

# Deep-sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach (DSF project)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10623

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Deep-sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach (DSF project)

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

11/25/2021

**Review completed by PM**

2/11/2022

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

# PIF

## CEO Endorsement

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes. The project builds on the GEF-5 Deep-Seas project (ID 4660) and the first phase of the Common Oceans program and is aligned with IW 2-4.

However, please correct the CEO document submission date. The portal shows 6/18/20.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

#### Agency Response

The submission date in the portal has been changed to 24 November 2021.

KINDLY note that sometimes the reviewed submission in the portal makes reference to the FAO ProDoc and its Annexes. These are attached to the roadmap of the submission in PDF format, labelled as GEF agency ProDoc. These attached documents should be considered as an integral part of the submission, as they provide a lot of relevant information addressing several of the comments received with the GEF Review Sheet.

#### Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address the following points:

(1) Please ensure that the figures included in the GEF Core Indicator section are reflected in Table B.

(2) The output indicators are primarily qualitative process related indicators. Please develop and include quantifiable indicators for both process and stress reduction output indicators.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Partly. Core indicators has been included in Table B, however, the notion that the project is not responsible to deliver the core indicators or other quantifiable indicators is non-starter. The premise for most transboundary investments is that policy advances and capacity building will be leading to changes in relation to process and stress reduction in the ecosystem that is being worked in.

Please make sure that the core indicators, stress reduction and process indicators are captured in the results framework, so that it is clear that these will be direct results of the investment proposed.

7th of February 2022 (cseverin): Addressed.

10th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address following issues in relation to the budget

1) Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) is charged across all components and PMC. Per Guidelines, project? staff has to be charged to the GEF portion *and* the co-financing portion allocated to PMC ? please ask the Agency to charge this personnel also to the co-financing portion (2.4 million were allocated). In addition, the CTA salary (\$960,000) represents 21% of the total project, (no project cleared to date had allocated such % of the total GEF Financing to a single position). Please revise.

2) Costs of M&E Expert need to be charged to M&E, not to PMC ? please revise.

3) Unspecified miscellaneous cannot be charged to the GEF portion of PMC ? it has to be covered by the co-financing portion of PMC

SH (2.21.22): All comments addressed except comment 1. Specific to comment 1, please address the below two points:

- The Agency says: ?The cost of the CTA cannot be covered by co-financing because this is entirely IN-KIND.? ? this is inaccurate as there is one co-financier that is providing the co-financing in cash (1 million) ? actually the explanation of ?how investment mobilized was identified? states that ?FAO Grant co-financing comprises relevant elements (between 1% and 25% of the budgets were considered) of voluntary cash contributions by various donors to FAO?s activities related to (and in line with the objectives of) the project. Calculations are based on project budgets for 2021 and 2022 and projected over the length of the project.? From this, one can infer that this co-finance could be utilized as no specific destination was identified.

- The Agency says: ?Beyond the calculation of the percentage, we believe that

having a GEF project run by only one staff performing both massive technical tasks and managerial duties, is a demonstration that the agencies are trying to streamline the staff cost to the minimum to ensure an effective and timely delivering? ? this is inaccurate as for the effective and timely delivering, the project also counts with the participation of another staff (PMU ? M&E expert) + a group of consultants that even if not mapped as staff, they are also part of the personnel cost.

3rd of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

## **Agency Response**

### **FAO 22 February 2022:**

- The CTA salary cannot be charged on the 1M grant portion. As specify in the letter of co-financing uploaded in the portal the 1M covers for grant contribution of USD 1,000,000 comprising a research cruise in the Southern Indian Ocean undertaken under the EAF Nansen Programme funded by the government of Norway related to and supporting the objectives of the project. For this reason, a specific destination for the co-financing has been identified.

- 

- To avoid confusion the text under table C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by Name and by Type, has been expanded (in yellow), as follow: ?FAO Grant co-financing comprises relevant elements (between 1% and 25% of the budgets were considered) of voluntary cash contributions by various donors to FAO?s activities related to (and in line with the objectives of) the project. **Concretely, as explained in the attached FAO?s letter of co-financing, the 1M USD grant contribution will support a research cruise in the Southern Indian Ocean undertaken under the EAF Nansen Programme related to and in support of the objectives of the project.** Calculations are based on project budgets for 2021 and 2022 and projected over the length of the project?.

