



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

|  |   |                              |                  |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4660  |                              |                  |
| Country/Region:                            | Global  |                              |                  |
| Project Title:                             | ABNJ Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of Deep-sea Living Marine Resources and Ecosystems in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) |                              |                  |
| GEF Agency:                                | FAO and UNEP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       |                  |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Multi Focal Area |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | IW-4; IW-4; BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;   |                              |                  |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0   | Project Grant:               | \$7,315,597      |
| Co-financing:                              | \$29,266,000  | Total Project Cost:          | \$36,581,597     |
| PIF Approval:                              |   | Council Approval/Expected:   | June 01, 2012    |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                  |
| Program Manager:                           | Andrew Hume   | Agency Contact Person:       | Kevern Cochrane  |

| Review Criteria                | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Eligibility                    | 1. Is the participating country eligible?  | Global - N/A   |  |
|                                | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?                                   | Global - N/A   |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | Yes, this project is being co-implemented by FAO and UNEP. FAO has a comparative advantage in handling ABNJ fisheries issues. FAO has close working relationships with deep-sea RFMOs and its Committee of Fisheries (COFI) is the only global inter-governmental forum addressing fisheries on a global scale. UNEP's Regional Seas Program, relationships with international conventions like CBD, and experience with ecosystem based management and environmental assessments gives the agency the comparative advantage for its |  |

|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
|                       |  | based planning.   |  |
|                       | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?                | N/A   |  |
|                       | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?                           | Yes, deep-sea fisheries and species and ecosystem conservation are part of FAO's Fisheries and Aquaculture Department's program and strategic objectives, as well as FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) and recommendations from FAO's International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas. Further, the project fits into UNEP's Ecosystem Management and Environmental Governance sub-programs.                           |  |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |   |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul> | N/A   |  |
|                       |  | <p>Kind reminder that GEF funds can not cover the following costs for staff of governments, agencies, international organizations, NGOs, Foundations, and Associations: salaries, baseline activities and associated travel.</p> <p>Please also note an error - the total Agency Fee stated in Table D is \$658,403 but the figure listed in the Project Identification at the beginning of the PIF is \$658,404 - a difference of \$1. Please correct.</p> |  |

|                     |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
|                     |  | addressed.   |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>   | N/A  |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>  | N/A  |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>  | N/A  |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>  | \$4,806,883 has been requested from the BD set-aside for ABNJ.   |  |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?  | Yes, the project is properly aligned with both the IW and BD results framework.  |  |
|                     | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?  | <p>Yes, the project is properly aligned IW and BD objectives.</p> <p>[3/29/12] Please clarify Output 1.1 of BD-1: Does 4,300M hectares mean 4.3 billion hectares?</p> <p>[4/4/12] Addressed.</p>   |  |
|                     | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | Global - the project is inline with the greater ABNJ program to address WSSD targets, CDB decisions on EBSAs and MPAs as well as FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries   |  |
|                     | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?  | <p>No, the proposal needs to better focus on operational issues, stressing sustainability that will be achieved by working directly with countries through their RFMOs and industry partners all along the supply line as well as addressing country commitments through international agreements.</p> <p>[3/29/12] Addressed. Capacities developed and sustainability of project outcomes have been enhanced, stressing the role of RFMOs and industry partners as support for individual country</p> |  |

11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?

Section B1.

IUCN has been involved in deep sea fisheries related activities for a while. Please describe these activities. Please move the GOBI aspects to section B6. Last para. of B1.

In line with the previous paras which argue for coordination, keep the "improve practices for fisheries management and BD conservation" focus. However "filling important knowledge gap" would require additional research to be funded by other parties and should either include the name of the organisation which will do this or be deleted.

The baseline lacks a summary of the BD deep sea situation. For example blue hake, spiny eel and spinytail skate, roundnose grenadier, onion-eye grenadier are reported to be on the verge of extinction, other species are threatened, and the role of sponges is now better understood.

[3/29/12] The baseline project is sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions. It is noted that there is a limited amount of reliable and relevant information to formulate DSF management practices, including limited species lists in certain regions.

Such activities to fill this knowledge gap will be need to be financed through cofinancing and/or partners (e.g. the EAF-Nasen project) because it's not eligible for GEF funding.

