose was to set up small informal groups comprising persons in attendance at the meeting or other relevant experts who may be able to contribute to the discussion on the three main areas identified: MSP, MPA, and Value Chain. The groups could communicate via social media chats or messaging platforms such as Whats App to provide helpful information to the consultants to better analyse and understand the issues and help move things forward.
485. The Belize Representative expressed the view that guidance should be provided by CRFM, FAO, CAF and the consultants based on the needs, and the countries should be able to bring on-board the national-level actors with the key expertise on the specified areas or to minimally have someone to maintain one-on-one contact to facilitate communication. He added that such a mechanism could be established by each country based on the thematic areas.
486. The CRFM Executive Director clarified that the proposed support group would be different. He added that the country representatives were expected to be the project focal points and key contacts or resource persons for their respective countries.
487. The Panama Representative supported the need to include other actors with relevant expertise to provide key information to the consultant.
488. The CRFM Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development affirmed that the participants appeared to be in agreement with the overall concept, and the formulation of the support groups to share information with the consultants via chats appeared to be feasible.
489. The CRFM Executive Director reiterated that, to the extent possible, the informal support groups should be formed so that the persons who are willing and available could assist the consultants in order to facilitate their completion of the work they were contracted to undertake.

Review of Implementation Schedule for PPG

490. The CRFM Executive Director noted that this area had already been covered.

Agreement with countries and CRFM on main project design activities and milestones

491. The CRFM Executive Director added that this item had also been covered. He highlighted the next listed event, which included the consultations, preparation of draft reports, and the second regional workshop tentatively slated for September 2020. The venue had not yet been determined. He added that after the other consultants are brought on-board, which could take another few weeks, the implementation schedule and milestones should be revisited and refined with further inputs from the countries.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

492. The CRFM Executive Director undertook to make the Draft Report of the meeting available to participants of the meeting within 2 weeks or by 20 March 2020, after an internal review of the compiled document, anticipated on 13 March 2020.
493. He underscored the value of information exchange among the parties. The CRFM Secretariat had made available via a shared Google Drive folder the Inception Workshop the presentations and documentation, including the PIF. Additionally, he urged participants to make available (as much as possible) the relevant information in their possession for project development purposes. He asked participants to send the documents, including laws, regulations, policies, to the CRFM and they would be shared via the Google Drive folder. He pointed out that access to the shared folder is only granted to the project group (workshop participants) and other relevant persons, including the National GEF Operational Focal Points, Fisheries Focal Points, Permanent Secretaries, and other project partners.
494. The Project Development Consultant noted that every GEF project, during its design phase, requires a policy and institutional assessment document, as well as information on the associated regulatory framework. He added that information is available publicly on several relevant initiatives undertaken during the recent years at the country level, and recommended that the relevant documentation could be made available via the shared folder.
495. The CRFM Executive Director added that the documents referenced during the country presentations could also be shared. He furthermore reminded the country representatives that it was expected that they would be the Liaison Officers or Points of Contact for their respective countries, as the invitation letter had stipulated that the organizers were requesting the attendance of the persons who would serve as the key contacts for the project.
496. The need for the formulation and/or identification of national inter-sectoral teams/mechanisms was also emphasized, to enable cross-sectoral inputs given that the scope of the BE CLME+ project extends beyond the Fisheries sector. The CRFM Advisor – Fisheries Management and Development recommended that the participants be tasked with providing information detailing the

desired composition of their inter-sectoral teams. The Belize Representative indicated that the project leadership could give an indication to the countries of the level of representation and expertise expected. The CRFM Advisor – Fisheries Management and Development said that it could be done at whatever level the countries determined to be appropriate.

