



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	
Project Title:	Sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation of deep-sea living marine resources and ecosystems in the areas beyond national jurisdiction
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/GLO/366/GFF
GEF ID:	4660
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters and Biodiversity
Project Executing Partners:	United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) Interim North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO) South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO) Comision Permanent del Pacifico Sur (CPPS) Secretariat and its Plan of Action The Nairobi Convention Secretariat International Coalition of Fisheries Associations (ICFA) Southern Indian Ocean Deep-sea Fishers Association (SIODFA) Sealord Group The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	10 June 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 September 2014
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 August 2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	31 December 2019
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,315,597 (4,900,597 FAO and 2,415,000 WCMC-UNEP)
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	79,558,500
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	5,020,382 (2,765,144 FAO and 2,255,238 WCMC-UNEP)
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	64,769,811

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	23-25 January 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	November 2017 - April 2018
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	July 2019 – early 2020
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

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

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	William Emerson (FIDF)	william.emerson@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Merete Tandstad (FIAF)	merete.tandstad@fao.org
Budget Holder	Jacqueline Alder (FIDF)	jacqueline.alder@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane (CBC)	GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To achieve efficiency and sustainability in the use of deep-sea living resources and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ, through the systematic application of an ecosystem approach for: (i) improving sustainable management practices for DSF, taking into account the impacts on related ecosystems; (ii) improving the protection of VMEs and components of EBSAs; and (iii) testing improved area-based planning tools for deep-sea ecosystems.						
Objective(s): To achieve efficiency and sustainability in the use of deep-sea living resources and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ, through the systematic application of an ecosystem approach for: (i) improving sustainable management practices for DSF, taking into account the impacts on related ecosystems; (ii) improving the protection of VMEs and components of EBSAs; and (iii) testing improved area-based planning tools for deep-sea ecosystems	<p>Number of national or regional organizations that have made improvements to legal or policy frameworks, management planning and implementation</p> <p>Extent of implementation of comprehensive adaptive management plans based on current best-practices, in accordance with an EAF framework, including protection of biodiversity</p> <p>Improved status of DSF and the resources, biodiversity and ecosystems</p>	<p>Some EAF measures in place in DSF, but low uptake of best practices in many regions</p> <p>Most tools not adequately adapted to address deep-sea issues in the ABNJ.</p>	Current available knowledge on best practices for application of an ecosystem approach, from legal frameworks to planning to implementation and monitoring, identified, synthesized and distributed;	<p>Measurable improvements to legal or policy frameworks, management planning and implementation in the two Deep-sea RFMOs and 50 percent of national institutions in the two pilot areas through uptake and implementation of guidance from the project;</p> <p>Management plans for DSF and biodiversity conservation developed and under implementation in the two pilot areas;</p> <p>Management measures taken to maintain sustainability of key deep-sea stocks and associated (measurable beyond life</p>	<p>The completed review and stepwise guide to international legal and policy instruments related to deep sea fisheries and biodiversity conservation in ABNJ has been published and promoted. SEAFO and SIOFA countries participated in a DEEP FLIP (Fisheries Law in Practice) pilot training program based on the review of international legal and policy instruments and have the capacity to implement the requirements.</p> <p>A range of reviews and studies (i.e. electronic</p>	

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	Two regions with improved knowledge of area-based planning and which incorporate it into the regional marine planning processes.			of the project -Year 10) Two regions have begun implementation and testing of area-based planning tools	<p>monitoring studies, gear impact studies, and global reviews of key species) have been completed to improve the knowledge base relating to the EAF elements and identify best practices in support of strengthening adaptive management in deep sea fisheries in the ABNJ. These have been complemented with regional workshops, trainings and workshops and supported specific activities to assist with the implementation of best practices. For example, the number of VMEs in deep sea RFMOs have increased from 170 in 2015 to 188 in 2019. In addition, deep sea RFMOs have closed the majority of their Convention areas to fishing except under strict exploratory fishing protocols.</p> <p>The project has fostered North/South cooperation with more</p>	

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<p>established RFMOs (such as NEAFC and NAFO) providing support to newer RFMOs with regards to scientific research and RFMO processes</p> <p>The reviews, studies and preparations intended to underpin area-based planning activities in the south east Pacific Ocean and Western Indian Ocean areas have advanced well.</p>	
Outcome 1.1: Improved implementation of existing policy and legal frameworks, incorporating obligations and good practices from global and regional legal and policy instruments for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation, are tested and disseminated to all competent authorities.	Number of national and regional organizations that implement the policy and legal instruments to DSF and biodiversity.	Limited awareness, tools and legal capacities to implement obligations and best practices from particular global and regional legal and policy instruments.	Five national and regional organizations in at least one region have benefitted from implementation tools and related training to implement legal and policy instruments related to DSF and biodiversity conservation in ABNJ.	Total of ten national and regional organizations in two regions implement the policy and legal instruments to DSF and biodiversity conservation.	Six national organizations (Comoros, Cook Islands, Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles and Thailand) and two regional organizations (SIOFA and SEAFO) now have the capacity to implement international policy and legal instruments relevant to deep sea fisheries and biodiversity conservation.	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 1.2: Global and regional networks are strengthened and/or expanded.	Extent to which network groups are used and contribute to cross-community and cross-regional dialogue.	Networks are largely sector oriented. At the regional level, there is a lack of coordination among various ongoing activities relevant for DSF and biodiversity in ABNJ.	One to two networks of relevant stakeholders are actively used and contribute to cross “community” dialogues and cross-regional connections.	At least four targeted networks of relevant stakeholders are actively used and contribute to cross “community” dialogues and cross-regional connections.	<p>In addition to regular meetings of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats hosted by FAO, informal meetings of the Deep Sea RFMO Secretariats ensure better coordination of deep sea RFMO activities.</p> <p>The Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plan Secretariats Network, which is a long-standing network of UN Environment, was strengthened through four area-based planning meetings. VME (FAO) and EBSA (CBD) websites operational.</p>	HS
Outcome 2.1: Improved application of management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and	Number of new protocols and tools for identification and mitigation of potential threats to biodiversity,	Limited availability of deep-sea specific protocols and tools.	At least two new protocols and tools developed for identification and mitigation of potential threats	At least four new protocols and tools developed and applied to DSF for identification and mitigation of potential threats to	Tools and protocols have been made available to DSF for the identification and mitigation of potential threats to	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
biodiversity is demonstrated.	<p>developed and applied in the pilot regions.</p> <p>Extent of uptake of these tools in protocols in other regions.</p>		to biodiversity, in the two pilot regions.	biodiversity, in the two pilot regions. Uptake of these protocols and tools will take place, as appropriate and possible, in other regions.	<p>biodiversity, in the two pilot regions, including:</p> <p>(i) Report on connectivity analysis for marine megafauna in the Western Indian Ocean and South east Pacific;</p> <p>(ii) Manual for the collection and analysis of data to document processes used to improve EBSA descriptions globally;</p> <p>(iii) Report on the risk of different fishing gears on biodiversity for SIOFA, SPRFMO, and SEAFO is being finalised;</p> <p>(iv) Report on VME Processes and Practices report provides guidance at the global level on measures to protect VMEs.</p>	

