



**Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations**



**Report of the  
Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction Deep Seas Project  
Third Project Steering Committee Meeting**

**17–18 April 2018 • Cambridge, United Kingdom**

**ABNJ Deep Seas Project**

**Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of Deep-sea Living Marine  
Resources and Ecosystems in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction**



**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Report of the  
Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction Deep Seas Project  
Third Project Steering Committee Meeting  
17–18 April 2018 • Cambridge, United Kingdom

ABNJ Deep Seas Project  
Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of Deep-sea Living Marine  
Resources and Ecosystems in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2019



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition.

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## Contents

<b>1. Opening of the meeting .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Background – the ABNJ Deep Seas Project.....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1. <i>Overview of the project.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<b>3. Project implementation status and project activities .....</b>	<b>1</b>
3.1. <i>Project activities .....</i>	<i>1</i>
3.2. <i>Mid-term Review.....</i>	<i>3</i>
3.3. <i>Proposed 2018–2019 work plan .....</i>	<i>4</i>
3.4. <i>Matters relating to project implementation .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>4. Any other business.....</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1. <i>Timing and location of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the PSC.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>5. Adoption of meeting conclusions.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Appendix 1 Meeting participants .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appendix 2 Agenda.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix 3 Main findings: Mid Term Review of “Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of deep-sea living marine resources and ecosystems in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction” .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix 4 2018-2019 work plan .....</b>	<b>11</b>

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ABNJ	Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
ABP	Area-Based Planning	MPA	Marine Protected Area
BBNJ	Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction	NAFO	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity	NEAFC	North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission
CCAMLR	Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources	NPFC	North Pacific Fisheries Commission
CECAF	Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic	NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
COFI	Committee on Fisheries	OPP	Ocean Partnerships Project
CCRF	Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries	PIR	Project Implementation Review
CPPS	Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (Permanent Commission for the South Pacific)	PMU	Project Management Unit
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Organization (Australia)	PPR	Project Progress Report
EAF	Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries	PSC	Project Steering Committee
EBSA	Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area	PSMA	Port State Measures Agreement
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone	RFMO/A	Regional Fisheries Management Organizations or Arrangements
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	RSN	Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network
GFCM	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean	RSP	Regional Seas Programme
GOBI	Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative	SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
GOF	Global Ocean Forum	SEAFO	South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation
ICFA	International Coalition of Fisheries Associations	SIOFA	Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement
IGO	Inter Governmental Organization	SIODFA	Southern Indian Ocean Deep-sea Fishers Association
IMO	International Maritime Organization	SPRFMO	South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission	UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
ISA	International Seabed Authority	UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature	UNEP-WCMC	UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre
IUCN-FEG	IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management Fisheries Expert Group	UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated	UNFSA	United Nations Fish Stock Agreement
LTO	Lead Technical Officer	VME	Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance	WOC	World Ocean Council
MDG	Millennium Development Goals	WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The third Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting of the ABNJ Deep Seas Project was held at WCMC headquarters in Cambridge, United Kingdom from 17–18 April 2018. The meeting was attended by representatives of 13 project partners, including the FAO and UNEP-WCMC.

The primary objective of this PSC meeting was to discuss the results of the Mid-Term Review (MTR), which covered the time period from the project start date to December 2017. As a result of the review recommendations and of discussions at the third PSC, some project activities were removed or merged with others to ensure timely completion of the project by the anticipated end-date for project activities (31 August 2019), with administrative closure by the end of the year. The PSC noted with concern the extensive delay in project implementation due to staff changes at both FAO and WCMC, and the administrative barriers causing delays in the hiring of the first Project Coordinator, and then the subsequent replacement. As a result, the project achieved around a quarter of planned activities by the mid-term review, and the challenge of completing all activities within the next year to project end.

During the presentation of the 2018-2019 workplan, and in consideration of the MTR recommendations, the PSC identified specific activities that could be removed (because they were either repetitions or determined to be outside the scope of the project) or merged with other activities, thus slightly shortening the workplan. Upon conclusion of the meeting, the FAO agreed to undertake a budget revision to allocate these funds where needed.

FAO and WCMC noted planned and upcoming activities of relevance to the project, including a number of workshops with pilot areas, and the engagement of a number of consultants for project activities (e.g. traceability, rights-based management, and monitoring, control, and surveillance), briefed the PSC on their respective plans of work and obtained feedback from the PSC on what is being proposed. This was a productive interaction which also enabled the consultants to signal to prospective partners, in particular the deep-sea fisheries management bodies, what requirements the proposed work will have of them.

The PSC endorsed the 2018-2019 work plan; and requested that a budget revision be presented at PSC4.

The PSC noted the various monitoring and evaluation activities being implemented by the PMU and agreed to the methods used by the PMU to estimate and present progress as it relates to outputs.

The PSC encouraged the PMU to produce a range of e-communication materials that highlight the major achievements of the Project for partners to distribute through their networks; and hard copy materials that can be distributed at various major events in 2018 and 2019.

The PSC agreed to hold its 4<sup>th</sup> meeting at the end of January 2019 in La Réunion.

---

---

## 1. Opening of the meeting

1. The third meeting of the ABNJ Deep Seas Project Steering Committee (PSC) was held at UNEP-WCMC headquarters in Cambridge, United Kingdom from 17–18 April 2018. The meeting was attended by representatives of 13 project partners, some of whom participated through remote connection. The list of the participants is attached as Appendix 1.
2. The meeting was opened by Ms Pamela Abbott (UNEP-WCMC), who welcomed participants. The PSC elected Mr Steve Fletcher (UNEP-WCMC) as Chair. Ms Jackie Alder welcomed the participants on behalf of the FAO, and noted the importance of this project to showcase regional partnerships that will influence the ongoing discussions on Sustainable Development Goal 14.
3. After a round of introductions, the meeting adopted the Agenda (Appendix 2).

## 2. Background – the ABNJ Deep Seas Project

### 2.1. Overview of the project

4. Mr Hassan Moustahfid (FAO) gave an overview of components 1-3 of the ABNJ Deep Seas Project and recalled the relationships between the project and other FAO initiatives and the ABNJ Programme. He highlighted the major contributions made by the Norway-funded Deep-seas Fisheries Project, now ended, and the ongoing Japan-funded project and the EC-funded Horizon 2020 SponGES project, which also links some key development activities for the study of deep-sea sponges in the Atlantic. In particular, the latter is sharing an activity with the ABNJ Deep Seas Project on developing a methodology for a deep-sea sponges valuation study.

