



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).....	8
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	16
6. RISKS	18
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	21
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	22
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	23
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	26
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	27
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	29
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	30

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	Global Coordination Project for the Common Oceans ABNJ Program
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GLO/1004/GFF
GEF ID:	10626
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	FAO Conservation International (CI) WWF (US)
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:	15 March 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):	2,752,294
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	10,256,256
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	940,089
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	434,600
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	2,741,496

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:	6-8 July 2022 (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:	Low
----------------------------------	-----

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)	Viktoria Varga Lencses, Senior Fishery Officer, NFI, FAO	Viktoria.VargaLencses@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)	Piero Mannini, Senior Fisheries Officer, NFI, FAO	Piero.Mannini@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)

Objective/Outcome	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
<u>Project Objective:</u> to maximize the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of GEF-7 investments in the Common Oceans ABNJ program	GEF indicator 11: Direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (number, disaggregated by gender)	0	1,787 men 1,187 women	3,575 men 2,375 women	100 men 87 women (47%)	S
	GEF Indicator 7.4: Engagement in IW:Learn activities (level)	0	At least level 3 engagement in IW:Learn activities	At least level 3 engagement in IW:Learn activities	2 Program website operational Engagement with programmatic partners and IW:Learn Project on contributions to IWC10 in Uruguay started IW Learn program and projects websites are in development.	
Component 1: Programme coordination, monitoring and adaptive management						

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.

<u>Outcome 1.1</u> The Program and its child projects (including participating partners) are collaborative and adaptive, through an effective and synergistic programme.	Coordination meeting reports indicating progress (number)	0	15 (6/year)	30 (6/year)	8 reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Inception workshop (July 2022) • 4 Program Coordination meetings (Sep 2022, Dec 2022, March 2023, May 2023) • 2 KMC WG meetings (Oct 2022, Feb 2023) • 1 M&E WG meeting (Feb 2023) 	HS
<u>Outcome 1.2</u> Project partners, integrated and aligned on ten joint activities , where appropriate, to increase effectiveness of the interventions at Program and Child Project levels	Joint project activities agreed and implemented between two or more projects (number)	0	6	10	No joint activities yet. The Global Coordination Unit is exploring how to set up discussion groups focusing on common thematic areas to go more into details on specific issues to exchange information among the projects.	S
<u>Outcome 1.3</u> The progress of the program is effectively and consistently monitored, and the results guide adaptive management of the program.	Child projects whose strategic directions consider, and where necessary respond to, the results of programmatic M&E (number)	NA	4	4	Key principles for programmatic M&E agreed. Program partners established a programmatic Working Group on M&E.	S
Component 2: Knowledge management, communications and outreach, and capacity building for effective and integrated sustainable use of the ABNJ						
<u>Outcome 2.1</u> Experiences and models of sustainable use of ABNJ are collated, analyzed and effectively communicated through 28 results reports) including IW:Learn notes), stimulating scaling up and replication	Programmatic results reports (number)	0	13 (at least. 5/year)	28 (at least. 5/year)	5 project fact sheets	S

<u>Outcome 2.2</u> Increased capacity among global, regional and national actors in common areas of learning (e.g. ecosystem approach, natural capital assessment, climate change, monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) communication)	Improved capacity measured by pre/post training questionnaires, or through dedicated surveys (score)	Baseline to be determined before trainings	Increase	Increase	No progress yet.	
“ General public increasingly aware of ABNJ issues and the actions of the Program to address these issues	Levels of awareness as determined by surveys of target audience. 1 during inception and one during final year of implementation.	To be determined at the beginning of the project	Increase	Increase	Program baseline survey ongoing.	S
Component 3: Innovative private sector engagement in the ABNJ						
<u>Outcome 3.1</u> The private sector enabled to engage and innovatively invest in collective action to address “global” or “ABNJ wide” sustainability issues through at least 12 private sector entities with enhanced understanding and ability to act to address ABNJ sustainability	Private sector entities with enhanced understanding and ability to act to address ABNJ sustainability (number)	N/A	At least 6	At least 12	No progress yet	S
<u>Outcome 3.2</u>	Financially viable private sector models	0	0	2	No progress yet	