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2.2 The capacities of stakeholders are developed, to use improved management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity.	Extent of application of improved management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in national processes.	National capacities to address DSF and biodiversity insufficient in many countries.	At least two regions benefited from training activities.	Ten countries apply improved management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in national processes.	Six regional VME training workshops have been convened (in the Western Central Atlantic, the Mediterranean, Eastern Central Atlantic, Southern Indian Ocean, and two in the North Pacific) and EBSA training has been provided at four regional workshops (Northern east Indian Ocean, north west Indian Ocean, Seas of South east Asia, Black Sea, Baltic Sea and the Caspian Sea). The countries that participated in the workshops have the capacity to apply improved management tools for mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in national processes. VMEs in the ABNJ increased from 170 in 2015 to 188 in	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					2019.	
Outcome 3.1: Planning and management processes for achieving sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation are improved, tested, and disseminated to all competent authorities.	Number of national and regional organizations that have planning and management processes consistent with EAF for achieving sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation.	EAF only partially considered in planning and management processes for DSF of national and regional organizations. Processes varies considerable from region to region, but even in those areas where practices are most advanced improvements are required, particularly but not only in relation to implementation of EAF.	Best practices for sustainable DSF management and biodiversity conservation analysed and information on status of selected deep-sea stocks synthesized.	Adaptive approaches to management planning and implementation under EAF, including MCS, developed and applied to DSF in at least 3 national or regional organizations.	Six countries (Angola, Comoros, Cook Islands Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, and Thailand) and two regional organizations (SIOFA and SEFAO) have received training on the implementation of MCS requirements. Global EAF baseline study reviews EAF implementation by 8 RFMOs.	S
Outcome 4.1: Efficient area-based planning tools and good practices based on ecosystem-based management practices are made available to competent	RSPs and other regional competent authorities have access to previous experiences with area-based planning in the ABNJ. A suite of relevant and applicable area-	Regional application of area-based planning exists in a variety of contexts but the enabling factors need to be highlighted to determine their applicability to other	Existing ABNJ approaches are shared with three RSPs, other than project areas of intervention. Two selected project areas of intervention are	Existing ABNJ approaches are shared with RSP coordination group, to reach all 18 RSPs, and related, relevant competent authorities.	Capacity needs assessments have been undertaken at the start of the project and at the end in the Western Indian Ocean and the South East Pacific. To determine the	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
authorities.	based planning tools are reviewed, and specific tools are selected and developed for use in regions.	regions. Existing area-based planning tools are specific to EEZs and have not been developed and tested in deep-sea ecosystem or ABNJ contexts.	engaged in developing area-based planning tools.		<p>capacity of each pilot region to undertake area-based planning as a network in ABNJ.</p> <p>Eight reviews of area-based planning tools and good practices intended to inform area-based planning activities in the south east Pacific Ocean and Western Indian Ocean areas have advanced well, are available in multiple languages. These have been disseminated widely, including through the Common Oceans website, promotional materials at regional and international events, to reach as wide a range of audiences as possible.</p>	

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 4.2: Area-based planning in ABNJ is incorporated into the regional marine planning processes in selected regions through partnerships between competent authorities.	Planning processes to discuss ABNJ area management are organized and attended by competent authorities, supported by regionally specific area-based planning tools and science-based advice, and draft scenarios are developed.	ABNJ planning has been undertaken in a few regions where clear mandates exist. There is high resource capacity. However, in other regions, ABNJ planning is very rarely largely due to different governance structures or lower capacity. Capacity for using area-based planning tools has not been developed.	Area-based planning has been discussed in one selected area of intervention, with identified sectoral stakeholders and policy-makers.	Area-based planning has been discussed in two selected areas of intervention, with identified sectoral stakeholders and policy-makers.	At present, there is a lack of a governance framework through which comprehensive, cross-sectoral area-based planning can be applied in ABNJ. Negotiations relating to BBNJ are ongoing and may shape the way in which area-based planning can occur in ABNJ in future. As such, a series of area-based planning workshops were held in the two Pilot Regions, in which participants were asked to test the application of a Marine Spatial Planning framework for ABNJ. The aim of this was to encourage regional stakeholders to consider what Marine Spatial Planning could look like in ABNJ in future under different governance	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					frameworks. The result is a framework that provides descriptions as to what Marine Spatial Planning could look like under different governance scenarios that may arise under a new legally binding agreement for marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ).	
Outcome 5.1: Project implementation conducted with adaptive results-based management, supported by M&E, including transmission of lessons learned via the IW-Learn Programme.	Adaptive results based management system in place and lessons learned shared through the IW-Learn Program.	No system in place.	Adaptive results-based management system in place and lessons learned shared through IW:Learn and the Common Oceans portal.	Adaptive results-based management system in place and lessons learned shared through IW:Learn and the Common Oceans portal.	<p>The project website operating and populated with project documents.</p> <p>Project specific M&E system is in place.</p> <p>Materials promoting results from project activities have been distributed at the various major events.</p>	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

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

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³				Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR 2016	2 nd PIR 2017	3 rd PIR 2018	Final PIR 2019		
Output 1.1.1. Challenges to the implementation of international policy and legal instruments identified and remedial measures are formulated.	Q1 Y3	2 activities: 2 completed. • A report has been produced and reviewed.	Review of the international legal and policy instruments completed.	Review of the international legal and policy instruments completed	Review of the international legal and policy instruments completed.	100%	
Output 1.1.2: Step-wise guide for implementation of relevant international policy and legal instruments to DSF and biodiversity conservation		2 activities: 1 completed, 1 not started. • The draft step-wise	Draft stepwise guide being developed.	Draft stepwise guide being developed.	Stepwise guide completed. Training workshop on implementation of the stepwise DEEP FLIP (Fisheries Law in Practice) including	100%	

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (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.

