



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1.	BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2.	PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3.	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	13
4.	SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	18
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	21
6.	RISKS	23
7.	FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	27
8.	MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	28
9.	STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	29
10.	GENDER MAINSTREAMING	31
11.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	33
12.	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	34
13.	CO-FINANCING TABLE	35

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	Deep sea fisheries under the ecosystem approach
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GLO/1002/GFF
GEF ID:	10623
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)
Initial project duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	This is a global project

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	07 April 2022
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 June 2022
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 May 2027
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	-

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,437,156
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	52,803,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	430,203
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	230,312
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	10,882,292

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	24 - 26 January 2023 Inception workshop
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	Q4 2024-Q1 2025
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	NA
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	Q1 2027
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NA

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>Satisfactory</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>Satisfactory</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Low</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>Low</i>
----------------------------------	------------

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Eszter Hidas, Project Officer, GFCM	Eszter.Hidas@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Manuel Barange, Director, NFI, FAO	NFI-Director@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	This is a global project.	
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Marcelo Vasconcellos, Fisheries Resources Officer, NFI, FAO	Marcelo.Vasconcellos@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Lorenzo Galbiati, Technical Officer, GEF Unit, FAO	Lorenzo.Galbiati@fao.org

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective: To ensure that DSF in the ABNJ are managed under an ecosystem approach that maintains demersal fish stock at levels capable of maximizing their sustainable yields and minimizing impacts on biodiversity, with a focus on data-limited stocks, deepwater sharks and vulnerable marine ecosystems.	<u>GEF-7 Core Indicator 2 part</u> Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use ¹² Areas (ha and % of VME area) with measures adopted for protection of new VMEs from bottom fishing impacts.	Current area of VMEs with closures = 120 million ha Current number = 200	6 million ha (i.e. 5% of the VME area)	12 million ha (i.e. 10% of the VME area)	First monitoring scheduled at mid-term	S
	<u>GEF-7 Core Indicator 2 part</u> Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use ¹³ Area (ha) of currently designated VMEs under improved management, for conservation and sustainable use, documented as improvements in monitoring, compliance, SAIs, and	Current VMEs are closed to one or more bottom fishing gears with no monitoring of SAIs or “ecosystem health”	Actions to improve monitoring of compliance, SAIs, and ecosystem health documented and adopted by RFMOs for	30 million ha (i.e. 25% of the current VME area).	First monitoring scheduled at mid-term	

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

¹² The PIF says 25% of existing VMEs = 12m ha. However, this is actually 10% (must have changed % but not value during PIF preparation)

¹³ The PIF says 25% of existing VMEs = 12m ha. However, this is actually 10% (must have changed % but not value during PIF preparation)

	ecosystem health by RFMOs and associated transparency.		12 million ha (10% by area) of current VMEs.		
	GEF Core indicator 7: Engagement in IW Learn to develop products and participation in the	Zero at beginning of project	1 experience note Contribute to IW Learn platform 1 IW Learn biennial conference	3 experience notes Contribute to IW Learn platform 2 IW Learn biennial conference	2 Programmatic website operational and updated Engagement with GEF Unit on participation in IWC10 in Uruguay started.
	<u>GEF-7 Core Indicator 8</u> Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels: Catch (metric tons, mt) coming from stocks with unknown or depleted status moved to catch coming from stocks with sustainably fished status during project period (biomass and fishing mortality).	Current stock status (see tables in Part 1F and Annex F). 32% of stocks are at low to depleted levels, 38% at moderate to B_{MSY} levels, and 30% at unknown biomass levels. The values for exploitation rates are 17%, 58% and 25%, respectively. The DSF catch in 2016 was estimated at 226 000 mt.	Data collected to allow for estimation of stock biomass and fishing mortality for DSF stocks for 25% of stocks currently with unknown status.	50 000 mt (25% of 2016 catch).	First monitoring scheduled at mid-term
	GEF-7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	0 people at start	35% of training participants trained by the project are women by year 3. (350 female / 750 male)	40% of training participants trained by the project are women by year 5. (800 female / 1,200 male)	Total:10 Male: 5 Female: 5 (50%)