## 3. Project implementation status and project activities

### 3.1. Project activities

5. The ABNJ Deep Seas Project provided updates to ongoing activities for Components 1-3 on: traceability and catch-documentation schemes; monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS); ecosystem services and the linkages with the SponGES project; climate-change and deep-sea fisheries; the update to the *Worldwide Review of Bottom Fisheries in the High Seas*; and key activities under Component 4.
6. Mr Graham Patchell provided an update from the work of Sealord and SIOFA, which included: a workshop in Rome in February 2017 on orange roughy acoustic data; a biomass estimation for orange roughy in SIOFA was produced in January 2018; an observer-training programme for Pacific Islanders licensed for the Cook Islands, and this included cross-credited certification for tuna observation; a stock assessment for orange roughy is planned under SIOFA.
7. The recently completed traceability work on catch documentation schemes (CDS) looks at best practices in market-based incentives for deep-sea fisheries. While similar work has already been done for certain tuna fisheries, the subject has not been developed to the same extent for deep-sea fisheries. While there are advantages to developing a super-CDS for deep-sea fisheries, it will be necessary to consider CDS operation and compliance burdens related to implementation.
8. The ongoing work with MCS and deep-sea fisheries was presented, along with the soon-to-be-published paper that reviews the legal frameworks for MCS in the deep-sea RFMOs. A consultant has been retained to organize and implement an MCS workshop in December 2018 with member countries of the two pilot areas: SEAFO and SIOFA, which will showcase best practice in MCS implementation, and develop an action plan for the pilot areas to further progress their MCS capacities.
9. The ongoing work on deep-sea ecosystem services, and its linkages to the SponGES project, was presented and it was noted that this linkage aims to consolidate and analyse existing socio-



economic information on deep-sea fisheries and associated biodiversity. The ABNJ Deep Seas Project activity produced a scoping study on the economic valuation of deep-sea sponges, and this formed the baseline for the SponGES work on developing a methodology for conducting an economic valuation study of deep-sea sponges in the North Atlantic. Ultimately, the work will tie in with the Project's global focus, and address impacts and relevant issues with deep-sea fisheries.

10. The recently completed workshop on potential impacts of climate change on deep-sea ecosystems and the implications for the management of deep-sea fisheries was organized from 26-27 August 2017 in Woods Hole, USA. The workshop was held in collaboration with the Scripps Institution of Oceanography and the Deep-Ocean Stewardship Initiative Working Group on Climate Change. The aim of the workshop was to combine the climate change working group's expertise and access to relevant oceanographic, ecological, and biological data, with the specialised knowledge of fisheries experts from the bodies that manage deep-sea fisheries in the ABNJ, and produce a FAO Technical Paper on potential impacts of climate change on deep-sea ecosystems and the implications for the management of deep-sea fisheries. The Technical Paper will be published by the end of 2018.
11. The work to produce an updated review of the *Worldwide Review of Bottom Fisheries in the High Seas*, covering the historical fisheries and those from 2007-2014 is underway and the deep-sea RFMOs can expect to receive their respective chapters to review by the end of the summer. The report is expected to be completed by the end of 2018 and published in early 2019.
12. Under Component 4, Mr Steve Fletcher provided an update on the new management structure, and Ms Ruth Fletcher and Ms Nina Bhola provided updates on recently completed and upcoming activities.
13. A discussion was had about the need for global datasets and portals. It was clarified that the metadata database curated by UNEP-WCMC, which also supports work under this component, is on the global scale and aims to avoid duplicating efforts with other global databases (e.g. OBIS). UNEP-WCMC is in touch with IOC-UNESCO who support OBIS. The efforts to find and collect these datasets, and compile them into a common "list" involves the development of standardized metadata sheets for each dataset, that includes the user restrictions for each dataset.
14. Ms Juliette Martin (UNEP-WCMC) provided an update on the data management tools work being undertaken which support the work of Component 4. Key points include:
  - a. The issue of fragmented data for marine and coastal ecosystems – the Component 4 work aims to make data more accessible;
  - b. ODV is an interactive data portal from which a number of global datasets can be downloaded;
  - c. The **Ocean + Initiative** aims to contribute towards a step-change in global access to ocean and coastal biodiversity data;
  - d. **Ocean + Data** – previously this was referred to as the Ocean data manuals. This is library of metadata related to marine biodiversity datasets. Presently, a lot of data contained within is relevant to ABNJ.
  - e. **Ocean + Habitat Atlas** – is in development – the aim is to further develop five habitat datasets that users are interested in;
  - f. Currently, the focus for the data management tools is global
15. Ms Ruth Fletcher (UNEP-WCMC) provided an update on the connectivity work underway for Component 4. The work aims to inform pilot regions about connectivity and improve understanding of the linkages to ABNJ. Next steps for the work include:
  - a. Analysis of selected transboundary species in the pilot regions – work with Duke University to highlight specific species that they are working on as part of their MICO database;
  - b. Collation of case studies of relevance to each of the pilot areas;

- c. Some work suggested on primary productivity and oceanographic processes of regional significance;
  - d. Assessment on how connectivity can be incorporated into spatial planning approaches in ABNJ using pilot regions.
16. The Project also identified areas where it could be effective in facilitating or promoting common messages with deep-sea RFMOs: namely during the BBNJ discussions in New York, and the SOI Dialogues with the CBD. To this end, the Project is in the process of providing interesting and important results that could contribute to these discussions: namely the value of deep-sea ecosystems and the economic benefits provided by deep-sea fisheries. The PSC noted it was particularly important to consider how the Project can facilitate the linkages between the EBSA and VMEs processes, such as good practices in this regard, and how they can be made more relevant to decision-making processes.

### 3.2. Mid-term Review

17. Mr Nigel Varty was contracted by FAO to be the independent mid-term reviewer. He recently conducted the mid-term review (MTR) for the ABNJ Tuna Project.
18. The MTR reflects the project up to the end of 2017, assessing how the project is progressing towards the final outcomes. The PSC was provided with an executive summary of the MTR to review prior to the meeting that included highlights of the findings and recommendations. The following deadline were proposed for the next steps of the MTR process:
- a. Comments to be sent to the reviewer by 25 April for revisions;
  - b. A revised version of the MTR to be produced 3 May;
  - c. Further comments required by 13 May;
  - d. Report to be finalized by 19 May;
  - e. Report distributed by 20 May;
  - f. Follow-up recommendations from the report will be produced and shared with the GEF Secretariat.
19. Mr Varty summarized the findings of the MTR to the PSC, including the theory of change that was produced for the project. The area of focus of the review is defined by the GEF, and it includes assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, the potential impact and sustainability, project design, partnerships, and project management, among others. The main function of the MTR is to improve delivery and impact for the second half of the project. The final evaluation will begin six months before the end of the project and will have a more technical focus on the sustainability of the outcomes.
20. MTR was produced after a series of more than 30 semi-structured interviews with project staff and partners, followed a standard methodology recommended by the United Nations. The overall rating for the project at the mid-term point is “moderately satisfactory”. Key findings and conclusions are summarized in Appendix 3 and briefly reproduced here:
- a. Relevance – *satisfactory (finding 1.1)*
  - b. Delivery of activities and outputs – *moderately satisfactory (finding 2.1)*
  - c. Attainment of outcomes – *moderately satisfactory (finding 2.2)*
  - d. Efficiency – *moderately unsatisfactory (finding 3.1)*
  - e. Design and preparedness – *moderately satisfactory (finding 4.1)*
  - f. Project oversight – *moderately satisfactory (finding 4.3)*
  - g. Monitoring and evaluation – *moderately satisfactory (finding 4.4)*
  - h. Communications – *moderately satisfactory (finding 4.5)*

- 
- i. Partnerships and stakeholders – *satisfactory (finding 5.1)*
  - j. Sustainability – *moderately likely (finding 6.1)*
  - k. Catalysis and replication – *moderately satisfactory (finding 6.2)*
  - l. Progress to objective and impacts – *moderately unlikely (finding 7.1)*

### **3.3. Proposed 2018–2019 work plan**

- 21. Based on recommendations from the MTR, the PSC agreed to amend the project workplan to reflect the limited time remaining in the project. The updated 2018-2019 workplan is summarized in Appendix 3.

