

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: April 13, 2012

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4660

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : 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 AGENCIES: FAO and UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: IUCN, CPPS, East African Seas Regional Coordinating Unit

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

FINAL VERSION FOR TOM TO REVIEW

1. The proposed project is one of the suite of projects identified within the Program ABNJ Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (GEF ID 4580). STAP welcomes that the project supports implementation of the 2008 Deep Sea Fisheries Guideline that is part of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, as the Code represents a valuable international soft law instrument that arose as action out of the 1992 Rio Conference. The present PIF is clearly written, summarizes the main threats and STAP commends the proponents for the major revisions and improvements that have been accomplished since the first draft was circulated alongside the parent program document.

2. STAP nevertheless has scientific and technical grounds for concern remaining which were first raised in its screening report on the Program proposed, and which should be addressed by the proponents within their forthcoming full project brief. These concerns, in summary, focus on three areas:

i) that the Program and its child projects do not address adequately market-driven pressure on deep sea fisheries and on vulnerable marine areas;

ii) management interventions to be explored could make better and more explicit use of the relevant article and instruments of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (such as the 2008 Deep Sea Fisheries Guidelines and technical guidelines for the ecosystem approach to fisheries); and

iii) threats other than fishing pressure such as oil and gas extraction, optic fiber cable laying and deep-sea mining are not considered further after first mention. Further detail about STAP's concerns and suggestions for revision are given below.

Context of the project

3. STAP understands that the present project is intended to address the (lack of) sustainability of the supply side of ABNJ fisheries by improving availability of various tools to competent authorities, including Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs), thus raising awareness on a global basis of the state of the knowledgebase on vulnerable marine ecosystems, their associated species and available relevant policies. The hypothesis advanced

regarding the global environmental benefit (GEB) is that making more widely available and critically reviewing existing policy and legal frameworks will result in more sustainable deep sea fisheries and better conservation of ABNJ. STAP questions whether this will be the case without significant consultation, dialogue and practical adaption to the deep sea contexts in question of the existing policy and legal frameworks. STAP requests that quantifiable targets be developed to demonstrate that GEBs result from this project. At present the GEB narrative for each project Component is vaguely worded and over-ambitious.

i) market-related drivers

4. In its screening report on the Program STAP requested minor revision to address the major conceptual weakness of the Program and therefore of its child projects regarding the lack of a documented model of how fisheries governance, including Rights Based Management (RBM), is expected to work at different levels (regional, national and subnational) from both the economic and political economy perspectives. Additionally the Program and associated PIFs address the issue of fisheries management primarily from the supply side of the market, and yet the market demand side is a major driver of all the ABNJ fisheries, with increasing pressure caused by the overfished state of many fisheries within national borders.

STAP requests that the proponents clarify how the project will be integrated and interact with other efforts intended to address the issues of the demand side of the market for ABNJ fisheries by reducing global demand for these products? The PIF mentions that efforts addressing market incentives through the development of international Guidelines for the Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine Capture Fisheries will also benefit the project, but this would appear to be a passive linkage not clearly connected to RBM for example. Although the Port State Measures Agreement is mentioned in passing, this would seem to be a potentially powerful tool for deep sea fisheries as most of the product is high value and therefore landed in specific ports that could require catch certifications or similar. This would be an avenue through which market supply could be monitored.

ii) Management interventions

5. Component 1 of the project addresses pilot testing of locally agreed variations on implementation of international instruments and this section also mentions testing of options for RBM and market-based incentives. However, the resulting "model legal and policy frameworks" do not appear to be conditioned by science as accepted good practice would require. In particular, Component 1 does not mention the need to base any management/ policy measure upon knowledge of the resource base (or lack of it) to be developed through Component 2. It would be more logical to use Component 2 to establish more clearly by "ground-truthing" the policy / legal framework deficit to be addressed by Component 1.

6. The proposal proponents may wish to reconsider making more explicit and comprehensive use of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries articles and the guidance in the Deep Sea Fisheries Guidelines and those for the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries. These instruments embody all the principles also from the WSSD and CBD decisions and should provide a more coherent framework for the project than it now has. They also provide sound concepts in terms of fisheries management, fishing operations, research, data and integrated approaches. Several of the Code and other concepts are scattered through the Components of the current PIF but not linked together in a coherent way.

iii) Threats and mitigation of risks

7. The parent Program document and this child PIF briefly mention threats other than fishing; the PIF is silent about the interaction of the proposed project interventions with the sectors that give rise to the other threats. STAP, however, recognizes that the project is already very complex and ambitious regarding goals to be achieved but expects that the proponents would at least describe how such threats would be considered within the work outline of Components 2 (reducing adverse impacts) and 4 (area-based planning) and fed back to condition the work in Component 1 (policy and legal frameworks) in order to realize the hoped for sustainability of fishing and conservation of biodiversity in ABNJ.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed

revision required.	<p>with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>