Model/approach for improved engagement of the private sector in addressing collective action in the ABNJ developed, established and operational with two financially viable private sector models and pilots.	and pilots (number)					
---	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Component 1: Programme coordination, monitoring and adaptive management				
<u>Outcome 1.1</u> The Program and its child projects (including participating partners) are collaborative and adaptive, through an effective and synergistic programme.				
<u>Output 1.1.1</u> Programme-wide coordination of actions that are common to two or more child-projects to ensure they are consistent and cohesive through bi-monthly coordination meetings	Programmatic coordination meetings, involving all child projects through virtual or in-person meetings (number) – target 30	6	8 meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Inception workshop (July 2022) • 4 Program Coordination meetings (Sep 2022, Dec 2022, March 2023, May 2023) • 2 KMC WG meetings (Oct 2022, Feb 2023) • 1 M&E WG meeting (Feb 2023) 	
<u>Outcome 1.2</u> Project partners, integrated and aligned on ten joint activities , where appropriate, to increase effectiveness of the interventions at Program and Child Project levels				
<u>Output 1.2.1</u> Collaborative partnerships synergizing their actions on common issues in the ABNJ following an agreed partnership strategy with ten opportunities for cooperation jointly identified	Opportunities for cooperation jointly identified by relevant partners and projects (number) – target 10	0	The Global Coordination Unit is exploring how to set up discussion groups focusing on common thematic areas to go more into details on specific issues to exchange information among the projects.	

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ 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)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outcome 1.3 The progress of the program is effectively and consistently monitored, and the results guide adaptive management of the program.				
Output 1.3.1 Harmonized programmatic M&E system to guide adaptive program management and reporting with yearly programmatic reports	Programmatic reports produced and submitted to GSC (number) – target 5	2	2 programmatic reports submitted to GEF Unit, programmatic reports for GSC still under development awaiting finalization of programmatic results framework. Key principles for programmatic M&E agreed. Working Group on M&E established and met once (Feb 2023) Draft programmatic results framework developed.	
Component 2: Knowledge management, communications and outreach, and capacity building for effective and integrated sustainable use of the ABNJ				
Outcome 2.1 Experiences and models of sustainable use of ABNJ are collated, analyzed and effectively communicated through 28 results reports) including IW:Learn notes), stimulating scaling up and replication				
Output 2.1.1 Integrated Program KM and Communication (KMC) strategy developed and implemented with common messaging and guidance for coordinated, consistent and harmonized communications including 1% allocation to IW:Learn activities.	Development of Program KMC Strategy and Guidelines	Completed	A programmatic KMC strategy and work plan have been developed in consultation with programmatic partners.	
Output 2.1.2 Guidance and support provided to the projects for dissemination of knowledge products that capture lessons learned through six KMC meetings, trainings and workshops. Consolidation of lessons learned across the Program into a narrative of the programmatic impacts.	KMC support to the other child projects facilitated	Ongoing	Programmatic Brand Book and style guide developed and finalized in consultation with programmatic and project partners 2 Power Point standards prepared for use by projects.	
	Program KMC meetings, trainings and workshops (number) – target 6	2	2 meetings Working Group on KMC established and met twice (Oct 2022 and Feb 2023)	
	Program knowledge-sharing hub integrated in Program website developed and managed	Ongoing	Development of Program knowledge-hub started and knowledge sharing platform identified (Dgroups).	

<u>Outcome 2.2</u> Increased capacity among global, regional and national actors in common areas of learning (e.g. ecosystem approach, natural capital assessment, climate change, monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) communication)				
<u>Output 2.2.1</u> Five capacity building products developed and processes to facilitate their uptake among key actors organised.	Capacity building tools focused on capacity building, including synthesis documents and program e-learning material developed and disseminated (number) – target 5	0	No work planned for year 1	
	Targeted individuals using common online materials and tools across the Program (number, disaggregated by gender) – target 5,000	0	No work planned for year 1	
<u>Outcome 2.3</u> General public increasingly aware of ABNJ issues and the actions of the Program to address these issues				
<u>Output 2.3.1</u> Consistent and branded outreach and awareness raising efforts for civil society stakeholders communicated by child projects, and coordinated at the Program level and 15 programmatic information, outreach and awareness raising products	Program information, outreach and awareness-raising products and activities (number) – target 15	5	5 total Fact sheets: 5 The program organized a side event during the UNFSA Review Conference in New York, USA The program and its projects were presented at a series of meetings and events listed in Annex 3.	
	Development and management of dedicated program website.	Ongoing	Current website updated with new information about the Program and projects, and 5 web stories published. Mock-up for new Program website in new content management system developed. Website users: 3,554 Website pageviews: 10,676 Twitter: 48 posts	

