



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)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	14
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	23
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	27
6. RISKS	29
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	33
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	34
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	35
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	37
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	38
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	39
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	40

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	Sustainable management of tuna fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) - phase II
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GLO/1000/GFF
GEF ID:	10622
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (Executing agency) Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), The Pacific Community (SPC) International Whaling Commission (IWC) INFOPECA International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Pakistan World Wildlife Fund (WWF) US Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) International MCS Network (IMCSN) The Ocean Foundation (TOF) Conservation International (CI) International Pole and Line Foundation (IPNLF) Mercator Ocean International
Initial project duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	<i>This is a global project. A map of the areas covered under the mandates of the tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organization was included in the project document.</i>

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	NA

¹ As per FPMIS

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

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	14,378,000
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	185,085,531
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	6,084,620
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	1,869,885
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	42,411,149

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	8-10 November 2022 (Inception Workshop)
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	Q4 2024-Q1 2025
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	NA
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	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>Moderate</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
---	-----

Status

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

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.

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.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Kim Stobberup, Project Officer, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission	Kim.Stobberup@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)	Nicolas Gutierrez, Senior Fisheries Officer, NFI, FAO	Nicolas.Gutierrez@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Lorenzo Galbiati, Technical Officer, GEF Unit, FAO	Lorenzo.Galbiati@fao.org

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 ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
To achieve responsible, efficient and sustainable tuna harvests and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ in face of a changing environment.	GEF indicator 8: Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (tonnes)	724,000 tonnes of catches are coming from tuna stocks which are subject to overfishing.	Reduction by 300,000 tonnes	Reduction by 724,000 tonnes	Reduction by 111,000 tonnes	S
	1A Catches from major commercial tuna stocks subject to overfishing (%)	14%	10%	0%	13%	S
	1B Strengthened implementation of and compliance with tuna RFMO measures for key areas (score, disaggregated by RFMO)	Baseline assessment currently ongoing under lead of the Tuna Compliance Network	Increase in five tuna RFMOs	Increase in five tuna RFMOs	Baseline assessment still ongoing under lead of the Tuna Compliance Network	S
	GEF indicator 11: Direct beneficiaries as co-benefit	0	5,000 in total 3,566 men	11,784 total 8,404 men	1,740 in total 1,247 men	S

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.

	of GEF investment (number, disaggregated by gender)		1,434 women (29%)	3,380 women (29%)	493 women (28%)	
	GEF Indicator 7.4: Level of engagement in IW:Learn activities (rating, 4 max.)	During phase I, there was level 3 to 4 engagement in IW:Learn activities	At least level 3	At least level 3	2 Program website online Engagement with IW:Learn and programmatic partners on IWC10 started. IW Learn project website in development.	S
Component 1: Strengthened management of tuna fisheries						
<u>Outcome 1.1.</u> Major tuna stocks are utilized in a sustainable manner with 23 stocks managed according to the precautionary approach (as described in UNFSA and CCRF).	Progress towards the full adoption of harvest strategies/management procedures for stocks of targeted species (stocks per progress category)	Stocks with HS/MP completely developed and under full implementation: 2 Stocks in advanced stage of HS/MP development: 4 Early stages and no development: 23	Stocks with HS/MP completely developed and under full implementation: 11 Stocks in advanced stage of HS/MP development: 12	Stocks with HS/MP completely developed and under full implementation: 23 Stocks in advanced stage of HS/MP development: 5	Stocks with HS/MP completely developed and under full implementation: 6 Stocks in advanced stage of HS/MP development: 4 Early stages and no development: 19	S
<u>Outcome 1.2.</u> Tuna fisheries are managed by explicitly incorporating ecosystem	Tuna RFMOs including EAFM in their work plans as a priority (number)	0 tuna-RFMOs continue without including the EAFM under	0	1	0	

considerations in at least two RMFOs, including climate change		their mandate and discussing how to operationalize the EAFM.				
	Operational indicators to facilitate translation of ecosystem impacts findings into policy/management decisions (number)	0 ICCAT: Commitment to EBFM implementation in Rec 15-11 WCPFC The development of operational indicators has been identified by the Pacific Island Nations and the WCPFC as a necessary step for implementation of climate change policy and adaptation for tuna fisheries.	0 1 interim evaluation of an indicator (ICCAT)	2 total 1 in ICCAT 1 in WCPFC (climate change)	No progress yet	
<u>Outcome 1.3.</u> At least four tuna RFMOs increased learning by exchanging technical knowledge on	Recommendations agreed to by joint t-RMFO workshops (number)	0	10	30	No progress yet	
	Recommendations by joint RFMO meetings included in work plans by the respective Commissions (number)	0	0	10	No progress yet	