Component 1: Governance – strengthening and implementing regulatory frameworks						
<p><u>Outcome 1.1</u> Wider adoption, enforcement and compliance of international obligations relating to sustainable fisheries (stocks and impacts) with 4 RFMOs and states having adopted new measures that improve the management of data-limited stocks and/or reduce impacts on bycatch species.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs and states having adopted new measures that improve the management of data-limited stocks and/or reduce impacts on bycatch species (especially deepwater sharks and VMEs).</p>	<p>0 (as counted from project start)</p>	<p>2 RFMOs discussing the results of the project reports and questionnaires from outputs 1.1.1 & 1.1.2 in their Compliance and Commission meetings.</p>	<p>4 RFMOs</p>	<p>Work is in progress to analyze the alignment of RFMO conservation and management measures (CMMs) with international requirements.</p> <p>Work is in progress to produce an e-learning course on deep-sea fisheries.</p> <p>However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>Number of RFMOs (or flag states) having improved their monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) through better compliance information gathering contributing to more sustainable DSF on data-limited stocks and reduced impacts on deepwater sharks and VMEs.</p>	<p>0 (as counted from project start)</p>	<p>3 RFMOs (or flag states) adopting improved methods of monitoring fisheries using new or improved techniques.</p>	<p>3 RFMOs (or flag states)</p>	<p>There were no activities planned for this reporting cycle.</p>	
Component 2: Strengthening effective management of DSF						
<p><u>Outcome 2.1</u> Effective decision making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts with three RFMOs having frameworks for more effective implementation of the PA and</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs having frameworks for more effective implementation of the precautionary approach (PA) and ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF).</p>	<p>The PA and EAF are applied to the management of fisheries to varying degrees in all RFMOs, though only NAFO and has frameworks. The science advisory body for NEAFC, ICES, has a complete PA Framework. Frameworks are needed to improve transparency and strengthen the application of the PA and EAF. The ecological component of EAF is partly implemented in all RFMOs, but</p>	<p>5 RFMOs have worked on developing frameworks for application of PA and EAF for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity</p>	<p>3 RFMOs</p>	<p>Terms of reference have been developed to conduct a preliminary study on modes of communication between scientific advisory bodies and the commission of RFMOs.</p> <p>However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

ecosystem approach to fisheries EAF and three new and innovative technologies used to monitor fisheries incorporated in scientific programs or compliance monitoring.		only NAFO is accounting for whole-ecosystem effects. The social and economic components are poorly developed in all RFMOs except GFCM.	conservation.			
	Number of RFMOs having established processes for improved cooperation between RFMOs and the fishing industry on matters relating to the sustainable management of deep-sea fisheries including mechanisms of receiving guidance from the fishing industry.	Fishing industry representatives currently have options to be observers at RFMO meetings where they can, subject to procedures, make opening statements, verbal interventions and submit information papers. They are also often members of delegations but have no independent voice at meetings but may consult with their Head of Delegation.	Discussions by at least 2 RFMOs, especially at the Commission level, formalising opportunities for the fishing industry to contribute advice.	2 RFMOs	Terms of reference have been developed for work with the industry. However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.	

	<p>Number of new and innovative technologies used to monitor fisheries (compliance, stock and/or ecosystem targeted) incorporated in scientific programs or compliance monitoring.</p> <p>Web-based platform for sharing technologies sustainable.</p>	<p>Technologies currently used to acquire information on vessel position, gears deployed, catch and effort statistics, and bycatch information for compliance and scientific monitoring.</p>	<p>3 new technologies identified and sea-going trials (or port sampling trails) completed and ready for up-scaling.</p>	<p>3 new technologies.</p> <p>Web-based platform extended beyond life of project.</p>	<p>Web-platform has been established and participants invited to join.</p> <p>However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.</p>	
<p><u>Outcome 2.2:</u> Advice supporting science-based fisheries management improved with two RFMOs having adopted TAC management measures and five stocks with improved assessments and reference points adopted.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs having adopted TAC management measures that include scientific advice from productivity models relating to the environmental effects on ecosystems and stock productivity.</p>	<p>The mandate of RFMOs started with the management of stocks, which progressed to bycatch and more recently biodiversity impacts. Ecosystem monitoring and advice varies according to region, but typically relates to environmental effects on fish and fisheries. This would help in the understanding of the ecosystem productivity and function. There is currently limited use of the productivity models by fisheries scientists and managers.</p>	<p>2 RFMOs have developed suitable productivity models.</p>	<p>2 RFMOs</p>	<p>Preliminary discussions held on the organization of a symposium on the ecosystem approach to fisheries.</p> <p>However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>Number of alfonso and armourhead stocks with improved assessments and reference points adopted.</p>	<p>The status of many of the deep sea fish stocks is difficult to assess owing to low catches and complex life histories. Nevertheless, quantitative assessments have been made and a number of stocks can be assessed with “some level of confidence”. It is currently believed that the status of the deep sea stocks is classified as good (15%), possibly good (9%), possibly poor (19%), and poor</p>	<p>2 stocks</p>	<p>5 stocks</p>	<p>Preliminary discussions held with partners.</p> <p>However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.</p>	

