

**GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING  
NATIONAL ACTION PLANS (NAP)  
FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GCLME STRATEGIC ACTION  
PROGRAM (SAP)**

**PROJECT/PROGRAMME - GPRAF04004 BL 11D8**

*Combating living resources depletion and coastal area degradation in the Guinea Current Large Marine  
Ecosystem through Ecosystem-based regional actions*

**ANDREW COOKE**

**CHLOE WEBSTER**

**RESOLVE CONSULTING**

**DECEMBER 2009**

**CONTENTS**

**GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING NATIONAL ACTION PLANS (NAP) IN GEF IW PROGRAMMES.....18**  
**(PREPARED FOR THE INTERIM GUINEA CURRENT COMMISSION AND MEMBER COUNTRIES)..... ERROR!**  
 BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT..... 18

*INTRODUCTION*..... 19

    What are NAPs? What are they for? ..... 19

    NAPs must follow the GCLME SAP framework..... 20

    Sources of guidance for the NAP process..... 21

        Guidance from the SAP itself..... 21

        Guidance from the original GCLME project document ..... 23

        Guidance from published training courses on GEF IW projects ..... 23

        Guidance from best international practice ..... 24

NAP FORMULATION PROCESS ..... 24

    The NAP formulation process is broken up into a planning cycle of six phases: ..... 24

    Phase 1: Inception ..... 25

    Phase 2 – Analysis ..... 25

    Phase 3 – Stakeholder Consultation..... 26

    Phase 4 – Project development and NAP Finalisation..... 26

    Phase 5 – Implementation of the NAP ..... 27

    Phase 6 – Monitoring & Evaluation ..... 27

*NAP process summary* ..... 28

ANNEX 1 - NAP PROCESS CHART WITH GUIDANCE NOTES..... 29

ANNEX 2 - NAP TEMPLATE ..... 34

## **PART 1 - REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND BEST PRACTICE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **Purpose of the assignment**

The overall purpose of the assignment is to guide the process to translate the GCLME Strategic Action Plan (SAP) into National Action Plans (NAPs). The NAPs are expected to set out the specific actions in terms of national legislation, policy, and planning that need to be implemented nationally by each country in an approach harmonized with the other countries concerned to achieve the SAP's goals.

In each country, and in accordance with the international agreements embodied in the SAP, each NAP should serve as the overarching framework for the sustainable management of coastal and marine environmental resources at the country level.

The NAP to be developed for each of the sixteen GCLME countries should incorporate pertinent proposed policy and legal, reforms, investment actions and economic instruments already identified in other existing national action plans (e.g. National Plans of Action on Land Based Activities (NPA-LBAs), National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan (NBSAP), Fisheries Management Plan, Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) Plan, NPOAs on sharks etc.) so as to ensure an integrated approach while avoiding duplication.

Each NAP is to be adopted and endorsed by the relevant laws of each member country of the GCLME and will represent the principal framework for implementation of the SAP at the national level. Successful implementation of the NAPs will therefore result in achievement of the objectives of the SAP.

In order to help guide the NAP formulation and implementation processes the following principal documents are to be generated:

- Comprehensive guidelines for the preparation of NAPs for GEF IW projects based on international best practice
- Format for the preparation of specific projects to be presented at a donors' conference for funding in 2010
- Guidelines on the identification of baseline and incremental processes and costs (according to funding principles of the GEF)
- Work plan and milestones for the development of the NAPs – this is to be developed in full consultation with the GCLME countries
- Guidelines to monitor environmental status (including definition of baseline and quantify pressure relief) – important technical guidance on how to monitor environmental benefits delivered through NAP implementation

#### **Main challenges**

### **Producing guidelines for NAP formulation in GEF IW projects**

The assignment to formulate guidelines for NAP elaboration for GEF IW projects involves a number of interrelated challenges:

#### For the guidelines themselves

- There are no existing authoritative guidelines on NAP formulation for GEF IW programmes despite the long-felt need for such guidelines (see e.g. Wang 2003) – the IGCC / GCLME will be breaking new ground in developing such guidelines
- The objective to produce GEF IW guidelines of general application beyond GCLME is admirable but necessitates looking well beyond the GCLME itself
- With 16 states with widely differing contexts, priorities, capacities and resources, there is a particular challenge in producing guidelines for NAP formulation that are workable for all countries
- The guidelines must allow for uneven experience and capacity across the countries and help them best identify and build on their respective strengths while taking measures to address any capacity weaknesses

#### For NAP formulation for GEF IW projects

- There are few working examples of NAPs under SAPs operating around the world and still fewer available articles, evaluations or reviews of experience or best practice in elaborating and implementing NAPs
- There exist significant differences in actual or recommended approach to NAP elaboration, the most fundamental of which is whether NAPs should be formulated before, during or after the SAP (the initial view appears to have been that NAPs are formulated first (based on the TDA) and constitute the building blocks for the SAP (as was done for the Caspian Sea) but the latter view and practice has been to formulate NAPs after the SAP)
- In several GEF IW LME projects, the preparation of NAPs was planned but never implemented (e.g. BCLME) or not proposed as a specific activity of the supporting GEF project (e.g. CCLME, ASCLME) – before formulating guidelines it is important to understand why NAPs have been neglected in some cases

#### For the GCLME NAP processes in particular

- The NAPs are to be the “overarching framework for the management of coastal and marine environmental resources at the national level” and which have to be adopted nationally at the “highest level” (GCLME prodoc) – this sets the NAP at a high level, similar to or above national ICZM or ICAM plans, and presupposes a high degree of sector integration at the national level
- NAPs must form an “integral part of the SAP” – this implies that NAPs must not only be adopted at the national level but that they should also be approved by the other GCLME member countries (they can be considered as protocols to the SAP itself)

- NAPs should achieve consensus building through “broad stakeholder, intersectoral and interministerial processes” (GCLME prodoc) – this is a substantial challenge in any circumstances – consensus is often easier to achieve at the regional general level than at the national intersectoral and highly specific level – funding is likely to be a limiting factor to the extent of consultation possible, so that strategies will be needed to achieve the greatest consultation at the least cost
- At the same time as all the above, NAPs must truly “operationalise” the SAP at national level through very specific commitments to (regionally harmonized) policy, legal and institutional reforms, and key investments – this need is to some extent in conflict with the ambition that NAPs should also be the national overarching framework - a balance has to be struck between overarching authority, comprehensiveness and practical “operationality” – the same conflict is seen in the SAP itself – it is an overarching and authoritative negotiated document (binding 16 countries), but it is, by the same token, generic
- The SAP provides that national projects should address “strategic transboundary issues and the most urgent environmental concerns at the national level” which reflects that NAPs are to serve as the overarching plans at the national level (i.e. they are to address local as well as transboundary problems) implies the need for guidance on how NAP elaboration processes should identify urgent problems at the national level.
- The IGCC / GCLME SAP does contain measurable and quantifiable ecosystem targets and indicators (Annex III), although the linkages between those indicators and the generic actions by issue (Annex IV) are not explicit – the challenge for NAP formulation is for the countries to make the linkages between the actions they plan and the quantifiable indicators in the SAP and to monitor their respective impacts on the GCLME (while the IGCC will monitor the collective impact)
- The actions to be defined in the NAPs must be precisely quantified, realistically achievable actions that the countries can truly afford to undertake and commit themselves to doing in view of the limited level of outside funding likely to be available – in this respect it is important to highlight that, in the case of the GCLME, there will be severe constraints on the financial support that the project is able to offer in support of NAP formulation
- Some countries have already initiated NAP or NPA processes, which may necessitate adjustment and harmonisation (and therefore some “unpacking” of what has already been done and starting over again
- Careful attention must be given to defining actions offering the maximum impact with limited resources – “good value for money” – the countries must therefore be free to determine the strategies that are optimal for them to achieve the results that the SAP requires of them
- There exists some confusion within IGCC / GCLME countries between National Action Plans under the SAP and *National Plans of Action* for addressing Land-Based Activities (LBA) affecting the marine environment (in the GCLME project document the NAPs were intended to integrate the NPAs

- NAPs must be compatible with the complex array of international directives, treaties and multinational agreements variously affecting the GCLME countries (which may have evolved since the SAP) and the linkages must be made clear so that the NAPs serve as a tool enabling countries to monitor their progress in relation to these broader frameworks

### **Developing national projects to be undertaken under NAPs**

GCLME countries are expected to develop specific projects “investment” to be presented at a donors’ conference for funding in 2010. Particular challenges in relation to developing such projects are:

- Section 3.3 of the SAP provides substantive guidance on the nature of “investment actions” which countries are obliged to follow – the project template to be provided will be one means of ensuring compliance with SAP directives
- The projects must be attractive to stakeholders, governments and development partners alike while also fully relevant to SAP and national objectives
- NAPs and their associated projects must take account of the changing donor environment – the increasing level of international doubt over the utility of certain types of aid has had a destabilising effect on donor policy, with only certain forms of aid remaining acceptable to all development partners. The NAP formulators must be aware of these changes and focus investment on activities for which assistance is required within these categories.
- A particular challenge is that projects are anticipated to be primarily national within the context of a regional programme. Certain donors have a marked preference for regional initiatives – the projects will need to demonstrate clear regional linkages or even involve several (e.g. neighbouring) countries
- Projects must be explicitly linked to the measurable and quantifiable indicators of Annex III of the SAP and classifiable according to the issues and categories of activities recognised in Annex IV of the SAP (nothing should prevent projects being in multiple categories):
- Given that some funding is likely to be sought from the GEF, the national projects must be drawn up in accordance with GEF rules on incremental costs and co-finance, with a clear description of the baseline and the alternative course of action proposed.
- Where a contribution from GEF is solicited, particular attention must be paid to the evolving priorities of the GEF itself, both generally and in relation to International Waters in particular

### **Other challenges of the assignment**

The remaining challenges of the assignment are relatively technical.

- Guidelines on the identification of baseline and incremental processes and costs – the challenge here is to collect the most up to date GEF guidance and thinking on the definitions of baseline and incremental costs and processes and to compile best international practice and techniques to make “incremental costs analysis” (ICA) as clear and simple to apply as possible by the countries themselves.