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | will be filled through partnerships with industry, as well as other partners to be determined during project preparation" (Agency response 4/3/12).  |  |
|  | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? |  |  |
|  | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?   | <p>As reflected in PFD and in several sections of the proposed project, the project's focus is on sustainable management of deep seas fisheries ecosystems and conservation of BD vulnerable deep sea ecosystems and species, based on available science and data (e.g known priority VMEs and EBSAs) to inform practical operations. At the moment the way the project components are designed lacks dynamics and does not reveal the main deep sea issues to be addressed and how they will be addressed to provide transformational impact with the deep sea RFMOs/countries and the fisheries industry in partnership with key institutions. It would be useful to adopt for the Deep Sea PIF the model of the Tuna PIF operational components, leading to specific transformation.</p> <p>Section B2:</p> <p>Framework and previous sections promote testing alternative fisheries management and BD conservation approaches. RFMOs and industrial associations stand ready to do so. Practical application should be the focus</p> |  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>best practices as already demonstrated, in many workshops including the Asia Pacific Fishery Commission one. Hence the following should be rephrased to reflect testing of practical applications: "The overall approach of the Project will focus on the development of global tools and best practices for sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ deep-seas including those aiming at reducing adverse impacts on VMEs and EBSAs (Components 1 and 2) and facilitating area-based planning tools which will then be tested and demonstrated together with other already existing tools in two to three regional contexts and pilot ABNJ (Components 3)". All components need to be revamped and reframed in the context of testing alternative fisheries management (including operationalizing agreements) and BD conservation approaches and producing transformative outcomes with at the center the instrumental participation of deep sea RFMOs/countries and industry associations: (a) exclusive of: new tools , methodologies, research etc; and (b) using known precautionary measures and existing data as the baseline, inclusive of: pilots to test implementation. See also comments in section 14. Overall, following the practical approach used in the tuna PIF would be warranted.</p> <p>The work to be carried out with the industrial associations, as refelected by ICFA and SIOFA co-financing and their</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   | <p>agreements (expressed at the 9/11 UNDOALOS workshop on impacts of bottom fishing on VMEs and deep sea fish stocks sustainability) is instrumental in the proposed project and should be articulated. Pilots with ICFA and SIOFA should be tested. For example operationalizing the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement, which includes essential BD deep sea habitats and species protection measures, and RBM to be tested with ICFA or SIOFA or SEAFO or a combination of thereof. This project will need a managerial committee which should include FAO, representatives of RFMOs/countries and industry, UNEP, and GEF.</p> <p>Please move the implementing and executing agencies section, from B5 to the end of B2, as well as the deep sea RFMOs and SOFIA and ICFA which are co-funding and are instrumental actors.</p> <p>[3/29/12] The proposed activities are better based on incremental reasoning. Operational purposes are now better highlighted to address issues of baseline situation. It is noted that VMEs and EBSAs are still at a nascent stage.</p> |  |
|  | <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> | <p>Please refer to comments in section 14 of the PFD review. Overall, and in consistency with: the PFD and proposed projects of which the focus is on sustainable management of high/deep seas fisheries ecosystems and conservation of BD vulnerable deep ecosystems and species, using available</p>  |  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>priority VMEs and EBSAs) related to ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries and BD conservation management and scientifically-based decision:</p> <p>Output 1.1.2 GEF funding can not be allocated to: "development of improved tools such as identification keys for vulnerable deep-sea species; carrying out of data collection and stock assessments". These are already carried out by FAO, RFMOs, and industry, please indicate the name of the organisation which will carry these activities or delete.</p> <p>Output 1.2.1: to facilitate deep sea RFMOs' conservation responsibilities, should harmonization and simplification of guidelines to make them more implementable and enable their enforcement be the output versus more analysis that are not going to produce results?</p> <p>To better reflect the emphasis on conservation, versus EIAs development and implementation which is outside the mandate of GEF, component 2 should be reworked to focus on coordination and implementation of conservation measures in pilot VMEs and EBSAs. This is already carried out by some RFMOs and industry associations and needs to be made more operational.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1:"Improved methodologies: (i) for better use of existing identification criteria concerning VMEs and EBSAs are developed, disseminated and used for guiding management" is redundant w/ what is proposed in 1.2.1 and does not adhere to the principles of working with already</p> |  |
|--|---|--|



