**Annex B - GEF 7 Core Indicators Worksheet**

*Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, item E to the extent applicable to your proposed program. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Indicator 1** | **Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use** | | | | | | | | | ***(Hectares)*** |
|  |  | | | | | *Hectares (1.1+1.2)* | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | *Expected* | | | Achieved | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 1.1 | Terrestrial protected areas newly created | | | | | | | | |  |
| Name of Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN category | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Sum | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2 | Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness | | | | | | | | |  |
| Name of Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN category | | Hectares | | METT Score | | | | |
| Baseline | | | Achieved | |
|  | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Sum |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 2** | **Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use** | | | | | | | | | ***(Hectares)*** |
|  |  | | | | | Hectares (2.1+2.2) | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | Expected | | | Achieved | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | *TE* |
|  | Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) | | | | | *12 million* |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 2.1 | Marine protected areas newly created | | | | | | | | |  |
| Name of Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN category | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
| Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs |  |  | | | | *11 million* |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Sum | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2 | Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness | | | | | | | | |  |
| Name of Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN category | | | Hectares | METT Score | | | | |
| Baseline | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
| Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) |  |  | | |  | *1 million* |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Sum | | |  |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 3** | **Area of land restored** | | | | | | | | | ***(Hectares)*** |
|  |  | | | | | Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4) | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | Expected | | | Achieved | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 3.1 | Area of degraded agricultural land restored | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2 | Area of forest and forest land restored | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3 | Area of natural grass and shrublands restored | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 3.4 | Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 4** | **Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)** | | | | | | | | | ***(Hectares)*** |
|  |  | | | | | Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4) | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | Expected | | | Expected | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 4.1 | Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2 | Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations | | | | | | | | |  |
| Third party certification(s): | | | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3 | Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 4.4 | Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided | | | | | | | | |  |
| Include documentation that justifies HCVF | | | | | | Hectares | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 5** | **Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity** | | | | | | | | | ***(Hectares)*** |
|  | See additional information below. | | | | | | | | | *3,885 million* |
| Indicator 5.1 | Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations | | | | | | | | |  |
| Third party certification(s): | | | | | | Number | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 5.2 | Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Number | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 5.3 | Amount of Marine Litter Avoided | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | Metric Tons | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 6** | **Greenhouse gas emission mitigated** | | | | | | | | | ***(Tons)*** |
|  |  | | | | | Expected metric tons of CO₂e (6.1+6.2) | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | MTR | | TE |
|  | Expected CO2e (direct) | | | | |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Expected CO2e (indirect) | | | | |  |  |  | |  |
| Indicator 6.1 | Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector | | | | | | |  | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Expected metric tons of CO₂e | | | | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  | Expected CO2e (direct) | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | Expected CO2e (indirect) | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | Anticipated start year of accounting | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | Duration of accounting | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 6.2 | Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Expected metric tons of CO₂e | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  | Expected CO2e (direct) | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | Expected CO2e (indirect) | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | Anticipated start year of accounting | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | Duration of accounting | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 6.3 | Energy saved | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | MJ | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 6.4 | Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Technology | | | | Capacity (MW) | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 7** | **Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management** | | | | | | | | | ***(Number)*** |
|  | See additional information below. | | | | | | | | | *2* |
| Indicator 7.1 | Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Shared water ecosystem | | | | Rating (scale 1-4) | | | | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 7.2 | Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Shared water ecosystem | | | | Rating (scale 1-4) | | | | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | Pacific Islands Region | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Nairobi Convention (Western Indian Ocean) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Abidjan Convention (Atlantic Coast of the West, Central and Southern Africa Region) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) (Southeast Pacific) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 7.3 | Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Shared water ecosystem | | | | Rating (scale 1-4) | | | | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | Pacific Islands Region/Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Nairobi Convention (Western Indian Ocean) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Abidjan Convention (Atlantic Coast of the West, Central and Southern Africa Region) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) (Southeast Pacific) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Bay of Bengal | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Caribbean | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 7.4 | Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Shared water ecosystem | | | | Rating (scale 1-4) | | | | |
| Rating | | | Rating | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | Pacific Islands Region/Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Nairobi Convention (Western Indian Ocean) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Abidjan Convention (Atlantic Coast of the West, Central and Southern Africa Region) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) (Southeast Pacific) | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Bay of Bengal | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Caribbean | | | | *1* |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 8** | **Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels** | | | | | | | | | ***(Tons)*** |
| Fishery Details  Tuna and deep sea fisheries. See additional information below. | | | | | | Metric Tons | | | | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
| *943,000* |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 9** | **Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products** | | | | | | | | | ***(Tons)*** |
|  |  | | | | | Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3) | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | Expected | | | Achieved | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | PIF stage | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 9.1 | Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type) | | | | | | | | |  |
| POPs type | | | | | | Metric Tons | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 9.2 | Quantity of mercury reduced | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Metric Tons | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 9.3 | Hydrochloroflurocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | Metric Tons | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | Expected | | | Achieved | |
|  |  | | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 9.4 | Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Number of Countries | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 9.5 | Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | Technology | | | | Number | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 9.6 | Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | Metric Tons | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | Expected | | | Achieved | |
|  |  |  | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | PIF stage | Endorsement |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 10** | **Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources** | | | | | | | | | ***(Grams)*** |
| Indicator 10.1 | Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Number of Countries | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| Indicator 10.2 | Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented | | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  | | | | Number | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
| PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | | | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Core Indicator 11** | **Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment** | | | | | | | | | ***(Number)*** |
|  |  |  | | | | Number | | | | |
| Expected | | | Achieved | |
|  |  |  | | | | PIF stage | Endorsement | | MTR | TE |
|  |  | Female | | | | *12,168* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | Male | | | | *14,292* |  | |  |  |
|  |  | *Total* | | | | *26,460* |  | |  |  |