topics of global relevance.						
<u>Outcome 1.4:</u> Sustainable practices implemented in fisheries thanks to new incentives, including better access to markets and better prices with 4,000,000 tonnes of tuna catches certified globally.	Catches of tuna fisheries benefitting from market incentives through MSC certification (tonnes)	1,666,512 (about 31% of 2019 catches)	2,500,000 (47% if 2019 catches)	4,000,000 (75% of 2019 catches)	Not monitored yet.	
Component 2: Strengthened MCS to improve fisheries data, compliance with CMMs and to tackle IUU fishing.						
<u>Outcome 2.1:</u> Greater effectiveness in the application of fisheries control and enforcement thanks to increased human capacity across t-RFMO member states based on regional training standards with implementation and compliance in relevant areas increased by 20%	Strengthened implementation of, and compliance with Port State Measures (PSM) and other schemes of inspection category in ICCAT CPCs (score, aggregated over ICCAT)	Baseline assessment currently ongoing under lead of the Tuna Compliance Network	Increase	Increase	Not monitored yet	
	Strengthened implementation of, and compliance with, tuna RFMO measures for key areas in four ICCAT CPCs targeted by Compliance support missions (score, aggregated over targeted countries)	Baseline assessment currently ongoing under lead of the Tuna Compliance Network	Increase	Increase	Not monitored yet	
	Monitoring, control and enforcement of tuna RFMO for key areas in FFA member countries (score,	Baseline assessment currently ongoing under	Increase	Increase	Not monitored yet	

	aggregated over targeted countries)	lead of the Tuna Compliance Network				
<u>Outcome 2.2.</u> Higher compliance and control of IUU fishing thanks to the adoption and implementation of six innovative tools	Tuna RFMOs where standards and protocols for EM or ER have been formally adopted (number)	No RFMOs have formally adopted standards and protocols for EM and ER	1	2	Not monitored yet	
	Countries with evidence for IOMS use (number)	7 IOMS currently being adopted/used in ICCAT	30	75	Not monitored yet	
	Integration of trialled/promoted tools within local, national and sub-regional MCS and/or CDS systems for tuna fisheries (number)	0 traceability 0 EM Previous use of traceability technologies has occurred in small scale tuna fisheries tuna in Indonesia and Maldives, but few if any have cost effectively achieved through at sea data collection and flow yet. There is a need for country based	0	4 total 1 traceability local IPNLF 1 traceability national WWF 2 EM national/ sub-regional WWF	Not monitored yet	

		documentation of the incorporation of traceability into minimal support mechanisms to build on a potential IOTC CDS.				
Component 3: Reduction of environmental impacts of tuna fisheries						
<u>Outcome 3.1.</u> Sustainable management of sharks and rays is enhanced through three shark stock assessments using improved data	Status of shark fishery data collection and CKMR programs in EPO coastal nations	Although significant progress on shark fishery data collection has been made in Central America during Tuna I, stock assessments for sharks at IATTC remain severely handicapped by the data-limited situation in EPO coastal States (perceived to take a dominant amount of the catches).	Sampling designs for shark fishery data collection and CKMR are developed, tested and implemented in EPO coastal nations	Long term shark fishery data collection and CKMR programs are ongoing in EPO coastal nations	Not monitored yet	
	Stock assessments for sharks in IATTC and ICCAT (number)		1 short term using data limited approaches (IATTC)	3 total	Not monitored yet	

				1 short term using data limited approaches (IATTC) 1 Close Kin Mark Recapture (IATTC) 1 ICCAT		
<u>Outcome 3.2.</u> Environmental impacts of fishing activities are reduced by the deployment of environmentally sound gear types in all t-RFMO areas of competency with catches from Indian Ocean gillnet fisheries reduced by 10% and 13 RFMO measures fully incorporating best practices for FAD management reducing negative impacts of FADs	Catches from gillnet fisheries in the Indian Ocean (tonnes)	583,775 (2019 catches)	566,262 (3% reduction)	525,398 (10% reduction)	Not monitored yet	
	RFMO measures incorporating management best practices or FAD management (number per category)	4 with full incorporation of a management best practice 9 with partial incorporation of a management best practice 11 with no incorporation of a management best practice	6 with full incorporation of a management best practice 16 with partial incorporation of a management best practice 2 with no incorporation of a management best practice	13 with full incorporation of a management best practice 11 with partial incorporation of a management best practice 0 with no incorporation of a management best practice	Not monitored yet	
<u>Outcome 3.3</u> Mitigation techniques supported by data are widely and effectively applied to mitigate impacts to bycatch species with seabird	Best practices with significant increase in acceptance (number)	Baseline to be established at the beginning of workshops.	0	10 total	Not monitored yet	
	CMMs on holistic bycatch management adopted by tuna RFMOs (number)	0	0	1	Not monitored yet	
	CMMs on small scale fishery data collection and	0	1	2	Not monitored yet	