Component 3: Innovative private sector engagement in the ABNJ				
Outcome 3.1 The private sector enabled to engage and innovatively invest in collective action to address “global” or “ABNJ wide” sustainability issues through at least 12 private sector entities with enhanced understanding and ability to act to address ABNJ sustainability				
<u>Output.3.1.1</u> Nine strategic documents and forums that improve private sector understanding of the financial feasibility and risks associated with investments and promote partnerships to support actions to address ABNJ-wide sustainability issues.	Strategic documents prepared and promoted (number) – target 7	0 WWF 0 CI	Detailed update below.	
	Strategic forums established and operational (number) – target 2	0 WWF 0 CI	Detailed update below.	
	WWF	10%	10 % LoA with WWF US operational since 21 March 2023. Initial design and content for the web based platform and analysis for first strategic document started started.	
	CI	0%	LoA with CI in final stages of development.	
Outcome 3.2 Model/approach for improved engagement of the private sector in addressing collective action in the ABNJ developed, established and operational with two financially viable private sector models and pilots.				
<u>Output 3.2.1</u> Two private sector investment agreement that contributes to realizing Program objectives	Private sector investment agreements developed to reduce the ecological impacts in ABNJ (number) – target 2	0 WWF 0 CI	Detailed update below.	
	WWF	10%	10% LoA with WWF US operational since 21 March 2023. Research and analysis on the marine debris business case started.	
	CI	0%	LoA with CI in final stages of development.	
<u>Output 3.2.2</u> Two pilot studies apply the value chain approach demonstrating private sector	Pilot studies to demonstrate improved private sector engagement (number) – target 2	0 WWF 0 CI	Detailed update below.	

adoption of best practices to improve sustainable use of ABNJ resources.	WWF	0%	LoA with WWF US operational since 21 March 2023. No work planned under this output.	
	CI	0%	LoA with CI in final stages of development.	

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)

In 2022 and in the first half of 2023 significant effort from all projects focused on the inception phase, designing work plans, organising resources and setting up PMUs. This preparatory phase therefore established the required cooperation and coordination mechanisms at programme level in an adaptable manner.

The programmatic inception workshop took place in a hybrid format in Rome at the FAO HQ, from 6-8 July 2022.

Discussions so far included agreement on key principles for cooperation, the role and setup of the Global Coordination Project and the Global Steering Committee, main areas for coordinated joint actions for the individual projects, the establishment of programmatic working groups on monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management and communication and program level coordination mechanisms.

The Global Coordination Unit is exploring how to set up discussion groups focusing on common thematic areas to go more into details on specific issues to exchange information among the projects.

A programmatic KMC strategy and work plan have been developed and discussed with programmatic partners.

A programmatic Brand Book and style guid providing guidance on the visual identity and communication is currently being finalized.

Key principles for programmatic M&E were agreed during the programmatic inception workshop. This includes that the information required as contribution from the projects for the programmatic M&E should be, to the extent possible, based on project progress and other reports prepared during implementation of the projects with the intention to avoid creating additional reporting obligations.

The Common Oceans Program and projects have been presented and discussed at various events listed under section 10 and in Annex 3.

The partnership approach of the project bringing together a wide range of organizations is considered a strength of the project.

The timeframe and amounts in the LoAs under this project are unusually high for this type of agreement, leading to lengthy and complex approval procedures. The LoA with WWF US is operational since 21 March 2023, the one with Conservation International in final stages of development.

Delays with the launch of the Cross sectoral project had to be taken into account when planning joint or harmonised activities and M&E actions.