- Work plan and milestones for the development of the NAPs – the main challenge will be to ensure that country experts are fully cognisant of the practicalities involved in NAP formulation and to ensure their full engagement in determining the common milestones and work plan.
- Guidelines to monitor environmental status (including definition of baseline and quantify pressure relief) – the main challenge here will be to ensure national experts are able to identify the linkages between SAP objectives, activity categories, NAP activities and quantifiable environmental indicators and how to monitor these during NAP implementation.

## **Purpose of the review**

The purpose of the review is to identify international best practice relevant to:

- Preparing guidelines for national environmental plans of various kinds (the general structure of guidelines, the layout and presentation, the style of communication etc.)
- The processes to be adopted at national level for the development of NAPs in the context of GEF IW programmes, and LMEs in particular (to include the definition of workplans and milestones)
- The contents of the NAPs themselves
- The elaboration of proposals for national projects to be supported as part of NAP implementation
- identification of baseline and incremental processes and costs (according to funding principles of the GEF)
- Guidelines to monitor environmental status (including definition of baseline and quantify pressure relief)

The review is particularly intended to provide national experts for the NPAs with insights about the NAP process they are to conduct.

## **METHOD**

The method used comprised the following steps:

- Identify the various categories of plans, strategies, guidelines and other similar documents of potential relevance to the development of National Action Plans for an LME and to the other products required
- Undertake targeted research relevant to the formulation of national action plans and similar documents on the searches and structured research in order to obtain the relevant documents and prepare an inventory thereof
- Specifically consult the GEF IW Learn Website) on NAPs and related issues
- Contact expert individuals with relevant experience by telephone or e-mail in order to pose particular questions about lessons learned and best practice
- Review the documents and information obtained in order to extract lessons learned and international best practice, including emerging trends in the formulation of national plans and strategies

## RESULTS

### Documents reviewed

In total, we obtained and reviewed a diverse assemblage of over 100 action plans, strategies, sets of guidelines and other relevant documents (see Annex 1). The following documents stand out as particularly relevant:

Task / product	Especially useful documents
<b>Using the best format for guidelines</b>	UNEP/GPA, 2006. Protecting coastal and marine environment from impacts of land-based activities: A guide for national action. The Hague, 2006. UNDP guidelines on formulating National Climate Adaptation Plans International transboundary cooperation – some best practice guidelines GEF IW Guidelines on Annual Project Performance Template
<b>Identifying the optimal processes for elaboration of NAPs</b>	UNEP/GPA, 2006. Protecting coastal and marine environment from impacts of land-based activities: A guide for national action. The Hague, 2006. Handbook on Governance and Socioeconomics of LMEs (NOAA) Lessons Learned Reporting on Stakeholder Involvement – WIOLab
<b>Ensuring successful implementation of NAPs (future or actual)</b>	UNEP/GPA, 2006. Protecting coastal and marine environment from impacts of land-based activities: A guide for national action. The Hague, 2006. 'European Commission GPP Training Tool kit – ppt pres. " Toolkit developed for the European Commission by ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability, 2008
<b>Defining the contents of NAPs</b>	UNEP/GPA, 2006. Protecting coastal and marine environment from impacts of land-based activities: A guide for national action. The Hague, 2006. Caspian Sea national action plans (NCAPs) Australia's National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities Eastern African Marine Ecoregion - Action Plan for Tanzania - 2004-2008
<b>Elaborating workplans and milestones for NAPs</b>	Caspian Ecosystem Programme (CEP) evaluations (Holland 2002; Fenton 2007).
<b>Defining the format and contents of investment projects</b>	GCLME SAP guidelines CCLME Demonstration project structure PRCM Project documents
<b>Guidelines and format on identifying baseline and incremental processes and costs</b>	GEF website and various guidelines GEF IW guidelines Examples of incremental cost analyses in recent GEF IW documents of high quality
<b>Guidelines for monitoring environmental status</b>	LME Modular Approach (various guides, articles and presentations on the LME approach) UNEP/GPA, 2006. Protecting coastal and marine environment



Overall, we found the UNEP/LPA manual on protecting the marine environment from land-based sources to be the most comprehensive and useful single document for the purposes of the present assignment, although it focuses on countries primarily individually, rather than in the context of an LME or broader regional plan and does not cover the full breadth of issues covered in an LME programme. Many other documentary sources were also useful, and direct consultation with expert practitioners proved to be highly invaluable.

### **Best practice on the format of guidelines for national action plans**

We found several examples of guidelines on how to prepare national action plans and other documents, the most useful of which were the UNEP guidelines on how to develop National Plans of Action for LBAs. The UNDP guidelines on preparing national action plans for climate change adaptation were also helpful. The UNDP guidelines adopt a tabular approach in which the elements of the plan are helpfully arranged vertically on the left hand side and guidance notes are provided opposite, but the content of the guide was felt to be a little too concise, much of the technical content being placed in annexes. The UNEP guidelines are presented in the form of a technical manual and we found this to be more helpful. In the Caspian Sea project, brief guidelines were issued to countries for NAP preparation but despite contacting the project were not obtainable. After experimenting with the manual approach, we found the tabular format to be more useful.

### **Best practice on processes for the development of NAPs in the context of GEF IW programmes**

#### **Planning principles**

There is a myriad of literature and experience on the principles of planning processes of general relevance to the development of any national action plan. At the highest level, environmental planning processes are founded on principles of “good governance”. In 2006 the UN Economic & Social Council reviewed the various definitions of “governance” and “good governance” and picked out the following concise definitions:

- “Governance” refers to the process whereby societies or organisations make important decisions, determine whom they involve and how they render account (Canadian Institute of Governance, 2002)
- “Good governance” has four major components – *legitimacy* (government should have consent of the governed), *accountability* (ensuring transparency, responsibility, freedom of media), *competence* (effective policy making, implementation and service delivery) and *respect for law and human rights* (DfID, UK)

In the context of national developmental or environmental planning, additional dimensions emerge, notably:

- *Participation* – the specific requirement that stakeholders should participate in decision making processes
- *Subsidiarity* – the principle that responsibility should be delegated to the appropriate level

- *Adaptation* – the principle that governance should be adaptable, not rigid, and include a learning process
- *Partnership* – includes public-private partnership and co-management and highlights the need for an action plan to interlink with other plans

Virtually all guidelines and published documents on environmental planning highlight the *precautionary principle* which may be considered a principle of good environmental governance. In practice, countries find and develop their own definitions in different contexts and no one definition should be considered appropriate. GCLME countries are of course free to agree on a definition for the purposes of the guidelines.

### **Planning processes**

***Planning is cyclical and iterative*** – planning processes should follow the iterative programme planning cycle of Preparation – Target setting – Developing an Action Plan – Implementing the Action Plan – Monitoring progress and reporting (see figure below).



### ***Plans are not an end in themselves -***

**Let's not ask**

“do we have a NAP document?” (i.e. it is not an end in itself)

**Let's ask**

“How effective are we in tackling the sustainable management of coastal and marine environmental resources at the country level?”

“How effective are we in addressing SAP targets?”

“How can our actions be continuously improved to be more successful?” (i.e. how can we learn as we go along?)

“What concrete and affordable steps are realistic to tackle SAP targets of the major transboundary (thus the country) issues?”

“What can we do at the national level (concrete actions) and what is required on the ground at the local level?”

### **Other useful formulations of best practice on NAP formulation**

We searched the most relevant documents for helpful formulations of best practice, and selected the following:

Guidance on NAP processes:

“NAPs must truly “operationalise” the SAP at national level through very specific commitments to (regionally harmonized) policy, legal and institutional reforms, and key investments” (Andy Hudson, UNDP, pers. comm.).

The UNEP manual for LBAs indicates that plan elaboration should generate the following:

- **Awareness and understanding** of the value, benefits and vulnerability of coastal and marine environments (and resources)
- A **flexible mechanism** for identifying (criteria) and addressing **priority** problems through **partnerships** and **consensus** amongst **stakeholders** (ie **participation**)
- **Realistic affordable activities** that address specific causes of degradation or threats need to be **identified, financed** and **implemented** – showing positive results (**strong indicators**)
- **Mobilization of resources** and **partners** – **Private Sector** included
- **Strengthen** the Public Sector to effectively respond to causes of degradation and ensure sustainability of activities undertaken
- **Enhance** existing environmental, financial, institutional, legislation and regulation **frameworks**
- **Mobilization of funds** should be kept in mind at all stages of a NAP process as a vital requirement for success.
- **Participation** is required at all levels and stages of the process (development to implementation) for success.

The NOAA handbook on the socio-economics and governance of LMEs highlights the following:

- The process should lead to **concrete action**
- **Commitment** should be secured to enable implementation – political, institutional, financial, personal (= “enabling environment”)
- **Linkages** should be built vertically, horizontally, geographically, stakeholder groups – mainstreaming
- **A tailor made framework** should be used
- **Stakeholder involvement** is ensured - ownership, legitimacy, consensus, trust, respect

Guidance for developing *realistic* action plans:

For plans to be realistic, the plan must consider the following:

- Strong assessment (problems / constraints and opportunities for action)
- Prioritisation for step-by-step implementation
- Precautionary and inter-generational equity (and gender)
- Affordable financing
- Built-in learning process
- transparent operational plans
- outreach and communication
- conflict resolution mechanisms
- monitoring, evaluation and revision
- capacity building

Specific guidance on how to secure adequate commitment:

We identified the following best practice on securing commitment:

- **Continuity in leadership** (for long term decision making and implementation of actions – ie: no drastic change of focus over time relating to resources sustainable management)
- **Absence of corruption**
- **Access to information** (this relates to all indicators: economic, social, environmental...)
- **Effective communication** (information, awareness...)
- **Science sharing** – sound and accessible databases (from local to regional to international)
- **Participation at all levels** (across society and at different stages: planning and decision making)
- **Effective legislation and justice** (this involves justice from issues on land/property legal to more specific enforcement of the NAP interventions)
- **Effective and non-conflicting laws, regulations and policies** (relating to the environment)
- **Affordable access to utilities**
- **Monetary stability** and strong system
- **Consistent and fair rules for investments**, transparent tax laws

#### Achieving successful implementation:

For specifically achieving successful implementation of the plan, the following guidance is relevant (this needs to be borne in mind during NAP formulation). Some of these have already been cited above.