**Core Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use**

Deep Sea Fisheries Project:

**Core indicator 2: Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use** is estimated at 25% of current VME closed areas, which equals 120 000 km2 (or 12 million hectares).

MPAs are area based management tools (ABMT) and have many definitions. The one used to assess progress towards the SDG 14.5 and Aichi 11 is that proposed by IUCN having biodiversity as the principal focus and is long-term. FAO has a broader definition that is any area affording more protection that the area outside. The Deep Sea Fisheries Project adopts an intermediate view and includes VMEs (that are closed to protect biodiversity from bottom fishing[[1]](#footnote-1) impacts) as MPA/ABMTs for the purpose of the project. This project will strive to have VMEs more widely recognized as MPA/ABMTs.

The table under Indicator 5 provides estimates of VME areas with current management measures (closures to bottom fishing in almost all cases). Expert judgement has been used in some areas. No estimate could be made for the South Pacific as SPRFMO does not separately identify and manage VMEs outside of the permitted bottom fishing area; no VMEs have been identified within their bottom fishing footprint.

**Core Indicator 5: Area of marine habitat under improved practices**

Deep Sea Fisheries Project:

**Core indicator 5:** Area of **marine habitat under improved practices** (excluding protected areas) is estimated as 25% of area outside of the fishing footprint used in core indicator table, which equals 32 million km2 (or 3,200 million hectares).

The following table shows the areas and percentages of adopted bottom fisheries management areas in the high seas. Owing to difficulties in acquiring some values, the table may not be accurate in all cases and percentages do not always add up to 100%.

This will support SDG 14.2 by protecting ecosystems from significant adverse impacts both within the fishing footprint and outside the fishing footprint.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region (management body) | High seas (or regulatory) area (km2) | Seafloor above 2000 m | Bottom fishing footprint (km2) | Outside of footprint (km2) | VMEs (km2) | VMEs (number) |
| NW Atlantic (NAFO) | 2,707,895 | 140,000 (5%) | 119,809 (4%) | 2,253,725 (%) | 282,320 (10%) | 21 |
| NE Atlantic (NEAFC) | 5,188,000 | 473,000 (9%) | 162,451 (3%) | 4,650,737 (90%) | 374,812 (7%) | 13 |
| Central Atlantic | 17,752,000 | 61,000 (0.3%) | - | - | - | 0 |
| SW Atlantic | 10,315,000 | 188,000 (2%) | - | - | - | 0 |
| SE Atlantic (SEAFO) | 15,627,000 | 174,000 (1%) | 543,193 (4%) | 14,646,380 (94%) | 503,815 (3%) | 12 |
| Mediterranean (GFCM) | 2,997,000 | 1,480,000 (49%) | 1,949,341 (65%) | 1,032,000 (34%) | 15,659 (0.5%) |  |
| North Pacific (NPFC) | 35,491,000 | 1,520,000 (4%) | 6,048 (0%) | 35,484,406 (100%) | 546 (0.0%) | 2 |
| South Pacific (SPRFMO) | 59,186,581 | 648,000 (1%) | 198,363 (0.3%) | 55,088,294 (93%) | - | ? |
| Indian Ocean (SIOFA) | 26,933,232 | 515,000 (2%) | - | - | 25,148 (0.1%) | 5 |
| Southern (CCAMLR) | 35,550,604 | 2,975,000 (8%) | 19,975,679 (56%) | 14,972,373 (42%) | 3,222 (0%) | 129 |

