

MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	10560
Project Name:	Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)
Countr(ies):	Regional, Albania, Algeria, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia, Türkiye
Implementing Agency:	FAO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
A. Description	3
B. Key Dates	3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES	3
A. Main MTR Findings	3
B. Stakeholder Engagement	11
C. Gender Equality	16
D. Knowledge Management	17
III. CORE INDICATORS	18
IV: CO FINANCING	21
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	23
VI. ANNEX	24

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)

Country

Regional, Albania, Algeria, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia, Türkiye

GEF ID

10560

Implementing Agency

FAO

Executing Entity

General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) and Mediterranean Action Plan (Barcelona Convention)

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To reverse the over-exploitation of select commercial living marine resources by enhancing the capacity of Mediterranean countries to manage fisheries, including through the application of ecosystem-based management tools, in their blue economy development pathway.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

8/11/2022

Agency Approval

7/15/2022

Implementation Start

1/1/2023

First Disbursement

8/31/2023

Expected MTR

3/31/2025

MTR Submission

7/10/2026

Actual MTR

1/9/2026

Expected Completion

12/31/2026

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main MTR Findings

Executive summary

1. This report presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the independent Mid-term Review (MTR) of the ‘Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED) project, GCP /INT/500/GFF known hereafter as the ‘FishEBM Med Project’). The purpose of the MTR was to assess progress towards expected project outcomes and objectives and identify recommendations for mid-course adjustments to improve performance, results and potential impact.

2. The MTR was conducted over the period mid-October 2025 to early February 2026 by two independent consultants, one based in the UK (Nigel Varty), the other based in Rome (Sima El Najjar). The MTR was supported by the staff of the project’s Project Management Unit (PMU) based at the GFCM headquarters in Rome, the UNEP-MAP headquarters in Athens, SPA/RAC office in Tunis, and FAO’s GEF Coordination Unit at FAO HQ in Rome. The MTR focuses on the inception and implementation periods of the project from the official project start date (1 January 2023) up to 31 December 2025 but also includes a less intensive review of the project’s design phase (2019-2022).

Introduction

3. The project’s objective is ‘to reverse the over-exploitation of select commercial living marine resources by enhancing the capacity of Mediterranean countries to manage fisheries, including through the application of ecosystem-based management tools, in their blue economy development pathway’, and comprises of five components: (1) Strengthened capacity to manage commercial fisheries, with particular focus on Small Scale Fisheries (SSF); (2) Enhanced integration of emerging monitoring, control, and surveillance technologies in the fight against Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing; (3) Integrated ecosystem based management tools and ecosystem approach to biodiversity protection and sustainable fisheries; (4) Innovative blue economy solutions accounting for the fishery sector, and (5) Knowledge management and outscaling.

4. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) is the main GEF Implementing Agency (IA) with execution carried out by the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) through a specially established project management unit (PMU) physically based at GFCM Headquarters in Rome. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the GEF co-Implementing Agency for the project with UNEP-MAP based in Athens, Greece as the co-executing partner which has contracted their Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC) based in Tunis, Tunisia to carry out the bulk of UNEP/MAP’s project activities as it is the regional centre that leads on biodiversity issues.

5. The project is a full-sized 5-year GEF-7 project with USD 7,273,973 of GEF funding comprising USD 7,000,000 of funding under the International Waters Focal Area with an allocation of USD 273,973 under the Biodiversity Focal Area (contribution from Montenegro). This was complemented by US 72,027,654 of pledged co-financing at the PPG stage principally from the private sector, GFCM and the participating governments, but interestingly no co-financing was listed from FAO or UNEP in the Project Document.