		(29%). The status of 27% of the stocks is unknown. Currently six and two regions fish alfonsino and armourhead, respectively, with the stock status being unknown for all, with the possible exception of alfonsino in the Indian ocean and Armourhead in the North Pacific.				
	Number of RFMOs agreeing to implement the gender equality and decent work framework developed with assistance of the project	RFMOs do not generally address issues related to gender equality and decent work in DSF, and yet to some extent these are included in various certification schemes and do affect consumer opinion. A more transparent process among RFMOs and their contracting parties would promote responsible fisheries through the application of decent work and gender equality frameworks and increase consumer confidence in fishery products by ensuring they are harvested according to modern societal norms.	2 RFMOs have declared their commitment to gender mainstreaming and equality in their work.	3 RFMOs	There were no activities planned for this reporting cycle.	
<u>Outcome 2.3</u> DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed with effective measures reducing incidental deepwater shark mortality in four RFMOs.	Number of RFMOs with effective measures reducing incidental deepwater shark mortality.	There are only a few targeted deepwater shark fisheries in the ABNJ, with most catches being discarded due to retention bans or species having no commercial value. Mitigation includes live release, move-on rules, retention bans, and fishing depth limits. Impacts, for some species, have been assessed in the NW Atlantic, NE Atlantic, South Pacific, Indian Ocean and Southern Ocean. The biggest	4 RFMOs have undertaken comprehensive shark impact assessments and identifying species of concern.	4 RFMOs	Draft terms of reference developed and consultant identified for the work. However, the activities carried out in year 1 have not yet produced a measurable progress towards the achievement of the outcome.	N/A

		constraint to reducing impacts is poor catch recording and reporting in commercial fisheries.				
	Number of RFMOs with full monitoring of vessel positions and gear deployment in DSF (in an anonymised format) and available for use by scientific committees to estimate fishing effort and assess risks to vulnerable species such as VMEs or deepwater sharks.	VMS data on vessel position is collected mainly for MCS, but is increasingly made available to scientific committees in summary form. The use of electronic monitoring of catches is again primarily for MCS. Some of this can be used to estimate fishing effort and risks to vulnerable species, but the main source of data for this comes from logbook information and observer reports that are available to CPs but are usually only submitted to Secretariats in summary form. The extent to which this is done varies among CPs. Improved reporting of gear deployment activities by all fishing nations would lead to improved stock and risk assessments. Confidentiality (and transparency) controls are in place for most of this data.	Requests made by Scientific Committees to Commissions in RFMOs specifying the importance of collecting and releasing vessel position and gear deployment information for use in stock and risk assessments in DSF of 3 RFMOs.	3 RFMOs.	There were no activities planned for this reporting cycle.	
Component 3: Improving understanding and management of cross-sectoral interactions with DSF						
<u>Outcome 3.1</u> Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability with mechanisms developed in	Number of RFMOs where mechanisms have been developed in collaboration with relevant sectoral agencies to mitigate and manage cross-sectoral impacts to DSF	Sectors, though all having impact assessments, have no formal or even voluntary cross-sectoral coordinating mechanisms to resolve spatial usage and conflict. Other coordinating mechanisms exist.	2 RFMOs have discussed in their relevant scientific committees or working groups cross-sectoral coordinatin	2 RFMOs	There were no activities planned for this reporting cycle.	N/A

collaboration with relevant sectoral agencies to mitigate and manage cross-sectoral impacts to DSF in two RFMOs.			g mechanisms to maximise resource usage and minimise impacts to DSF.			
Component 4: Knowledge management, communication and M&E						
<u>Outcome 4.1</u> Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements in three RFMOs among stakeholders and target audiences	Number of RFMOs that have new or improved communication strategies that are implemented, including improved websites, with a view to achieving wider stakeholder appreciation of their work.	RFMOs have, since around 2010, dramatically improved the information content and layout of their websites. However, they still specifically target the fisheries sector, which is their primary audience and mandate. This lacks impact on other sectors and the wider stakeholder community.	3 RFMO websites reviewed within the context of reaching and being informative to non-fisheries stakeholder s ¹⁴ , whilst still maintaining consistency with RFMO mandates.	3 RFMOs	There were no activities planned for this reporting cycle.	N/A

¹⁴ The DSF Project will, under output 2.1.1 activity 4, review the RFMO websites with respect to serving their three constituent committees (management, compliance, science) and the Secretariat. This activity will be undertaken jointly with the KMCS project.