bycatch reduced by 40%, increased acceptance of ten best practices by fishers, and seven RFMO measures requiring mitigation techniques reducing the impacts on bycatch species	gillnet settings in IOTC (number)					
	RFMO measures incorporating management best practices for cetacean bycatch data collection, assessment and mitigation in tuna fisheries (number per category)	0 with full incorporation of a management best practice 13 with partial incorporation of a management best practice 22 with no incorporation of a management best practice	0 with full incorporation of a management best practice 14 with partial incorporation of a management best practice 21 with no incorporation of a management best practice	4 with full incorporation of a management best practice 18 with partial incorporation of a management best practice 13 with no incorporation of a management best practice	Not monitored yet	
	Demonstrated regulatory required compliance of CCSBT members with seabird bycatch mitigation measures, verified by data obtained from adequately trained observers, port inspections and/or electronic monitoring (score, max value 16)	2	4	12	Not monitored yet	
	Seabirds bycaught per year in tuna pelagic longline fisheries south of 20°S (number)	36,000 (2016 data)	Not applicable, assessment will be done at the end of the project	21,600	Assessment will be done at the end of the project.	
<u>Outcome 3.4.</u> Marine waste from fishing gear is minimized through	CMMs related to marine waste adopted by IOTC (number)	0	0	1	0	S

implementation of one new policy in the Indian Ocean						
Component 4: KM, Communication, M&E and gender mainstreaming						
<u>Outcome 4.1</u> Awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences is increased through the dissemination of information and sharing of knowledge and evidence of effective project implementation.	Levels of awareness as determined by surveys of target audience.	To be determined at the beginning of the project	Increase	Increase	Programmatic baseline survey is currently ongoing.	S
	Executing partners and t-RFMOs have stated their commitment to improving gender equality in fisheries and in their functioning (Percentage)	Executing partners and tuna RFMOs do not generally address issues related to gender equality.	15%	40%	Not monitored yet	

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
<u>Outcome 1.1.</u> Major tuna stocks are utilized in a sustainable manner with 23 stocks managed according to the precautionary approach (as described in UNFSA and CCRF).				
<u>Output 1.1.1</u> Scientific and technical capacity for further development of harvest strategies (HS) for tuna species strengthened	Products in support of harvest strategies (learning modules, webinars, digital media and print) developed and available (number) – target 39	1	0 LoA with The Ocean Foundation in place since 14 April 2023. None of the deliverables have been finalized yet.	Considerable progress in setting up the work. First webinar is planned in early July 2023.
<u>Outcome 1.2.</u> Tuna fisheries are managed by explicitly incorporating ecosystem considerations in at least two RMFOs, including climate change				
<u>Output 1.2.1:</u> Support to development of EAFM including climate change in 5 t-RMFOs	RFMOs benefitting from EAFM support through capacity development, modelling work (number) – target 5	0	See below for detailed progress by partner	
	CI - Tuna and Climate initiative % progress – target 1	0%	LoA with Conservation International not operational yet.	
	Mercator – New global ocean forcing to inform tuna modelling % progress - target 1	0%	LoA with Mercator not operational yet.	

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.

	SPC - Modelling the effect of climate change on tuna distribution and abundance in the Pacific Ocean and Indian Oceans % progress - target 1	0%	LoA with SPC not operational yet.	
	ISSF- Support to development of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management % progress - target 1	0%	5% LoA with ISSF in place since 9 February 2023. ISSF engaged with key partners (SPC, IATTC, IOTC and ICCAT). White paper outlining the implementation of EAFM in tuna RFMOs, including a roadmap for implementation, is being developed for presentation at various tuna RFMO meetings	
	ICCAT - Development and usage of EcoTest tool percentage progress - target 1	0%	LoA with ICCAT not operational yet.	
Outcome 1.3. At least four tuna RFMOs increased learning by exchanging technical knowledge on topics of global relevance.				
Output 1.3.1: Financial and technical support to three joint tuna RFMO Working Groups on topics of global relevance	Joint t-RFMO workshops on issues of common interest (number)	0	LoA with ICCAT not operational yet.	
Outcome 1.4: Sustainable practices implemented in fisheries thanks to new incentives, including better access to markets and better prices with 4,000,000 tonnes of tuna catches certified globally.				
Output 1.4.1 Four Fishery Improvement Plans working towards achievement of MSC sustainability standards in developing coastal state fisheries developed	Fishery Improvement Plans prepared in WCPFC area smaller-scale domestic fleets – target 4	0	Detailed progress below.	
	MSC – work plan progress	1%	1% LoA with MSC in place since 21 April 2023. MSC has started the mapping stage of the pathway program and jointly with FFA identified Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Tonga, Samoa as target countries to approach for the work.	