- Operational aspects of the plans must be transparent
- There must be outreach and communication
- Conflict Resolution mechanisms need to be included
- There must be regular monitoring, evaluation and revision
- Capacity building must be included in the plan
- Flexible and cyclical approach

#### **Practical experience of NAP processes in LMEs**

The Caspian Ecosystem Programme (CEP) appears to offer the single greatest body of collective practical experience on NAP formulation and implementation for an LME, but in a somewhat specific context. In that case, the NAPs (known as National Caspian Action Plans or NCAPs) were prepared on the basis of the TDA before the SAP. The timetable was as follows:

- 1998-2000 - Preliminary TDA leading to the formation of the Caspian Environment Programme (CEP) and the formulation and approval of a GEF as well as an EU Project under the CEP umbrella
- 2000-2004 - TDA/CAP/SAP process leading to the TDA in 2003, NCAPs in 2004 and SAP more or less at same time. The TDA was used to develop the TOR for the NCAPs. SAP and NCAP preparation interacted and the final SAP made references to NCAPs.

- 2004-2008 - Updating process. During this round the TDA came after the Updated NCAPs due to delays. The SAP was also updated and repackaged as the Tehran Convention Strategic Caspian Action Plan.

In 2002/3 the CEP project developed TORs for the NAPs and Guidelines on how to develop them. For each country a NAP Development Workshop was organised. An Intersectoral Experts' Team was established and led by a Lead National Consultant which had the NAPs developed and subjected to National Forum prior to finalisation. By 2004 there were four NAPs which were approved at fairly high national levels.

It should also be noted that the Caspian is an enclosed single ecosystem involving only 5 close neighbour countries placed around the water body, whereas GCLME is a very much larger and open ended area with countries arranged linearly along its edge, offering less opportunity for interaction, especially for the countries at opposite ends.

Nonetheless, some key lessons were learned from CEP relevant to the NAP process for all water bodies, most notably:

- The critical importance of involving economic and planning ministry authorities in the development of the NAPs (helps to avoid generating mere environmental "wish lists")
- The need to specify in detail the institutional mechanisms, the resources to be mobilised (in particular finance) and the human capacities available for implementation
- In order to avoid "action plan fatigue" and for more efficient use of resources, it is essential to develop the plan in concert with existing plans and to ensure linkages and integration with these other plans

(Hamidreza Ghaffarzadeh, CEP, pers. comms).

The last point is very important – the GCLME NAPs should not attempt to impose themselves over and above other national plans, but must fully consult and integrate with them. Ultimately, this is a surer way to an authoritative national action plan for the marine and coastal environment.

NAPs are definitely beneficial - NCAPs engendered a new sense of "Caspian-ness" in each of the countries (or in Russia's case, the three regions bordering the Caspian). The NCAPs helped to overcome the inertia caused by the complexity and scale of issues facing the region and demystifying just what the countries could do at the national level (Holland 2002).

## **Best practice on the contents of the NAPs themselves**

### GCLME SAP directives:

The GCLME SAP specifies the following contents for the NAPs:

- Policy actions
- Legislative/regulatory actions
- Institutional strengthening actions
- Investment actions
- Scientific investigation actions

- Data management actions

It is to be noted that the focus of the GCLME SAP is on the obligatory categories of actions to be included in the plan, but does not mention other content countries are likely to require in a national plan, such as the preliminaries (context, process of elaboration, justification, constraints, organizational structures, M&E, financing mechanisms, communication etc.).

#### Published reviews of NAPs:

Wang (2003) suggested the four main sections of a NAP as:

- Explaining constraints to national action
- Identify ongoing & planned activities relevant to the identified issues
- Define the specific action for each identified issue
- Describe the implications for the proposed actions by different sectors

...although does not present an actual template to illustrate the recommendation.

#### Practical experience of NAP contents

The Caspian Sea NAPs offer the most complete example of practice as regards the contents and structure of the NAP documents. The format used for the Caspian was developed in 2002 and successfully applied. Project evaluations concluded that the NAPs had been a major contributor to success of the Caspian Sea project (Holland 2002; Fenton & Griffin 2007). When the plans were updated in 2008, the same structure was retained, indicating that project coordinators and countries had both found it satisfactory. The format used is also fully consistent with applicable GEF principles. An expert responsible for their development would retain the same content, but require more detail on parties to be involved, institutional arrangements, resource mobilisation and integration with other plans (cf. *supra*).

However, in the CEP, the NAPs were prepared based on the TDA and before the SAP (an interim evaluation of the CEP suggested that it would have been better to formulate the SAP first - Holland 2002). This has implications for both the process of plan elaboration and the contents of the finished plan. As a result, several of the Caspian NAPs sections must be relocated under different (more introductory) titles in the NAP contents structure - for example, mechanisms for action (which concerns institutional arrangements for implementation) are presented prior to strategies (objectives & activities) for two reasons: 1. the SAP structure must be followed; 2. best practice indicates that presenting mechanisms first will actually make it easier for responsible entities to implement the strategy, and has the effect of putting responsibility (and therefore serious commitment) up front.

The NAP-then-SAP approach seems more advantageous in building the necessary country buy-in. (ASCLME is following this approach.)

- The SAP-then-NAP approach definitely can assist developing a sense of regional solidarity and give clearer guidance to each country re: areas of focus for SAP. (BCLME is following this approach.)

- But, the best practice, in my opinion, lies somewhere between. i.e., NAP and SAP developments happen somewhat concurrently, giving room for each process to influence each other. Thus, I value the pre-NAP or pre-SAP consultation process through conducting CCA based on the available knowledge (either in the form of TDA or just some expert knowledge in those

stakeholders' brain and experience) and get some feel that what can/should/cannot be included in the final SAP and NAPs from early stage. (Okavango River is somewhat practicing this. Their SAP and NAPs development are progressing at the same time, and draft SAP and NAPs will be available almost at the same time.)

One practice that I would avoid is finalizing the SAP without any preliminary form of NAPs (BCLME falls in this category, but as you said, because the project was so successful in nurturing strong regional solidarity (and it is only three countries), this won't pose a serious problem.) Lake Tanganyika project didn't produce separate NAPs when it assisted the 4 countries to produce and endorse its SAP (2000); but it did include mini-NAPs in the SAP from which a full NAP can be easily developed. This made the L. Tanganyika SAP as a very practical and implementable document (compared to L. Chad SAP.)

In the Caspian region the NAPs (which were based on the TDA, and elaborated before the SAP, had the following contents:

- **Introduction** (objectives; connections of NAP to TDA-SAP and regional investment projects; method used for developing the NAP; national status of NAP (means of endorsement & implementation); process of revision)
- **National conditions** (political, institutional, legislative & socio-economic situation and future development prospects; country social, institutional & financial capacity)
- **The importance of the LME for the country** (economic activities in relation to the LME; potential of LME to contribute to national development; economic, social & environmental significance)
- **Main problems and root causes** (reflects the TDA, from a national perspective, which is the technical basis of the NAP)
- **Strategy and measures** (core of the NAP – criteria for ranking causes and determining strategies & measures; long term strategies & urgent measures)
- **Potential obstacles and ways of overcoming** (political, institutional, socio-economic, human resources, technology & financial obstacles)
- **Resources attraction strategy** (financial resources needed for implementation, how to secure them)
- **Mechanisms for action** (organizational structures for implementation, M&E, transparency, accountability & public awareness)

An evaluation the NCAPs highlighted the importance of:

- a comprehensive assessment of issues
- assessment of the human, institutional and financial resources required to undertake the interventions
- proper consideration for the time-scales required
- Need for indicators to monitor impact
- Need for reflection on the structure for inter-sectoral co-ordination required to achieve the interventions effectively.

The same evaluation recommended that NAPs should:

1. Define clearly the scope of interventions;
2. Prioritise interventions adequately;
3. Identify institutional responsibilities to achieve interventions, and where inter-sectoral coordination is required;
4. Break-down interventions into short-, medium-, and long-term activities;
5. Assess resources (financial and human) required to undertake interventions, and detail on the source of funding; and
6. Provide indicators to monitor effectiveness and impact of interventions.

(Source: Holland 2002)

### **Proposals for national projects**

There are very many examples of proposals for national projects within the context of GEF IW programmes, including demonstration projects (used in GEF IW foundation / capacity building programmes), SAP implementation projects (demonstration or pilot projects) as used in regional programmes such as the BCLME and projects as used in more mature GEF strategic partnership programmes (which can be demonstrations, pilots or investment projects). The general rules of best practice in project proposal writing (including the use of logical frameworks and verifiable indicators) are well established. We focused on best practice relating to projects within LME programmes, particularly those relating to SAP implementation or strategic partnerships (demonstration, pilot or investment projects) and involving some degree of GEF support. We found the process and format used for the CCLME project preparation to be particularly useful, although requiring adaptation. We also found the experience of the PRCM programme in West Africa useful, because of its relative success in raising funds from donors, partly resulting from an attractive choice of project themes.

### **Identification of baseline and incremental processes and costs**

The GEF rules on incremental costs are well established but continue to be refined. The identification of baseline and incremental processes and costs requires specialist knowledge of the sphere of intervention. Thus, we focussed on recent best practice in GEF IW LME programmes in the light of current GEF practice and strategic priorities, which narrows the field considerably. Again, we found the CCLME experience a useful example, since it is recent and had to address substantial revisions to GEF IW strategic priorities and a tightening up of GEF rules with regard to what could be considered as incremental.

### **Monitoring environmental status**

Environmental monitoring within the context of national action plans is well established, including in plans or strategies addressing land based activities (LBAs), biodiversity, fisheries, coastal area management, POPs etc. We found that the UNEP LBA manual offered the most helpful treatment of environmental monitoring, while not covering fisheries. The BCLME programme represents the cutting edge scientifically with regard to the assessment and prediction of LMEs, but relates to a dynamic, upwelling system not representative of all LMEs or other international water bodies. The

## **CONCLUSIONS**



Developing NAP development guidelines for GEF IW projects in general is a significant challenge given the relative lack of published information of the experience of NAP formulation and the varying approaches that have been taken by projects, including in some cases apparent abandonment of the NAPs. There is good evidence, however, that NAPs are highly beneficial and there appears to be an emerging view that NAPs are better developed after the SAP, or at least in close coordination with the SAP.