- 

- We agreed with the comment of the Secretariat. We also reaffirm that the CTA will indeed run both management and technical tasks. The latest are explained in details in the attached **Revised Annex N - ToRs 22Feb22\_tracked**. The annex now includes a clear indication of the % of CTA?s cost supported by the PMC and by the project grants. The Annex N is uploaded in the roadmap of the submission as standalone document for easy reference.

---

### **FAO 11 February 2022:**

1) Re to the cost of the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA)

- We revised the budget, increasing the portion of the CTA's cost ion PMC.

- The cost allocated for the CTA (\$960,000) represents the cost for a P4 staff. Although we acknowledge that this is now 17% (after the review) of the overall budget, one must also consider that the CTA is the ONLY staff of the project, i.e. it represents the full cost of the Project Management Unit.
- The CTA will be a technical Staff mainly performing technical duties.
- The CTA's salary, allocated to the technical components, is fully justified by the attached REVISED Annex N (uploaded again in the roadmap of the submission). The document provides a detailed description of the Management Duties (covered by the portion allocated on PMC = \$210,000) and the technical tasks who are linked one by one to the project outputs with their respective costs.
- The cost of the CTA cannot be covered by co-financing because this is entirely IN-KIND. The portion of the project partner's co-financing labelled as PM is used by them to pay their staff/support for the projects/initiatives/investments who are directly or indirectly contributing to the success of the Deep Fish Project. For this reason, it cannot be used to pay the staff of our project.
- Beyond the calculation of the percentage, we believe that having a GEF project run by only one staff performing both massive technical tasks and managerial duties, is a demonstration that the agencies are trying to streamline the staff cost to the minimum to ensure an effective and timely delivering.

2) Re to the M&E Expert:

- The cost of the M&E Officer had been allocated to M&E (Output 4.1.2). The correspondent ToR in the REVISED Annex N has been adapted.

3) Re to the miscellaneous :

- This cost has been removed from the budget.

-----

**FAO 4 February 2022:**

Agreed. The Core indicators, stress reduction and process indicators are captured in both Table B and Logical Framework. Moreover, all project's outputs have quantitative targets now, which are reflected in the results framework and Table B. Duplicate mentions to 'targets' in Table B have been consolidated in the new text maintaining the quantitative focus.

The revised PRODOC and Annex A1 (Logical Framework) have been uploaded on the roadmap of the submission. Both documents have tracked texts in yellow identifying the changes made to address the GEFSEC's comments made on 3 February 2022.

-----

(1) The GEF-7 CIs, and outcome and output targets have been included in Table B.

(2) The output indicators provide in the Project Results Framework (also attached as Annex A1) are almost all quantitative and relate to what the project can achieve. Quantitative indicators relating to process and to stress reduction are included at the outcome level as they are beyond the direct control of the project (i.e. require action from partners followed by improvements at the ecological level. Some of these drift into GEF core and objective level indicators that are also provided in Project Results Framework (also attached as Annex A1).

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

#### **Agency Response NA**

Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address below comments:

1) Of the \$48,603,000 of co-financing, only \$1,000,000 (4.9%) is classified as grant/investment mobilized. Please review the definition/guidelines for GEF co-financing and reconsider if some of the co-financing would classify as other than ?in-kind? (which refers to operational recurrent costs).

(2) Please spell out all acronyms in Table C

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

#### **Agency Response**

**FAO 11 February 2022:**

Kindly note that a new Co-financing letter from South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO), committing 1,500,000 USD in kind co-financing has been added. The total co-financing of the project has been updated accordingly across the submission.

-----

**FAO 4 February 2022:**

Kindly note that a new Co-financing letter from Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) committing 1,000,000 USD in kind co-financing has been added. The total co-financing of the project has been updated accordingly.

-----

The DSF Project has revisited the GEF definitions and guidelines on co-financing and confirm that the 'in-kind' designation provided in Table C is correct and as identified in the partner's co-financing letters.

Acronyms in Table C have been spelt out.