497. The FAO StewardFish Project Coordinator pointed to the need to include teams comprised of the key Ministries involved, but also to integrate other stakeholders. The project development can be placed on the agenda of engagements organized for entities such as Fisheries Advisory Bodies, Ocean Governance Teams or an appropriate inter-sectoral coordinating arrangement to get people *au fait* on the project.
498. The FAO Sub-Regional Office Representative underscored the value of the intended stakeholder mapping exercise commenced on day 1 of the Inception Workshop. It was emphasized that the participating countries, which are expected to consult their stakeholders, can fill in the information gaps to help advance the process.
499. The CRFM Executive Director recommended that countries with inter-sectoral mechanisms already in place may want to utilize those rather than attempt to establish new arrangements. Countries should indicate as soon as possible if those mechanisms already exist or whether they will have to be established, and who the points of contact will be. He furthermore recommended that countries should send at least a preliminary list by the week following the Inception meeting, in order to supply the consultants with the information needed on the key agencies for engagement of participating countries.
500. He appealed to all partners to be proactive, and to share any ideas that they have to contribute to the process.
501. The Inception Workshop concluded with the organizers expressing their appreciation for the attendance and contributions of the participants, and for a very fruitful first engagement to chart the way forward for the development of the project document.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<p><u>BARBADOS</u></p> <p>Mr. Fabian Hinds Coastal Planner Coastal Zone Management Unit Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Blue Economy Warrens Towers II Warrens St. Michael 12001 Tel: 246-535-5700 Fax: 246-421-5956 Email: fhinds@coastal.gov.bb</p>	<p><u>BARBADOS</u></p> <p>Mr. Philip Jackman Deputy Chief Fisheries Office (Ag.) Fisheries Division Ministry of Maritime and the Blue Economy Princess Alice Highway Bridgetown Tel: 246-535-5800 Fax: 246-436-9068 Email: fisheries@barbados.gov.bb philip.jackman@barbados.gov.bb</p>
<p><u>BELIZE</u></p> <p>Dr. Lennox Gladden Chief Climate Change Officer National Climate Change Office Ministry of Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development Market Square Belmopan City Cayo District Tel: 501-828-5962 Email: coord.cc@environment.gov.bz</p>	<p><u>BELIZE</u></p> <p>Mr. Rigoberto Quintana Senior Fisheries Officer Fisheries Department Ministry of Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development Princess Margaret Drive P.O. Box 148 Belize City Tel: 501-224-4552 501-223-2187 Fax: 501-223-2983 Email: fisheries_department@fisheries.gov.bz seniorfisheriesofficer@fisheries.gov.bz Skype: rigoberto.quintana3</p>
<p><u>GUYANA</u></p> <p>Mr. Troy Broomes Environmental Officer Multilateral Environmental Agreements Unit Environmental Protection Agency Ganges Street Sophia Georgetown Tel: 592-225-5472 Email: troybroomes@live.com</p>	<p><u>GUYANA</u></p> <p>Mr. Denzil Roberts Chief Fisheries Officer Fisheries Department Ministry of Agriculture Regent and Vlissengen Roads Bourda Georgetown Tel: 592-225-9559 592-225-9551 Email: fisheriesguyana@gmail.com bertz99@yahoo.com</p>

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

<p><u>JAMAICA</u></p> <p>Mr. Courtney Cole Chief Executive Officer (Interim) National Fisheries Authority Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Fisheries Hope Gardens P.O. Box 480 Kingston 6 Tel: 876-434-1803 876-927-1731 876-948-9014 Fax: 876-927-1904 Email: cbcole@micaf.gov.jm tdo@micaf.gov.jm fisheries@moa.gov.jm</p>	<p><u>PANAMA</u></p> <p>Ms. Yoisy Belen Castillo Gutierrez Climate Change Analyst Ministry of Environment Climate Change Directorate Diego Dominguez Street Building 804 Albrook Tel: 507-500-0855 extn. 6057 Email: ybcastillo@miambiente.gob.pa</p>
<p><u>PANAMA</u></p> <p>Mr. Jorge Elias Jaén Bonilla Head of the Coastal and Seas Spaces Planning Department Ministry of Environment of Panama Street Diego Domínguez Building 804 Albrook Ancón Panamá Tel: 507-2329621 Email: jejaen@miambiente.gob.pa</p>	<p><u>SAINT LUCIA</u></p> <p>Ms. Maier Sifflet Sustainable Development and Environment Officer Department of Sustainable Development Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development Georgiana Court John Compton Highway Castries Tel: 758-451-8746 758-520-3068 Fax: 758-450-1904 Email: msifflet.gov@gmail.com</p>
<p><u>SAINT LUCIA</u></p> <p>Ms. Margaret Rita Straughn Fisheries Assistant Department of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Co-operatives Conway Post Office Castries, LC04 301 Tel: 758-468-4135 Fax: 758-452-3853 Email: rita.harrison@govt.lc</p>	