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>proposed by countries and ABNJ program.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3 Protocols and management responses for mitigating impacts with VMEs are clarified and facilitated. This falls under the responsibility of governments, please indicate the name of the organisation which will carry these activities or delete.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2 Countries and industry should be the drivers of this network with support of others</p> <p>Output 3.1.1 Please qualify which aspects of management would be improved</p> <p>Output 3.1.2 Impacts and risks are known and EAF are the responsibilities of polluters. Please indicate the name of the organisation which will carry these activities or delete.</p> <p>3.1.3 "Improved information/data, plus available international databases [such as OBIS and others] used in decision-making processes of the competent authorities in the two regions". Please rephrase to indicate that available data will be used and include CoML data.</p> <p>Output 3.1.4 "EBSA training manuals are used as regional training aids to help proper collection/processing of ecological information" This is the baseline of other organisations. Please indicate the name of the organisation which will carry these activities or delete.</p> <p>Output 3.2.1 Focus should be on application and evaluation versus improved methodologies</p> <p>Output 3.3.5 As referred above, focus should be on alternative management</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>the organisation which will carry these EAF or delete.</p> <p>Output 4.1.2 - This output should specifically state in the framework and text that it will coordinate with Output 1.2.3 of the Global Coordination "Glue" PIF.</p> <p>Component 5 (M&amp;E) needs to comply with IW:LEARN, including allocating 1% of IW budget to IW:Learn activities. Please use the following language:</p> <p>For outcome - "... transmission of lessons learned via the IW: LEARN program (financed at 1 percent of the GEF IW Grant).</p> <p>For output - "...The project will establish a website with the IW:LEARN program to transmit lessons learned, report annual IW tracking tool, participate in IW conferences and workshops, and produce experience notes."</p> <p>[3/29/12] The project framework has been reworked and is now more clear and more consistent with the PFD. Most output-specific issues have been addressed as reflected in the provided response to review, including IW:Learn activities.</p> <p>However, please provide the specific improvement and expansion of tools in order to determine GEF eligibility: in reference to, "improvement/expansion of tools are therefore instrumental to facilitate improved knowledge base for</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | <p>addressing biodiversity concern." (Agency response to Box 14). Please adjust funding for objective accordingly.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please list several "competent authorities" as named in Expected Outcome 3.1 (e.g. RFMOs, etc).</li> <li>- With UNEP's background in area-based planning for ecosystem services, please change "Science-based advice" of Expected Output 4.2.2 to include not just science, but also economic, policy etc based advice to capture true area-based planning.</li> </ul> <p>[4/4/12] Please provide specific detailed information about the proposed tool above at time of CEO Endorsement bearing in mind that many of the activities proposed in the agency response (4/4/12) are the responsibility executing agencies and not eligible for GEF funding.</p> <p>Output 4.2.2. has been updated.</p> |  |
|  | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?   | Yes, applied methodology to address this global issue based on incremental reasoning of ongoing work in appropriate.   |  |
|  | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits? | Addressed  |  |
|  | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people. taken  | Addressed  |  |