The particular challenges of developing NAPs for the GCLME countries include the large number and diversity of countries, their linear arrangement along the ecosystem edge, the ambitious target set by the project that they should be “overarching national plans” yet also highly specific and operational, the need to identify clear linkages with transboundary issues and indicators and the anticipated shortage of funding for their elaboration and implementation.

The challenges to developing national investment projects include the general difficulty of obtaining donor funding in a changing donor environment (including from the GEF), the need for substantial matching country contributions and the need to link projects adequately to the SAP and its indicators. Other challenges to the assignment concern ensuring the application of the best recent techniques (in incremental cost analysis and designing environmental monitoring frameworks).

After extensive review, a relatively small number of existing documents and reports provide the majority of useful information on best practice. Consultation with international experts and consideration of project evaluations has been especially helpful, reflecting the absence of published reviews. The UNEP handbook on protecting the coastal and marine environment from land based activities proved a particularly useful general reference.

The key recommendations to emerge on best practice for SAP formulation included adopting the correct set of overarching principles and using cyclical and dynamic planning processes. Plans should not be seen as an end in themselves, but as a manifestation of the process to ensure sustainable management of marine and coastal resources. Apart from the usual ingredients of planning processes (assessment, participation, setting realistic objectives etc.) there emerged a particular emphasis on the need to involve economics and planning authorities, the critical importance of institutional mechanisms and linkages (with other plans) and ensuring well defined and adequate resource mobilisation.

The contents of NAPs should adequately reflect the NAP process and be comprehensive, although the precise arrangement of sections is not critical. However, the plans should rigorously link activities to the SAP and its indicators. Adequate technical assessment of issues, resources, time planning, indicators and intersectoral coordination mechanisms are particularly important.

The formulation of national projects must be rigorously in accordance with the SAP objectives and indicators, but must also be made as attractive as possible to donors.

## **Annex 1 – References Consulted**

See separate excel file.

## PART 2 - GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING NATIONAL ACTION PLANS (NAP) IN GEF IW PROGRAMMES

### ABOUT THE GUIDELINES

The present guidelines follow on from the systematic review of international best practice in NAP formulation and related tasks (Part I of this volume), and aim to provide a set of guidelines on the development of National Action Plans for general application in GEF IW projects and for specific application in the case of the GCLME.

The guidelines are addressed primarily to national personnel of GCLME countries responsible for the development of National Action Plans and to others concerned in the process.

Once the GCLME NAPs are completed, it is anticipated that the lessons learned from the GCLME NAP experience, together with a comprehensive review of cumulative international experience, will be fed back into these guidelines in order to produce an authoritative set of guidelines useful for other GEF IW projects. For this reason, national experts responsible are encouraged to maintain a record of their experiences to contribute to a lessons-learned exercise at the end of the process.

The document is in three sections:

- The **Introduction** – which sets the scene for the GCLME NPAs and highlights the directives of the SAP itself, other potential sources of guidance (SAP, GCLME project document, international training courses, best practice review).
- The **NAP Formulation Process** for developing and implementing the NAP - Working to a **6 phase process** (establishment, analysis & conception, stakeholder consultation, project development & NAP finalisation, NAP implementation, monitoring & evaluation), this section presents the main process phases, actions, outputs and milestones with guidance for each step and highlights keys to a successful process. It also provides an introduction to the tools that may be required along the way (scenario planning, gap analysis, economic & cost benefit analysis, feasibility assessment, logical framework analysis etc.) [Note - Toolkit presentation to be prepared]. While the principal six phases of the process should be respected by all countries, there is room for variation in detail according to country context.
- The **NAP Template** – The template provides countries with the required NAP format and explanatory notes so that all 16 countries may present it in the same way to stakeholders, donors and the IGCC. The template is intended to serve as a complete check list of the matters to be covered in the NAP. The NAP template outline follows the general structure of the SAP while allowing flexibility in the strategies to be adopted to address SAP & national issues and deliver the required policy/legislative changes, cross-cutting actions and investments at the national level. Section 5 (Mechanisms for Action) includes a detailed description of linkages between institutions concerned with NAP implementation. Section 6 (Logical framework) should include an expanded logframe which presents SAP-NAP objectives (corresponding with SAP issues), national level objectives (corresponding with national variants on SAP issues), activities by category (including policy, legal, cross-cutting and investments) and relating these to SAP targets and indicators.

## INTRODUCTION

### What are NAPs? What are they for?

In most GEF IW projects, following the TDA, a SAP document is elaborated. In order to reach SAP targets, which address major transboundary prioritized issues, nations need to translate the regional approach into a concrete and comprehensive **National Action Plan**, where defined interventions (the general scope of which is defined by the SAP) are to be adapted and implemented by countries through actions appropriate to their own context.

According to one expert – “NAPs should aim to truly operationalise the SAP at national level through very specific commitments to (regionally harmonised) policy, legal and institutional reforms, and key investments”.<sup>1</sup>

According to another (edited): “The key functions of NAPs are threefold:

- to give clarity to the responsibilities and activities that must be implemented at the national level to achieve successful SAP implementation
- to assist each country to integrate transboundary water management issues and priorities into national development planning and
- to assist countries to prioritize their actions and mobilise the necessary resources from the national budget and development partners.

In more detail, the importance of these functions is:

1. The NAP process is a way of enabling member states to play their part in the implementation of the SAP and to counter the common misconception that most SAP activities (because of the transboundary nature of the issues) should be carried out by a regional project or entity (in this case the GCLME programme and IGCC). Quite the reverse, the more that activities can be conducted and owned at the national level (leaving only a few truly regional activities at the SAP level), the better the chances of successful SAP implementation. Countries will be free to proceed at their own pace, without waiting upon slow regional processes. In most cases (and this is certainly so for the GCLME) a regional commission does not have the capacity to implement activities. A commission’s intended role is to oversee and monitor the collective impact of national activities on transboundary concerns and to direct overall strategy of the SAP.
2. Transboundary priorities must be taken beyond the traditional fishery & environment sectors into national integrated development planning - the NAP process helps to engage decision makers in the planning and finance sectors so that they become aware that transboundary priorities affect sustainable development of country and the entire region.
3. Used effectively, the NAP can help to secure greater national budget allocation towards addressing the transboundary priorities. Countries can also use their NAP instruments in

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Hudson, UNDP-GEF IW

*bilateral negotiations with donors as well to orientate donor support towards investments needed to address transboundary concerns".<sup>2</sup>*

### **NAPs must follow the GCLME SAP framework**

The GCLME SAP offers a general framework for action with room for flexibility in approach and strategy at the national level. Nonetheless, to comply with the SAP, countries must operate within the broad framework of key issues, activities, targets and indicators, all set out in the SAP which are:

#### The Issues:

- Sustainable fisheries
- Water quality
- Balanced habitats

#### The Categories of activity within each issue:

- Policy actions
- Legislative / regulatory action
- Cross cutting (institutional strengthening, capacity building, communication etc.)
- Investment actions
- Scientific investigation

#### The Targets

##### Sustainable fisheries:

- 1) populations of threatened species stabilized or recovered by 2015;
- 2) Fish populations restored to levels of mid-1970s by 2020
- 3) All commercially important fish species being fished sustainably with minimum by-catch and habitat impacts by 2020

##### Water quality:

- 1) Reduce annual inputs of all priority land and sea-based pollutants to the marine environment by at least 10% by 2015
- 2) Measurably improve water quality in two priority coastal hotspots in each country by 2015

##### Balanced habitats:

- 1) Zero net loss of mangroves by 2015
- 2) Reduced aerial coverage of eutrophied lagoons by 50% by 2015
- 3) Measurably reduced coastal erosion at five sites by 2015

The ecosystem state indicators: These are set out in full in the SAP itself and not repeated here. The activities of the NAP must be related as far as possible to SAP ecosystem state indicators. The exceptions are where NAP activities relate to other national plans or programmes unrelated to the SAP.

---

<sup>2</sup> Akiko Yamamoto, UNDP-GEF IW

## **Sources of guidance for the NAP process**

Various sources of guidance have contributed to the present guidelines.

### ***Guidance from the SAP itself***

The SAP is a legally binding document and must necessarily be followed by the countries. Nonetheless, its terms are relatively broad, allowing countries flexibility of approach. National action plans are addressed in Chapter 4 of the SAP (see text box below). The key points to highlight are that:

- **All countries must develop a NAP.** This is a fundamental obligation and there is no escape!
- **Where a NAP already exists, countries must review and update it.** This applies to six GCLME countries that have already developed NAPs.
- **The NAPs will identify a “suite of measures” and “present details of national actions”** for “environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources” – the actions must comprise an ensemble of measures and specific actions must be described in detail.
- **NAPs will address “strategic transboundary issues” and “the most urgent environmental concerns at the national level”** – the latter possibility is to encourage national ownership of the NAPs – they are not exclusively regional in scope and allow for the expression of national priorities.
- **The NAPs must “take full account of the cost...of financing...the actions required** in the short, medium and long term” – this relates to international experience of NAPs failing because adequate cost estimations were not conducted, and funding commitments not secured. The GCLME NAPs must be rigorously budgeted and financing commitments secured from government and development partners.
- **The NAPs will take account of “any additional funding** to strengthen financial sustainability and ensure the prompt and adequate provision of funding for priority environmental actions funded in the NAP-SAP” – **the NAPs must include sustainable financing mechanisms** as well as ensuring the short term funding of priority actions.
- **The NAP is the “overarching framework at the country level”** and will “incorporate pertinent...actions already identified in the various [national] action plans” – the integration of other national action plans (including the closely related National Plans of Action under the Global Plan of Action for Protecting the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities of GPA-LBA) is a key aspect of the GCLME NAPs, reflecting the integrated approach of the GCLME programme itself and the importance of capitalising on what has already been achieved.
- **Each NAP is to be adopted by “by-laws to be enacted by each member country”** – it is a common handicap of national plans and strategies that they do not benefit from formal legal adoption. By seeking such adoption the NAPs will not only help secure SAP-NAP implementation, but also the implementation (and funding) of other national plans. The NAP thus comes to those other plans as an ally, not as a competitor for resources. In a context of

“action plan fatigue” often witnessed, this is a strong point of the GCLME NAP approach and should help national experts secure the cooperation of other sectors and plan managers.