made available to competent authorities, industry partners and other stakeholders.		guide is available.			selected member countries from SIOFA and SEAFO (Comoros, Cook Islands, Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles, Thailand) and the SIOFA Secretariat. Participating countries have been enabled to implement policy and legal frameworks for DSF and biodiversity conservation.		
Output 1.1.3: Model policy and legal frameworks, enabling sustainable DSF management and biodiversity conservation at the regional and national levels, developed and integrated into national legislation in countries in at least one region (to be determined: either Southeast Atlantic, or Indian Ocean, depending on specific country requests).		<p>4 sequential activities: 1 started, 3 not started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model policy and legal frameworks identified. Five countries have indicated their interest in participating 		Regional workshops being planned	Regional assessments of capacity building requirements underway.	25%	<p>Activities start once activities under output 1.1.2 are completed.</p> <p>The third meeting of the Project Steering Committee agreed that Target 12 under Output 1.1.3 was beyond the scope of the project.</p>
Output 1.1.4. Options for market-based incentives (e.g. trade certification and eco-labelling) developed and tested in at least one selected pilot area (Indian Ocean and Southeast Atlantic).		<p>3 (sequential) activities: 1 started, 2 not started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert consultation on Establishing Guidelines 	The work under this target is advanced and due for completion in January 2018	A Report on Catch Documentation Schemes is close to publication. Options for testing market based options are being	Report on Catch Documentation Schemes (CDS) is published. The report has been made available to SIOFA and SEAFO to identify options for implementation of market-based incentives related to CDS.	80%	The testing of CDS options would be up to the respective RFMOs and discussions would need to follow RFMO processes. Hence, this target may or may not reach 100% by the end of the project depending on decisions reached by RFMOs.

		<p>for Catch Documentation Schemes to Improve the Traceability of Fishery Products held in July 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDS Consultant identified and draft TORs developed. Work to start in 2017. 		developed.	<p>The FAO Conference adopted Voluntary Guidelines for Catch Documentation Schemes in 2017. The Guidelines are global in nature and are designed to provide assistance to States, RFMOs, regional economic integration organizations and other intergovernmental organizations when developing and implementing new CDS, or harmonizing or reviewing existing CDS</p>		
<p>Output 1.2.1: Collaborative networks and partnerships, including all stakeholders involved in ABNJ-DSF and biodiversity conservation, strengthened or set-up, with links to global and regional communities of practice under the ABNJ Program.</p>		<p>2 activities: 1 started, 1 not started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two meetings of deep-sea fishing industry facilitated. • Informal secretariats contact group formed. • The EBSA network was strengthened through 	<p>Global and regional networks are ongoing.</p> <p>A gender analysis was undertaken on the deep sea fishing industry, and presented at the industry-project meeting in 2016</p>	<p>Global and regional networks are ongoing.</p> <p>VME (FAO) and EBSA (CBD) websites operational.</p> <p>Workshops on climate change and VMEs were held.</p> <p>Further gender assessment as part of a decent work study</p>	<p>Global and regional networks are ongoing.</p> <p>Deep Sea meeting in May 2019 highlighted project results. The meeting included stakeholders representing multiple sectors within the ABNJ, to discuss opportunities and challenges to support sustainable deep-sea fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ.</p> <p>In addition to regular meetings of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats hosted by FAO, informal</p>	100%	<p>Re. Target 21. Increased percentage of women contributing to Global and regional networks. This target is above the accountability ceiling of the project.</p>

		<p>two area-based planning meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions describing the project have been made to GOBI and RSN newsletters. • The Project has produced information materials to BBNJ discussions and the Bottom Fisheries review process. 		<p>being proposed in activity 2.1.1.</p>	<p>meetings of the Deep Sea RFMO Secretariats ensure better coordination of deep sea RFMO activities.</p> <p>VME (FAO) and EBSA (CBD) websites operational.</p> <p>The Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plan Secretariats Network, which is a long-standing network of UN Environment, was strengthened through two area-based planning meetings.</p>		
<p>Output 2.1.1: Biological, ecological and economic analyses of DSF and biodiversity in the ABNJ carried out, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to classify risks and threats and identify vulnerable marine ecosystems.</p>		<p>6 activities: 1 completed, 4 started, 1 not started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSIRO, Duke University, and GOBI have been collecting and grooming data as part of the CBD 	<p>Biological and ecological information on DSF and associated biodiversity data is collected.</p>	<p>LoA is being finalised with CSIRO to undertake additional analysis related to EBSAs and VMEs.</p>	<p>LOA with CSIRO is collating and validating existing biological and ecological information on deep-sea fish species managed by SIOFA and SPRFMO and associated biodiversity for the Indian Ocean and the South Pacific Ocean. It is also analyzing the risks and threats of major fishing gears on biodiversity for three deep-sea RFMO/As (SIOFA, SEAFO and SPRFMO).</p>	80%	

		<p>EBSA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A preliminary gender analysis of deep-sea fisheries, including an industry survey, was undertaken in the first half of 2016. • The drafting of the second WWR of Bottom Fisheries as advanced. • A report on best practices for the identification of VMEs is advanced and expected to be published later in 2016. • In 2015, the FAO Deep-seas Fisheries Programme, 			<p>Support the capacity of SEAFO, SIOFA and SPRFMO to undertake work in support of the assessment of bottom fishing impacts on VMEs as normal practice, including developing bottom fishing impact assessment standards.</p> <p>Integrated CSIRO, Duke University, GOBI, GRID Arendal, collection and consolidation of existing biological and ecological information on DSF and associated biodiversity data as part of their normal activities.</p> <p>Since project commencement, CBD has held 6 regional EBSA workshops (3 in 2015, 2 in 2017 and 1 in 2018) to compile, review and analyse relevant data.</p> <p>The 2009 Worldwide Review of Bottom Fisheries in the High Seas is being updated and expanded. Publication of the update review is expected in Q3 2019.</p> <p>A VME workshop was convened in collaboration with SIOFA to assist SIOFA with the development of a measure to protect VMEs</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>the EAF-Nansen project and SEAFO organized a research cruise with the R/V <i>Dr Fridtjof Nansen</i> to conduct basic mapping and identification of VMEs and fisheries on seamounts.</p>			<p>from significant adverse impact.</p> <p>A workshop in collaboration with the Deep Ocean Stewardship Initiative (DOSI) Climate Change working group and RFMOS experts was organized in August 2017. A report is expected in 2019.</p>		
<p>Output 2.1.2: Interactive web databases, for identification and use in mitigation of threats to sustainable DSF and biodiversity in ABNJ, particularly for VMEs and components of EBSAs, improved for use in regions in close collaboration with all stakeholders.</p>		<p>3 activities: 1 completed, 2 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VME DataBase and portal (http://www.fao.org/in-action/vulnerable-marine-ecosystems/) 	<p>VME database and EBSA repository are operational.</p>	<p>LoA with CSIRO (see above) will support the development of regional databases to support EBSA identification.</p>	<p>FAO VME database and CBD EBSA repository are operational.</p> <p>LoA with CSIRO (see above) supports the development of regional databases to support EBSA identification. The LoA also includes the identification and metadata development of available telemetry data outlining migratory connectivity and</p>	90%	