### **3.4. Matters relating to project implementation**

- 22. The PSC stressed the importance of the linkages between component activities, and noted that the ongoing good cooperation and harmonisation of the components between FAO and UNEP-WCMC was key to avoiding duplication of work and optimising the sharing and use of project knowledge and outputs.
- 23. The PSC requested that project activities, in the pilot areas, include to the extent possible, the full range of countries with an interest in fishing activities within the regional bodies concerned, including contracting parties, cooperating non-contracting parties, signatories (yet to ratify) and coastal states with waters under national jurisdictions that are adjacent to the ABNJ.

## **4. Any other business**

### **4.1. Timing and location of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the PSC**

- 24. The PSC agreed to hold its 4<sup>th</sup> meeting in late January 2019 in La Réunion.

## **5. Adoption of meeting conclusions**

- 25. The PSC agreed in principle to a range of amendments to the 2018-2019 Workplan before the end of the meeting. It was agreed that final adoption of the amendments would occur when the final report was reviewed and adopted by email.

## Appendix 1 Meeting participants



### List of Participants

#### CBD

##### **Jihyun Lee – REMOTE CONNECTION**

Environment Affairs Officer,  
Convention on Biological Diversity  
jihyun.lee@cbd.int

#### CPPS

##### **Méntor Villagómez – REMOTE CONNECTION**

Secretary General,  
Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur  
mvillagomez@cpps-int.org

##### **Agnes Inés Cosulich – REMOTE CONNECTION**

CPPS Coordinator  
Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur  
ines@cpps-int.org

##### **Fernando Félix – REMOTE CONNECTION**

Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur  
ffelix@cpps-int.org

#### GEF Secretariat

##### **Cyrille Frederic Marie Barnerias – REMOTE CONNECTION**

The Global Environment Facility  
cbarnerias@thegef.org

#### GRID-ARENDAL

##### **Miles MacMillan-Lawler**

Programme Leader Marine Spatial Planning,  
GRID-Arendal  
miles.macmillan-lawler@grida.no

#### FAO

##### **Jackie Alder**

FishCode Director  
ABNJ Programme Coordinator  
jacqueline.alder@fao.org

##### **Genevieve Braun – REMOTE CONNECTION**

TCID  
genevieve.braun@fao.org

##### **William Emerson**

ABNJ Deep Seas Project Coordinator  
william.emerson@fao.org

##### **Jessica Fuller**

Fisheries and biodiversity consultant  
jessica.fuller@fao.org

##### **Hassan Moustahfid**

Senior Fisheries Officer  
hassan.moustahfid@fao.org

##### **Dale Squires**

RBM consultant  
dsquires@ucsd.edu

##### **Tony Thompson**

Fisheries consultant  
tony.thompson@tele2.se

##### **Nigel Varty**

Independent Mid-Term Reviewer  
nigelvarty@hotmail.com

#### NEAFC

##### **Darius Campbell**

Secretary,  
North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission  
darius@neafc.org

<b>NOAA</b>
<b>Elizabethann English – REMOTE CONNECTION</b> Senior Policy Advisor, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration liz.english@noaa.gov
<b>SEAFO</b>
<b>Lizette Voges</b> Executive Secretary lvoges@seafo.org
<b>SEALORD GROUP</b>
<b>Graham Patchell – REMOTE CONNECTION</b> Resource Manager, Sealord Group Ltd gjp@sealord.co.nz
<b>SIOFA</b>
<b>Jon Lansley</b> Executive Secretary Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement jon@siofa.org
<b>UN Environment</b>
<b>Marieta Sakalian – REMOTE CONNECTION</b> Senior Programme Management/ Liaison Officer, UNEP/FAO/CGIAR marieta.sakalian@unep.org
<b>UNEP-WCMC</b>
<p><b>Ruth Fletcher</b> Area-based planning specialist/Senior programme officer ruth.fletcher@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Nina Bhola</b> Project manager/Programme officer nina.bhola@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Steve Fletcher</b> Chief Strategy Officer steve.fletcher@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Pamela Abbot</b> Director of Programmes pamela.abbot@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Corli Pretorius</b> Deputy Director UNEP-WCMC corli.pretorius@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Josie Wastell</b> Assistant Programme Officer josie.wastell@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Rachael Scrimgeour</b> Assistant Programme Officer rachael.scrimgeour@unep-wcmc.org</p> <p><b>Juliette Martin</b> Programme Officer juliette.martin@unep-wcmc.org</p>

## Appendix 2      Agenda

### Tuesday, 17 April

<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>	<b>09:00 – 09:30</b>
1.1 Opening remarks	09:00 – 09:10
1.2 Introductions	09:10 – 09:15
1.3 Election of a chairperson	09:15 – 09:20
1.4 Adoption of the agenda	09:20 – 09:25
1.5 Housekeeping matters	09:25 – 09:30
<b>2. Project progress report</b>	<b>09:30 – 10:30</b>
2.1 Components 1-3	09:30 – 10:10
2.2 Component 4	10:10 – 10:30
<i>Coffee break</i>	<b>10:30 – 10:50</b>
<b>3. Project highlights</b>	<b>10:50 – 11:30</b>
3.1 Traceability	
3.2 Monitoring, control, and surveillance	
3.3 Ecosystem services and linkages to SponGES	
3.4 Climate change and deep-sea fisheries	
3.5 Update Worldwide Review of Bottom Fisheries	
3.6 Component 4	
<b>4. Budgeting and finances</b>	<b>11:30 – 12:30</b>
4.1 Budget status to date	
4.2 Co-financing and partner contributions	
4.3 Discussion	
<i>Lunch</i>	<b>12:30 – 13:30</b>
<b>5. Mid-term review</b>	<b>13:30 – 15:00</b>
5.1 Overview and summary of report	
5.2 Report recommendations	
<i>Coffee break</i>	<b>15:00 – 15:20</b>
<b>6. Project workplan</b>	<b>15:20 – 17:00</b>
6.1 ProDoc workplan recap	
6.2 Discussion	