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

<p><u>CAF LATIN AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK</u></p> <p>Mrs. Luciana Fainstain CAF Executive – Gender Expert CAF Latin American Development Bank Dirección de Sostenibilidad, Inclusión y Cambio Climático Ciudadela 1235 CP 11100 Montevideo Uruguay Tel: 598-2917-3147 598-9866-5182 Email: lfainstain@caf.com uruguay@caf.com</p>	<p><u>CENTRAL AMERICA FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE ORGANIZATION (OSPESCA)</u></p> <p>Lic. Manoel Cifuentes Marckwordt Researcher Central America Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization (OSPESCA) Bilevor Concillewa Dishlo el Espino Cuidad Merliot Antiguo Cuscatlan La Libertad El Salvador Tel: 503-2248-8840 503-2248-8841 Email: manoeljose@gmail.com rmorales@sica.int</p>
<p><u>CENTRE FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES (CERMES)</u></p> <p>Dr. Hazel Oxenford Professor of Marine Ecology and Fisheries CERMES The University of the West Indies Cave Hill Campus BARBADOS Tel: 246-417-4571 Email: oxenford.hazel@gmail.com hazel.oxenford@cavehill.uwi.edu Skype: hazel.oxenford</p>	<p><u>CARIBBEAN NETWORK OF FISHERFOLK ORGANISATIONS (CNFO)</u></p> <p>Ms. Nadine Nembhard Administrative Officer CNFO c/o CRFM Secretariat Princess Margaret Drive Belize City Belize Tel: 501-624-5364 Email: cnfo_cu@yahoo.com Skype: nembhardnadine501</p>

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

<p><u>FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS</u></p> <p>Dr. Yvette Diei-Ouadi Fishery and Aquaculture Officer Secretary of the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 2nd Floor United Nations House Balmoral Gap, Marine Gardens Christ Church Barbados Tel: 246-426-7110 ext. 249 Fax: 246-427-6075 Email : yvette.dieiouadi@fao.org Skype: mummyyvie</p>	<p><u>FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS</u></p> <p>Mr. Gianluca Gondolini GEF / GCF Project Task Manager for the Caribbean Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 2nd Floor United Nations House Balmoral Gap, Marine Gardens Christ Church Barbados Tel: 246-267-5855 Fax: 246-427-6075 Email: Gianluca.Gondolini@fao.org Skype: gianluca31866</p>
<p><u>FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS</u></p> <p>Mr. Terrence Phillips Regional Project Coordinator, STEWARDFISH Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 2nd Floor United Nations House Marine Gardens Hastings Barbados Tel: 246-426-7110 Fax: 246-427-6075 Email: Terrence.Phillips@fao.org Skype: terrencephillips</p>	<p><u>UNDP / GEF CLME+ PROJECT</u></p> <p>Mr. Patrick Debels Regional Coordinator CLME+ Project CLME+ SAP ICM Secretariat IOCARIBE Offices Edificio Inteligente Chambacú Oficina 405, Cra 13B #26-78 130002 Cartagena COLOMBIA Tel: 57-316-831-5033 Email: patrickd@unops.org Skype: pdebels</p>