- means no measure taken.

area (usually shallower than 2000 m) where bottom fishing is permitted (commonly referred to as the bottom fishing footprint). Bottom fishing is only allowed outside of this area under strict exploratory fishing protocols to ensure that VMEs are identified and protected. This project includes these “outside” areas in this GEF-7 core indicator category.

Sargasso Sea Project:

**Core indicator 5:** Area of **marine habitat under improved practices** (excluding protected areas) expected at PIF is 685 million hectares.

The project will address a number of the SDG 14 targets and indicators as follows:

14.1 Steps will be taken to try and minimize ship-based pollution within the Sargasso Sea.

14.2 The project objective will be to protect the Sargasso Sea to avoid any significant adverse impacts and support a healthy and sustainable ocean through a process of monitoring and stewardship.

14.3 Improved understanding of the impacts of climate change, including ocean acidification, through an on-going time series of measurements at a suite of sampling stations throughout the area

14.4 Collaboration with SSC partners and particularly the appropriate existing and mandated regional bodies in measures designed to regulate and eliminate IUU fishing and other destructive fishing practices and to promote a more effective science-based management approach

14.5 Contribute to the global conservation of 10 percent of marine areas consistent with international law and based on best available scientific evidence

14.7 Increase the economic benefits to Small Island Developing States (i.e. Dominican Republic, Bahamas, Haiti) and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism which depends on the Sargasso Sea ecosystem and the species it supports.

14.7c Implementing international law as reflected in UNCLOS, which provides the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources, as recalled in paragraph 158 of The Future We Want (i.e. piloting governance mechanisms for ABNJ).

Furthermore, the Project will address Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 by contributing to the requirement that 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures.

**Indicator 7: Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management**

Cross-sectoral Project:

**Core indicator 7: Number of shared water ecosystems** (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management. 2

During the PPG process and following consultation with partners and candidate regional entities, we will consider the selection of two regions for special attention in the project.

The regions under consideration are Pacific Islands Region/Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), Nairobi Convention (Western Indian Ocean), Abidjan Convention (Atlantic Coast of the West, Central and Southern Africa Region), Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) (Southeast Pacific), Bay of Bengal, and the Caribbean region.

**Indicator 7.2 Level of Regional Legal Agreement and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation**

No regional legal agreement, or neither institutional framework nor RMI in place - for the Cross-Sectoral Project, we take this to mean a new regional cross-sectoral mechanism on ABNJ. We are targeting to achieve a rating of 1.5 meaning that capacity is built to develop a new regional cross-sectoral mechanism in ABNJ by the end of the project for 2-3 regions to be decided during the PPG phase.

**Indicator 7.3 Level of National/Local Reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees**

Neither national/local reforms nor IMCs - for the Cross-Sectoral Project, we take this to mean any new cross-sectoral mechanism developed at the national level, including Inter-Ministerial Committees on ABNJ. We are targeting to achieve a rating 1.5 meaning capacity is built to develop any new national cross-sectoral mechanism for ABNJ by the end of the project for 2 regions to be decided during the PPG phase.

**Core indicator 8: Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons)**

Tuna Project:

**Core indicator 8:** Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons) expected at PIF stage is 893,000 metric tonnes.

As baseline, by the end of 2019, from the 23 commercial tuna stocks monitored, annual catch totaling  4,034,000 mt (83% of the total) was made from 18 stocks being fished at levels which assure healthy abundance, while 893,000 mt annual catch (17% of the total) was made from 5 stocks being overexploited. As a target, further improvement in catch tonnage of at least 893,000 mt per annum can be achieved through more sustainable management practices allowing rebuilding of overexploited stocks to healthy abundance.