### Wednesday, 18 April

<b>7. Mid-term review continued</b>	<b>09:30 – 10:30</b>
7.1 Clarification and implications of MTR	
7.2 Ways forward	
<i>Coffee break</i>	<b>10:30 – 10:50</b>
<b>8. Project Workplan 2018 and 2019</b>	<b>10:50 – 12:30</b>
8.1 Workplan revision for 2018 and 2019	
8.2 Budgetary Implications of revisions	
<i>Lunch</i>	<b>12:30 – 13:30</b>
<b>9. Project Workplan</b>	<b>13:30 – 15:00</b>
9.1 Continue workplan <sup>1</sup>	
<i>Coffee break</i>	<b>15:00 – 15:50</b>
<b>10. Other</b>	<b>15:50 – 16:05</b>
10.1 Japan Project and SponGES Project activities	
<b>11. Timing and location of PSC4</b>	<b>16:05 – 16:15</b>
<b>12. Outstanding items and adoption of the meeting conclusions</b>	<b>16:15 – 17:00</b>

<sup>1</sup> Depending on the outcome of the discussion, the final workplan and budget revisions may be endorsed electronically.

## Appendix 3 Main findings: Mid Term Review of “Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of deep-sea living marine resources and ecosystems in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction”

### Main findings

The main findings of the Mid Term Review are presented below, according to review question.

1. **RQ1: How and to what extent does the project contribute to national, regional and international ABNJ and fisheries management priorities and initiatives, and to FAO’s Strategic Objective?** *Finding 1.1 – The relevance of the Project is Satisfactory.* The Project has contributed to several of FAO’s Strategic Objectives, and is aligned with UN Environment’s strategic objectives and 2014-2017 Medium-term Strategy and with UNEP-WCMC’s marine programme. The Project is in line with GEF International Waters and Biodiversity Focal Area Outcomes. It is highly relevant to the Deep Sea RFMOs, and also of interest to the Regional Seas Programmes but the perception of relevance varies within the membership of these two groups. Project results are also relevant to the Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction process, to which the Project has made important contributions.
2. **RQ2: To what extent has the project delivered on its outputs, outcomes, and objectives?** *Finding 2.1: Delivery of outputs to date has been Moderately Satisfactory.* The Project has produced some good project results by the mid-term, particularly under Components 1, 2 and 4, but overall delivery of the expected outputs has been mixed with many deliverables behind schedule.
3. *Finding 2.2: The rating for the achievement of project outcomes is Moderately Satisfactory.* There has been some movement towards achievement of project outcomes (as formulated in the reconstructed Theory of Change) across all five outcomes. The Project has increased awareness and understanding of the importance and obligations of laws and policies relevant to Deep Sea Fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in ABNJ among national fisheries authorities and decision-makers (Outcome 1), although this new knowledge does not appear to have yet been being applied in practice, e.g. translated into updating legislation or policies. The Project has also contributed to new knowledge and tools to help identify and manage threats to marine biodiversity and sustainable deep-sea fisheries in ABNJ (Outcome 2), through several global reviews, manuals, and identification guides with related training courses to support capacity building, and support for further development of both VME and EBSA databases. Project efforts to encourage greater uptake of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries by Deep Sea RFMOs (Outcome 3) have also been limited to date and have largely focused on a series of reviews. The development and testing of ABP tools and approaches to better assess and manage multi-sectoral impacts to deep sea ecosystems in ABNJ (Outcome 4) is still largely at a preliminary stage and focused mostly on the Regional Seas Programmes and their members. Revised Outcome 5, which addresses collaborative networks to support Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries in ABNJ, has made some progress and the opportunity for such a diverse mix of partners to meet and exchange ideas and experience is highly valued.
4. **RQ3: *Finding 3.1: Assessment of efficiency – Moderately Unsatisfactory.*** Efficiency has been very mixed. The Project built on long-established partnerships and programmes, but for some areas of the Project, it has taken time to build constituency and engage interest among national partners in ABNJ, e.g. among members of the Nairobi Convention and the *Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur* (Permanent Commission for the South Pacific). Also, FAO took many months to recruit the Project Coordinator (on both occasions), during which time project delivery slowed. In addition, the FAO and UN Environment project management and administrative systems were considered very bureaucratic and time consuming.
5. **RQ4: What factors have affected the delivery and results of the project and how can the delivery can be improved?** *Finding 4.1: The design and preparedness of the Project are Moderately Satisfactory.* The Project had a complicated design history with significant challenges during its development. The design process resulted in a split (fracture) across the Project between Components 1-3 and Component 4, in terms of its structure, execution, management and stakeholder understanding. Overall, the Project’s design is



considered too complex, not sufficiently coherent, with too many unrealistic or inappropriate targets. Each of the three pilot regions selected for testing tools and demonstrations present their own challenges.

6. *Finding 4.2: Project management and administration of the Project are Moderately Satisfactory.* The Project has been led by a PMU based in Rome who had responsibility for managing delivery of Components 1-3, communications, partnership relations, Monitoring and Evaluation and overall project implementation, but with Component 4 executed separately through UNEP-WCMC, based in Cambridge, United Kingdom. Project management has been generally good and sought ways to deliver a complex project, but has faced several significant challenges, with substantial delays due to staff changes and temporary capacity gaps, especially relating to the recruitment of the initial Project Coordinator by FAO and then his replacement, and changes to staff and capacity at UNEP-WCMC, with most changes occurring in a relatively short space of time (July 2017-March 2018). Both the PMU and team at UNEP-WCMC have also faced challenges due to their administrative systems, and in the case of UNEP-WCMC having to additionally deal with institutional restructuring within UN Environment. Communication between the PMU in Rome and the team at UNEP-WCMC in Cambridge has not been as regular as it should have been. Many interviewees had limited knowledge of areas of the Project and 'silos' have developed to some extent between project Components, particularly between Components 1-3 and Component 4.
7. *Finding 4.3: Project oversight is Moderately Satisfactory.* FAO is providing both the GEF Implementing Agency and Executing Agency roles, but both are located within FAO's Fisheries and Aquaculture Division, so there is the potential for conflicts of interest to develop and the 'firewall' separating these two functions is not clear within the Division. The UN Environment Task Manager has been based in Rome which potentially offers advantages. UN Environment has not been significantly involved during project implementation despite being co-implementing agency. The Project Steering Committee composed of representatives from the main partners and stakeholders has met annually and is valued by participants although some members feel it has not been sufficiently involved in decision-making.
8. *Finding 4.4: Monitoring, reporting and evaluation on the Project are Moderately Satisfactory.* The Project Management Unit produced the required annual and 6-monthly reports to FAO and GEF and detailed reports to the Project Steering Committee. In addition, the project was added to FAO's Field Programme Management Information System, which provided an additional means of project monitoring. However, the Project has a complicated logframe, large number of poor indicators, and excessive number of targets, some of which do not relate well to their associated activities, outputs or outcomes. The Project largely lacks indicators for measuring institutional capacity of competent institutions involved with ABNJ, particularly the Deep Sea RFMOs which would be useful to include. Despite awareness of weaknesses in the Monitoring and Evaluation framework, no changes were made at the inception stage due to the Project just starting. The presence of two GEF Implementing Agencies on this Project (FAO and UN Environment) and GEF has created challenges as there is no single streamlined reporting process which has made the reporting process longer, more complex and less efficient than it could be (for future projects this should be streamlined). There has been no structured lesson learning to date and no overall framework to identify and capture lessons.
9. *Finding 4.5: Assessment of communications and knowledge management – Moderately Satisfactory.* The Project has offered the opportunity to promote ABNJ issues and solutions, which is innovative, including connectivity between Exclusive Economic Zones and ABNJ. However, appreciation of the importance of ABNJ and why it needs to be targeted is still variable, especially its relationship to national marine issues (fisheries and other sectors), its socio-economic importance and benefits to individual countries. The Project has had low visibility and its aims and results have not been communicated effectively, as it is not clear to many people what the Project will eventually achieve. FAO technical support on project communications has been irregular with a lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities for communications within FAO. A different arrangement governs communications at UNEP-WCMC. A simple, short Communications Strategy was produced in the first year of the Project but needs revision.
10. **RQ5: To what extent has the Project's partnership approach contributed to the Project's delivery of stated outcomes and outputs?** *Finding 5.1: Assessment of achievement of partnerships and stakeholder relationships and linkage with other relevant projects – Satisfactory.* The Project has brought together a diverse (and unusual) mix of partners and stakeholders, including the Deep Sea RFMOs, FAO, UN