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 rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ 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>Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. This preparatory phase established the required cooperation and coordination mechanisms at programme level in an adaptive manner. Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. Good progress on components 1 and 3, some delays with the operational launch of the Cross-sectoral project had to be taken into account when planning joint or harmonised activities as well as regarding KMC and M&E actions. Some delays with the operationalization of the LoAs under component 3.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>Ratings are cleared by Mr Manuel Barange, Director, NFI.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	NA	NA	<i>This is a global project</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<i>Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. This preparatory phase established the required cooperation and coordination mechanisms.</i>

¹⁵ **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.

¹⁶ **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.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			<i>Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.</i>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	<p>Over the reporting period, the Global Coordination Project performed an excellent job of providing effective support to the entire Common Ocean Program. This includes coordination with UNDP and UNEP, which are implementing two of the five child projects under the program.</p> <p>The GCP provided constant coordination and support throughout the program. The effort to keep the five-projects involved and connected to the programmatic approach is evident. The best example is the efforts made to establish programmatic working groups on monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management, and communication, which focus on the entire program rather than just a single child project.</p> <p>The GCP was also representing the Common Oceans Program in several events and discussions with the GEF. This provides a good base for unfolding the program as a coordinated effort of its five child projects. In conclusion, the GCP did very well over the reporting period. I think it is on track to meet all its goals quickly and effectively.</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.

This project has been classified as LOW risk.

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				
	Stakeholder consultations to raise issue and explore possible interventions	No specific action so far.	Interpret issue in the context of the program	
ESS 8: Gender Equality				

	See section 10.	Detailed update under section 10.		
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	Stakeholder consultations to raise issue and explore possible interventions	No specific action so far.	Interpret issue in the context of the program	
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 ²⁰ . 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.

²⁰ **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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Lack of participation from the child projects	L	Y	An agreement on a number of principles to govern the interaction among projects have been agreed to and included in each project document.	Completed. Partnership strategy discussed and agreed during inception workshop.	
2	Climate change	M	Y	Climate change will strengthen the rationale for the GCP, rather than undermine it. The GCP will support IP and non-IP countries in addressing climate change issues at national and transboundary levels.	Early phase of implementation.	

²¹ 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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Impacts on communication and participation due to national, regional or global health emergencies	L	Y	Advisory and IT support to participating countries to permit remote communication among team members and with project stakeholders	Good progress in making IT and virtual solutions available to programmatic partners and stakeholders.	
4	COVID19 pandemic related impacts on the internal and international travel, operation of government/ partners/ project; health impacts on general population as well as economic impacts, regionally, nationally and locally	L	Y	If there are changes in cofinance, then partners to work closely to seek alternative options for co-financing and ensure continuity of resource allocation to ongoing initiatives in project target areas. The GCP will support the child projects in identifying methodological alternatives that allow effective participation under these circumstances, and where necessary will arrange for technical inputs from the GCP to be provided to the child projects virtually (on line). Ensure close collaboration with private sector entities and logistic companies to understand emerging barriers related to the pandemic and establish feasible options, with an emphasis on regional/transboundary collaboration.	The effects of the COVID19 pandemic are currently low. Partners haven't changed their co-financing commitments. Good progress in making IT and virtual solutions available to programmatic partners and stakeholders.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	PMU resources insufficient for attending relevant meetings in person.	M	N	Explore hybrid options and pooling of resources to ensure coordinated representation.	Good progress.	

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
NA	L	The two risks with potentially high impact, lack of participation from the child projects and the COVID19 pandemic currently have low probability of occurring. Considering the overall picture, the current overall risk rating is low with a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize.

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.

Not applicable.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
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 Guidelines²². 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.

Not applicable.