Outcome 2.1: Greater effectiveness in the application of fisheries control and enforcement thanks to increased human capacity across t-RFMO member states based on regional training standards with implementation and compliance in relevant areas increased by 20%				
Output 2.1.1: Four MCS-related training courses and compliance support missions developed or expanded and delivered	MCS-related training courses and compliance support missions developed or expanded and delivered (number) – target 4	0	Detailed progress by training course below.	
	1. FFA - Advanced Diploma Fisheries Management - target 1	0%	LoA with FFA not operational yet	
	2. FFA - Replicate CertIV MCS in another RFMO – target 1	0%		
	3. FFA – Training in leadership and data analysis - target 1	0%		
	4. ICCAT - Port inspection training and compliance support - target 1	0%	LoA with ICCAT not operational yet	
Outcome 2.2. Higher compliance and control of IUU fishing thanks to the adoption and implementation of six innovative tools				
Output 2.1.2: Monitoring processes for compliance reviewed in tuna and non-tuna RFMOs to identify drivers of compliance rates and measures to improve compliance in member states.	Comparative analysis of tuna and non-tuna RFMO compliance assessment processes and guidelines and methodology on best practices (BP) in the assessment of compliance processes – target 2	0	0 LoA with IMCSN in place since 06 February 2023. The first TCN Workshop was held in Tokyo, Japan from 27 – 30 June.	The TCN noted that they have some concerns about their role in developing an indicator to measure compliance in the tuna RFMOs. They expressed specific concerns how this may be received by members.
Output 2.2.1 Regional standards and support for establishing electronic systems to improve fisheries monitoring and two tools in support of traceability developed and tested for possible upscaling.	Regional standards and support for establishing electronic systems to improve fisheries monitoring and tools in support of traceability developed and tested for possible upscaling – target 7	0	Detailed progress by partner below	
	IPNLF: Monitoring / traceability technology for small scale tuna fisheries – target 1	0%	6% LoA with IPNLF in place since 13 April 2023. Initial assessments completed in two sites Kawa, Indonsia and Mabul, Malaysia and opportunities for implementation of traceability technology noted. Final decision on technology and locations to	

			be taken when assessments will be completed.	
	WWF: Overcoming Barriers to Electronic Monitoring for Tuna Fisheries – target 4	10%	5% LoA with WWF in place since 21 March 2023. WWF initiated project activities in April 2023 and completed an initial draft of Electronic Monitoring consultation document.	Consultation document will be finalized during the next quarter and used to fill knowledge gaps with stakeholders at subsequent meetings.
	ICCAT: Development of IOMS special enhancements – target 1	0%	LoA with ICCAT to conduct this work not operational yet	
	ISSF: EM/ER support - target 1	20%	0% LoA with ISSF in place since 13 April 2023. ISSF attended the key meetings where EM standards were developed/discussed and supported harmonization as well as their adoption in different RFMOs. The development of EM standards in all tuna RFMO has made significant progress and the EM standards development is in the final stage for adoption	Considering the rapid progress in the development of EM standards, it is necessary to modify the project objectives and focus of the three consensus workshops. Instead of discussing the identification of standards, the workshops will now focus on how to leverage and implement EM programs at tuna RFMOs using the developed standards.
Outcome 3.1. Sustainable management of sharks and rays is enhanced through three shark stock assessments using improved data				
Output 3.1.1 Improved monitoring of catches in six countries for more consistent fishery and biodiversity management of sharks and rays	Countries in the SAO and EPO with shark sampling program designed and implemented – target 6	0	Detailed progress by partner below	
	IATTC: Improving the monitoring and assessment of shark stocks in the Eastern Pacific Ocean: expansion to Ecuador, Mexico and Peru – target 3	1%	1% LoA with IATTC in place since 20 March 2023. IATTC held project inception meetings with various fisheries management and scientific authorities in each CPC (Mexico, Ecuador and Peru) which led to an updated assessment of ongoing shark	

			data collection activities/programs in CPCs, and consequently to a review of the needed contracts and their associated budgets.	
	Infopesca: Improved Monitoring of catches in sharks for reduction environmental impacts of tuna fisheries in the South West Atlantic Ocean – target 3	0%	LoA with Infopesca still under discussion.	
Outcome 3.2. Environmental impacts of fishing activities are reduced by the deployment of environmentally sound gear types in all t-RFMO areas of competency with catches from Indian Ocean gillnet fisheries reduced by 10% and 13 RFMO measures fully incorporating best practices for FAD management reducing negative impacts of FADs				
Output 3.2.1 Alternatives to gill nets demonstrated and promoted through workshops and in-field testing by fishers especially in the Indian Ocean.	Gear conversion pilot making a business case for conversion from gillnets to one-to-one fishing method with results disseminated through workshops and at RFMOs – target 1	0	Detailed progress below	
	IPNLF: Gillnet conversion – target 1	0%	LoA with IPNLF in place since 13 April 2023. During the two assessments completed to date (Mabul, Malaysia and Kawa, Indonesia), IPNLF hasn't identified operational pelagic fisheries providing suitable opportunities. Additional assessments planned.	
	WWF Pakistan: Converting 10 fishing vessels from gillnet to longline gear – target 1	0%	LoA with WWF Pakistan in place since 31 May 2023.	
	Value chain improvement pilots demonstrating benefits associated with one-by-one tuna fishing methods – target at least 2	0	Detailed progress below	
	IPNLF: Handline improvement – target at least 1	0%	LoA with IPNLF in place since 13 April 2023. The two assessments completed so far (Mabul, Malaysia and Kawa, Indonesia) show potential for harvest handling and value chain improvements to potentially increase the value and	