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Not applicable			

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹⁵	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁶ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁷ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1: Wider adoption, enforcement and compliance of international obligations relating to sustainable fisheries (stocks and impacts)				
<u>Output 1.1.1</u> Gaps in regional obligations to (i) manage fish stocks and (ii) reduce fisheries impacts on biodiversity identified (updated) and corrective measures proposed through at least one workshop and one report.	Report on the requirements of international instruments relevant to the management of data-limited fish stocks, deepwater sharks and VMEs in the ABNJ. Workshop on the requirements of international instruments for the management of DSF in the ABNJ and how this applies in data-limited situations to commercial landed species and incidental discarded bycatch species (e.g. deepwater sharks and VME indicator species) being discussed and taken up by RFMOs	- TORs of work developed - Draft data collection framework developed	The terms of reference of the work to be undertaken has been elaborated and agreed. The requirements of international instruments relevant to the management of deep-sea fisheries stocks in the ABNJ have been identified and collated. Work is in progress to analyze the alignment of RFMO conservation and management measures (CMMS) with these international requirements.	
<u>Output 1.1.2</u> Actions to address RFMO and national legal and regulatory gaps in uptake of international obligations related to fisheries management identified through participation of at least 20 government officials.	Number of Government officials from Contracting Parties having completed e-learning package. Report available on gender gaps in relevant national legislations identified through the self-assessment	- Outline of e-learning lessons defined - Draft content of lessons developed	An e-learning course, consisting of 5 modules, introducing DSF, challenges related to their management, and outlining key international and national-level requirements to manage DSF sustainably, is under development. The outlines of the lessons have been agreed, and the draft content has been developed.	

¹⁵ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹⁶ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁷ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<p><u>Output.1.1.3</u> Gaps in existing capacity to strengthen compliance and enforcement identified and training provided in three regions.</p>	<p>Number of people given training on with a view to improving MCS: - At-sea observer duties - Port inspection duties - VMS maintenance and reporting - Shark bycatch recording - Others as identified</p>	<p>No targets for Year 1</p>	<p>No work planned for year 1</p>	
<p>Outcome 2.1 Effective decision making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts with three RFMOs having frameworks for more effective implementation of the PA and ecosystem approach to fisheries EAF and three new and innovative technologies used to monitor fisheries incorporated in scientific programs or compliance monitoring.</p>				
<p><u>Output.2.1.1</u> Frameworks to improve science-management interface and exchange strengthened in two RFMOs.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs using an improved and standardised framework for PA and EAF as the basis for their application of PA and EAF.</p>	<p>- TORs developed and agreed re study on current frameworks and mechanisms by which the management and science committees communicate</p>	<p>TORs under development/discussion</p>	
<p><u>Output 2.1.2</u> Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF developed in two RFMOs.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs having developed routines and cooperative partnerships for formal industry contributions (including RFMOs seeking input and views from industry) to the RFMO management, compliance and science process.</p>	<p>- TORs developed and agreed re study to review current cooperation and frameworks for industry contributions to RFMOs - List of target industry groups compiled</p>	<p>Draft ToRs have been developed but are yet to be finalized. Draft list of target industry groups has been compiled.</p>	
<p><u>Output.2.1.3</u> One platform for sharing new and innovative approaches and technologies for improved monitoring, reporting and information sharing developed and operational.</p>	<p>Web-based platform for sharing technologies operational and supported by RFMOs, industry, developers, environmental NGOs and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>- Web-based platform established - Engagement with stakeholders initiated</p>	<p>The web-based platform has been set up in D-Groups and the first stakeholders (i.e. observers, scientists) have been invited to join the site.</p>	
<p>Outcome 2.2: Advice supporting science-based fisheries management improved with two RFMOs having adopted TAC management measures and five stocks with improved assessments and reference points adopted.</p>				
<p><u>Output.2.2.1</u> Ecosystem and stock productivity models developed to support scientific advice (including demersal and small pelagic species and climate change effects) in four RFMOs.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs discussing ecosystem and stock productivity models for producing advice for stock assessments in scientific committees.</p>	<p>- Concept note developed for the organization of a symposium on ecosystem modeling and EAF - Partner organizations interested in co-organizing symposium identified</p>	<p>Preliminary discussions held for the organization of a symposium on ecosystem modeling and EAF. Attendance of various international EAF meetings to scope out demand for, and interest in symposium. Concept note finalized, and NAFO's co-organization of</p>	