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)			

²² 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			
Regional/Intergovernmental Organizations (Stakeholders participating in the Project execution or supporting the implementation of specific activities)	<p>Deep-Sea and Tuna RFMOs attended the PSC meetings of the relevant projects.</p> <p>The Program and the projects were presented in the following regional fora:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Fishery Body Secretariats' Network meeting (September 2022) • 44th NAFO Annual Meeting (19–23 Sep 2022) in Portugal • ICES WKLIFE workshop (17 January 2023) • 11th Meeting of the SPRFMO Commission, Manta, Ecuador, 13 to 17 February 2023, • 23rd Special Meeting of the ICCAT Commission (13-21 Nov 2022) • GFCM Working Group on vulnerable marine ecosystems (8-10 March 2022) • 2nd Meeting of the ICCAT Sub-group on the Ecosystem Report Card (4-5 April 2023) • 27th Session of the IOTC Commission (8-12 May 2023) • Workshop on deepwater sharks in the SIOFA area (20-21 March 2023) • Inter American Sea Turtle Convention consultative committee meeting (April 2023) 	
National Governments and Agencies	Stakeholders supporting the implementation of specific activities, and will be able to influence and decide on the Project execution, and/or use Project outcomes for decision making)	<p>The Program organized a side event at the Resumed Review Conference of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement held from V at UN HQ in New York, USA including participation by FAO, ICCAT Secretariat, NAFO Secretariat, ISSF and WWF.</p> <p>The Program or its projects were present at various global events providing opportunities to engagement with national governments and agencies:</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNGA Bottom Fishing Workshop (2-3 Aug 2022) • 5th session of the Intergovernmental Conference on an International Legally Binding Instrument the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of ABNJ (15 to 26 August 2022) • Resumed 5th session of the Intergovernmental Conference on an International Legally Binding Instrument the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of ABNJ (BBNJ) (20 February to 3 March 2023) • EU Thematic Workshop on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Operationalization in tuna and non-tuna RFMOs (1-3 Mar 2023) 	
NGOs²³			
Civil Society (including vulnerable groups)	Stakeholders participating in the Project execution, supporting the implementation of specific activities, or to be affected, directly and/or indirectly, by Project outcomes	<p>Conservation and WWF International are participating in project execution and the Global Steering Committee. The Program and its projects participated in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IUCN high seas workshop and SARGADOM advisory board (June 2023) • The Bright Future of Our Oceans: The Transformative Impact of Hope Spots' at the Explorers Club in New York (June 2023) • IFOMC 10th International Fisheries Observer and Monitoring Conference (6-10 March 2023) • IMPAC 5 conference - during a High Seas Alliance event about the first generation of high seas MPAs (February 2023) 	
Private sector entities			
Private sector	Stakeholders participating in the Project execution, or to be affected, directly and/or indirectly, by Project outcomes	The Program and the Tuna project attended the Bermeo Tuna Forum (2-3 May 2023). Other opportunities for interactions on the program and its projects with the private sector included a meeting with ICFA in 2022.	

²³ Non-government organizations

Others²⁴			
Donor and GEF Agencies	Stakeholders participating in the Project execution	Meeting with the programmatic partners take place regularly through the Programmatic Coordination meetings and the KMC and M&E WG meetings.	
Global Development Agencies and Networks	Stakeholders participating in the Project execution	Meeting with the programmatic partners take place regularly through the Programmatic Coordination meetings and the KMC and M&E WG meetings.	
Foundations and trusts	Stakeholders participating in the Project execution	Foundations and trusts were involved in the various regional and global meetings with participation from the program and its projects.	
Research institutions/Academia (Stakeholders supporting the implementation of project activities	Several academic institutions and representatives of academia were involved in the various regional and global meetings with participation from the program and its projects.	
<i>New stakeholders identified</i>			

²⁴ 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 and gender action plan were prepared during the PPG phase
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	PMU has a strong share of female staffing. Female representation at international events is ensured. Gender balance taken into account for composition of panel for events.
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	Women's participation is encouraged in all activities. The programmatic side event the Resumed Review Conference of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement held from 20–26 May 2023 at UN HQ in New York had 4 panelists, three of them women plus a female moderator and female FAO Director.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		<p><i>Please provide progress on gender sensitive indicators of the project results framework.</i></p> <p>GEF indicator 11: Direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (number, disaggregated by gender) 100 men 87 women (47%)</p> <p>Output 2.2.1 Targeted individuals using common online materials and tools across the Program (number, disaggregated by gender) No progress yet.</p>
Staff with gender expertise		PMU staff will complete training on gender issues and inclusive working environment.
Any other good practices on gender		Not at the moment.