- Finally, **the NAP should become the “major tool [to] facilitate implementation of the SAP at the national level”** – this implies that SAP implementation itself shall be undertaken from the national level in a grass roots approach. To this end, NAPs must be fully nationally owned. **They are your plans!**

*National Action Plans (extracted from the SAP)*

Each member country will **review and update the National Action Plan (NAP)** which will form an integral part of this SAP. Each NAP shall **identify a suite of measures and present details of national actions** for environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources that will be taken to effectively **address strategic transboundary issues and the most urgent environmental concerns at the national level.**

Each NAP will **include cost data to take full account of the cost estimates of financing the implementation of actions required in the short, medium and long-term** and any additional funding to strengthen the financial sustainability and ensure the prompt and adequate provision of funding for priority environmental actions identified in the NAP/SAP.

**The NAP as the overarching framework for coastal and marine environmental management at the country level, will incorporate pertinent proposed policy reforms and investment actions already identified in the various action plans** (National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan (NBSAP), NPAs, POPs / NIPs, ICARM), for the avoidance of duplication. **Each NAP is to be adopted and endorsed by the relevant by-laws** to be enacted by each member country of the GCLME and therefore represent the **major tool that shall facilitate the implementation of the SAP at the national level.** The successful implementation of the NAPs will therefore enable the achievement of the objectives of the SAP.

IGCC will support Member Countries to formulate and implement NAPs for the successful national level implementation of the SAP, and where necessary provide national and regional training for achieving same.

In addition to Chapter 4, the SAP document offers the following guidance for NAPs:

- **“Adequate funding for priority actions will be secured by the member countries** in the form of external investments, loans, grants and other technical assistance arrangements” (SAP Executive Summary) – the placing of an obligation on the countries to secure the funding for priority actions is an incentive for greater national ownership. The NAP process and IGCC guidance must foster national initiative to seek and secure such funding, the NAP instrument itself offering valuable leverage – by the same token the NAP process must allow countries the flexibility they need to negotiate such funding in their own manner taking account of the national interest.
- **National governments will play a major role in “monitoring and assessment of SAP/NAP”** – monitoring and assessment must be included in the NAP as part of the national commitment to the SAP – this will be a substantial part of the NAPs.
- **There must be “wide stakeholder involvement in SAP-NAP implementation”** – The NAPs must ensure active public participation in the NAP formulation and implementation process, implying the need for specific provisions on stakeholder participation.

## ***Guidance from the original GCLME project document***

The GCLME project document submitted to the GEF offers an indication of how the NAPs were originally conceived at the start of GCLME programme implementation.

The key point to note is that **the GCLME project document provided that NAPs should be developed before the SAP**. This reflects the considered best practice of the time which was that NAPs should be the building blocks of the SAP and developed from the TDA. This was done in the case of the Caspian Ecosystem Programme, and resulted in a high degree of national ownership of the national plans. However, in hindsight it was concluded that NAPs should be developed concurrently with the SAP to ensure adequate articulation, which is the current thinking today (e.g. at UNDP/GEF).

In the GCLME, NAPs will be developed after the SAP. While this is theoretically not ideal, without the guidance of a (flexible and broad) SAP framework, the 16 countries might have generated a heterogeneous array of national plans without proper regional articulation. In effect, in the case of the GCLME, it was necessary to await the SAP. However, this makes it all the more important to develop a sense of national ownership through the NAP process.

The project document also provided that NAPs should achieve consensus building through “broad stakeholder, intersectoral and interministerial processes” – this encapsulates the broad scope of the NAP process and which is fully reflected in the planning process presented here.

## ***Guidance from published training courses on GEF IW projects***

A recent training course on GEF IW projects developed by the TRAINSEACOAST programme and GEF IWLEARN, indicates that NAPs and the SAP should be developed in parallel interactively after the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA). According to this approach, each country appoints a “**NAP Formulation Team**” which operates in coordination with the “SAP Formulation Team”. Both teams are made up of “technical specialists”.

The national teams should include a mixture of specialists in technical, legal, financial and public policy issues. The teams should include “adequate stakeholder representation” (this reflects the original GCLME project document, but “adequate” is not defined). **The NAP teams will generate draft NAPs.**

The SAP formulation team should include representatives of the TDA Technical Task Team (an expert team used to undertake the TDA) and from the national NAP Teams, in order to ensure adequate synergy to address regional priorities.

Since the GCLME SAP has already been prepared and the IGCC already created, the role of the “SAP formulation team” will be assured by the IGCC itself, supported technically by the GCLME project and its consultants as necessary.

The main point to highlight for present purposes is that: **interaction between the NAP Formulation Teams and the IGCC is critical.**

## ***Guidance from best international practice***

For the purposes of the present guidelines, a separate review was undertaken of global best practice in NAP formulation. The key points emerging from that review can be briefly summarised as:

- Apply the principles of good governance (this captures most aspects of best practice)
- Apply an iterative planning cycle (adaptive management)
- Adopt and maintain a goal orientated approach (a plan is not an end in itself)
- Ensure concrete actions, secured commitments, full linkages, tailor-made framework and stakeholder involvement (NOAA LME governance handbook)
- Ensure continuous leadership and good communication
- Be sure to integrate finance and planning ministries in the planning process
- Define institutional mechanisms and resource mobilisation in detail
- A planning cycle in 6 phases as used for NPAs under the LBA is a proven process

## **NAP FORMULATION PROCESS**

The NAP formulation process is broken up into a **planning cycle of six phases**:

1. Establishment (of NAP Formulation Team)
2. Analysis & conception
3. Stakeholder consultation
4. NAP activity & projects finalisation
5. Implementation
6. Monitoring & Evaluation

The six phases are adapted from those used for the elaboration of National Plans of Action under the GPA-LBA (global plan of action on protecting the marine environment from land-based sources). Thus, GCLME countries that have already prepared NPAs will be able to fully capitalize on that experience.

Each phase will comprise **activities, outputs and milestones**. Milestones correspond to the completion of a phase.



### **Phase 1: Inception**

The main purpose of Phase 1 is to get the NAP process started. This implies the establishment and official mandating of a **NAP Formulation Team**. In accordance with best practice, the NAPFT must be composed of sectoral experts (which must imperatively include representatives from the finance and planning sectors). The main purpose of the team will be to formulate the NAP (**at a later stage the NAPFT will be transformed into the NAP monitoring team** with the appropriate adjustments). The NAPFT should have “adequate” stakeholder representation. The NAPFT has a technical function and, in accordance with the rule of “competence” in good governance, should be made up only of technically competent individuals. Stakeholder representation for representation’s sake alone should be avoided although the engagement of senior individuals (where they are technically qualified) can add useful political weight to the team.

Upon inception, the NAPFT will hold a brainstorming meeting in which it will revisit the TDA-SAP and SAP targets, identify linkages to other national plans, make any necessary informal enquiries, finalise its own composition and **develop a work plan**.

A very important part of phase 1 is for the NAPFT to **identify other relevant national plans and establish linkages and communication with the coordinators of those plans**. One way of doing this is to appoint individuals onto the NAPFT who already work in relation to those plans. Another would be to fuse the NAPFT with another team engaged on closely related tasks (e.g. a national ICZM technical committee). Adjustments to the NAPFT team should be made during this stage if considered necessary.

**The “milestone” indicating completion of Phase 1 is the official establishment of a fully operational and fully “linked” NAP Formulation Team complete with workplan.**

### **Phase 2 – Analysis**

The main purpose of Phase 2 is to undertake **the necessary analyses for NAP formulation**. The key tasks of this phase are to **revisit of the TDA-SAP**, assess its continued relevance to the country, review (and if necessary update) the **causal chain analysis** and **define the strategic transboundary issues as they are perceived at the country level**. Typically, this would be a variant on the regional strategic issue. Thus, in relation to the “sustainable fisheries” issue, the national issue might be “overexploitation of shrimp fisheries” in the country, while under water quality it might be “pollution from aluminium smelter in neighbour state X”. Having identified all the strategic issues as perceived in the country, the NAPFT should then consider whether there are any **urgent national environmental concerns** relating to protection or sustainable use of marine and coastal environmental resources that need to be addressed at the national level in the short term. The NAPFT should then attempt to rank the various issues according to their importance in terms of their eventual **environmental impact** and **socio-economic consequences** for the country. The NAPFT should take care always to distinguish between strategic transboundary issues and the urgent but purely national issues.

Having identified and ranked the country transboundary issues and urgent national concerns, the NAPFT will consider the full array of existing or planned activities and plans in the country and undertake a **gap analysis**. In relation to each gap i.e. each concern not adequately addressed, the

NAPFT should identify the **actions** needed to address them (“actions” here includes the action categories in the SAP – i.e. any policy, legislative, cross-cutting or investment action that might be required to address the issue). For each action, the NAPFT should identify responsibilities, necessary resources needed (human, technical and financial) and any cross-cutting support required (capacity building etc.).

Based on the above analyses, the NAPFT will prepare a **first draft of the NAP** to include a draft text (following the template provided) with supporting logical framework and budget. Even at this draft stage, it is very important to include proposals for institutional arrangements and resource mobilization. The NAPFT should then consult the IGCC and within the national administration to secure approval of the draft NAP for stakeholder consultation.

**The milestone indicating completion of phase 2 is the completed and approved first draft of the NAP ready for stakeholder consultation.**

### **Phase 3 – Stakeholder Consultation**

As noted above, the NAP Formulation Team must include “adequate stakeholder representation” but not to the extent that its technical functions are impaired. The main purpose of the consultation phase is to take the draft NAP to a wider constituency and to **hold a national forum**. The process will also be useful to benefit from **stakeholder feedback** in order to further refine and improve the draft NAP.

Prior to the National Forum, the NAPFT will identify the full range of potential actions (taking a lead from the non-exhaustive list in the SAP) that appear most suitable to be conducted as **investment projects** requiring special financing, such as from Public-Private Partnerships or direct donor funding. The NAPFT will **develop criteria for selection and ranking of investment projects** and will develop a **call for concept proposals** to be launched at the national forum. For this reason, it is especially important that the private sector is represented at the national forum. This approach is intended to capture the best and most innovative ideas for investment projects.