		en). • EBSA database (http://www.cbd.int/ebsa/)			the development of regional views of the MiCO ¹⁵ system.		
Output 2.1.3. Indicators for the identification of potential VMEs and for description of areas meeting EBSA criteria, developed in at least one pilot area. This will include pilot activities for the Southeast Atlantic, the Indian Ocean and the South Pacific.		3 activities: 3 started. • R/V <i>Dr Fridtjof Nansen</i> survey information used in the development of VME advice for SEAFO. • Ongoing promotion of good practices in the EBSA process. • Identification tools for sponges (Indian Ocean) and sponges and corals	The report Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems – processes and practices in the high seas summarizes the regional processes (10 regions) and practices in place for VMEs and associated measures.	CBD and Duke University signed contract with CSIRO to support peer-reviewed publication reviewing results of EBSA processes. A workshop on the Protection of VMEs in the North Pacific Commission area was convened.	RFMOs manage and monitor VME interactions. In collaboration with the Deep-sea Fisheries Programme of FAO, regional identification tools developed for key VME indicators groups in the Mediterranean (Sponges and corals) and the Indian Ocean (Sponges) that can be used and tested by fisheries scientists and observers at sea. Guidance documents on the collection and preservation of vulnerable species groups have also been prepared (e.g. http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6353e.pdf), including in collaboration with the SponGES project. Most RFMOs are aware of the EBSA process (as determined through technical reports) and they	80%	Re. Target 39: Project Steering Committee agreed that Target 39 under Output 2.1.3 could not be delivered by the end of the project.

¹⁵ The Migratory Connectivity in the Ocean (MiCO) consortium is a group of over 50 organizations that seeks to fill knowledge gaps related to global migratory routes and connected areas for marine mammal, seabird, sea turtle and fish species.

		(Mediterranean) are under development/discussion. Training on the use of sponges and coral identification guides – to be followed up in the second half of 2016.			take the general approach of remaining aware of EBSAs within their respective convention areas and of the factors that led to their definitions. The project promotes the use of EBSA information, including in international fora, such as the CBD/FAO Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fisheries Bodies on Accelerating Progress Towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. A VME publication on science is planned for 2019.		
Output 2.1.4: Improved fishing practices to reduce impacts on VMEs and marine biodiversity, developed in at least one pilot area. This will include pilot activities for Southeast Atlantic and the Indian Ocean.		3 activities: 3 started. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Species guides and catalogues of the deep-sea cartilaginous fishes of the Indian Ocean and the southeast Atlantic available.• Identification catalogue	A biological data collection manual, based on the additional requirements for reporting on VMEs that are included in the FAO International Guidelines for Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas, was published in late 2016	Finalising report on management measures for the conservation and management of biodiversity conservation and an overview of management measures of relevance to biodiversity conservation.	A biological data collection manual, based on the additional requirements for reporting on VMEs that are included in the FAO International Guidelines for Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas has been published. The number of VMEs in ABNJ has increased from 170 in 2015 to 188 in 2019. Identification guide for deep-sea cartilaginous fishes of the south eastern Pacific Ocean has been published.	80%	

		<p>and guide for deep-sea elasmobranchs under development for the eastern Pacific region. Training on the use of guides is planned for the second half of 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine species biological data collection manual published in 2016. • A list of management measures for the conservation and management of biodiversity conservation (binding and non-binding) and an overview of management 			<p>A species catalogue and a field guide dedicated to the identification of deep-sea cartilaginous fishes of the south eastern Pacific Ocean has been published. Other identification guides include those for the Indian ocean and south-eastern Atlantic Ocean.</p> <p>Identification tools for sponges of the Indian Ocean and sponges and corals of the Mediterranean have been published.</p> <p>All RFMOs have management measures to mitigate the impact of DSF, and review processes to assess impacts. It is beyond the accountability ceiling and budget of the project to test these.</p> <p>A feasibility study on the use of electronic monitoring systems on Cook Island deep-sea fishing vessels operating in SIOFA is underway.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

		t measures of relevance to biodiversity conservation has been collated and categorized.					
Output 2.2.1: Customized support provided to at least ten developing countries to fully integrate best practices for sustainable DSF and biodiversity conservation in their management processes.		<p>2 activities: 2 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taxonomy training at the national level. • Ocean governance training at the national level. 	Capacity development needs have been identified in a range of areas and a range of capacity development activities have been undertaken and planned.	Capacity development needs have been identified in a range of areas and a range of capacity development activities have been undertaken and planned	Capacity development needs have been identified in a range of areas (including for legal and policy implementation; and for monitoring, control and surveillance; taxonomy/ deep sea species identification; ocean governance; VMEs; EBSAs) and a range of capacity development activities have been undertaken and planned, providing customized support to participants from more than ten developing countries.	100%	
Output 2.2.2: Technical and operational support on the application of VME and EBSA criteria provided, for systematic use by countries.		<p>1 activity: 1 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VME training provided for CEEAF countries (GFCM countries in July 2016 and WECAFC countries in November 	Four VME training workshops have been held since 2014.	Various VME workshops the since the project started.	Six VME training workshops have been held since 2014. EBSA training has been provided at four regional workshops since 2015 (Northern east Indian Ocean, north west Indian Ocean and Seas of South east Asia.	100%	

		2016). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EBSA training provided at 3 regional workshops. 					
Output 3.1.1: Best practices, methods and tools for comprehensive management planning, encompassing an ecosystem approach and allowing for adaptive changes, reviewed and adapted to the special conditions of DSF in the ABNJ.		3 activities: 1 completed, 2 started. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cornerstone document on the biology, assessment and management of alfonsino published (http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5336e.pdf). Cornerstone document on the biology, assessment, and management of orange roughy in preparation. 	Global review of alfonsino (<i>Beryx</i> spp.) completed). Report of the workshop to review orange roughy acoustics data completed.	Global review of orange roughy (<i>hoplostethus atlanticus</i>) fisheries, biology and management ready for publication.	Material collected and developed over the course of the project highlight best practices, methods and tools including: -Global review of alfonsino (<i>Beryx</i> spp.), their fisheries, biology and management -Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems: Processes and Practices in the High Sea -Best practices in VME encounter protocols and impact assessments -Report of the expert meeting to share experiences and lessons learned on the scientific methodologies and approaches for the descriptions of EBSAs. -Identification guide for deep-sea cartilaginous fishes of the south eastern Pacific Ocean. -Identification tools for Sponges of the Indian Ocean and sponges and corals of the Mediterranean have been published. -NAFO ID guide for corals -Marine Species Data	90%	