Environment, the Convention on Biological Diversity, Regional Seas Programmes, UNEP-WCMC and other global and regional organisations to discuss common issues, priorities and viewpoints relevant to ABNJ. This opportunity for exchange of views and experiences and to promote understanding is widely seen as an important result and benefit of the Project, and has improved the constituency (“widened the foundation”) for ABNJ. The Project has contributed to building capacity of the Deep Sea RFMOs and other stakeholder groups, generated greater exchange among the RFMOs and created a foundation for more collaborative work. However, the Project’s partnership is largely divided into two main groups (FAO and the Deep Sea RFMOs, and UNEP-WCMC and the Regional Seas Programmes) reflecting the split between Components 1-3 and Component 4. Surprisingly, the Project has not developed a partnership strategy to define and guide partnership actions. As a result, roles, responsibilities, activities, timelines, budgets, etc, for each partner have not been clear at times. There has also been only limited interaction with the other projects in the ABNJ (Common Oceans) programme, mostly with the ABNJ Capacity Project, and the programme level is poorly understood by non-FAO stakeholders and not perceived to have added any significant value to the Project or vice versa.

11. **RQ6: To what extent are the project results likely to be sustainable and is sustainability being embedded in project activities and results?** *Finding 6.1: Assessment of sustainability – Moderately Likely.* Project publications are hosted on FAO and UNEP-WCMC websites so have a level of sustainability, and there is potential for uptake and integration of some project results in partner programmes and frameworks. However, the sustainability of the Project’s capacity building activities mostly in relation to supporting enabling conditions is of concern as once they are finished countries will need to take on follow-on activities. Other capacity building efforts e.g. for Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries can hopefully be linked to other FAO and partner work. However, at present there is no plan for financing follow-up courses once the GEF funding finishes.
12. *Finding 6.2: Assessment of replication and catalysis – Moderately Satisfactory.* There has been limited evidence or opportunities for replication and catalysis of project results to date, although at the mid-point this is not unexpected.

### Crosscutting issues

13. **Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI). What are the likely mid- and long-term impacts of the project and what can be done to improve the likely achievement of positive impacts?** *Finding 7.1: The Project’s likely achievement of the project objective and longer-term impact is judged as ‘Moderately unlikely’ at the Mid Term Review stage.* Based on a Review of Outcomes to Impacts analysis the Project is judged to have not yet produced sufficient results to make achievement of the project objective likely. However, this may change by the Final Evaluation as more results are delivered and sustainability and replication of project results are addressed.
14. **Gender Analysis.** *Finding 8.1: Treatment of gender issues is Moderately Satisfactory.* Little attention was given to gender issues during the design of the Project. However, the Project Management Unit undertook a deep seas fishery industry gender analysis in 2016 as a precursor to a study on labour issues and decent work practices in Deep Sea Fisheries in ABNJ, although this latter work was deferred when the former Project Coordinator left the Project. The Project has encouraged women to participate in project activities, and women are well represented in the project team, especially at UNEP-WCMC. There has been some recording of the numbers of men and women attending project events but gender disaggregated data has not been routinely collected and reported on.
15. **Co-financing.** *Finding 9.1: Materialisation of co-financing is Moderately Satisfactory.* Although pledged GEF to co-financing is high (1 GEF: 10.88 co-financing), the picture on co-financing is confused and does not accurately reflect the level or type of partner contributions and commitments.
16. Based on the evidence presented above, several conclusions on relevance, project design, effectiveness, implementation, etc, can be drawn; the order does not imply priority.

---

## **Appendix 4      2018-2019 work plan**

This document was prepared by the Coordinator following inputs and guidance from the Project Steering Committee in April 2018. The activities in red represent those that have been deleted based on recommendations from the MTR and approved by the PSC.