Deep Sea Fisheries Project:

**Core indicator 8:** Globally over-exploited **marine fisheries** moved to more sustainable levels is estimated as 25% of 2016 catch used in the core indicator table, which is approximately 50,000 metric tons.

The FAO publication, State of the World Fisheries and Aquaculture (SOFIA) (<http://www.fao.org/3/I9540EN/i9540en.pdf>, p. 41) lists the percentage of fish stocks at biological sustainable levels by region in 2015. Many of the deep-sea stocks lack assessments and are data-limited, meaning that there is insufficient information to include them in the SOFIA sustainability estimates. The GEF-5 Deep-seas project estimated that the stock status of around 50% of the fished deep-sea stocks is unknown. This does not necessarily mean that the stock is unsustainably fished, rather that it is difficult to make a valid assessment. The project will improve knowledge of fishing pressures and stock status for deep-sea stocks. Progress towards SDG 14.4 and Aichi 6 is very difficult to currently assess for DSF.

An initial baseline study undertaken in February 2020 provided the following assessments (source: RFMO websites and expert judgement):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region  (management body) | Biomass | | | | Exploitation rate (fishing pressure) | | | | Stock measure  (TAC or effort control) | | Number of deep-sea stocks assessed |
| Low to depleted | Intermediate | *c*. MSY levels | Unknown | Unsustainable | Intermediate | Sustainable | Unknown | No | Yes |
| NW Atlantic (NAFO) | 7 | 1 | 8 |  |  | 1 | 15 |  | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| NE Atlantic (NEAFC) | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Central Atlantic |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| SW Atlantic |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  | 6 |
| SE Atlantic (SEAFO) | 1 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Mediterranean (GFCM) | 18 |  |  |  | 10 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 18 |  | 18 |
| North Pacific (NPFC) |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| South Pacific (SPRFMO) |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Indian Ocean (SIOFA) |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Southern Ocean (CCAMLR) |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 | 6 |

It is expected that much of this will come from the data-limited stocks that comprise around 50% of the fisheries.

Expected changes by 2027 (at end of project):

Biomass: 50% of “unknowns” become known and 25% of other stocks shift up one category.

Exploitation rate: 50% of “unknowns” become known and 25% of overexploited stocks move to being fished at intermediate or sustainable levels.

Stock measures: 50% of deep-sea species go from the “No” to “Yes” stock measure category.

**Core indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment**

Tuna Project:

**Core indicator 11:** Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment: 4,000 women and 6,000 men

Based on a recent study of the tuna sector (McCluney et.al., 2019, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09466-6 ), the potentially largest direct benefits attributable to improvements in sustanible tuna harvesting can accrue to participants in the post-harvest sector, including those in developing cosatal countries, since the study found value chains able to preserve quality and transport fish to high value markets outperform others. However, the numbers of indirect beneficiaries is much larger since well managed tuna fisheries have the potential to sustain the livelihoods of hundreds of millions of people, and support the communities who depend on them.

Deep Sea Fisheries Project:

**Core indicator 11:** Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment: 500 women and1,500 men

SOFIA[[2]](#footnote-2) included a national gender analysis for six countries in 2016, which was expanded slightly in 2018. Gender analyses has not been systematically undertaken for DSF. The current project will undertake a gender analysis as part of a supply chain analysis and identify gender-related needs. The project will also provide positive-action support and training to selected suitably-qualified women from GEF-eligible countries who wish to work in RFMO or national science, management and compliance activities.

Cross-sectoral Project:

**Core indicator 11:** Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment: 1,750 women and 1,750 men

For the Cross-Sectoral Project, we assume 500 participants from Outcome 1.1; 500 participants from Outcome 2.1; 500 participants from Outcome 2.2; 2,000 participants from Outcome 2.3 (media event and online self-paced training) = 3,500 participants

Sargasso Sea Project:

**Core indicator 11:** Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment: 4,718 women and 3,842 men

Global Coordination Project:

**Core indicator 11:** Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment: 1,200 women and 1,200 men

1. For consistency with RFMO terminology, DSF are referred to as bottom fisheries in Annex 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. SOFIA 2016: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5555e.pdf>, SOFIA 2018: <http://www.fao.org/3/I9540EN/i9540en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)