					<p>Collection Manual (http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6353e.pdf).</p> <p>-The Report of the workshop to review orange roughy acoustics data.</p> <p>-Global review Orange roughy biology, assessment and management.</p> <p>Rights based management workshop was conducted in April 2019. The workshop report is being finalized.</p>		
Output 3.1.2: Adaptive management processes demonstrated, including identification of management objectives and priorities, through participatory risk analysis in at least one selected pilot area. This will include pilot activities in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Atlantic.		3 (sequential) activities: 0 started.	Ecosystems approach to fisheries consultancy to start Q3 2017.	Ecosystems approach to fisheries consultancy underway.	An Ecosystems Approach to Fisheries baseline report for the 8 deep seas RFMOs is being finalised.	75%	Pilot activities on applying directly EAF steps and risk assessment approach to a specific fishery proved to be challenging to achieve in the reporting period, and hence some of the targets and associated activities were dropped as per recommendation from the Steering Committee. At the same time a first baseline on EAF for all RFMOs has been prepared.
Output 3.1.3: Objective-based indicators and reference points (related to target species, catch/bycatch composition, biodiversity, etc.) selected and a related monitoring program for DSF in the ABNJ tested in a selected pilot area. This		2 (sequential) activities: 0 started.					The third Project Steering Committee agreed to delete Output 3.1.3.

will include pilot activities in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Atlantic.							
Output 3.1.4: Action plan for adoption of MCS best practices, adapted to the specific conditions of DSF in the ABNJ, formulated and adopted in one of the selected pilot areas (this will include pilot activities in the Indian Ocean).		2 (sequential) activities: 0 started.	MCS review well underway.	Completion of the MCS review is expected in Q3 2018.	Report on monitoring, control and surveillance in deep-seas fisheries in ABNJ is being finalised. A monitoring, control and surveillance workshop for SIOFA and SEAFO was convened in December 2018. The workshop report, including an action plan for adoption of MCS best practices, is being finalized.	75%	
Output 3.1.5: Options for improved management measures for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation - including: i) encounters with vulnerable species/habitats, (ii) spatial management tools, and (iii) fishing operations aimed at mitigating adverse impacts on sensitive habitats and ecosystems - developed and disseminated. This will include pilot activities in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Atlantic.		1 activity: 0 started.	A contract being developed with Sealord on the development and testing of improved fishing systems, including implementation of real time fibre optic winch system. Discussions are also advanced with the Cook Islands to trial electronic monitoring systems on deep	Contract with Sealord on the development and testing of improved fishing systems, including implementation of real time fibre optic winch system close to being finalised. Discussions with the Cook Islands to trial electronic monitoring systems on	Discussions are ongoing with the Cook Islands to trial electronic monitoring systems on deep sea fishing vessels operating in the ABNJ to collect information on VMEs. The trialing of electronic monitoring systems on deep sea fishing vessels will be further developed once the ongoing electronic monitoring system feasibility study is completed (to be completed before project closure).	50%	

			sea fishing vessels	deep sea fishing vessels are ongoing.			
Output 4.1.1: Adaptation and further development of available area-based planning tools addressing deep-sea ecosystems in ABNJ and connected exclusive economic zones (This will include pilot activities in the Western Indian Ocean and the Southeast Pacific).		<p>2 activities: 2 started.</p> <p>4 studies complete and nearing publication, 1 study in progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional arrangements and legal instruments in the southeast Pacific and western Indian Ocean. • Review of area-based planning tools. • Introduction to global marine datasets of biodiversity importance in the western Indian Ocean. 	<p>Review of institutional and governance arrangements in the pilot regions has been developed to understand the governance landscape and the various sectors involved in area-based planning in ABNJ.</p> <p>A side event was completed at the BBNJ Preparation Committee III titled: Options for using Area Based Planning Tools in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction.</p> <p>IUCN held a 'Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdictions: Area-based</p>	<p>A contract with OpenOceans to undertake cumulative impacts assessment in pilot region has been finalized.</p> <p>Area-based planning tools reviews is nearing completion and has benefited from feedback from experts. It has recently been issued for external review</p> <p>A contract with Duke University to review ecological connectivity between EEZ and ABNJ is signed. Work is underway</p> <p>Two regional</p>	<p>Cumulative impact assessments have been undertaken for each Pilot Region, identifying how such information can be used to inform area-based planning in ABNJ.</p> <p>Review of area-based planning tools has been undertaken. This review seeks to identify key features of area-based planning tools which enable their application in ABNJ to support the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ).</p> <p>A series of connectivity – related studies have been completed. These explore the relevance of connectivity to the EEZ and ABNJ (report here) and provide insight into how connectivity is relevant to area-based planning (report here).</p> <p>Global and regional marine datasets of biodiversity importance have been</p>	95%	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to global marine datasets of biodiversity importance in the southeast Pacific connectivity study (in progress). 	<p>Management Tools, including Marine Protected Areas' workshop in Switzerland, 16–17 May 2017.</p> <p>The terms of reference for a connectivity analysis have been shared with project partners (Duke University, CPPS and the Nairobi Convention) for their review. To identify the relevant data needed for area-based planning in ABNJ – Terms of reference for the identification of data have been shared with the Nairobi Convention and CPPS for their review prior to commencement.</p>	<p>metadata inventories are being finalized, highlighting relevant data that could be used for area-based planning.</p>	<p>identified in the pilot regions through a metadata study. This aims to result in the completion of metadata inventories for each region. This work is currently underway. It is hoped that these inventories can then be incorporated into UNEP-WCMC's <u>Ocean+ initiative</u> to help disseminate information to a wider range of user and marine stakeholders, both within and beyond the pilot regions.</p> <p>Additional work is being carried out to integrate biodiversity data relevant to ABNJ into Ocean+ Library to support Regional Fishery Management Organisations and Regional Seas Organisations to find data that is of relevance to area-based planning in the Deep Seas. This links with the work done under Component 2 regarding VMEs and EBSAs.</p> <p>Synthesis report bringing together key findings from Component 4 is underway.</p> <p>An agreement is in place with GRID-Arendal to create prototype for a single online platform to highlight the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					existing management measures in ABNJ to increase the visibility of potential interaction between sectors. The platform will include some key biodiversity data as well as individual sectoral information.		
Output 4.1.2: Knowledge and experiences sharing from the Northeast Atlantic and the Mediterranean concerning deep-sea marine ecosystems and area-based planning.		<p>1 activity: 1 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of regional area-based planning (ABP) approaches in the ABNJ is underway. 	The case studies report is currently being updated to include recently released data for the four regions of interest. It will then be issues for review by experts in each of the case study regions	A review of experiences in area-based planning approaches has been undertaken for four case study regions . These have been issued for review by experts in each of the case study regions. The report will include a range of lessons learned from the regions and how these may be of relevance to the project pilot regions. Project engagement 3 rd project Steering Committee was held at UNEP-	<p>Review of case studies of area-based planning in ABNJ has been undertaken. This review looks at four regions in which area-based planning is occurring in ABNJ and explores the different contexts and methods used in each.</p> <p>Two regional knowledge exchange and capacity building workshops have been held in the South-East Pacific and Western Indian Ocean Pilot Regions.</p> <p>The pilot regions have been involved in the development and testing of an area-based planning framework for ABNJ. Participants have participated in interactive planning sessions, which aim to bring together perspectives from different sectors (including, fisheries, environment, academia, shipping, mining, telecommunications) to</p>	95%	Regional perspectives and feedback has been used to update the area-based planning framework and further review with regional stakeholders, sectoral representatives and area-based planning experts is on-going. The plan is to publish this in July 2019 and formally launch this at Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) 3 in August 2019.