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	<p>Program website: https://www.fao.org/in-action/commonoceans/en/</p> <p>IW Learn program website: https://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/10548</p> <p>Program YouTube playlist: https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK5O74ZpL_A2iGNxD6hojc1n</p> <p>Program Twitter Tag: https://twitter.com/search?q=%23CommonOceans&src=saved_search_click&f=live</p>
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 Factsheet</p> <p>Common Oceans Program - Deep-sea fisheries (10 February 2023)</p> <p>Common Oceans Program - Tuna fisheries (10 February 2023)</p> <p>Common Oceans Program – Sargasso Sea</p> <p>Common Oceans – Cross-sectoral cooperation</p> <p>Web stories:</p> <p>Program:</p> <p>FAO set to support implementation of landmark treaty for conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity on high seas (22 June 2023)</p>

	<p>Spotlighting the impact of the Common Oceans Program in the context of the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA) (24 May 2023)</p> <p>New deep-sea fisheries project committed to reduce impacts on marine habitats and achieve sustainable fisheries (24 Jan 2023)</p> <p>The Ocean Foundation and FAO launch groundbreaking knowledge hub for fisheries management (2 November 2022)</p> <p>Ambitious, new phase of Common Oceans Program to keep the ocean healthy (6 July 2022)</p> <p>Program video of Phase 1: A partnership for sustainability in the common oceans – achievements from 2014-2019</p> <p>D-group: https://dgroups.org/fao/common_oceans_program</p>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p>Maarten Roest Maarten.Roest@fao.org</p> <p>Qingqing Wang qingqing.wang@fao.org</p>

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 ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	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	FAO	Grant	3,515,000	1,393,245	NA	3,515,000
Donor Agency	WWF-US	In-kind	6,258,901	1,251,780	NA	6,258,901
Donor Agency	CI*	In-kind	482,355	96,471	NA	482,355
		TOTAL	10,256,256	2,741,496		10,256,256

* Estimate

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

²⁵Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁶Grant, 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

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.

Annex 3

List of meetings where the Common Oceans Program and projects have been presented and discussed

- UN Ocean Conference at a side event for the SARGADOM project (July 2022)
- UNGA Bottom Fishing Workshop (2-3 Aug 2022)
- 5th session of the Intergovernmental Conference on an International Legally Binding Instrument the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of ABNJ (15 to 26 August 2022)
- Regional Fishery Body Secretariats' Network meeting (September 2022)
- COLACMAR conference - SARGADOM roundtable event on conservation challenges for ABNJ (Sept 2022)
- 44th NAFO Annual Meeting (19–23 Sep 2022)
- Inception workshop for the Sargasso project in Costa Rica, as well as SARGADOM steering committee and joint meetings of Commissioners and Signatories (October 2022)
- FAO-ICFA meeting (27 September 2022)
- 23rd Special Meeting of the ICCAT Commission (13-21 Nov 2022)
- ICES WKLIFE workshop (17 January 2023)
- IMPAC 5 conference - during a High Seas Alliance event about the first generation of high seas MPAs (February 2023)
- 11th Meeting of the SPRFMO Commission, Manta, Ecuador, 13 to 17 February 2023,
- Resumed 5th session of the Intergovernmental Conference on an International Legally Binding Instrument the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of ABNJ (BBNJ) (20 February to 3 March 2023)
- EU Thematic Workshop on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Operationalization in tuna and non-tuna RFMOs (1-3 Mar 2023)
- IFOMC 10th International Fisheries Observer and Monitoring Conference (6-10 March 2023)
- GFCM Working Group on vulnerable marine ecosystems (8-10 March 2022)
- Workshop on deepwater sharks in the SIOFA area (20-21 March 2023)
- Inter American Sea Turtle Convention consultative committee meeting (April 2023)
- 2nd Meeting of the ICCAT Sub-group on the Ecosystem Report Card (4-5 April 2023)
- Bermeo Tuna Forum (2-3 May 2023)
- 27th Session of the IOTC Commission (8-12 May 2023)
- The Bright Future of Our Oceans: The Transformative Impact of Hope Spots' at the Explorers Club in New York (June 2023)
- IUCN high seas workshop and SARGADOM advisory board (June 2023)