			the event approved by its Scientific Committee.	
<p><u>Output.2.2.2</u> Support provided to four RFMOs for improving catch recording (retained and discarded) and scientific advice on data-limited stocks.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs supported to improve fit-for-purpose data collection on data-limited stocks, with a focus on alfoncino and armourhead.</p> <p>Number of RFMOs having received support to review, revise and/or establish new assessments that improve knowledge of status of data-limited stocks, with a focus on alfoncino and armourhead.</p>	<p>- Gauge interest from partner RFMOs to partake in data collection and assessment of alfoncino and armourhead spp.</p> <p>- Develop and agree on TORs for work to be delivered by ICES</p>	<p>Letter seeking an expression of interest to partake in the data collection and assessment of alfoncino and armourhead was distributed to partner RFMOs, but fewer than expected potential participants were identified. Discussions are now in progress to possibly expand scope of this work to additional species.</p> <p>Discussions with ICES have been initiated regarding the work to be outsourced to them under this output. However, scope of the work still needs to be agreed and finalized.</p>	
<p><u>Output.2.2.3</u> Selected issues related to the social and economic dimensions of DSF assessed in six RFMOs (including gender and decent work) and 1 value chain analysis completed.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs who are aware of the gender action plan (GAP) and who are working with the DSF project to promote gender equality.</p> <p>Number of fisheries/value chains (on a stock, species or fishery basis) on which analysis has been undertaken including gender-equitable employment analysis and decent work considerations.</p>	No targets for Year 1	No work planned for year 1	
<p><u>Outcome 2.3 DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed with effective measures reducing incidental deepwater shark mortality in four RFMOs</u></p>				
<p><u>Output.2.3.1</u> Impacts of DSF on deepwater sharks assessed and mitigation proposed in four RFMOs.</p>	<p>Number of RFMOs having been provided with methodologies and tools for identification of deepwater sharks.</p> <p>Number of RFMOs having received support to undertake shark ERA assessments with improved methodologies or through analysis of deepwater shark catch by commercial vessels</p>	<p>- Contract consultant to collect photographic material of deepwater sharks for the development of a deepwater shark identification key</p> <p>- Develop TORs for a study to assess current methods and protocols to record deepwater sharks</p>	<p>Consultant identified to collect photographic material, and develop an identification key of deepwater sharks in the Indian Ocean and administrative arrangements are underway to contract consultant.</p> <p>TORs for a study to assess current methods and protocols to record deepwater sharks in draft form.</p>	

<u>Output.2.3.2</u> Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved in <u>four RFMOs</u> .	Guide on Technologies to Identify VMEs by research and commercial fishing vessels.	No targets for Year 1	No work planned for year 1	
	Review of Implementation of FAO DSF Guidelines		Expert workshop held to review the implementation of the International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas in December 2022. Publication of the review written up into an advanced draft form.	
	Report on identifying methods to monitor VMEs and assess the extent of impacts from a wide variety of threats	No targets for Year 1	No work planned for year 1	
	Number of RFMOs having contributed spatial fishing data to the project's workshop and publication on mapping of DSF by gear type.	No targets for Year 1	No work planned for year 1	
Outcome 3.1 Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability with mechanisms developed in collaboration with relevant sectoral agencies to mitigate and manage cross-sectoral impacts to DSF in two RFMOs				
<u>Output.3.1.1</u> Interactions with DSF from other sectors operating in the deep seas identified and information made available with three current and future opportunities and threats from other "sectors" to DSF identified and information collected to allow for impact analyses.	Number of current and future opportunities and threats from other "sectors" (including changes in fishing technology and biodiversity) to DSF identified and information collected to allow for impact analyses	No targets for Year 1	No work planned for year 1. Contact made with the International Seabed Authority regarding the cross-sectoral activities of the project.	
<u>Output 3.1.2</u> One framework to better mitigate and manage cross-sector interactions with DSF developed	Template for cooperating mechanism developed and presented to RFMOs	No targets for Year 1	No work planned for year 1. Contact made with the International Seabed Authority regarding the cross-sectoral activities of the project.	
Outcome 4.1 Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements in three RFMOs among stakeholders and target audiences				
<u>Output.4.1.1</u> Key successes in achieving the project objective's focal areas	Number of knowledge products on project key achievements (advances made in the sustainable management and conservation of data-limited stocks,	0	Knowledge management and communications strategy developed and approved by partners.	

identified and messaging disseminated through at least 4 knowledge products and experience notes and 1% allocated to IW:Learn activities.	deepwater sharks and VMEs) for civil society and various stakeholders.		Common Ocean Program Brand Book and Publishing Guide developed including chapter to the project including visual identity and templates of communication products	
	Number of RFMOs having received support to improve their communications with a broader audience	0	No work planned for year 1	
	Number of IW:LEARN Experience Notes prepared and shared with the IW:LEARN Network	0	No work planned for year 1	
	Number of IW LEARN GEF International Waters Conferences attended	0	Liaison with IW:Learn and programmatic partners on engagement in upcoming IWC10 has started.	
<u>Output.4.1.2</u> An operational project M&E system implemented with at least 23 reports and other products developed.	Number of M&E plan and project reports in line with FAO and GEF requirements	2	2 First PPR and PIR prepared and submitted M&E Plan under development.	
	Number of review and evaluation reports prepared and published	0	No work planned for year 1	
	Number of documentation packages to PSC for decision and information	1	1 The project's inception workshop was held from 24-26 January 2023. The workshop was attended by all PSC members. The TORs of the PSC, and the annual workplan and budget for the first year of implementation, were submitted for discussion and approval at the meeting.	
	Number of reports on implementation of Gender Action Plan is monitored	0	No work planned for year 1	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