				WCMC, Cambridge. Follow up meetings have been held between FAO and UNEP-WCMC. Engagement with UN Environment has been strengthened, particularly in terms of reviewing outputs from the project.	consider an aspect of planning under a particular governance framework.		
Output 4.2.1: Testing of area-based planning tools in the selected regions (Western Indian Ocean and Southeast Pacific).		2 (sequential) activities: 1 started. • Workshops planned for Q4 in 2016.	Capacity assessment methodologies for use in each pilot region have been significantly expanded in response to existing capacity to engage in project activities, and this area of the project has been revised to reflect the need a clear identification of capacity levels,	Capacity assessments have been finalized in the two pilot regions on area-based planning. These have been validated during two regional workshops in 2017.	A second round of capacity needs assessments for each pilot region has been undertaken to review previous and current capacity of regional networks to undertake area-based planning in ABNJ. Four area-based planning workshops have been held. In the South-East Pacific, these were held in November 2018 and March 2019. In the Western Indian Ocean, these workshops were held in March and June 2019.	100%	

			<p>capacity gaps and therefore areas for capacity building towards achievement of project goals. Revised capacity assessments are being shared for regional review with regional partners and will be revised with the two regions to identify a series of capacity building activities. Within the Western Indian Ocean, the need for capacity development activities on spatial planning in national jurisdictions has already been clearly identified and a Marine Spatial Planning workshop is planned for October</p>		<p>Two of the four area-based planning workshops have been hosted in collaboration with the Strengthening Regional Ocean Governance (STRONG) High Seas Project, funded by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) established by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of the German Government. These joint workshops have provided an opportunity for synergies between the two projects to be realized and provided opportunities to engage with a third Regional Seas Convention – the Abidjan Convention.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Output 4.2.2: Science-based and policy relevant advice on area-based planning and management applied in regional deep-sea ecosystem planning processes in the selected test regions with engagement of relevant stakeholders and through the partnership between competent authorities (Western Indian Ocean and Southeast Pacific).		<p>1 activity: 0 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To start in 2017. 	Meetings held with Regional Seas Programmes and Regional Fisheries Bodies In Southwest Indian Ocean	<p>Regional engagement</p> <p>Two pilot region workshops were held in 2017 with the purpose of raising the profile of the ABNJ Deep Seas Project</p>	<p>The ABNJ Deep Seas project in the South East Pacific region helped to inform the region that an ABNJ Working Group was required, and this was established in 2018.</p> <p>At the 10th Conference of Parties to the Nairobi Convention in 2018 the Member States adopted Decision 9/10 on ocean governance and the conservation of marine biodiversity in areas adjacent to areas beyond national jurisdiction.</p> <p>Side-events relating to the work of the Deep Seas Project have been held throughout the BBNJ process. To date, this has included events at:</p> <p><u>March 2017: Preparatory Committee Meeting III – “Options for using Area Based Planning Tools in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction”</u></p> <p><u>July 2017: Preparatory Committee Meeting IV – “Capacity Development in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction: Experiences, Lessons, and Possible Ways Forward”</u></p>	100%	
--	--	---	---	---	---	------	--

					<p><u>Sept 2018:</u> <u>Intergovernmental Conference I – “Area-based planning in ABNJ”</u></p> <p><u>April 2019:</u> <u>Intergovernmental Conference II – “Connectivity: A Critical Consideration in Global Ocean Governance”.</u></p> <p>During each Project Steering Committee meeting, area based planning experiences, lessons and practices have been shared and discussed with the RFMOs in order to inform future area-based planning processes.</p>		
Output 5.1.1: Website established which is compatible with IW-Learn program and contributes to the ABNJ Program portal).		<p>2 activities: 1 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing. Website established and being populated with project material. The project website is part of the common oceans website (http://www.commonoceans.org). 	Common Oceans website operating and populated with project documents (http://www.commonoceans.org). This website was assimilated into the FAO website framework and updated.	Common Oceans website operating and populated with project documents (http://www.commonoceans.org). This website was assimilated into the FAO website framework and updated.	<p>The Project Coordinator participated in the 9th GEF International Waters Conference to represent the ABNJ Deep Sea Project and to participate in the FAO led TDA-SAP Marine World Cafe session and to participate in the Transformational Solutions for Long-Term Sustainability of Ongoing and New Interventions Roundtable.</p> <p>Common Oceans website operating and populated</p>	90%	

		<p>fao.org/in-action/commonoceans/en/).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No contributions made to IW:Learn as yet. 		<p>with project documents (http://www.commonoceans.org). This website was assimilated into the FAO website framework and updated.</p> <p>To ensure the outputs reach as wide a range as possible, all the outputs produced have been disseminated online via the Common Oceans webpage. Component 4 outputs have also been disseminated on the <u>UNEP-WCMC website</u>.</p> <p>A series of webinars have been produced in English and Spanish in order to provide alternative capacity-building opportunities for stakeholders from the Pilot Regions, and also wider stakeholders, to learn about ABNJ-related issues.</p> <p>Additional work: The next step is to produce a story outlining the entire ABNJ Deep Seas project and make this available as an interactive online summary report. The link will be widely disseminated to the RSPs and RFMOs. The products developed under the project will be accessible</p>		
--	--	---	--	---	--	--

					via the online report.		
Output 5.1.2: Project monitoring system operating and systematically providing information on progress in meeting project output and outcome targets.		<p>2 activities: 2 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing. The monitoring system has been set up and the Project is being monitored with the assistance of the FAO project management database. Progress reports are being produced. The LogFrame is being critically assessed as project activities are planned and implemented. 	Ongoing, the system comprises: 1) PSC meetings 2016 and 2017, 2) an independent critical review of the M&E system was undertaken, 3) FAO Project task force meetings held to review project progress.	The PSC met in April 2018.	The PSC met in January 2019.	100%	
Output 5.1.3: Timely biannual PPRs available for		1 activity: 1 started.	PPRs for Jul-Dec 2015, Jan-Jun	PPRs for Jul-Dec 2017, Jan-Jun	PPRs for July-December 2018 completed and in FPMIS.	100%	

adaptive results-based management.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPRs produced according to requirements. 	2016, Jul-Dec 2016, Jan-Jun 2017 completed and in FPMIS.	2018 completed and in FPMIS			
Output 5.1.4: Midterm and terminal evaluation carried out and reports available.		<p>2 activities: 0 started.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MTE planned for Q2 2017. 	Midterm review is planned for Q4 2017	Midterm review carried out and endorsed by the PSC.	<p>Arrangements underway for terminal evaluation (consultant has been identified)</p> <p>The Terminal Evaluation began in July 2019 and is expected to be completed in early 2020.</p>	90%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

The majority of the deep sea fisheries in ABNJ are under the jurisdiction of deep sea RFMOs, and the majority of those areas under the jurisdiction of deep sea RFMOs are either closed to fishing, or only allow exploratory fishing under very precautionary conditions. Over the project's lifespan the protection of VMEs in deep sea RFMOs has improved with the number of VMEs increasing from 170 in 2015 to 188 in 2019.