6. The MTR aimed to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and risks to the sustainability of the project results, and factors that have affected its performance and delivery to date, as well as cross-cutting issues (including gender and Environmental and Social Safeguards). The following key review questions (RQ, summarised) guided the work of the MTR:

- RQ1 – How and to what extent are the project’s objectives and its intended outcomes consistent with national priorities, GEF strategic programmes and FAO strategic objectives and operational programmes? What is the current level of ownership of the project and its results by the project partners and the target beneficiary groups?
- RQ2 – To what extent has the project delivered on its expected outputs, outcomes and objectives, in terms of their quality, quantity and timeliness?
- RQ3 – How efficient has the project been in its implementation and delivery of results to date?
- RQ4 – What have been the main factors affecting the project’s implementation to date?
- RQ5 - What is the likelihood of project results and benefits being sustained after the project ends and what are the key risks to the sustainability of the project results and progress towards longer-term impacts?
- RQ6 - To what extent has gender equality and other equity concerns been taken in account in the design and implementation of the project?

7. To address the above questions, the MTR team undertook a review of background project documentation and associated literature along with semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders guided by questions

from a questionnaire. This was refined during an initial inception mission to FAO HQ in Rome in November 2025 (no other field visits were considered necessary). Interviews were held with a total of 54 individuals with c.70-75 hours¹ of interviews (November 2025 – January 2026).

Key Findings

RQ 1- Relevance, cohesion and ownership

8. The project is considered highly relevant and helps meet global and regional (GEF IW, GFCM and SPA/RAC and UNEP-MAP) agenda and priorities and complement existing initiatives e.g. Fish4Med programme. However, the picture is mixed at the national level with the importance of different elements varying by country. Unfortunately, partly due to the COVID pandemic, there was limited national stakeholder input at the project design stage, and the project was not considered sufficiently tailored to the needs/priorities of individual countries (ownership issue). Also, the ‘common ownership’ of project has not occurred at neither national nor regional levels. It is viewed as more relevant, and likely to have a greater impact, for project’s fisheries than environment aims.

RQ2 – Effectiveness – delivery of project outputs and progress towards project outcomes

Component 1 - Strengthened capacity to manage commercial fisheries, with particular focus on Small Scale Fisheries (SSF)

9. Delivery of this Component is progressing well with collection and analysis of socioeconomic data likely to be complete by mid 2026, although integration and use of such data in fisheries management nationally unclear. The data from at-sea surveys is providing valuable information on fish stocks and project activities are supporting the development and application of the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) approach for data poor stocks. However, there have been delays over the project’s intended value chain activities and only minimal piloting is likely before formal end of project. The project’s stakeholder mapping is still ongoing but should provide important information for better engaging local fisher groups in GFCM decision-making and improve fisheries management. However, the capacity needs assessments for SSF organisations have not been carried out.

Component 2: Enhanced integration of emerging monitoring, control, and surveillance technologies in the fight against Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing

10. Collection of data on economic losses due to IUU fishing and the scale and impacts of IUU fishing has not been undertaken up to the MTR point (31 December 2025) due to significant delays on a decision by GFCM on an appropriate common methodology to collect the data. An alternative approach was being developed at the MTR point and due to be piloted in the final year of the project. However, there has been important updating and expansion of information on legal frameworks held within the GFCM-Lex database under this Component, including related to IUU fishing. There has also been continued progress on the uptake of Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) in Montenegro and Albania, although the development and endorsement of a National Plan of Action (NPOA) on IUU fishing (NPOA-IUU) is only likely to be achieved in two countries (Albania or Türkiye) by the end of project.

Component 3: Integrated ecosystem based management tools and ecosystem approach to biodiversity protection and sustainable fisheries

11. Whilst there have been no direct project activities within officially designated marine protected Areas (MPAs) in the mediterranean through the project, the project has provided critical support to creation of a new 270,200 hectares Fisheries Restricted Area (FRA) in the Adriatic Sea (Otranto Channel) which represents a contribution to 30x30 target, including an important stakeholder engagement process. There has also been some useful survey work on status of vulnerable benthic ecosystems with piloting of innovative eDNA metabarcoding, which may have wider potential interest and application beyond fisheries (e.g. general biodiversity surveys). In addition, a Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) workshop was delivered and well received according to interviewees, but the development of follow-up national/local climate change adaptation strategies or action plans seems unlikely before end of project given the timeframe and project resources available. The project’s activities related to mitigating the negative effects of NIS have also been limited, although a useful workshop was held and series of ‘measures’ promoted which have helped to raise awareness and knowledge of potential solutions. Project activities to address fisheries tenure issues were minimal and not a priority for most countries (low ownership).