			marketability of harvests coming from these sites. ILNLF will assess additional sites to inform the most strategic pilot site selection.	
<u>Output 3.2.2</u> Biodegradable/non-entangling FADs introduced and promoted through workshops with stakeholders and tested by fishers throughout the t-RFMO areas of competency	Field tests of biodegradable FADs with results disseminated through skippers workshops and at RFMOs – target 1	0	Detailed progress below.	
	ISSF: BioFADs/non-entangling FADs introduced and promoted	0%	LoA with ISSF in place since 9 February 2023. No work planned in this reporting period.	
<u>Outcome 3.3</u> Mitigation techniques supported by data are widely and effectively applied to mitigate impacts to bycatch species with seabird bycatch reduced by 40%, increased acceptance of ten best practices by fishers, and seven RFMO measures requiring mitigation techniques reducing the impacts on bycatch species				
<u>Output 3.3.1:</u> Two new technologies and materials for reducing bycatch interactions developed	New technologies and materials for reducing bycatch interactions developed – target 2	0	Detailed progress by partner below	
	WWF Pakistan: Scaling different gear settings in tuna directed gillnet/driftnet fisheries in the Indian Ocean *- target 1	0%	Discussions with WWF Pakistan still ongoing.	
	ISSF: Application of acoustic technology to tropical tunas – target 1	0%	LoA with ISSF in place since 9 February 2023. No work planned in this reporting period. The focus has been on organizing and arranging the different tasks.	
<u>Output 3.3.2:</u> At least three monitoring and management systems to quantify and mitigate bycatch strengthened	Monitoring and management systems to quantify and mitigate bycatch strengthened – target 3	0	Detailed progress by partner below.	
	CCSBT: Enhancing education on and implementation of Ecologically Related Species seabird measures within CCSBT fisheries – target 1	3%	1% LoA with CCSBT in place since 10 February 2023. Work focused on preparatory activities and engagement with members with respect to all planned activities.	Originally planned meeting has been moved to first half of 2024, at the request of several CCSBT Members.
	IWC: Assessing and addressing cetacean bycatch in tuna fisheries – target 1	6%	6%	

			LoA with IWC in place since 07 February 2023. Work focused on establishing contact and relationships with stakeholders from the Indian Ocean region. In March 2023, a Cooperation Agreement between IWC and the IOTC was signed. Ongoing IWC initiatives in the Indian Ocean through in-kind co-financing.	
	ISSF: Holistic bycatch management policy paper – target 1	0%	LoA with ISSF in place since 9 February 2023. No work planned in this reporting period. ISSF has attended key tuna RFMO meetings where progress and adoption of biodegradable FADs was discussed.	
<u>Output 3.3.3:</u> At least ten best practice mitigation techniques disseminated to fishers through direct interaction with harvesters and processors	Workshops targeting purse seine, longline, pole and line and handline skippers and participants disaggregated by gender – target 17	0	4 Detailed progress by partner below.	Good progress already achieved by both partners.
	IPNLF: Pole-and-line, handline & rod-and-line gears skipper workshops – target 9	0	1 LoA with IPNLF in place since 13 April 2023. First skippers workshop held in Malaysia.	IPNLF is preparing to implement faster than planned while also promoting more overlap between different activities under their lead to implement more cost effectively.
	ISSF: PS and longline Skippers' workshops – target 8	0	3 LoA with ISSF in place since 9 February 2023. The materials related to longline skipper WS were reviewed and the ISSF Longline Skipper Guidebook was updated with the collaboration of Birdlife, ACAP and various shark/seabird/sea turtle experts.	ISSF has been holding skipper workshops since 2009 with different types of funding and could quickly start the activities once funds were transferred.

			Three purse seine skipper workshops carried out in Spain, France and Indonesia.	
Outcome 3.4. Marine waste from fishing gear is minimized through implementation of one new policy in the Indian Ocean				
Output 3.4.1 Marine waste from fishing gear identified and quantified in the Indian Ocean	Reports from national ALDFG surveys in IOTC members – target 5	2	2 reports were already completed during the PPG phase focusing on Pakistan and Seychelles. Work on improving the questionnaire, user manual and R scripts for automated generation of survey reports is ongoing. Selection of target countries and negotiation of LoAs started.	
Outcome 4.1 Awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences is increased through the dissemination of information and sharing of knowledge and evidence of effective project implementation.				
Output 4.1.1 Knowledge products developed and shared through available knowledge sharing platforms and processes to facilitate exchange of lessons learned, best practices, and expertise generated during project implementation organized including 1% allocation to IW:Learn activities	Knowledge products including three IW:LEARN Experience and Result Notes developed and disseminated – target 5	0	No progress so far.	
	People reached via knowledge-sharing events including IW:Learn IWCs and global and regional events – target 330	0	Liaison with IW:Learn and programmatic partners on engagement in upcoming IWC10 has started.	
Output 4.1.2 Communication products developed,	Communication products developed and disseminated through available channels including program website and the IW:LEARN platform – target 25	4	4 Communication products: 2 project news items 1 fact sheet	

including information packages, tools and approaches and shared through appropriate channels including relevant knowledge-sharing platforms to reach targeted audiences			1 video currently being completed	
	People in target audiences reached via available channels and events – target 10,000	2,000	3,554 website users Website pageviews: 10,676 Twitter: 48 posts	
<u>Output 4.1.3:</u> Operational project M&E system implemented	M&E plan and project reports in line with FAO and GEF requirements – target 17	3	3 M&E plan drafted and ready for submission to PSC for approval in July 2023 First PPR and first PIR prepared and submitted	
	Review and evaluation reports prepared and published – target 2	0	No activities planned during reporting period	
<u>Output 4.1.4</u> Gender is mainstreamed in the project activities and management	Lessons learnt and/or shared best practices with a gender focus – target 2	0	No activities planned during reporting period	
	GAP is implemented and implementation monitored	No target	Gender-disaggregated beneficiaries tracking ongoing	

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)

The project is currently transitioning from inception into implementation phase. The Project Manager Mr Kim Stobberup started his assignment 27 October 2022, the remaining team consists of shared human resources already in place since project start.