<b>Component 1: Policy and legal frameworks for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ deep seas.</b>
<b>Component 1 - Outcome 1.1: Improved implementation of existing policy and legal frameworks, incorporating obligations and good practices from global and regional legal and policy instruments for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation, are tested and disseminated to all competent authorities</b> Target 6. Five national and regional organizations in at least one region have benefitted from implementation tools and related training to implement legal and policy instruments related to DSF and biodiversity conservation in ABNJ (by mid project) Target 7. Total of ten national and regional organizations in two regions implement the policy and legal instruments to DSF and biodiversity conservation on the basis of the guide (by project end).
<b>Output 1.1.1: Challenges to the implementation of international policy and legal instruments identified and remedial measures are formulated.</b> Target 8. Challenges to the implementation of all relevant international policy and legal instruments identified and fully documented (by mid-term)
Activity 1.1.1.1: Analysis of challenges and best practices in the implementation of policy and legal instruments and processes as well as of relevant institutions involved, relating to DSF management and biodiversity in the ABNJ.
Activity 1.1.1.2: Carrying out of an e-review to solicit input in the analysis prepared under Activity 1.1.1.1
<b>Output 1.1.2: Step-wise guide for implementation of relevant international policy and legal instruments to deep-sea fisheries and biodiversity conservation made available to competent authorities, industry partners and other stakeholders.</b> Target 9. Agreed step-wise implementation guide made available to national and regional organizations globally. Associated training is provided in Southeast Pacific region (by mid project). Target 10. Five national and regional organizations in at least the South-East Pacific region have the demonstrable capacity to implement legal and policy instruments related to DSF and biodiversity conservation in ABNJ, making use of the implementation tools and related training (by project end)
Activity 1.1.2.1: Design and production of the step-wise guide.
Activity 1.1.2.2: Training in the use of the step-wise guide.
<b>Output 1.1.3: Model policy and legal frameworks, enabling sustainable DSF management and biodiversity conservation at the regional and national levels, developed and integrated into national legislation in countries in at least one region.</b> Target 11. Regional model policy and legal framework, providing practical guidance on implementation of relevant instruments completed for at least one region (by mid project) Target 12. At least three countries update national legislation enabling sustainable DSF management and biodiversity conservation (by project end).
Activity 1.1.3.1: Development of a regional model policy and legal framework for at least one selected pilot region.
Activity 1.1.3.2: Carrying out of a stakeholder consultation in at least one pilot region.
Activity 1.1.3.3: Preparation and implementation of a legal capacity building program in the selected pilot region.
<del>Activity 4: Revision of the national legislations of selected developing countries in the pilot region, with regards to DSF and biodiversity.</del>
<b>Output 1.1.4: Options for market-based incentives developed and tested in at least one selected pilot area.</b> Target 13. Global best practices on market-based incentives (including ecolabelling and PES schemes) and agreed operational manual completed for utilization of traceability schemes; Both made available to countries and Deep-sea RFMOs (by mid project) Target 14. Two countries or regional organizations make use of at least one market-based mechanisms for DSF (by project end)
Activity 1.1.4.1: Best practices in market-based incentives for DSF.
Activity 1.1.4.2: Production of operational manual of best practices and utilization of traceability.
Activity 1.1.4.3: Implementation of a model outline for catch/trade documentation or traceability scheme.
<b>Component 1 - Outcome 1.2: Global and regional networks are strengthened and/or expanded.</b> Target 15. One to two targeted networks of relevant stakeholders are actively used and contributes to cross “community” dialogues and cross- regional connections (by mid project). Target 16. At least four targeted networks of relevant stakeholders are actively used and contributes to cross “community” dialogues and cross regional connections (by project end).
<b>Output 1.2.1: Collaborative networks and partnerships, including all stakeholders involved in ABNJ-DSF and biodiversity conservation, strengthened or set-up, with links to global and regional communities of practice under the ABNJ Program.</b>

Target 17. One electronic network related to VMEs and EBSAs strengthened by providing links to communities of practice (by mid project)
Target 18. Two channels established for sharing of information, experiences and lessons learned on all aspects related to DSF and its associated biodiversity (by mid project)
Target 19. Some gender disaggregated data made available (by mid project)
Target 20. Five global and regional networks, both cross-sectoral and sectoral have been put into place and ensure that stakeholders have a tool for intra and cross-sectoral dialogue and exchange of best practices (by project end)
<del>Target 21. Increased percentage of women contributing to Global and regional networks (by project end)</del>
Activity 1.2.1.1: Carrying out of two global stakeholder meetings for DSF and biodiversity communities.
Activity 1.2.1.2: Strengthening of global and regional networks related to DSF and associated biodiversity.
<b>Component 2: Reducing adverse impact on VMEs and enhancing conservation of components of EBSAs.</b>
<b>Component 2 - Outcome 2.1: Improved application of management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity is demonstrated</b>
Target 22. At least two new protocols and tools developed for identification and mitigation of potential threats to biodiversity, in the two pilot regions
Target 23. At least four new protocols and tools developed and applied to DSF for identification and mitigation of potential threats to biodiversity, in the two pilot regions. Uptake of these protocols and tools will take place, as appropriate and possible, in other regions
<b>Output 2.1.1: Biological, ecological and economic analyses of DSF and associated biodiversity in the ABNJ carried out, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to classify risks and threats and identify VMEs.</b>
Target 24. Datasets identified and compiled (by mid project)
Target 25. Analysis of risks and threats of significant impacts for major fishing gears on biodiversity in one DSF RFMO (by mid project)
Target 26. Updated understanding on DSF through the Worldwide Review of Bottom Fisheries in the High Seas produced in collaboration with Deep-sea RFMOs
Target 27. Best practices for identification of VMEs prepared based on experiences within Deep-sea RFMOs (by mid project)
Target 28. Analysis of datasets completed and made available for at least two regions (to be identified based on availability of data)
Target 29. Risks and threats of significant impacts for major fishing gears on biodiversity in one additional DSF RFMO area; Analysis made available to other RFMOs for possible future upscaling (by project end)
Target 30. Improved EBSA descriptions developed in collaboration with the CBD (by project end)
Activity 2.1.1.1: Collation and consolidation of existing biological and ecological information on DSF and associated biodiversity.
Activity 2.1.1.2: Consolidation and analysis of existing socio-economic information on DSF and associated biodiversity.
Activity 2.1.1.3: Assessment of potential interactions between DSF and biodiversity.
Activity 2.1.1.4: Updating of the Worldwide Review of Bottom Fisheries in the High Seas.
Activity 2.1.1.5: Report on best practices for identification of VMEs.
Activity 2.1.1.6: Production of a manual for the collection and analyses of data to improve EBSA descriptions.
<b>Output 2.1.2: Interactive web databases, for identification and use in mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in ABNJ, particularly for VMEs and components of EBSAs, improved for use in regions in close collaboration with all stakeholders.</b>
Target 31. Sharing mechanism operational (by mid project)
Target 32. Sources of information identified; metadata descriptions made and open-source, portal developed that allows access to existing datasets or to sources of datasets. New information being added to databases and available through portal (by project end)
Target 33. 80% of deep-sea RFMO/As contribute information to VME database (by mid project)
Target 34. All RFMO/As actively supporting and using VME database. Additional functionality on research areas, survey data, networking and support fora operational (by project end)
Target 35. Beta versions of regional databases available for two regions (by mid project)