In addition, kindly note that Tables A, B and C have been updated to reflect a new co-financing from the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO) not included in Pro Doc submission on 11/24/21. We are still expecting co-financing from the RFMOs SIOFA and SPRFMO, and from the industry Sealord Group. These commitments will be integrated as soon as available.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**  
(cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response NA**  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**  
(cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response NA**  
**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following comments:

- 1) Under the sub-heading to this section, please summarize all calculation methodologies set out in Annex F.
- 2) Please include Core Indicator 7 for level of engagement in IW:LEARN, and set the count for number of shared ecosystems to 1 ?Global?.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

The GEF-7 CI methodologies have been included in the portal submission here as summaries. The full description is in Annex F which should be consulted for details. Annex F includes tables and graphs that cannot be included (copy/paste) in the portal's textbox under the GEF7 CI section.

The GEF-7 CI7 regarding IW Learn has been added to Table F.

**KINDLY note that sometimes the reviewed submission in the portal makes reference to the FAO ProDoc and its Annexes. These are attached to the roadmap of the submission in PDF format, labelled as GEF agency ProDoc. These attached documents should be considered as an integral part of the submission, as they provide a lot of relevant information addressing several of the comments received with the GEF Review Sheet.**

### **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. The description only partly pinpoints the problems, root causes and barriers to be addressed. Please revise accordingly.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

This section has been expanded to better explain root causes for fisheries stock management and impact issues. This is undertaken in line within the overall focus of the project which is under IW on deep sea fisheries' management including sustainable



fisheries on stocks and reducing/eliminating fisheries related impacts on the environment and biodiversity.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however, given its importance to establish baseline knowledge, please upload the terminal evaluation of the GEF-5 Deep-seas project to the portal as an annex.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

The baselines to the current GEF-7 project are provided in detail in Annex M (35 pages). This Annex provides better and updated baselines than are provided in the Terminal Evaluation (TE).

The TE to the GEF-5 Deep sea project has been included as Annex R, but it should be appreciated that the GEF-5 project had a broader remit as it was also under both the GEF IW and biodiversity focal areas.

**KINDLY note that sometimes the reviewed submission in the portal makes reference to the FAO ProDoc and its Annexes. These are attached to the roadmap of the submission in PDF format, labelled as GEF agency ProDoc. These attached documents should be considered as an integral part of the submission, as they provide a lot of relevant information addressing several of the comments received with the GEF Review Sheet.**

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response NA**

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) But please better describe how the project aligns with the GEF's private sector engagement strategy.

2) Please describe how the project contributes to the GEF's Response to Covid-19 (supports transformational change to restore a balance between natural systems and human systems)?

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** Text has been added in the submission to address comments ?1? and ?2

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA

## **Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response NA**

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please specify how stakeholder engagement under this project will tie into the overall Common Oceans stakeholder engagement process? How will the project coordinate with other child projects on this front?

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

Text added to the submission explaining how stakeholder engagement under this project will tie into the overall Common Oceans stakeholder engagement process. In general, opportunities for coordination will be explored through the GCP project. With respect to Tuna and DSF Projects, opportunities have been specifically identified in GCP (Annex L), DSF (Annex O) and Tuna (Annex P) projects. Collaborative opportunities with the Sargasso Sea and Cross-Sectoral projects are less apparent and will be discussed at the program's inception workshop?.

### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. This section calls for a description of the gender analysis. Please provide a summary of the gender analysis and the resulting GAP presented in Annex P here.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** A summary of the gender analysis and the resulting GAP presented in Annex P has been included in the submission.

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please demonstrate how the project will coordinate with the umbrella coordination project on private sector engagement. The coordination project has a dedicated Component 3 on innovative private sector engagement in the ABNJ.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

Text has been added to the DSF Project Document to further explain the role of the private sector in the DSF Project.

The DSF Project will collaborate with, and possibly benefit from, Component 3 of the GCP. As part of the work of the GCP, opportunities for initiatives involving direct participation and contributions from the private sector will be identified for the various other child projects, including the DSF. The GCP Component 3 will serve as a clearing-house mechanism for such potential partnerships.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. The Covid-19 risk analysis is present. However, the opportunities the pandemic presents for DSF is not fully established. Please revise accordingly.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

The section has been elaborated and extended to account for innovative opportunities that manifest themselves under the covid pandemic.