From June to October 2022, project implementation was limited to three main activities, mostly delivered by the deep-sea fisheries expert and the lead technical officer of the project: i) attendance of international and regional fisheries management organizations' (RFMOs') meetings to introduce the DSF project to partners and other stakeholders; ii) the organization of an expert workshop for the review of the implementation of the *FAO International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas* (Output 2.3.2), and (iii) the design of an e-learning course on deep-sea fisheries (Output 1.1.2).

In November 2022, the Chief Technical Officer was recruited and began her duties as the project manager. Subsequently, the following key activities were achieved until end June 2023:

- Inception workshop, held from 24-26 January 2023 at FAO HQ, Rome, Italy
- Annual workplan and budget developed and approved by partners
- Terms of Reference of the Project Steering Committee developed and approved by partners
- Knowledge management and communications strategy developed and approved by partners
- TORs developed, and work underway to review the alignment of RFMO conservation and management measures (CMMs) with international requirements (Output 1.1.1)
- An e-learning course, consisting of 5 modules, introducing DSF, challenges related to their management, and outlining key international and national-level requirements to manage DSF sustainably, under development (Output 1.1.2)
- TORs developed and under discussion regarding (i) a study on current frameworks and mechanisms by which the RFMO management and science committees communicate (Output 2.1.1), (ii) a study to review current cooperation and frameworks for industry contributions to RFMOs (Output 2.1.2) and (iii) a study to assess current methods and protocols to record deepwater sharks (Output 2.3.1)
- Web-based platform for sharing new and innovative approaches and technologies for improved monitoring, reporting and information established in D-Groups and 28 participants joined (Output 2.1.3)
- Preliminary discussions held for the organization of a symposium on ecosystem modeling, and NAFO's co-organization of the event approved by its Scientific Committee (Output 2.2.1)
- Expert workshop held to review the implementation of the *International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas*, and review written up into an advanced draft (Output 2.3.2)

Attendance of scientific and/or annual meetings, and engagement with the Contracting Parties, of partner RFMOs GFCM, NAFO, NPFC and SIOFA

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁸	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁹	Comments/reasons²⁰ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>In its first year of implementation the project progressed well, with work on 8 of 13 technical outputs initiated and some tangible deliverables already under development. Considering the slight delay in the recruitment of the project manager, the progress can only be expected to increase in subsequent years of the project. At this point, the project is therefore expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>DSF Project Implementation Report ratings were cleared by Mr Manuel Barange, Director, NFI.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point²¹	NA	NA	<i>This is a global Project</i>
Lead Technical Officer²²	S	S	<i>Project team working well and progressing towards several technical outputs. Project is expected to achieve most of its main objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.</i>

¹⁸ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁹ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

²⁰ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

²¹ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

²² The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	<p>Over its first year of implementation, the project made excellent progress. Operational agreements were negotiated, and technical work commenced for the majority of the anticipated tasks.</p> <p>The Project Management Unit worked well, helping to execute the activities and making sure that the DSF project is also contributing to the Common Ocean programmatic approach.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe that the project is well on track to achieve all of its technical goals and contribute to the overall objectives of the Common Ocean Program.</p>
--	----------	----------	---

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please indicate if new risks have emerged during this FY.

All risks associated with the DSF Project were assessed as **LOW**.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²³ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Low

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No grievance received.

²³ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁴	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	The great number and diversity of stakeholders in deep-sea fisheries and biodiversity conservation constrains efficient coordination and implementation of the Project's activities	L	Y	The involvement of stakeholders is built in throughout the project (mainly through PSC, FAO Project Task Force, Project Website, M&E system and IW-Learn, regular workshops and roundtables) providing the opportunity for interactions and discussions between different partners.	Inception workshop was held in January 2023, was attended by all partners, and dedicated one full day to technical discussions related to the implementation of project activities in its first year. A follow-up, virtual technical consultation was held with partners in June 2023.	