Target 36. At least one regional “EBSA” database developed or expanded in one region to support the global CBD/EBSA process (by project end)
Activity 2.1.2.1: Sharing of geospatial information on DSF and associated biodiversity.
Activity 2.1.2.2: Development of specialized applications for and interactive VME database.
Activity 2.1.2.3: Develop a regional EBSA information sharing platform in support of EBSA Global Repository.
<b>Output 2.1.3: Indicators for the identification of potential VMEs and for description of areas meeting EBSA criteria, developed in at least one pilot area.</b>
Target 37. Global review of VME indicators completed (by mid project)
Target 38. EBSA global review completed (by mid project)
<del>Target 39. VME indicators implemented and tested at sea in one pilot area (by project end)</del>
Target 40. At least one deep-sea RFMOs/As and/or regional organization consider information from EBSA process (by project end)
Activity 2.1.3.1: Review and develop VME indicators in pilot areas.
Activity 2.1.3.2: Use of EBSA information for enhancing conservation and management measures in pilot areas.
Activity 2.1.3.3: Development of appropriate monitoring methods and tools for VME indicators in pilot areas.
<b>Output 2.1.4: Improved fishing practices to reduce impacts on VMEs and marine biodiversity, developed in at least one pilot area.</b>
Target 41. One formal partnership established in one pilot area which leads to for improved collection and recording of biodiversity information (by mid project)
Target 42. At least two partnerships that allow for a more diverse range of information collection and tool development for recording biodiversity and possible impacts on biodiversity (by project end).
Target 43. Review of regional fisheries management measures on Biodiversity conservation completed for two regions (by mid project).
Target 44. Review of regional fisheries management measures on Biodiversity conservation completed for all regions (by project end)
Target 45. Two tools for testing agreed to and implementation plans for their testing developed (by mid project)
Target 46. Management measures to reduce key known and important negative impacts by DSF are tested at sea in at least one pilot area (by project end)
Activity 2.1.4.1: Establishment of partnerships and tools for recording biodiversity information.
Activity 2.1.4.2: Review of regional fisheries management measures on biodiversity conservation.
Activity 2.1.4.3: Testing of new techniques for mitigating adverse from DSF on ecosystems.
<b>Component 2 - Outcome 2.2: Extent of application of improved management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in national processes</b>
Target 47. At least two regions benefited from training activities (by mid project)
Target 48. Ten countries apply improved management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in national processes (by project end)
<b>Output 2.2.1: Customized support provided to at least ten developing countries to fully integrate best practices for sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation in their management processes.</b>
Target 49. Capacity development program to integrate best practices for sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation agreed (by mid project)
Target 50. Participants from ten developing countries have received training in the use of improved management tools (by project end)
Activity 2.2.1.1: Formulation of capacity development programs for integrating sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation into national management processes and for supporting their implementation.
Activity 2.2.1.2: Support to enhance participation of developing countries in DSF and conservation processes.
<b>Output 2.2.2: Technical and operational support on the application of VME and EBSA criteria provided, for systematic use by countries.</b>
Target 51. Needs assessment conducted and training material developed, used and disseminated through IW: Learn (by mid project)
Target 52. At least 10 national or regional organizations able to apply VME and EBSA criteria (by project end)
Activity 2.2.2.1: Carrying out of customized training workshops on the application of VME and EBSA criteria.

<b>Component 3: Improved planning and adaptive management for deep-sea fisheries in the ABNJ.</b>
<b>Component 3 - Outcome 3.1: Planning and management processes for achieving sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation are improved, tested, and disseminated to all competent authorities</b>
Target 53. Best practices for sustainable DSF management and biodiversity conservation analysed and information on status of selected deep-sea stocks synthesized (by mid project)
Target 54. Adaptive approaches to management planning and implementation under EAF, including MCS, developed and applied to DSF in at least 3 national or regional organizations (by project end)
<b>Output 3.1.1: Best practices, methods and tools for comprehensive management planning, encompassing an ecosystem approach and allowing for adaptive changes, reviewed and adapted to the special conditions of ABNJ-DSF.</b>
Target 55. Agreed operational manual for improved DSF and biodiversity conservation made available to countries and Deep-sea RFMOs
<del>Target 56. Five national and regional organizations make use of operational manual for DSF and biodiversity conservation in their planning and management processes (by project end)</del>
Target 57. Improved information on at least one deep-sea fish stocks made available to national and regional organizations (by mid project)
Target 58. Inventory of existing and emerging methods and tools relevant to DSF and recommendations for their use (by mid project)
Target 59. Improved information on at least two deep-sea fish stocks made available to national and regional organizations (by project end)
Target 60. Existing and emerging methods and technologies for assessing the state of DSF stocks analysed for relevance in DSF and disseminated to national and regional organizations (by project end)
Activity 3.1.1.1: (global) Analysis of best practices for DSF and development of an operational manual for improved planning and management for DSF.
Activity 3.1.1.2: (global) Improving knowledge on key deep-sea species and on methodologies and technologies for studying and assessing them.
Activity 3.1.1.3: (Global) Review of effectiveness and application of RBM in fisheries in the ABNJ.
<b>Output 3.1.2: Adaptive management processes demonstrated, including identification of management objectives and priorities, through participatory risk analysis in at least one selected pilot area.</b>
Target 61. EAF process initiated for at least one fishery (by mid project)
Target 62. EAF Baseline report (by mid project)
Target 63. EAF objectives and priorities identified through participatory Risk assessment (by mid project)
<del>Target 64. EAF process demonstrated in at least one fishery (by project end).</del>
<del>Target 65. Options for strengthening current management measures in order to achieve priority objectives will have been identified and accepted by stakeholders in at least one fishery (by project end)</del>
Activity 3.1.2.1: (Pilot areas) Preparation of EAF baseline report for the selected pilot areas.
Activity 3.1.2.2: (Pilot areas) Issue identification and prioritization for management planning.
<del>Activity 3: (pilot areas) Development of operational objectives.</del>
<del>Activity 4: (Pilot areas) Identification of options for improved adaptive management measures.</del>
<b>Output 3.1.3: Objective-based indicators and reference points selected and a related monitoring programme for DSF in the ABNJ tested in a selected pilot area.</b>
<del>Target 66. Indicators and reference points to address priority concerns identified through a structured risk assessment in one pilot region</del>
<del>Target 67. Monitoring program for indicators and references points designed and tested for at least one fishery.</del>
<del>Activity 1: (Pilot areas) Selection of objective-based indicators and reference points.</del>
<del>Activity 2: (Pilot areas) Design and implementation of monitoring programme.</del>
<b>Output 3.1.4: Action plan for adoption of best MCS practices, adapted to the specific conditions of DSF in the ABNJ, formulated and adopted in one of the selected pilot areas.</b>
Target 68. A report on best practices on MCS for DSF globally produced and disseminated to all stakeholders
Target 69. An MCS action plan designed and adopted by the management body or flag states in one pilot region.
Activity 3.1.4.1: (Global/pilot areas) Review global successful practices in MCS and existing MCS systems.
Activity 3.1.4.2: (pilot areas) Consider options for strengthened MCS and compliance and develop or revise MCS action plan(s) accordingly.