**The milestone indicating completion of phase 3 is the holding of a national forum with launch of the call for investment project proposals.**

### **Phase 4 – Project development and NAP Finalisation**

The main purposes of Phase 4 are to **call in and finalise investment project proposals** and **finalise the NAP** itself with the final selection of projects. An important step in Phase 4, if possible, will be for **countries to participate at a regional donors’ forum in order to present project proposals** for which funding is being sought. Following the donor conference, project proposals would be finalized and integrated into the finalized NAP. Alternatively, the donors’ conference could be held at a later date – in such case the final, adopted, NAPs would be presented to the donors, including the investment project proposals.

The **NAP would then be submitted for formal adoption** at the national level (formal adoption at the regional inter-country IGCC level may be legally necessary at a later stage).

While awaiting formal adoption of the SAP, the NAPFT and the countries could **use the waiting time to negotiate further support for the NAP and the project proposals**, particularly in the case of Public-Private Partnerships.

**The milestone indicating completion of Phase 4 will be the formal legal adoption of the NAP at national level, including proposed investment projects.**

### **Phase 5 – Implementation of the NAP**

The main purpose of Phase 5 will be to **implement the NAP**, including the defined investment projects. An important part of this step will be to **transform the NAPFT into the NAP monitoring team**, with appropriate adjustments to composition and mandate. The implementation phase would focus on various categories of actions (policy, legislative, cross-cutting (e.g. communication, capacity building) and the investment projects themselves. **Mobilisation of resources** is likely to be a major challenge during this phase, requiring constant vigilance of the NAP monitoring team.

**The milestone indicating completion of phase 5 will be that annual reports demonstrate the implementation of actions**

### **Phase 6 – Monitoring & Evaluation**

The main purpose of Phase 6 will be to carry out **monitoring in accordance with agreed NAP monitoring frameworks** which would be directly linked to NAP-SAP monitoring by the IGCC at the regional level and **to adapt the NAP** as necessary for improved results. **Monitoring would focus on performance, process and impact indicators.** The M&E mechanism will include an **annual NAP implementation review** at the national level with reporting back to governments and IGCC and a **mechanism for revision of the NAPs** where necessary. Depending on country progress and available funding, it may be appropriate to hold a **mid term implementation review at the regional level.**

**The milestones of Phase 6 will be the cyclic implementation reviews and the adjusted NAP.**

## NAP process summary

PHASE	PROCESS STEPS
Inception Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Presentation of Recommendations from the GCLME NAP Guidelines Workshop</li> <li>■ Set up of the NAP Formulation Team</li> <li>■ 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of NAPFT for Official Appointments</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 1<sup>st</sup> NAPF Team Brainstorm Meeting               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revisit TDA</li> <li>- Revisit SAP / Targets</li> <li>- Identify linkages to other national plans</li> <li>- Informal consultations with stakeholders to assist with completing linkages</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Adjust composition of the NAPF Team as appropriate (+ identify resource people to invite at key steps during the phases)</li> <li>■ Define a work plan and time line for developing the NAP (to validation &amp; adoption)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Series of NAPFT Analysis Meetings               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of TDA-SAP and identification &amp; ranking of strategic / national issues</li> <li>- Gap analysis in the different national plans</li> <li>- Gap analysis for the TDA - SAP</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Identification of additional Actions (not yet addressed through plans - relevant nationally and relevant to SAP)</li> <li>■ Analyze feasibility of Actions at national level</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Produce a draft Action Plan presenting budgeted actions and a time-line to undertaken them</li> </ul>
Consulting for Actions Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organize the 1<sup>st</sup> National Stakeholders Forum (in the form of Planning Workshop – Stocktaking exercise – a Projects criteria presentation and launch of calls for proposals)</li> <li>■ Integrate results to the working document (Advanced Draft NAP)</li> </ul>
Project Development & NAP finalization Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Review project proposals for selection</li> <li>■ Perfect selected project proposals in consultation with proponents</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Attend IGCC Forum for Major Donors interest (for selected projects)</li> <li>■ Adjustments to project proposals</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Finalize NAP with the projects proposed</li> <li>■ Submit NAP for validation and</li> <li>■ Formal adoption</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Develop partnerships and sustainable financing for implementation</li> </ul>
Implementation Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Team transformation &amp; adjustment (NAPFT replaced by NAP monitoring team)</li> <li>■ Policy Actions implementation in relation to SAP</li> <li>■ Legislative Actions implementation in relation to SAP</li> <li>■ Cross-cutting actions in relation to SAP</li> <li>■ Investment Actions implementation in relation to SAP</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Monitoring               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreed milestones</li> <li>- Process indicators (SAP, national)</li> <li>- Impact indicators (SAP, national)</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Reporting &amp; sharing (success stories)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Reporting at the Regional level</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Making appropriate adjustments (adaptive management)</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 1 - NAP Process chart with guidance notes

PHASE 1	PROCESS STEPS	OUTPUTS	GUIDANCE NOTES
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Inception Phase</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Presentation of Recommendations from the GCLIME NAP Guidelines Workshop</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Feedback report produced and circulated</b></li> <li>• <b>Short report on Team composition and roles distributed</b></li> <li>• <b>Technical working document (including work plan and time line) produced and circulated</b></li> </ul>	<p>Phase 1 is for establishment of the <b>NAP Formulation team</b>, initial orientation and planning and <b>establishing linkages</b> with parallel processes while <b>revisiting the TDA-SAP process</b> to ensure continuity. The main elements needed to develop the NAP should be clearly identified and a <b>NAP workplan prepared</b>.</p> <p>It is important that the NAP formulation team involves authorities from key planning and finance ministries (including Economics, Finance and Planning) and that all parties have good communication facilities between them.</p> <p>Good linkages with other national plans need to be established.</p> <p>The NAPFT needs to be formally validated with clear roles and responsibilities (and communicated to the IGCC and wider community).</p> <p>Finally, a working document with a time line, including the assignment of role and responsibilities for the activities should be presented, with a preliminary estimated budget.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Set up of the NAP Formulation Team</li> <li>■ 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of NAPFT for Official Appointments</li> <li>■ 1<sup>st</sup> NAPF Team Brainstorm Meeting                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revisit TDA</li> <li>- Revisit SAP / Targets</li> <li>- Identify linkages to other national plans</li> <li>- Initial contacts with stakeholders to assist with completing linkages</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Adjust composition of the NAPF Team as appropriate (+ identify resource people to invite at key steps during the phases)</li> <li>■ Define a work plan and time line for developing the NAP (to validation &amp; adoption)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>MILESTONE</b></p>	<p>➤ <b>A functional NAPF team is established, operational, with the necessary linkages and has provided a first technical working document</b></p>		

PHASE 2	PROCESS STEPS	OUTPUTS	GUIDANCE NOTES
---------	---------------	---------	----------------

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Series of NAPFT Analysis Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of TDA-SAP and identification &amp; ranking of strategic transboundary issues of the SAP and urgent national issues</li> <li>- Undertake simplified causal chain analysis for the issues as perceived at national level based on the TDA</li> <li>- Economic analyses for determining the relative socioeconomic importance of the issues</li> <li>- Gap analysis of the different national plans</li> <li>- Gap analysis for the TDA – SAP</li> <li>- Logical framework analysis for first draft NAP</li> <li>- Other technical analyses including scenario planning, critical path analysis etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Identification of additional Actions (not yet addressed through plans - relevant nationally and relevant to SAP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Identify potential investment projects</li> <li>■ Analyze feasibility of Actions at national level</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Produce a draft Action Plan presenting budgeted actions and a time-line to undertaken them</li> <li>■ Develop a call for proposals for investment projects with detailed selection criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Report series on 'Analysis for defining Actions' meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>1<sup>st</sup> Draft of Action Plan produced</b></li> </ul>	<p>Phase 2 consists of the analyses needed to formulate the NAP</p> <p>In particular, it is essential to be able to prioritize transboundary issues and actions that need to be taken in the short, medium and longer term. In addition, countries are also permitted and encouraged to consider <u>urgent national environmental issues</u> and actions affecting the marine &amp; coastal environment.</p> <p>The NAPFT will use a series of analytical tools in order to help prioritize the strategic national issues and sharpen the planning process. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gap analysis</li> <li>• Simplified causal chain analysis to identify the root causes of the trans-boundary issues</li> <li>• Logframe analysis for identifying NAP strategy (objectives, activities and indicators)</li> <li>• Economic analysis (to assess the relative importance of issues)</li> </ul> <p>The gap analysis of national plans will identify transboundary and national issues not currently covered by any plan. Gap analysis of the TDA-SAP will help identify the urgent national environmental issues not covered in the SAP and which countries may include in the NAP.</p> <p>During this phase the <b>NAPFT should identify the potential investment projects</b> to form part of the NAP. A list of the potential projects is provided in the SAP. In addition, the NAPFT should consider the full range of potential projects proposed under the African Process, NEPAD and other directives. <b>Particular emphasis should be placed on innovative public-private projects.</b> NAPFT should also consider potential multi-country projects e.g where two or more countries share a specific transboundary problem.</p> <p>Logical framework analysis will ensure that the NAP and its components are logically coherent with verifiable indicators. <b>Scenario planning</b> may be used to test whether the plan will be robust in different possible future scenarios. <b>Critical path analysis</b> will help to identify the critical set of steps to achieve the intended results (this will be of particular use for investment projects). <b>Feasibility assessment</b> will help to ensure that actions and projects are financially and technically feasible.</p> <p>Before finalizing the draft NAP, the NAP Formulation Team should ensure that it has the necessary <b>non-objection at ministry level</b> before it is presented to wider stakeholders. The draft should also be <b>approved by the IGCC</b> to ensure it is coherent with the GCLME SAP.</p> <p>The milestone of Phase 2 will be a first draft Action Plan.</p>
<b>MILESTONE</b>		