The inception workshop took place virtually from 8-10 November 2022, the first PSC will be taking place from 11-14 July 2023 in Rome in a hybrid setting.

Focus since project start was on the negotiation and clearance processes of the LoAs with the executing partners. Currently, there are 10 LoAs operational with the first one in place from 6 February 2023, 5 LoAs are being reviewed by CSLP and 3 still require discussions with the partners. The status of LoAs as of 30 June 2023 is shown below.

Executing partner	Status LoA
Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)	Operational since 10 February 2023
Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)	Operational since 20 March 2023
International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)	Submitted for approval / under review
Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA),	Submitted for approval / under review
The Pacific Community (SPC)	Submitted for approval / under review
International Whaling Commission (IWC)	Operational since 07 February 2023
INFOPESCA	Still under negotiation
International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)	Operational since 09 February 2023
World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Pakistan	Operational since 31 May 2023, 2 additional LoAs to be negotiated
World Wildlife Fund (WWF) US	Operational since 21 March 2023
Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)	Operational since 21 April 2023
International MCS Network (IMCSN)	Operational since 06 February 2023
The Ocean Foundation (TOF)	Operational since 14 April 2023
Conservation International (CI)	Submitted for approval / under review
International Pole and Line Foundation (IPNLF)	Operational since 13 April 2023
Mercator Ocean International	Submitted for approval / under review

The M&E Plan is in advanced stages of development and reporting towards project outcome indicators is being included in the contractual arrangements with partners.

A draft project KMC strategy has been developed and will be discussed in the PSC (11-14 July 2023). Two news items were launched:

- [New tuna fisheries project poised to ensure all major tuna stocks are fished sustainably by 2027](#)
- [The Ocean Foundation and FAO launch groundbreaking knowledge hub for fisheries management](#)

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 design incorporated time needed to set up execution arrangements and all planned LoAs are still within the timeframe of the project. Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action</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>Ratings are cleared by Mr Nicolas Gutierrez, Senior Fisheries Officer</i>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	<i>There was remarkable progress over the reporting periods. Most of the legal agreements with the executing agencies are either operative or are close to being operative. This is already a significant accomplishment, considering the large number of executing agencies involved.</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.

			<p>Major meetings were organized timely and efficiently and were instrumental in keeping all the relevant stakeholders informed.</p> <p>The project management unit is doing well, putting in great effort, time, and resources to make sure the project's activities are executed, and the Tuna project is also contributing to the common ocean program. Coordination with the Global Project is evident and efficient.</p> <p>In conclusion, the project did very well over the period and set the stage for its goals to be met in the coming years.</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 is a low risk project.

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				
	NA			
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	NA			
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	NA			
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	NA			
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	NA			
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	NA			
ESS 7: Decent Work				
	NA			
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
	Reduction of gender bias and promotion of women’s participation in all aspects of the project.	Gender-disaggregated tracking of beneficiaries included in contracts with executing partners.	Reduction of gender bias and promotion of women’s participation in all aspects of the project.	Mainly PMU and executing partners

ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	Assessment of working conditions for fishermen from Indigenous Peoples	None	Assessment of working conditions for fishermen from Indigenous Peoples	Mainly PMU and relevant partners
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
None				

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	Sufficient political will at global, regional and national levels will not be sustained to support sustainable management of tuna fisheries	M	Y	The Project provides awareness-raising/outreach activities aimed at political actors, including through its partners, to provide them with evidence of the mutual benefits of managing the ABNJ tuna resources sustainably. This includes reporting to governing bodies of the RFMOs and individual countries on the Project.	The project participated in RFMO and other meetings, promoting the concept of sustainability, how the project partners work towards this goal, and explaining the consequences of failing to achieve it.	
2	National governments fail to tackle IUU and associated corruption	M	Y	Project support for strengthened MCS to improve compliance with CMMs and to address IUU through capacity building; Support for best practices for compliance assessments; Support for the development and uptake of new technical tools to combat IUU; Increased transparency through better information on IUU.	Delay in the start of some of the related activities such as MCS capacity building. Activities on various tools to combat IUU have initiated. Best practices for compliance assessments are being developed, including recommendations for increased transparency.	