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

<u>CARIBBEAN REGIONAL FISHERIES MECHANISM (CRFM) SECRETARIAT</u>	
<p>Milton Haughton Executive Director CRFM Secretariat Belize City P.O. Box 642 Belize Tel: 501-223-4443 Cell: 501-610-3315 Fax: 501-223-4446 Email: milton.haughton@crfm.int Skype: milton_h</p>	<p>Mr. Peter A. Murray Advisor Fisheries Management and Development CRFM Secretariat Belize City P.O. Box 642 Belize Tel: 501-223-4443 Fax: 501-223-4446 Email: peter.a.murray@crfm.int</p>
<p>Mr. Delmar Lanza Manager, Finance and Administration CRFM Secretariat Fisheries Compound Princess Margaret Drive P.O. Box 642 Belize City Belize Tel: 501-223-4443 Fax: 501-223-4446 Email: delmar.lanza@crfm.int Skype: Delmar0364</p>	<p>Ms. Rochelle E. Staine-Gill Documentation Officer / Secretary CRFM Secretariat Fisheries Compound Princess Margaret Drive P.O. Box 642 Belize City BELIZE Tel: 501-223-4443 / 4 / 5 Fax: 501-223-4446 Email: rochelle.staine@crfm.int secretariat@crfm.int Skype: rochelle.staine</p>
<p>Ms. Adele Ramos Rapporteur CRFM Secretariat Fisheries Compound Princess Margaret Drive P.O. Box 642 Belize City Belize Tel: 501-223-4443 Fax: 501-223-4446 Email: adele.bze@gmail.com</p>	<p><u>CONSULTANT</u></p> <p>Mr. Noel D. Jacobs Project Development Consultant Institutional Development & Management Consultants Ltd (ID&M) 98 Broadgate Lane Deeping St. James PE6 8NN Peterborough United Kingdom Tel: 44-798-546-1261 Email: Jacobs_ND@mail.co.uk inf@idmcservices.com Skype: noel.jacobs98</p>

APPENDIX II

AGENDA

Thursday, 5 March 2020		
Theme	Time	Sessions
Scope	8:00 - 8:30	Registration of participants
	8:30 - 9:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Opening remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRFM Representative • CAF Representative • FAO Representative • Government of Belize □ Objectives and Overview of the Workshop Agenda (by CRFM)
Overview	9:00 - 11:00	Theme 1: Overview of Blue Economy project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Overview of BE / CLME+ Project, including all components and main deliverables (by M. Haughton, CRFM & G. Gondolini, FAO) □ Supporting Facility I: Roles of CAF and FAO as Implementing Agencies (N. Jacobs, Consultant) □ Supporting Facility II: Roles of CRFM as Executing Agency (M. Haughton, CRFM) □ Group Discussion □ PPG Implementation Timetable and GEF deadlines (N. Jacobs, Consultant)
	11:00 - 11:30	Coffee break and Official photo

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

Marine Spatial Planning	11:30 - 13:00	<p>Theme 2: Development of Component 1 Implementing cross-sectoral Marine Spatial Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Review of Institutional Mechanisms and implementation/execution arrangements for Development of Component 1 (by project team) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of CAF, FAO, and CRFM (N. Jacobs, Consultant) • Collaboration with other partners such as CLME+ PCU and SAP ICM, regional and national universities, NGOs (e.g. UWI, CNFO, OSPESCA, etc.) - Presentations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) P. Debels, CLME+; 2) M. J Cifuentes, OSPESCA; 3) N. Nembhard, CNFO; 4) H. Oxenford (CERMES, UWI)
	13:00 - 14:00	Lunch
	14:00 - 15:00	<p>Theme 2: Development of Component 1 Implementing cross-sectoral Marine Spatial Planning & MPAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Overview of MSP work in the Caribbean and presentation of the methodology and tools for development of project component 1, including BE strategies and MPA interventions (Andrew Humes, Consultant) □ Creating synergies with other projects across the Caribbean (by T. Phillips, FAO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group discussion of Component 1 (by CRFM)
Sustainable fisheries	15:00 - 16:00	<p>Theme 3: Development of Component 2 Inclusive Sustainable Fisheries Value Chains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Overview of fisheries value chain analysis and development (by Y. Diei-Ouadi, FAO) □ Co-financing aspects for sustainable fisheries value chains (N. Jacobs, Consultant) □ Discussion with Participating Countries on the (a) Rationale for the Selection of the Value Chains and areas of intervention (b) Information Requirements / Constraints and (c) Supporting resources (Y. Diei-Ouadi & N. Jacobs) □ National preparation and consultation process (by countries)
	16:00 - 16:30	Coffee break