The 1 <sup>st</sup> NAP Draft is produced and non-objections are obtained from ministries & IGCC			
PHASE 3	PROCESS STEPS	OUTPUTS	GUIDANCE NOTES
Consulting for Actions Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organize the 1<sup>st</sup> National Stakeholders Forum (in the form of Planning Workshop – Stocktaking exercise – a Projects criteria presentation and launch of calls for proposals)</li> <li>■ Integrate results to the working document (Advanced Draft NAP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Report on national Stakeholders Forum widely circulated</b></li> </ul>	<p>The main purpose of the Phase 3 is to take the draft NAP to a wider constituency and to hold a <b>national forum</b>.</p> <p>The NAPFT should <b>identify the full range stakeholders</b> to be consulted based on the contents of the draft proposed NAP. A checklist of stakeholders typically to be considered for LME programmes is provided. Special attention should be paid to stakeholders potentially concerned with the investment projects and the <b>private sector</b>.</p> <p>At the national forum the NAPTF will present the options for investment projects and will launch a <b>call for proposals for investment project concepts</b> based on the guidelines provided. The NAPFT will explain donor criteria and highlight <b>the need for innovative approaches</b>.</p> <p>The Stakeholders Forum is also a means to <b>benefit from stakeholder feedback</b> in order to generally improve the NAP document (including improved linkages, priorities, identify constraints and opportunities), define the appropriate legal and financial frameworks, have the draft plan adopted, and <b>improve the proposed M&amp;E framework</b>.</p>
MILESTONE			
➤ National forum held and call for investment project concepts is launched			
PHASE 4	PROCESS STEPS	OUTPUTS	GUIDANCE NOTES
Project Development & NAP Finalization Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Review project proposals for selection</li> <li>■ Perfect selected project proposals in consultation with proponents</li> <li>■ Attend IGCC Forum for Major Donors interest (for selected projects)</li> <li>■ Adjustments to project proposals</li> <li>■ Finalize NAP with the projects proposed</li> <li>■ Submit NAP for validation and Formal adoption</li> <li>■ Develop partnerships and sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Report on Selected Projects issued</b></li> <li>• <b>Report on Major Donors Forum</b></li> <li>• <b>Final NAP draft</b></li> </ul>	<p>The main purposes of Phase 4 are to <b>call in and finalise investment project proposals and finalise the NAP</b> itself.</p> <p>Much time and effort will have to go in ensuring that the projects developed address the SAP objectives, follow national prioritized Actions and fit the transboundary objectives of the SAP. realm.</p> <p>The various elements needed for a useful and attractive project proposal can be found in the NAP Guidelines Document on Project Proposals.</p> <p>These projects along with identified actions at the policy and cross-cutting issues are essential to finalizing the NAP.</p>

	financing for implementation		While major donors will be interested by transboundary project proposals, countries also need to <b>identify sustainable financing mechanisms</b> which will help support the many facets of the NAP implementation.		
<b>MILESTONE</b>	<b>formal legal adoption of the NAP at national level, including proposed investment projects</b>				
<b>PHASE 5</b>	<b>PROCESS STEPS</b>	<b>OUTPUTS</b>	<b>GUIDANCE NOTES</b>		
<b>Implementation Phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Team transformation &amp; adjustment (NAPFT replaced by NAP monitoring team)</li> <li>■ Policy Actions implementation in relation to SAP</li> <li>■ Legislative Actions implementation in relation to SAP</li> <li>■ Cross-cutting actions in relation to SAP</li> <li>■ Investment Actions implementation in relation to SAP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NAP monitoring Team set up and operational</b></li> </ul>	<p>Once the NAP has been validated, it must be implemented, including the investment projects. Arrangements must be made for NAP monitoring. Typically, the <b>NAP Formulation team would become a NAP Monitoring Team</b>, with the necessary adjustments to mandate and composition.</p> <p>NAP implementation will focus on the various categories of actions identified in the SAP.</p> <p>The implementation phase will require a great deal of vigilance to ensure proper <b>resource mobilization</b>. Communication and follow up will be needed to ensure that interested parties fully understand their roles and responsibilities.</p>		
<b>MILESTONE</b>	<b>Annual reports demonstrate the implementation of policy Actions/Cross-cutting Actions/Investment Actions</b>				
<b>PHASE 6</b>	<b>PROCESS STEPS</b>	<b>OUTPUTS</b>	<b>GUIDANCE NOTES</b>		
<b>Monitoring, Evaluation &amp; Reporting Phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreed milestones</li> <li>- Process indicators (SAP, national)</li> <li>- Impact indicators (SAP, national)</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Reporting &amp; sharing (success stories)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Monitoring Team set and operational</b></li> <li>• <b>Monitoring and Evaluation Report produced</b></li> <li>• <b>Adjustments implemented</b></li> </ul>	<p>The main purpose of Phase 6 will be to carry out <b>monitoring in accordance with agreed NAP monitoring frameworks</b> which would be directly linked to NAP-SAP monitoring by the IGCC at the regional level</p> <p>Phase 6 could be described as a continuous, cyclical and <b>adaptive process</b>.</p> <p>A guide to Indicators has been provided in the guidelines and the Tool Kit section will assist the</p>		



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Reporting at the Regional level</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Making appropriate adjustments (adaptive management)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>MILESTONE</b></p> <p>➤ <b>Cyclic implementation reviews and adjusted NAP</b></p>			

## **ANNEX 2 - NAP TEMPLATE**

**National Action Plan (NAP) for the sustainable management of coastal and marine environmental resources in [*country name*]**

**Achieving the objectives of the GCLME Strategic Action Plan (SAP)**

[Date]

**Responsible entities**

***LOGOS***

## CONTENTS

### LIST OF TABLES

### LIST OF BOXES

### LIST OF ACRONYMS

### PREFACE

## INTRODUCTION

### Purpose of the NAP

### Relationship of the NAP to TDA and SAP

### Relationship of the NAP to existing relevant National Plans

### Guidelines used for developing the NAP

### National Status of the NAP

### Process for reviewing and updating of the NAP

### Readers guide

## PART I – CONTEXT

### I.1 NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

#### *The National political and institutional framework*

#### *The National economic, financial and planning situation*

#### *The socio-economic context*

#### *General trends on the country*

### I.2 IMPORTANCE OF THE GCLME TO THE NATIONAL LEVEL

- Marine living resources
- Mineral and extractive resources
- Ecosystem functions (stability)
- Ecosystem biodiversity functions
- Water quality
- Future prospects for the GCLME significance

### I.3 MAJOR PROBLEMS AND ISSUES JUSTIFYING THE NAP

- Major transboundary problems and issues
- Marine and Coastal environment and Major existing nation problems and issues
  - a. Description of the environment
    - Biophysical (land & Ocean) and climatic
    - Environmental (land, freshwater & coast)
    - Environmental (coast & ocean)
    - Hotspots, Protected Areas, Areas of special importance
    - Significant species et resources
    - ...
  - b. National problems and issues
- Root causes for these problems

#### 1.4 REVIEW OF CURRENT SECTORAL NATIONAL PLANS THAT HAVE BEGUN ADDRESSING THESE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

- International & Regional binding protocols/conventions
- Sectoral Action Plans

#### 1.5 GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE AND POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

- Policy and institutional barriers
- Social, cultural and economic barriers
- Inadequate human capacity
- Financial barriers

### PART II – THE STRATEGY BEHIND THE NAP

#### II.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPING THE NAP

- Principles adopted for developing the NAP
- Principles adopted for the implementation stages

#### II.2 PROCESS USED TO DEVELOPING THE NAP

- Activities undertaken at the preparatory stage
- Activities undertaken at the analytical stage
- Activities undertaken at the strategic design stage

#### II.3 CRITERIA USED FOR PRIORITISATION OF ACTIONS

- Urgency
- Time-line
- Scale of environmental impact
- Socio-economic consequences
- Feasibility

### PART III - THE STRATEGIC ACTONS OF THE NAP

#### THESE NEED MORE WORK – AC

#### III.1 INTRODUCTION

#### III.2 LONG TERM STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS PRIORITY ROOT CAUSES

#### III.3 IMMEDIATE ACTIONS TO ADDRESS PRIORITY ROOT CAUSES

#### III.4 RESOURCE MOBILIZATION STRATEGY **must include sustainable financing, innovative methods, private sector, PPPs**

#### III.5 MECHANISM FOR ACTION **NEEDS MORE DETAIL**

#### **NEED TO INCLUDE A COMMUNICATION STRATEGY - NEEDS MORE**

**DETAIL**

**III.6 LOGFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAP STRATEGY**

**Needs to be presented in relation to the issues**

**MAJOR ISSUE 1 – Sustainable Fisheries**

**Descriptions below**

**MAJOR ISSUE 2 – High quality water to sustain balanced ecosystem**

**Same**

**MAJOR ISSUE 3 - Balanced habitats for sustainable ecology and environment**

**Same**

**III.7 MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN *we can provide guidelines***

**III.8 REPORTING MECHANISM *reader must be able to see the reporting is done***

**PART IV - PROJECT PROPOSALS outline**

**Title 1**

**Description**

**Title 2**

**Description**

**Title**

**Description**

**...**

**REFERENCES**

**ANNEXES**

## Details

<p><b>CONTENTS</b></p> <p><b>LIST OF TABLES</b></p> <p><b>LIST OF BOXES</b></p> <p><b>LIST OF ACRONYMS</b></p>	
<p><b>PREFACE</b></p>	<p><i>Someone from GCC</i>  <i>Someone from the Country Government (preferably finance/economy/planning)</i>  <i>Someone from the Community at large (renowned, appreciated, admired by civil society (non political))</i></p>
<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p><b>Purpose of the NAP</b>  <b>Relationship of the NAP to TDA and SAP</b>  <b>Relationship of the NAP to Integrated Coastal Area Management Plans</b>  <b>Guidelines used for developing the NAP</b>  <b>National Status of the NAP</b>  <b>Process for reviewing and updating of the NAP</b></p>	<p><i>(overarching umbrella (but need for integration and linkages with other national plans)</i></p> <p><i>Flexibility and good evaluation</i></p>
<p><b>Readers guide</b></p>	<p><i>Inclusion of a short summary of what the different parts contain (substance as a way to guide the reader)</i></p>
<p><b>PART I – CONTEXT</b></p>	
<p><b>NATIONAL FRAMEWORK</b></p> <p><i>The National political and institutional framework</i>  <i>The National economic, financial and planning situation</i>  <i>The socio-economic context</i>  <i>General trends on the country</i></p>	<p><i>In order to present the reader with contextual presentations of the country (ie: profile)</i></p>
<p><b>IMPORTANCE OF THE GCLME TO THE NATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Marine living resources</b></li> <li>- <b>Mineral and extractive resources</b></li> <li>- <b>Ecosystem functions (stability)</b></li> <li>- <b>Ecosystem biodiversity functions</b></li> <li>- <b>Water quality</b></li> <li>- <b>Future prospects for the GCLME significance</b></li> </ul>	<p><i>(Environment)</i></p> <p><i>This part will in effect use the SAP issues (policy and investments actions) to highlight the significance of the LME to the nation. Although this part is descriptive, these sub-sections will enable to clearly link it to the SAP.</i></p> <p><i>(incl. ecosystem services)</i>  <i>Future prospects will provide the frame for a long term vision</i></p>
<p><b>MAJOR PROBLEMS AND ISSUES JUSTIFYING THE NAP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Major transboundary problems and issues</b></li> <li>- <b>Marine and Coastal environment and Major</b></li> </ul>	<p><i>This is really tracing what problematics justify the need to develop and implement the NAP</i></p> <p><i>An ecosystem approach can be used when presenting</i></p>