|                   |   |  |  |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
|                   | identified and addressed properly?  |  |  |
|                   | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | <p>The risk on lack of sufficient scientific knowledge should be eliminated as the proposed project is not mandated to address that gap.</p> <p>[3/29/12] Justification for knowledge gap risk provided in agency response to review is understood and relevant.</p>   |  |
|                   | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?  | <p>Section B6</p> <p>Second para. should be rephrased to reflect that it will benefit from the results obtained by GOBI, CoML, OBIS, ISA, etc...</p> <p>Last para. Initial results of the seamounts work should be provided</p> <p>[3/29/12] Wording about initial results of seamounts have been adequately provided.</p> |  |
|                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?  | Addressed  |  |
|                   | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?  |  |  |
|                   | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?  |  |  |
|                   | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?   | Yes, project management is 5% of GEF grant.  |  |
| Project Financing |   |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>  | <p>The co-financing for Component 4 is too low (with a ratio of approximately 1:1.35) relative to the overall project co-financing. Please adjust.</p> <p>[3/29/12] Additional in-kind cofinancing has been named by UNEP-WCMC for \$4M. Please specify at CEO Endorsement.</p>  |  |
|  | <p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br/>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p> | <p>Please refer to comments in section 22 of the PFD review. As indicated in the review of the PFD, co-financing should be increased to reflect a 1:4 ratio or the GEF contribution can be reduced accordingly. At present, co-financing is 1:3.78. Can co-financing for Component 4 be increased? Is SEAFO co-financing available?</p> <p>[3/29/12] It is noted that over \$5M of the cofinancing type is listed as unknown at this stage. Please be sure to specify at CEO Endorsement.</p>  |  |
|  | <p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>                          | <p>Please elaborate on FAO's grant sources in Section C.1 - specifically on the breakdown of the \$14,900,000 per co-financing type. Further, C.1. specifies that UNEP is providing both in-kind and grant co-financing, but Table C only shows \$4,000,000 of in-kind and no grant. Please correct accordingly.</p> <p>[3/29/12] Only 6% (1.7 out of 29.6) of the total cofinancing is being provided as grant. It would be to the project's benefit if more cash resources were invested in this ambitious proposal. Please explore additional cash cofinancing for these activities during project preparation.</p> |  |

|                                   |  |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                   |  | [4/4/12] Noted that additional cash cofinancing will be explored prior to CEO Endorsement.  |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? |   |  |
|                                   | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?  |   |  |
| Agency Responses                  | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:  |   |  |
|                                   | • STAP?  |   |  |
|                                   | • Convention Secretariat?  |   |  |
|                                   | • Council comments?  |   |  |
|                                   | • Other GEF Agencies?  |   |  |
| Secretariat Recommendation        |  |   |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage       | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>  | <p>[9/22/11] No, PIF is not being recommended at this time. Please address issues raised above and be sure to fill in the GEF ID in the project identification box.</p> <p>[3/29/12] The PIF will be recommended upon addressing the remaining issues.</p> <p>1) Please provide specific information about "improvement/expansion of tools are therefore instrumental to facilitate improved knowledge base for improved management of fisheries and addressing biodiversity concern."</p> <p>2) It is noted that there is a limited amount of reliable and relevant information to formulate DSF management practices, including limited species lists in certain regions.</p> |  |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   | <p>knowledge gap must be financed by other partners (e.g. the EAF-Nasen project) because it's not eligible for GEF funding. Please adjust funding for objective accordingly.</p> <p>3) - Please list several "competent authorities" as named in Expected Outcome 3.1 (e.g. RFMOs, etc).</p> <p>4) With UNEP's background in area-based planning for ecosystem services, please change "Science-based advice" of Expected Output 4.2.2 to include not just science, but also economic, policy etc based advice to capture true area-based planning.</p> <p>[4/4/12] Yes, the PIF is being recommended at this time with the understanding that the issues noted in the review above will be taken into consideration at time of CEO Endorsement -</p> |  |
|  | <p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p> | <p>September 22, 2011</p> <p>The project framework in the PIF identifies a number of important outcomes that this project will achieve with regards to improved management of deep-sea fisheries and biodiversity (outcome 1.1, outcome 3.2). The PIF also identifies BD-1, outcome 1.1 as one FA outcome the project will contribute to: "improved management effectiveness of 4300M hectares and two new protected areas". By the time of CEO endorsement, please develop explicit biological status indicators for measuring improved management of</p>  |  |

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>addition, given the that current Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) is not geared towards ABNJ or marine areas in general, we encourage the project proponents to develop an appropriate and simple tool that identifies the key aspects of management effectiveness that will be measured with a scorecard ala the METT. The GEFSEC will work with FAO and UNEP to develop this tool.</p> <p>[4/4/12] Please also note issues raised in above review for consideration at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |   |  |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |   |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | September 22, 2011  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | March 29, 2012  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | April 04, 2012  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |   |  |

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points   | Program Manager Comments |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------|
| PPG Budget      | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? |                          |
|                 | 2. Is itemized budget justified?                                    |                          |
| Secretariat     | <b>3. Is PPG approval being</b>                                     |                          |



|                 |                                  |  |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                 | 4. Other comments                |  |
| Review Date (s) | First review*                    |  |
|                 | Additional review (as necessary) |  |

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.