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	Reduced consumer willingness to pay a premium for sustainably sourced tuna	M	Y	Support for MSC and other tools to certify sustainable fisheries; Promote market incentives to promote changes in consumer behaviour leading to increased demand for sustainable caught fish products, engaging the seafood industry as necessary.	Activities on developing Fishery Improvement Programs have started which will include awareness raising on the benefits of sustainable fisheries.	
4	Increased risk of environmental degradation to marine environment threatens tuna and their respective ecosystems.	M	Y	Project support for monitoring possible threats to habitat quality at RFMO level as part of the EAFM.	Activities related to implementation of EAFM and assessment of marine plastic pollution (ALDFG) have been initiated. However, the start of work on the development of ecosystem indicators is delayed.	
5	Financial subsidies driving overcapacity	M	Y	Promote World Trade Organization (WTO) decision to prohibit fisheries subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and overfishing and IUU.	Tuna II does not specifically address subsidies, but the WTO decision on fisheries subsidies will be promoted.	
6	Insufficient scientific information for effective decision-making, or limited availability of key information	M	Y	Support for HS which incorporates uncertainty due to poor data (precautionary approach); Facilitating the collection, compilation and sharing of existing information; Work closely with RFMO Scientific Committees in supporting efforts to address critical data restrictions.	HS capacity building and promotion/awareness raising has started, as well as support for EAFM; Activities focusing on the collection and compilation of relevant information for stock assessment have started, focusing on Central and South America, and more is expected to follow.	

	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
7	Complex and demanding stakeholder relationships and partnerships	M	Y	The PMU and the programmatic Global Coordination project will ensure efficient communication, collaboration and coordination between all project partners and other stakeholders including other projects under the Program;	Ongoing coordination at Program level and between projects. Coordination between project partners was initiated at the inception workshop and will be a key focus of the 1 st Project Steering Committee to be held 11-14 July 2023, now that many activities have started.	
8	Institutional and technical capacity constraints impede project implementation	M	Y	Depending on the issue, critical institutional gaps will be addressed through Project-promoted capacity building activities, including a formal on-line capacity building course composed of a range of technical modules suitable for managers, scientists, and stakeholders; Support the development and the up taking of innovative field solutions to existing issues.	Various related activities have initiated such as support for and capacity building in HS and EAFM, as well as skippers' workshops, gear conversion. More activities are expected to start soon on capacity building in MCS and compliance.	
9	Impacts of climate change irreversibly affect structure and function of ecosystems and biodiversity in the ABNJ Climate Change	M	Y	The project will provide information on possible CC consequences on availability of resources for RFMO members, in particular coastal States, to facilitate the formulation of adaptation plans at national level.	There has been a delay in the start of related activities. These are expected to start soon, focusing on providing information for adaptation to CC effects on tuna fisheries.	
10	Risk of Covid-19 Impacts to Project Design and Implementation	L	Y	The project design and first stages of implementation were completed in spite of the difficulties posed by the pandemic. Since May 2023, WHO declared that Covid-19 is no longer a global health emergency, removing most of the potential restrictions for further implementation of the Projects	No actions required as COVID is now considered endemic.	

	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
11	PMU staffing and resources insufficient for a project of this size.	M	N	Pooling of resources to support the project within the Program as a whole. Assess the requirements of the project and maintain some flexibility to cover key areas.	The pool of M&E, KMC and technical support resources are being strengthened for the project and the program as a whole, including support staff in the form of interns.	

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	M	The first year of the project has focused on setting up execution arrangements (LoAs) and many of the activities have started, which also address the identified risks. Progress towards achieving the project objectives is satisfactory and the risks will be managed through the identified actions.

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

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

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

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	Two additional partners, WCPFC and TNC submitted co-financing letters after CEO Endorsement	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission WCPFC 3 May 2022 The Nature Conservancy 25 May 2022	
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			
Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), InterAmerican Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna (ICCAT), Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), Western and Central Pacific Fisheries (WCPFC), International Whaling Commission (IWC), Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Centre for Marketing Information and Advisory Services for Fishery Products in Latin America and the Caribbean (INFOPESCA), Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP), Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)	Executing and or co-financing partners	During the reporting period, there were intense discussions with these stakeholders to prepare the contractual arrangements. Most of these stakeholders participated in the project inception workshop. The project participated in the following related meetings to engage with these organizations and their member states. - 23rd Special Meeting of the ICCAT Commission (13-21 Nov 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).	
European Commission, National Oceanographic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Maldives Ministry of Fisheries, Mozambique Ministry of the Sea and Fisheries, Oman Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries Wealth, Kenya Fisheries Department and Beach Management Units, Seychelles Fisheries Authority (SFA) Tanzania Deep Sea Fishing Authority, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Pakistan, Iran, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Pacific SIDs involved in FIPs.	Co-financing partners or governments involved in the implementation of specific activities.	NOAA participated in the project inception workshop. Ecuador, Mexico and Peru are involved in data collection on sharks under IATTC's lead which just started. Pilot sites / fisheries are in the process of being identified which will determine the stakeholders (ex. IPNLF, MSC, IOTC) and others may be involved (ex. INFOPESCA). The project participated in the - EU Thematic	