<p><b>existing nation problems and issues</b></p> <p><b>c. Description of the environment</b>  Biophysical (land &amp; Ocean) and climatic  Environmental (land, freshwater &amp; coast)  Environmental (coast &amp; ocean)  Hotspots, Protected Areas, Areas of special importance  Significant species et resources  ...</p> <p><b>d. National problems and issues</b></p> <p>- <b>Root causes for these problems</b></p>	<p><i>the environment of the country (fauna/floral and significant resources within specific ecosystems that are linked to coastal and marine environments – looking upstream) – transboundary perspective to be pointed at</i></p> <p><i>This will require concrete examples at the national level and some indication of the urgency to address the problem</i></p> <p><i>For degradation, conflicts, depletion...</i></p>
<p><b>REVIEW OF CURRENT SECTORAL NATIONAL PLANS THAT HAVE BEGUN ADDRESSING THESE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES</b></p> <p>- <b>International &amp; Regional binding protocols/conventions</b></p> <p>- <b>Sectoral Action Plans</b></p>	<p><i>This will help identify linkages -</i></p> <p><i>International/Regional - a list and how they translate into action and the national level</i></p> <p><i>National Sectoral - These can be sorted in those that are economic orientated, and those that are environment orientated, thus forming two sub-sections.</i></p> <p><i>Showing all the different plans, what they address, how, by whom and where they fall under the NAP umbrella - (It will be specified whether national actions plans specific to various issues that relate to the sustainable management of coastal and marine environmental resources are being implemented (climate, biodiversity, fisheries, environmental, economic, pollution,...)</i></p> <p><i>(A diagram on how NAP relates to different other national plans can be presented)</i></p> <p><i>There could also be a note on the different Ministries and how the country functions for relevant issues / Plans (also stating the level of decision delegated at the country region's level)</i></p>
<p><b>GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE AND POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO SUCCESS</b></p> <p>- <b>Policy and institutional barriers</b></p> <p>- <b>Social, cultural and economic barriers</b></p> <p>- <b>Inadequate human capacity</b></p> <p>- <b>Financial barriers</b></p>	<p><i>Each section will be a list (bullet points) of the gaps in knowledge and potential barriers/constraints to applying solutions – ie limitations, risks, ...</i></p> <p><i>In effect, it sets the scene for challenges and will assist in prioritizing action and use appropriate tools.</i></p>

<b>PART II – THE STRATEGY BEHIND THE NAP</b>	
<b>GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPING THE NAP</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Principles adopted for developing the NAP</li> <li>- Principles adopted for the implementation stages</li> </ul>	<i>for the country but related to the SAP</i>  <i>Guiding principles will be presented as extracted from Best practice and lessons learnt (see guidelines)</i>
<b>PROCESS USED TO DEVELOPING THE NAP</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities undertaken at the preparatory stage</li> <li>- Activities undertaken at the analytical stage</li> <li>- Activities undertaken at the strategic design stage</li> </ul>	<i>This succinct part will present the preparatory (which may include update to SAP eg: time-lines) and analytical and development stages.</i>  <i>It will provide the reader with an understanding of the systematic process that was used to reach the strategic actions selected for the Action Plan and of the length of time required to do so.</i>  <i>It should also show that principles were applied.</i>
	<i>This section will unable countries to present the national translation of the SAP</i>
<b>CRITERIA USED FOR PRIORITISATION OF ACTIONS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urgency</li> <li>- Time-line</li> </ul>	<i>Criteria for ranking root causes and for prioritisation of strategies and actions</i>
-	<i>The Investment actions form the backbone of the strategy (logframe to follow for Actions to be undertaken by each country)</i>
<b>PART III - THE STRATEGIC ACTONS OF THE NAP</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<i>This will present the overall national approach and strategy (ie: Global Vision/Goal), stating the major issues to be addressed and underlining best practice in implementation</i>
<b>2. LONG TERM STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS PRIORITY ROOT CAUSES</b>	<i>This may be divided according to the SAP ACTIONS:</i>  <i>Policy Actions (6)</i>  <i>Cross-cutting Issues (4)</i>  <i>Investment Actions (3)</i>
<b>3. IMMEDIATE ACTIONS TO ADDRESS PRIORITY ROOT CAUSES</b>	<i>This may be divided according to the SAP ACTIONS:</i>  <i>Policy Actions (6)</i>  <i>Cross-cutting Issues (4)</i>



	<i>Investment Actions (3)</i>
<b>4. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION STRATEGY</b>	<b>SUSTAINABLE FINANCING ACTION PLAN</b>
<b>5. MECHANISM FOR ACTION</b>	<p><i>This will present clear mechanisms for</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The organizational structure for implementation of actions (who has the responsibility to do what – and how it interlinks)</i></li> <li>- <i>A realistic time-line for completing Actions</i></li> <li>- <i>Targets linked to the SAP process with clear progress indicators that attain Minlestones</i></li> <li>- <i>A communication Strategy (public accountability)</i></li> </ul>
<b>6. LOGFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAP STRATEGY</b>	
<b>MAJOR ISSUE 1 – Sustainable Fisheries</b>	
<b>Presentation of SAP 3 targets</b>	<p><i>(The time line will have changed for the first target)</i></p> <p><i>These targets constitute the upshot of the Plan of Action once the later will have been successfully implemented</i></p> <p><i>It is important to underline why these have to be targeted at the national level to reach transboundary objectives</i></p> <p><i>Target 1 has 4 outcomes</i></p>
<b><u>Detailed plan of actions</u></b>	<i>This is an example</i>
<b><u>Target 1</u></b>	
<p><b><u>Outcome 1:</u> the national assessment of vulnerable species and habitats is completed by yr xxx</b></p> <p><b>Review of current state of knowledge</b></p> <p><b>Action 1.1 – A scientific investigation committee is set up and field research team ready by mth/yr xxx</b></p> <p><b>Action 1.2 – actions are costed and funds are secured to undertake the field work</b></p> <p><b>Action 1.3 – Data is collected in place 1 &amp; 2 by mth/yr xxx</b></p> <p><b>Action 1.4 - Data is collected in place 3 &amp; 4 by mth/yr</b></p>	<p><i>The national outcome is the result expected at the national level which enables to reach the SAP targets</i></p> <p><i>National actions need to be ambitious yet realistic in time to fix the milestones.</i></p> <p><i>The actions will vary between countries as a result of whether there is already a scientific committee, and on how much data has already been collected.</i></p> <p><i>A priority note (depending on a set of criteria) and a lapse of time for completion, need to be linked to each action.</i></p>

<p>xxx</p> <p><b>Action 1.5 – Data is centralized, analysed and final report completed by mth/yr xxx</b></p> <p><u>Milestones</u>: yr xxx + yr xxx</p> <p><u>Indicator</u> for outcome 1. / for activities</p> <p><u>Linkages</u></p> <p><u>Reporting system</u></p> <p><u>Cost</u> for undertaking activities</p> <p><u>Responsible entities</u> for outcome 1.</p>	<p><i>Ex: Milestone 1 = data is complete for zone 1 &amp; 2 by 2010 – Milestone 2 = draft final report ready for circulation by 2011.</i></p> <p><i>Scientific Type of Intervention – list of entities</i></p>
<p><b><u>Outcome 2</u>: A National / Regional Fisheries Plan(s) is(are) implemented and co-monitored with local communities and user groups for major fisheries (with measures to address threatened species) by YrXXX</b></p> <p><b>Action 2.1</b></p> <p><b>Action 2.2</b></p> <p><b>Etc...</b></p> <p><u>Milestones</u>: yr xxx + yr xxx</p> <p><u>Indicator</u> for outcome 2. / for activities</p> <p><u>Linkages</u></p> <p><u>Reporting system</u></p> <p><u>Cost</u> for undertaking activities</p> <p><u>Responsible entities</u> for outcome 2.</p>	<p><i>Depending on the stage at which the country is with fisheries management plan(s), there will be different types of actions and also more or less of them</i></p> <p><i>Depending on the type of implementation framework, there may be different ways to manage (at the regional level vs centralized)</i></p> <p><i>Legislative/Regulatory Type of Intervention – list of entities</i></p>
<p><b><u>Outcome 3</u>:</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Outcome 4</u>:</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Target 2</u></b></p>	<p><i>Target 2 has 7 outcomes</i></p>
<p><b>MAJOR ISSUE 2 – High quality water to sustain balanced ecosystem</b></p>	

same	
<b>MAJOR ISSUE 3 - Balanced habitats for sustainable ecology and environment</b>	
same	
<b>MONITORING &amp; EVALUATION PLAN</b>	
<b>REPORTING MECHANISM</b>	
<b>PART IV - PROJECT PROPOSALS outline</b>	
<b>Title</b> <b>description</b>	
<b>Title</b> <b>Description</b>	
<b>Title</b> <b>description</b>	
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ANNEXES</b>	