This is an important consideration, as the pandemic has highlighted many 'obvious' shortcomings in current processes. These have now been addressed in the Pro doc and will be elaborated upon throughout the DSF Project.

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, Please address following points:

- 1) A table that sets out relevant GEF-financed projects is included. The last column includes 'coordination approach'. However, this is not sufficiently clear/elaborated for the purposes of this section. Please explain what the benefits of coordination with these projects are.
- 2) Coordination with Non-GEF 'projects' in the ABNJ is not apparent. If coordination with such projects is planned, please elaborate accordingly (or describe why not).

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

(1) Additional text has been added to the last column to explain the benefits of coordination in Table 11.

(2) Coordination with relevant non-GEF projects (e.g. EU and other FAO projects) is likely to be substantial. It is, however, very difficult to provide details and cooperation arrangements at this stage prior to the start of the DSF Project. Some of this coordination will also occur through the GCP at the programme level.

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes.

However, it is noted that the section mentions some countries. Please clarify if activities are planned to be undertaken in countries. Please note that if activities are to be undertaken in eligible countries, LOEs needs to be submitted.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Cleared, as it is noted that NO activities are planned in any countries.

**Agency Response** At this stage, there are no planned activities for the DSF Project in specifically ?named? countries. The project will coordinate all activities through RFMOs.  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** NA

Project Results Framework

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please include participation in GEF International Waters Conferences as an output indicator.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Cleared

**Agency Response** The participation in GEF IWC as an output indicator was added to the Project Results Framework (also included as Annex A1), under output 4.1.1.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**Agency Response** NA

Council comments

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request** 21st of December 2021

(cseverin): Yes, adequately addressed

**Agency Response** NA

STAP comments

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request** 21st of December 2021

(cseverin): none received

**Agency Response** NA

**Convention Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**

(cseverin): none received

**Agency Response NA**

**Other Agencies comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**

(cseverin): none received

**Agency Response NA**

**CSOs comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**

(cseverin): none received

**Agency Response NA**

**Status of PPG utilization**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**

(cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response NA**

**Project maps and coordinates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021**

(cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response NA**

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

NA

**Agency Response**

NA



**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address above comment

7th of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.

10th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

SH (2.21. 2022): Please address comments in review box 2 and resubmit.

3rd of March 2022 (thenshaw): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

**First Review**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

This project is one of five child projects under the 'Common Oceans' programme (developed in collaboration by FAO, UNDP, UNEP and GEF) which aims to demonstrate and promote more comprehensive processes and integrated approaches to the sustainable use and management of the ABNJ.

This project is one of two child projects with a fisheries sector focus. Its objective is to ensure that deep sea fisheries in the ABNJ are managed under an ecosystem approach that maintains demersal fish stocks at levels capable of maximizing their sustainable yields and minimizing impacts on biodiversity, with a focus on data-limited stocks, deepwater sharks and vulnerable marine ecosystems.

To this end, the project will (a) strengthen deep sea fisheries governance by deep sea regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) in the ABNJ through the wider adoption, enforcement and compliance of international obligations by fishing nations to achieve sustainable fisheries aimed at maintaining stocks and reducing impacts; (b) increase cooperation on the provision of improved scientific advice for effective decision making to increase fishery sustainability and reduce impacts; (c) support RFMOs to further assess and quantify impacts on biodiversity that may arise during the course of deep sea fishing operations with gears that contact the seafloor; and (d) improve or develop linkages between the activities of the fisheries sector and other resource users of the ABNJ marine space to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability.

The project will result in several global environmental benefits and socioeconomic benefits: in total, 3,200,000 ha of marine habitat in four RFMOs will come under improved practices; 50,000 metric tons of deep sea fisheries catch will be moved from being overexploited to more sustainable levels, 42,000,000 ha in the ABNJ will see new and/or improved measures to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems from bottom fishing impacts; and 2,000 people (800 female and 1,200 male) would directly benefit from the project. The

project will also support improved ABNJ fisheries management to avoid the possibility of an uncontrolled rise in IUU fishing.