		Workshop on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Operationalization in tuna and non-tuna RFMOs (1-3 Mar 2023)	
NGOs			
Birdlife International (BLI), Conservation International (CI), Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US and WWF-Pakistan), Mercator	Executing and/or co-financing partners	During the reporting period, there were intense discussions with these stakeholders to prepare the contractual arrangements.	
Private sector entities			
International Seafood Sustainability Association (ISSA)	Co-financing partner	This is a co-financing partner strongly involved with ISSF activities. More general engagement with the private sector through participation in the Bermeo Tuna Forum (2-3 May 2023)	
Others²³			
International Pole and Line Foundation (IPNLF), International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) the Ocean Foundation (TOF), the Pew Charitable Trusts	Executing and/or co-financing partners	During the reporting period, there were intense discussions with these stakeholders to prepare the contractual arrangements. These stakeholders participated in the project inception workshop.	
University of the South Pacific (USP)	Partner for FFA activities in the WCPO.	Will be involved in accreditation of FFA certified courses in the Pacific region.	
International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network (IMSCN)	Executing partner	During the reporting period, there were intense discussions to prepare the contractual arrangements.	
New stakeholders identified			

²³ 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	Completed during formulation stage
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Not started yet
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	Initial discussions with programmatic partners started to address this jointly across the FAO-led Common Oceans projects. ToRs for a gender specialist will be developed to implement the GAP.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	<p>Gender sensitive indicators: Executing partners and t-RFMOs have stated their commitment to improving gender equality in fisheries and in their functioning (Percentage) No progress yet</p> <p>GEF indicator 11: Direct beneficiaries as co-benefit of GEF investment (number, disaggregated by gender) Target: 11,784 total 8,404 men 3,380 women (29%)</p> <p>Current status Target: 1,740 total 1,247 men 493 women (28%)</p>
Staff with gender expertise		Gender specialist to be hired by end of 2023 or early 2024.
Any other good practices on gender		None

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Yes
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Yes
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Not applicable for year 1
Please provide links to related website, social media account	Project website: https://www.fao.org/in-action/commonoceans/what-we-do/tuna/en/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>Publication: Compliance Assessment in the Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations - A Comparative Review</p> <p>Leaflets (Fact sheet): Common Oceans Program - Tuna fisheries (10 February 2023)</p> <p>Web stories: Project: New tuna fisheries project poised to ensure all major tuna stocks are fished sustainably by 2027 (9 November 2022) The Ocean Foundation and FAO launch groundbreaking knowledge hub for fisheries management (2 November 2022)</p> <p>D-group: https://dgroups.org/fao/common_oceans_program/common-ocean_tuna</p>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Qingqing Wang qingqing.wang@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

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

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

Local communities will be involved in the activities of IPNLF and MSC. Fisheries haven't been selected yet.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁵	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	In-kind	3,670,000	953,611		3,670,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	3,680,000	1,428,050		3,680,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)	In-kind	2,158,273	480,060		2,158,273
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)	In-kind	9,528,572	1,850,047		9,528,572
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)	In-kind	5,165,025	423,171		5,165,025
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)	In-kind	11,760,000	2,340,000		11,760,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)	In-kind	8,471,636	1,828,400		8,471,636

²⁴Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁵Grant, 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

2023 Project Implementation Report

Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)	In-kind	2,100,735	102,950		2,100,735
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	International Whaling Commission	In-kind	1,815,118	582,029		1,815,118
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	The Pacific Community (SPC)	In-kind	555,000	48,577		555,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	In-kind	70,000	35,000		70,000
National government	United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	In-kind	59,500,000	14,358,526		59,500,000
Civil Society Organization	BirdLife International (BLI)	In-kind	5,000,000	1,481,460		5,000,000
Civil Society Organization	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)	In-kind	4,000,000	890,000		4,000,000
Foundations & Trusts	Pew Charitable Trusts-The Ocean Foundation	In-kind	9,600,000	2,900,000		9,600,000
Foundations & Trusts	International Pole and Line Foundation - Grant	In-kind	73,000	0		73,000
Foundations & Trusts	International Pole and Line Foundation	In-kind	3,061,948	43,161		3,061,948
Civil Society Organization	World Wildlife Fund (WWF) US	In-kind	3,723,185	744,637		3,723,185
Civil Society Organization	World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Pakistan	In-kind	4,000,000	800,000		4,000,000
Civil Society Organization	Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)	In-kind	5,552,000	1,119,857		5,552,000

2023 Project Implementation Report

Civil Society Organization	Conservation International*	In-kind	587,272	117,454		587,272
Private sector	International Seafood Sustainability Association (ISSA)	Grant	50,000,000	9,000,000		50,000,000
Other	International MCS Network	In-kind	72,675	40,000		72,675
Civil Society Organization	The Nature Conservancy	In-kind	3,200,000	640,000		3,200,000
Other Intergovernmental Organizations	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels	In-kind	973,915	204,159		973,915
		TOTAL	198,318,354	42,411,149		198,318,354

* Estimates

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

Two additional letters of co-financing came in after CEO Endorsement, from the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) bringing in USD 8,471,636 of in-kind co-financing, and The Nature Conservancy bringing in USD 3,200,000 of in-kind co-financing.

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.