Component 4: Innovative blue economy solutions accounting for the fishery sector

12. No new fisheries sector investments have been identified and mobilised through the project but a well-received Small Scale Fisheries (SSF) workshop on addressing Non Indigenous Species (NIS) has been held although there has not been any significant targeted follow up. Up to the MTR point, no National Action Plan Plus (NAP+) with associated investment plan tested had been developed and endorsed (or even drafted), although SPA/RAC had begun some preliminary activities with the Government of Montenegro, but full NAP+ implementation is judged to be highly unlikely by end 2026. SPA/RAC was also exploring an alternative approach (to that set out in the Project Document) of integrating fisheries considerations into already existing Blue Economy planning processes in Tunisia, Libya, and Morocco.

Component 5: Knowledge management and outscaling

13. National stakeholder platforms to encourage engagement and investment have not yet been finalized. Only an outline project Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) Plan was developed and has not been properly operationalised. It was also not linked to the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP). Some communication pieces, knowledge products have been delivered although these have been limited in scope, and a clear framework for dissemination of project results and knowledge products tailored to different audiences and stakeholder groups is still lacking. However, regional and global knowledge-exchange events have been well attended by the project. Overall, KMC efforts remain at an early stage and are not yet fully systematic.

RQ2 – Effectiveness - progress towards achieving project objective

14. As expected at the MTR point, whilst there has been good delivery of some outputs (see above), the progress towards to achieving meaningful change at the project outcome and objective levels has been mixed and less certain. The degree to which the project objective is being achieved is difficult to assess due to poorly formulated objective and outcome statements and associated indicators (see M&E below). The project is not addressing improvement in the effectiveness of management for MPAs but has provided important support for the establishment of an FRA (an Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measure, OECM) in the Otranto Channel in the Adriatic Sea, contributing to meeting GEF Core Indicator 2. The project has increased the tonnage of landings from fisheries under more sustainable management contributing to GEF Core Indicator 8.

15. At the outcome level, although there has been some good data collection and helping to build a better ‘data culture’ in countries (Outcome 1), it is still unclear to what extent fisheries-related information (including stakeholder information and socio-economic data) generated by the project has been used or how it will be integrated into current management decision processes by the end of the project. Similarly, direct project impacts on addressing IUU fishing through the project (Outcome 2) are likely to be limited before the end of the project (mostly through support to Montenegro, Albania and Türkiye), agreement on a common regional methodology represents an important step and the information and guidance on legal frameworks addressing IUU within the updated regional GFCM-Lex database should help support national efforts. Efforts to assess the extent to which project activities have contributed to Outcome 3 – achieving ‘healthier marine ecosystems’ - are challenging given the poor formulation of the outcome and associated indicators, but the most significant contribution to change under this Outcome so far has been the role played by the project in the creation of the FRA Otranto Channel. There has been little progress towards Outcome 4 as no NAP+ has been developed by the MTR with no associated investment, and there was considerable confusion over what was intended, although there are opportunities to develop guidance to better promote sustainable fisheries within existing blue economy processes in Tunisia, Libya and Morocco which could have significant impact over the longer term (beyond the project’s timeframe). In terms of the project’s KMC activities to promote awareness and solutions (Outcome 5), some useful knowledge management products and communication pieces have been produced distributed but these remain limited in scope, and their uptake, integration and use are not well documented and consequently, the degree to which the project has changed perceptions and values through its KMC efforts are also difficult to assess. This has not been helped by a weak ‘integrative’ approach to KMC.

RQ3 - Efficiency

16. Overall efficiency has been mixed with both positive and negative factors contributing to the delivery of the project. Judged on delivery of project activities and results and spending of GEF funds, efficiency has been greater for GFCM than UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC activities at the MTR point.