Two new deep sea RFMOs (NPFC and SIOFA) have been established since the project started. The project has supported the scientific and management processes of the new RFMO/As by sharing knowledge and information from other regions, developing regional capacity through trainings and workshops, and supported specific activities within those areas (i.e. electronic monitoring studies, gear impact studies, and global reviews of key species). The project has fostered North/South cooperation with more established RFMOs (such as NEAFC and NAFO) providing support to newer RFMOs with regards to scientific research and RFMO processes.

The Project convened a Deep Sea meeting in 2019 that highlighted project results. The meeting included approximately 60 participants representing multiple sectors within the ABNJ. The workshop reviewed opportunities and challenges to support sustainable deep-sea fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ in terms of governance, science and management.

Two Regional workshops (Western Indian Ocean and South East Pacific) have been hosted in collaboration with the IKI-Funded Strengthening Regional Ocean Governance (STRONG) High Seas Project. These joint workshops have provided an opportunity for synergies between the two projects to be realised by regional stakeholders and has helped to ensure greater attendance as travel has only been required once.

Activities in these workshops have included the undertaking of a capacity assessment with regional stakeholders, interactive area-based planning sessions and data sharing exercises. This has involved regional and sectoral stakeholders undertaking planning exercises for their respective regions to understand the process and to provide perspectives on how planning could be undertaken.

Side-events relating to the work of the Deep Seas Project have been held throughout the BBNJ process. Side events at throughout the BBNJ process have provided opportunities to share project results and outputs with the wider global policy community. These events have allowed the ABNJ Deep Seas project to support Member Countries of the Pilot Regions to engage with the BBNJ discussions and negotiations.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

The project still has approximately USD 2.1 million in unspent funds. Underspending is partially due to the fact that a number of project activities have been undertaken by project partners as their co-financing contribution. The USD 2.1 million balance will be used for project staff salaries through the end of the project, to fund outstanding

activities and to cover the project preparation grant.

A contract with Sealord for the development and testing of improved fishing systems, including implementation of real time fibre optic, had to be cancelled due to intellectual property considerations.

A challenge for the Project has been engaging with the RFMO Contracting Parties. The Project's main partners are the secretariats of the deep sea RFMOs. However, decisions regarding the conservation and management of deep sea fisheries and biodiversity conservation are made by the Contracting Parties so there is a need to engage with them more closely.

The lack of information regarding the deep seas of the ABNJ implies that detecting changes in deep sea fishstocks, biodiversity and ecosystems over the duration of the project is not easy. A positive change in the status of deep sea fishstocks, biodiversity and ecosystems should be considered to be a future indicator of the success of this project. The project can be expected to contribute to the improved capacities of RFMOs and their members to manage deep sea fisheries and its impacts on biodiversity in the ABNJ.

Representatives from the Regional Seas Convention and their Member States have highlighted a lack of information as a key challenge to fully engaging in ocean governance. Further data and information would be beneficial to support improved knowledge and awareness of: the legal regime establishing administrative boundaries for national jurisdictions and High Seas areas; potential impacts of human activities on marine ecosystems; marine connectivity; and marine genetic resources. In relation to this, participants indicated the potential for improved monitoring and surveillance and improved data and information sharing between countries. Member country representatives noted that limited resources and access to available information can hinder the participation of developing states on equal footing in international negotiations on a new legally binding instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	S	The project started in September 2014 and the overall MS rating reflects a slower than expected start in the project and a subsequent delay in the recruitment of new project coordinator. All partners are engaged to some extent in project-related activities. Major activities such the legal review, CDS, MCS and EAF reviews are underway or completed.
Budget Holder	MS	S	The project delivery improved and various activities completed with partners fully engaged and supporting the project. An unplanned benefit of this project has been the development of N-S cooperation between RFMOs in the project.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	MS	S	While some delay has occurred the project activities have picked up again with the assignment of the new project coordinator and implementation of the activities realigned to current circumstances and needs is progressing. It therefore expected that the project will deliver according to the revised work plan and achieve most objectives.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	Project activities have picked up over the last year and due to realignment of project activities. However, it is likely that a number of activities sets will not be completed by the end of the project, even with its extension to 31 December 2019, and it is possible that there will be unspent GEF funds (c USD2.1 million needed to be spent before 31 December 2019).

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low (minimal or no adverse environmental and social impacts)	The Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<p>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</p> <p>The project has a range of challenges. While detecting positive changes in deep sea fishstocks, biodiversity and ecosystems over the duration of the project is not biologically realistic, the project can be expected to contribute to the improved capacities of RFMOs and their members to better manage deep sea fisheries and its impacts on biodiversity in the ABNJ.</p> <p>Furthermore, many of the project outcomes are contingent on actions of RFMOs, and RFMO actions depend on the priorities, capacities and will of individual country members that can change and consequently affect project activities and timelines. The two project focal area RFMOs have peculiarities that may limit proposed activities. For example, the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement is in its formative years, and the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation has only one vessel operating; and the countries eligible for GEF financing in these regions are currently not deep sea fishing in the ABNJ.</p> <p>The initial Project Coordinator left the project in July 2017 and the project operated in a limited fashion following his departure. This resulted in a delay the implementation of activities, until the new Coordinator took over in April 2018.</p>

¹⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
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/M	The involvement of stakeholders is built in the project (mainly through PSC, FAO and UNEP Project Task Forces, Project Website, M&E system and IW-Learn, regular workshops and roundtables) providing opportunities for interactions and discussions between different partners.	Regular interaction with project stakeholders has resulted in efficient coordination and implementation of the Project's activities.	
2	There could be risks of non-cooperation from particular fishing actors following the adoption of measures constraining their short-term financial interests.	L/M	Where measures constrain the short-term financial interests of particular fishing actors, the project will explore the possibility of introducing specific compensatory measures such as the promotion of alternative income-generating activities and/or the provision of direct financial support.	There has not been any evidence of non-cooperation due to the adoption of measures constraining financial interests.	PSC dialogue demonstrated that there is a low risk of non-cooperation from fishing actors.