<p><b>Output 3.1.5: Options for improved management measures for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation, - including: i) encounters with vulnerable species/habitats, (ii) spatial management tools, and (iii) fishing operations aimed at mitigating adverse impacts on sensitive habitats and ecosystems - developed and disseminated. This will include pilot activities in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Atlantic</b></p> <p>Target 70. Implementation plans for testing two agreed management measures are developed</p> <p>Target 71. At least two improved management measures have been tested and disseminated</p>
Activity 3.1.5.1: (Global/regional) Experimental testing and trial implementation of improved management measures, indicators and thresholds.
<b>Component 4: Development and testing of a methodology for area-based planning.</b>
<p><b>Component 4 - Outcome 4.1: Efficient area-based planning tools and good practices based on ecosystem-based management practices are made available to competent authorities</b></p> <p>72. Existing ABNJ approaches are shared with three RSPs, other than project areas of intervention (by mid project)</p> <p>73. Two selected project areas of intervention are engaged in developing area-based planning tools (by mid project)</p> <p>74. Existing ABNJ approaches are shared with RSP coordination group, to reach all eighteen RSPs, and related, relevant competent authorities (by project end).</p> <p>75. Two selected project areas of intervention have developed and tested area-based planning tools within a planning process (by project end)</p>
<p><b>Output 4.1.1: Adaptation and further development of available area-based planning tools addressing deep-sea ecosystems in ABNJ and connected EEZs.</b></p> <p>Target 76. Four case studies concerning planning processes in the ABNJ, are gathered and analysed (by mid project)</p> <p>Target 77. Four case studies concerning planning processes in the ABNJ, are gathered and analysed and shared in knowledge transfer workshops in the two selected areas of intervention (by project end)</p>
Activity 4.1.1.1: Review and outlook of area-based planning.
Activity 4.1.1.2: Development of area-based planning tools and technologies for ABNJ application in regional pilot areas.
<p><b>Output 4.1.2: Knowledge and experiences sharing from the Northeast Atlantic and the Mediterranean concerning deep-sea marine ecosystems and area-based planning.</b></p> <p>Target 78. Area-based planning tools are described and demonstrated in one area of intervention (by mid project)</p> <p>Target 79. Area-based planning tools are described and demonstrated in two areas of intervention (by project end)</p> <p>Target 80. Competent authorities, regional experts and policy makers have been engaged in discussions regarding area-based planning in one area of intervention (by mid project)</p>
Activity 4.1.2.1: Collate and communicate lessons learned and experiences in area-based planning processes to regional policy makers and key regional authorities.
<p><b>Component 4 - Outcome 4.2: Area-based planning in ABNJ is incorporated into the regional marine planning processes in selected regions through partnerships between competent authorities</b></p> <p>Target 81. Area-based planning has been discussed in one selected area of intervention, with identified sectoral stakeholders and policy makers (by mid project)</p> <p>Target 82. Area-based planning has been discussed in two selected areas of intervention, with identified sectoral stakeholders and policy makers (by project end)</p>
<p><b>Output 4.2.1: Testing of area-based planning tools in the selected regions.</b></p> <p>Target 83. Area-based planning tools are described and demonstrated in one area of intervention (by mid project)</p> <p>Target 84. Area-based planning tools are described and demonstrated in two areas of intervention (by project end)</p>
Activity 4.2.1.1: Regional pilot area engagement, stakeholder analysis, governance and area-based planning capacity assessment.
Activity 4.2.1.2: Undertake participatory area-based planning in the pilot regions to test ABNJ area-based planning tools.
<p><b>Output 4.2.2: Science-based and policy relevant advice on area-based planning and management applied in regional deep-sea ecosystem planning processes in the selected test regions with engagement of relevant stakeholders and through the partnership between competent authorities.</b></p> <p>Target 85. Competent authorities, regional experts and policy makers have been engaged in discussions regarding area-based planning in one area of intervention (by mid project)</p> <p>Target 86. Competent authorities, regional experts and policy makers, are engaged in planning processes in two selected regions and the experience and lessons learned are captured for future capacity building (by project end)</p>
Activity 4.2.2.1: Carrying out workshop with policy makers.

<b>Component 5: Project monitoring and evaluation.</b>
<b>Component 5 - outcome 5.1: Project implementation conducted with adaptive results-based management, supported by M&amp;E, including transmission of lessons learned via the IW-Learn Program</b>
Target 87. Adaptive results-based management system in place and lessons learned shared through IW: Learn and the Common Oceans Portal
Target 88. Adaptive results-based management system in place and lessons learned shared through IW: Learn and the Common Oceans Portal
<b>Output 5.1.1: Website established which is compatible with IW-Learn program and contributes to ABNJ Program portal.</b>
Target 89. Website set up completed under Common Oceans Portal (by mid project)
Target 90. Two representatives from the pilot regions and 1 project staff supported to participate in one IW Conference (by mid project)
Target 91. This website has provided continued and updated information to stakeholders through quarterly updates (by project end)
Target 92. Two representatives from the pilot regions and 1 project staff supported to participate for each IW Conference (by project end)
Target 93. Two experience notes prepared and published (by project end)
Activity 5.1.1.1: Setting-up of website
Activity 5.1.1.2: IW-Learn activities
<b>Output 5.1.2: Project monitoring system operating and systematically providing information on progress in meeting project output and outcome targets.</b>
Target 94. Project specific M&E system set up (by mid project)
Target 95. There is a project-specific M&E system set up and fully operational (by project end)
Activity 5.1.2.1: Setting-up of monitoring system
Activity 5.1.2.2: Operation and maintenance of monitoring system
<b>Output 5.1.3: Timely biannual PPRs available for adaptive results-based management.</b>
Target 96. PPRs have been produced biannually and according to standards (by mid project)
Target 97. PPRs have been produced biannually and according to standards (by project end)
Activity 5.1.3.1: Preparation of PPRs
<b>Output 5.1.4: Midterm and terminal evaluation carried out and reports available.</b>
98. Midterm review completed (by mid project)
99. Midterm and terminal reports have been produced according to schedule and standards (by project end)
Activity 5.1.4.1: Carrying out of evaluations
<b>Project Management</b>
Contracting of project management staff



The *Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation of Deep Sea Living Resources in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction* Project (ABNJ Deep Seas Project for short) is a five year project supported by the Global Environment Facility, and implemented jointly by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the United Nations Environment Programme. The UNEP project component is executed through the UNEP World Conservation and Monitoring Centre.

The Project is designed to enhance sustainability in the use of deep-sea living resources and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ through the systematic application of an ecosystem approach. It brings together over 20 partners who work on deep-sea fisheries and conservation issues in the ABNJ globally. The partnership includes regional organizations responsible for the management of deep-sea fisheries, Regional Seas Programmes, the fishing industry and international organizations. The Project aims to:

- strengthen policy and legal frameworks for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ deep seas;
- reduce adverse impacts on VMEs and enhanced conservation and management of components of EBSAs;
- improve planning and adaptive management for deep sea fisheries in ABNJ; and
- develop and test methods for area-based planning.

The ABNJ Deep Seas Project started in September 2015 and is one of four projects under the GEF Common Oceans Programme. More information is available from [www.commonoceans.org](http://www.commonoceans.org)



Convention on  
Biological Diversity



General Fisheries Commission  
for the Mediterranean  
Commission générale des pêches  
pour la Méditerranée



International Coalition of Fisheries Associations