²⁴ Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁴	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Changes in decision makers, or other events beyond the control of the Project, lead to changes in policies and/or support for the objectives and activities. Political risks may include lack of support at national level, or unexpected conflict between regional partners.	L	Y	The Project priorities are in line with what all stakeholders have agreed in international forums and are therefore anchored in existing policies. Support at national and regional level will be secured through careful selection of initial partner States, linking with regional bodies, and the building of support through regional and international dialogue and sectoral policy and development processes. It is envisaged that support will be strengthened/widened during preparation and all along implementation. The project will work to an agreed-upon timeline.	Efforts to maintain an international dialogue on the importance of sustainable DSF in ABNJ, including the introduction re how the DSF project will contribute to this in coming years, through the attendance of various relevant international and regional (RFMO) meetings, as well as information distributed via the Common Oceans website, fact sheets, news stories and side events	
3	There is insufficient capacity to support the Project's proposed transformational changes, particularly with regard to institutional and administrative support	L	Y	The scope of the Project has been agreed with the relevant stakeholders and, by focusing on a selected number of issues in a limited number of locations, it should be possible to achieve results without putting undue pressure on the existing institutions. Nevertheless, some customized capacity building/training will be available from the Project, as required in the case of developing countries.	No progress in year 1	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁴	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Because of the actual lack of scientific knowledge on the particularly complex and fragile ecosystems of the deep seas, progress concerning the development of more biodiversity-friendly effective tools and practices is less successful than expected	M	Y	The project includes activities aimed at substantially enhancing the practical/reliable knowledge available through: (i) compilation and sharing of existing information from different communities, (ii) targeted information gathering to cover key gaps and (iii) direct engagement of the fishing industry in the data collection processes. These steps should substantially reduce the lack of the necessary scientific knowledge and the development of tools and practices should therefore be significant. In addition, the project will identify the nature and types of knowledge necessary in follow-up phases for the further development of specific tools and practices, as deemed appropriate.	No progress in year 1	
5	Adverse climate changes compromise the Program's achievements, particularly concerning the ecosystems and biodiversity.	L	Y	The significance and impact of climatic changes depends on the physicochemical and bioecological transformational processes involved, not all of which are well understood in the deep seas. However, significant changes are not expected to take place for decades. In the meantime, precautionary management to increase resilience and knowledge building will be required as supported through this project. The Program's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system will include indicators allowing for a close monitoring of the possible climate change impacts over time. Moreover, climate resilient management practices for particularly vulnerable ecosystems will be developed and promoted.	No progress in year 1	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁴	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Risk of Covid-19 Impacts to Project design and implementation include reduced or no travel, no personal meetings, delays of workshops and risks and impacts on human resources	L	Y	<p>Develop a budgeted, contingency plan to cover the first two years of the project in case COVID19 does not permit the implementation of initial activities as proposed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conduct COVID19-related risk assessments and opportunities to inform approach to project implementation to the potential effects of COVID-19; - adopt COVID-19 mitigation measures (e.g., for managing travel, workshops etc.) in line with government and partner policies and procedures; - revert to virtual mechanisms (Zoom, Skype, email-type platforms); - shift education courses to online courses supported by increased engagement of learners and encouragement of enrolment through using advance learning technologies; - personnel boarding and inspection replaced by EMS; - adoption of online survey tools; and - field activities where necessary and/or are more efficient shifted to the project's outer years 	<p>Year 1 has seen a significant relaxing of Covid-19 measures across the globe, with most borders open and global travel permitted.</p> <p>Nevertheless, albeit encouraging in-person attendance, the project consistently allowed for hybrid meeting modalities to ensure all partners and invited participants were able to take part in relevant meetings.</p>	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
	L	At this early stage of project implementation, the assumptions of the project hold true, and mitigation actions have been taken where possible, so the project is likely to face only low risks

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	Not applicable.
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation.....	
Recommendation.....	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	
--	--

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²⁵. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

²⁵ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
FAO Fisheries Division	Implementing agency	FAO Fisheries Division (NFI) was informed of DSF project and key activities through a seminar held on 23 November. NFI staff working on topics relevant to the DSF project (e.g. sharks, EAF) also consulted bilaterally.	None to report for year 1
RFMO members and Contracting Parties (usually via the RFMO Secretariats)	Project partners	Attendance of scientific and/or annual meetings, and engagement with the Contracting Parties, of partner RFMOs: GFCM, NAFO, NPFC and SIOFA Attendance of other partner RFMOs' meetings planned for second half of 2023.	Contracting Parties are usually very busy during RFMO meetings, interactions are often brief
Deep Sea RFMOs	Project partners via the secretariats	Executive Secretariats engaged through inception workshop, virtual technical meetings and bilateral meetings.	Secretariats have very limited time, so have to be very concise in the engagement
Other marine sector UN Agencies: ISA, CBD, IMO, etc	Stakeholders to be affected, directly or indirectly, by the outcomes of the Project implementation	Formal and informal discussions held with ISA Discussions with other stakeholders planned for second half of 2023.	None to report for year 1
NGOs²⁶			
Civil society (eNGOs – biodiversity conservation)	Stakeholders to be affected, directly or indirectly, by the outcomes of the Project implementation and able to influence and decide on project implementation	No progress in year 1	
Civil society (markets and consumers)	Stakeholders to be affected, directly or indirectly, by the outcomes of the Project implementation and able to	No progress in year 1	