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²¹ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	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/M	Project priorities are in line with what all stakeholders have agreed. Support at national and regional level will be secured through 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.	Although there has been some turnover at the decision maker level this has not changed the level of support for the project's priorities.	Changes of RFMOs Leaderships.
4	There is insufficient capacity to support the Project's proposed transformational changes, particularly with regard to institutional and administrative support.	L/M	The scope of the Project has been agreed with the relevant stakeholders. Customized capacity building/training available from the Project, as required in the case of developing countries.	Capacity building training or workshops have been convened as required.	
5	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.	L/M	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.	The implementation of biodiversity friendly tools and practices has not been hampered by the lack of scientific knowledge. Decisions related to biodiversity conservation are made based on the best available evidence. The uptake of measures to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems during the Project's lifespan has been a significant outcome.	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Adverse climate changes compromise the Program's achievements, particularly concerning the ecosystems and biodiversity.	L	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 is required.	Climate change has not had an adverse impact on the Program's achievements. The deep sea project convened a workshop to better understand the impact of deep ocean climate change on habitat, fish and fisheries.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L-M	L	The Coordinator left the project in July 2017 and the project operated in a limited fashion following his departure, which resulted in a delay the implementation of activities. A new Coordinator commenced in April 2018 and implementation of project activities is now on track for operational closure by 31 August 2019.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	Y	Based on recommendations from the Mid Term Review, the PSC agreed to amend the project workplan to reflect the limited time remaining in the project.
Project Outputs	Y	Based on recommendations from the Mid Term Review, the PSC agreed to amend the project workplan to reflect the limited time remaining in the project.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: Revised NTE: 31 December 2019</p> <p>Justification: The PSC agreed to a 4 month no-cost extension to close the project on 31 December 2019. This aligns the Deep Seas Project with the closing date for the other Common Oceans Programme projects.</p>

²² Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

The Project has encouraged women to participate in project activities, and women are well represented in the project team, especially at UNEP-WCMC. There has been some recording of the numbers of men and women attending project events but gender disaggregated data has not been routinely collected and reported on.

A preliminary survey of the role of women in deep sea fishing in the ABNJ confirmed that it is a male dominated industry. Overall, there is very little detailed information available but it is known that the proportion of women working in DSF is very low and almost entirely port-based.

RFMOs operate in a gender equitable way.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

N/A

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

This project does not have a stakeholder engagement plan. All project executing partners listed at the beginning of this report are project stakeholders (Nairobi Convention, CBD, NEAFC, NAFO, SEAFO, CCAMLR, GFCM, NPFC, SPRFMO, SIOFPA, Sealord Group, ICFA, Seascapes Ltd/ GOBI Secretariat, Grid-Arendal, Duke University, IUCN, CPPs Secretariat, NOAA, SIOFA).

The stakeholders meet formally during the Project Steering Committee or during meetings convened by the project (i.e. workshops, deep sea meeting) or more informally (i.e. informal network of deep sea RFMOs).

The yearly PSC is the main project meeting where project-related decisions are taken.

All decisions at the RFMO level are being taken exclusively by member countries.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

Publications, videos and other materials can be accessed through <http://www.fao.org/in-action/commonoceans/documents/en/>

A wealth of conservation and management measures to protect deep sea vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) from significant adverse impact have been implemented during the ABNJ Deep Seas Project's lifespan. These respond to UNGA resolution 61/105, calling for the protection of marine biodiversity in ABNJ, and have been actively supported by the ABNJ Project. Currently 77% of the deep sea fisheries in ABNJ are under the jurisdiction of a deep sea RFMO. Only 5% of these areas are potentially fishable (i.e. areas under 2000 meters in depth), and 76% of these potentially fishable areas are either closed to bottom fishing or subject to strict access regulations. These measures are primarily designed to protect VMEs. This is a major step forward in the protection of marine biodiversity in ABNJ.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
UN Org	FAO	Cash	5,500,000	4,984,375 (E)	3,966,667 (E)	5,500,000
UN Org	FAO	In-kind	7,000,000	6,343,750 (E)	2,993,485 (R)	7,000,000
UN Org	UN Environment	In-kind	380,000	400,000 (R)	215,333 (R)	400,000 (R)
Multilateral Agency	Nairobi Convention	In-kind	870,000	788,438 (E)	493,000 (E)	870,000
Multilateral Agency	CBD	In-kind	0	1,296,471 (E)	760,000 (R)	1,430,588 (E)
RFMO	NEAFC	In-kind	1,950,000	1,767,188 (E)	1,105,000 (E)	1,950,000
RFMO	NAFO	In-kind	2,100,000	1,903,125 (E)	1,190,000 (E)	2,100,000
RFMO	SEAFO	In-kind	1,700,000	1,500,000 (R)	963,333 (E)	1,700,000
Management body	CCAMLR	In-kind	100,000	90,265 (E)	35,000 (R)	100,000
RFMO	GFCM	In-kind	350,000	317,188 (E)	198,333 (E)	350,000
RFMO	NPFC	In-kind	300,000	271,875 (E)	170,000 (E)	300,000

²³ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

RFMO	SPRFMO	In-kind	200,000	181,250 (E)	113,333 (E)	200,000
Private sector	SIODFA	In-kind	20,000,000	18,125,000 (E)	11,333,333 (E)	20,000,000
Private sector	Sealord Group	In-kind	14,000,000	12,687,500 (E)	7,933,333 (E)	14,000,000
Private sector	ICFA	In-kind	5,000,000	4,531,250 (E)	2,833,333 (E)	5,000,000
International scientific partnership	Seascapes Ltd/GOBI Secretariat	In-kind	300,000	271,875 (E)	170,000 (E)	300,000
UN Centre	Grid-Arendal	In-kind	800,000	726,786 (R)	562,000 (R)	792,636 (R)
UN Centre	Grid-Arendal	Cash	50,000	64,062 (R)	58,000 (R)	71,062 (R)
Private sector	Duke University	In-kind	5,136,000	1,750,000 (R)	2,910,400 (E)	5,136,000 (E)
NGO	IUCN	In-kind	2,110,000	1,912,188 (E)	1,430,000 (R)	2,110,000
UN Org	UNEP-WCMC	In-kind	4,000,000	4,000,000 (R)	2,266,667 (R)	4,000,000 (R)
Regional body	CPPs Secretariat	In-kind	975,000	659,750 (R)	552,500 (R)	682,500 (R)
Regional body	CPPs Secretariat	Cash	237,500	176,610 (R)	134,583 (R)	172,860 (R)
National Govt agency	NOAA	In-kind	6,500,000	5,890.625 (E)	3,683,333 (E)	6,500,000
RFMO	SIOFA	In-kind	0	14,974 (E)	8,778 (R)	9,686 (E)
		TOTAL	79,558,500	64,769,811	46,079,744	80,083,365

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **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 of 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 – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **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.