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

	16:00 - 18:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Opportunities for Private Sector Collaboration for Potential Co-Financing □ (by N. Jacobs) □ Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-Scale fisheries and addressing other comments by GEF and STAP (by Y. Diei-Ouadi FAO) □ Group discussion
--	---------------	--

Friday, 6 March 2020		
<p>Gender</p> <p>Knowledge management</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation</p>	8:30 - 10:30	<p>Theme 4: Gender Mainstreaming and Development of Component 3 Knowledge Management (KM), communication and Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Gender mainstreaming strategies (by L. Fainstain, CAF) □ Key elements of KM, systematization of lessons learnt and experience sharing from project stakeholders (by project design team) □ Project Communications and Outreach strategy (by team)
	10:30 - 11:00	Coffee break
	11:00 - 13:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Theme 5: Monitoring and evaluation aspects (by N. Jacobs, Consultant) <p>Closing session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Roadmap for PPG Implementation: An Overview and Agreement of an Implementation Schedule (Presentation and discussion) □ Establishment of Support Groups (MSP, MPA, Value Chain): Aims, Objectives and Members □ Review of Implementation Schedule for PPG □ Agreement with countries and CRFM on main project design activities and milestones □ Conclusions and recommendations (CRFM, CAF and FAO)
	13:00 - 14:00	Lunch
	14:00 – 18:00	FIELD TRIP TO ALTUN HA MAYAN RUINS

APPENDIX III

STAKEHOLDER MATRIX: PANAMA REVISION

Stakeholder	Participation in project preparation	Participation in project implementation
Government Institutions		
PANAMA		
Coastal and Marine Management Division Ministry of Environment	Project Focal Point and Liaison Office in country Project Focal Point and Liaison Office in country GEF Operational Focal Point Validation and endorsement of PIF and CEO Endorsement Request	Direct responsibility for supporting the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine resources. Facilitate and support all policy related outcomes proposed by the project Project Monitoring and Evaluation at the national level Liaison with the GEF Implementing Agency and the project's Executing Agency Direct responsibility for ecosystem-based fisheries management inside de MPA's, research and licensing
Tourism Authority	Source of information on tourism within the context of blue economy	Important project partner for capacity building, blue economy advocacy, and Knowledge Management
Panama Coast Guard National aeronaval service (SENAN)	Consultation on operational opportunities to promote fisheries MCS	Key partner for capacity building and definition of strategies to promote ensure, protection, safety and surveillance of the air and marine spaces.

Report of the Project Inception Workshop for the GEF/CAF/FAO Project: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+), Belize City, Belize, 5-6 March 2020

National Customs Authority— Panama Panama Aquatic Resources Authority (ARAP)	Consultation on operational and structural opportunities to incorporate surveillance and monitoring of fishing into customs operations	Key capacity building and advocacy partner for blue economy and promote legal fishing
Panama Maritime Authority/Panama Canal Authority	****	Key capacity building and advocacy partner for blue economy on aspect for sustainable port and marine transportation.
Ministry of Social Development (MIDES)	Have the mission of coordinating and executing the national policy of equal opportunities for women, through the National Women's Institute (INAMU).	Key capacity building and advocacy partner to ensure the roll of the women on the process of marine spatial planning.
NGO's/ Civil Society Organizations		
MARVIVA	A nonprofit organization aimed at the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal goods and services with special attention to Marine Protected Areas; and currently with priority to the processes of Marine Spatial Planning.	
Private Sector		
Maritime Chamber of Panama	Gather almost 200 companies of the marine sector, and seeks the growth of the sector as a pillar of the country's development.	This organization can engage the participation of the private sector, and its point of view on the marine spatial sector exercise.

CRFM

The CRFM is an inter-governmental organisation whose mission is to “Promote and facilitate the responsible utilisation of the region’s fisheries and other aquatic resources for the economic and social benefits of the current and future population of the region”. The CRFM consists of three bodies – the Ministerial Council, the Caribbean Fisheries Forum and the CRFM Secretariat.

CRFM members are Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, and The Turks and Caicos Islands.