²⁶ Non-government organizations

	influence and decide on project implementation		
Private sector entities			
DSF Industry and industry groups	Participation in the project stakeholders to be affected, directly or indirectly, by the outcomes of the Project implementation and able to influence and decide on project implementation	Industry groups partner to the project took part in the inception workshop, as well as the technical meeting held on 28 June. Engagement with additional industry groups planned for second half of 2023.	None to report for year 1
Others²⁷			
Research Institutes (and independent advisory bodies) - ICES	ICES to work directly with RFMOs and CPs on developing and reviewing data requirements and stock assessment methodologies.	ICES, as a partner, took part in the inception workshop, as well as the technical meeting held on 28 June. Informal dialogues held with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science re potential collaboration on deepwater sharks.	
New stakeholders identified			

²⁷ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	A gender analysis was carried out during project preparation.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Of the 10 experts invited to a workshop for the review of the DSF Guidelines, half were women Ongoing discussions within PMU, as well as with project partners, on how to incorporate gender-responsive measures into the project
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Of the 10 experts invited to a workshop for the review of the DSF Guidelines, half were women.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	No progress in year 1
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	<i>Please provide progress on gender sensitive indicators of the project results framework.</i> GEF Core 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment Total:10 Male: 5 Female: 5 Outcome 2.2: Number of RFMOs agreeing to implement the gender equality and decent work framework developed with assistance of the project No progress in year 1

2023 Project Implementation Report

		<p>Output 1.1.2 Number of Government officials from Contracting Parties having completed e-learning package (disaggregated by gender) No progress in year 1</p> <p>Output 1.1.3 Number of people given training on with a view to improving MCS (disaggregated by gender) No progress in year 1</p> <p>Output 2.2.3: Number of fisheries/value chains (on a stock, species or fishery basis) on which analysis has been undertaken including gender-equitable employment analysis and decent work considerations. No progress in year 1</p> <p>Output 4.1.2 Number of reports on implementation of Gender Action Plan is monitored No progress in year 1</p>
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Yes
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Yes
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Not applicable for year 1
Please provide links to related website, social media account	Project website: https://www.fao.org/in-action/commonoceans/what-we-do/deepsea/en/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>Publications:</p> <p>Vessel trip report on aimed bottom trawling for orange roughy in the southwestern Indian Ocean, June–July 2009 (20 March 2023)</p> <p>Report of the areas beyond national jurisdiction Deep-sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach Project's validation workshop 23 August 2022)</p> <p>Leaflets (Fact sheet):</p> <p>Common Oceans Program - Deep-sea fisheries (10 February 2023)</p> <p>Web stories:</p> <p>Project: New deep-sea fisheries project committed to reduce impacts on marine habitats and achieve sustainable fisheries (24 January 2023)</p> <p>D-group:</p> <p>https://dgroups.org/fao/common_oceans_deep_sea_fisheries</p>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Qingqing Wang qingqing.wang@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

Not applicable

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁸	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁹	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	In-kind	6,145,000	1,159,957		6,145,000
GEF Agency	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Grant	1,000,000	0		1,000,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC)	In-kind	2,026,000	395,960		2,026,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)	In-kind	3,032,000	714,200		3,032,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)	In-kind	500,000	50,000		500,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC)*	In-kind	1,500,000	300,000		1,500,000

²⁸Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁹Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

Other Intergovernmental Organizations	South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO)	In-kind	1,700,000	340,000		1,700,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA)	In-kind	1,000,000	85,000		1,000,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO)	In-kind	1,500,000	300,000		1,500,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	In-kind	3,000,000	732,780		3,000,000
Private sector	Southern Indian Ocean Deepsea Fishers Association (SIODFA)	In-kind	20,000,000	5,000,000		20,000,000
Private sector	International Coalition of Fisheries Associations (ICFA)	In-kind	5,000,000	300,000		5,000,000
National Governments	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)*	In-kind	6,400,000	1,504,395		6,400,000
TOTAL			52,803,000	10,882,292		52,803,000

*Estimate

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement?

The grant co-financing by FAO is linked to a research cruise of the EAF Nansen in the Southern Indian Ocean which is currently planned for 2025.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks

Annex 2.**GEO LOCATION INFORMATION**

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.