RQ4 - Factors affecting performance

Design and readiness

17. The project suffers from a poorly designed Results Framework, including its project objective and some outcome statements, and associated outcome indicators (mostly outputs), with some elements notably Component 3 being particularly unclear and lacking coherence. Unfortunately, partly due to COVID restrictions, there was limited consultations during the project design phase but no revision to reduce weaknesses in the design took place at project inception. 'Readiness to start' reportedly presented a challenge at national level and there were delays over the formation of GFCM team and a very long delay before SPA/RAC activities could begin.

Project implementation and oversight

18. There has been good operational support from the FAO LTO, but FAO processes e.g. procurement were widely felt to be burdensome/time consuming by partners, and more instruction on GEF requirements could have been provided to GFCM at beginning by FAO. UNEP, the co-IA, delegated project execution to UNEP/MAP but SPA/RAC was requested to undertake most of the execution of the elements led by UNEP/MAP. Oversight by UNEP/MAP has not been as frequent as needed and there has been little oversight inputs from UNEP in Nairobi until recently. Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings were felt to be useful by participants, especially for exchange and knowledge on the project, but not as a participatory decision-making forum.

Project management and execution

19. Execution by the GFCM project team for the project activities for which they are responsible has been good. The GFCM team has high technical capacity in most relevant areas and is led by a highly capable Technical Project Manager/Project Coordinator (TPM/PC). GFCM introduced a project management system and additional staffing to speed up and improve quality of project execution early in project execution. Both UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC teams have competent staff, but they began project activities very late due to delays over project agreements, which has especially affected SPA/RAC execution. Although SPA/RAC has made efforts to increase the team's capacity it has still not caught up with delivery, and some activity sets are unlikely to be deliverable in their present form before the end of the project.

20. There was a lack of discussion and little detail developed during the design and early project execution stages on the structures and operational arrangements required for coordination between UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC and GFCM on project activities, with unclear roles and responsibilities over key areas such as reporting, planning, etc, which contributed to this poor coordination.

Financial management and co-financing

21. There were no major issues with financial management. Delivery of co-financing is difficult to assess but there has been some significant additional 'leveraged' co-financing that needs to be captured.

Partnerships and stakeholder relationships

22. An initial Project Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was prepared during the design phase but not developed further at inception and remains largely descriptive and insufficiently operationalized. Stakeholder engagement has been uneven across countries and stakeholder groups (e.g. limited involvement of NGOs, women's groups, and the private sector). However, GFCM, UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC all have well established relationships with key project partners which has supported project execution. Unfortunately, coordination between the project's fisheries and environmental National Focal Points (NFPs) has remained limited and largely ad hoc.

Communications, awareness-raising and knowledge management

23. Some project KMC products, particularly technical reports, have been delivered, but KMC have been constrained by fragmented institutional arrangements within GFCM and SPA/RAC, limited strategic guidance from FAO and UNEP/MAP, and weak project positioning within GFCM, resulting in an insufficiently coordinated KMC approach.

M&E design and implementation

24. The project follows the standard FAO-GEF M&E framework, but M&E execution has been handicapped by a poor Results Framework (outcomes, outputs, indicators) which was poorly constructed and has many weaknesses (many non-SMART indicators). Unfortunately, no changes were made at inception, and reporting and assessment of project delivery, and especially outcome level, is questionable in many cases.

RQ5 - Sustainability of project results

25. Most threats (risks) to sustainability of the project results are likely to be addressed before the end of the project, but a No Cost Extension (NCE) will be needed to ensure some activities, particularly those led by SPA/RAC, can be completed in time. Continued support from GFCM and UNEP MedProgramme is likely (depending on their funding) for key aims of the project, and some participating Governments clearly see the value of project (notably Albania and Montenegro for fisheries, and Morocco for environmental aspects) and likely to support project results after GEF funding ends. National membership of GFCM and the UNEP MedProgramme and long-term commitments to sustainable use of the natural resources of the Mediterranean should also support project sustainability aims, and there are no significant negative environmental risks likely from the project. However, there has been no significant evidence of catalysis or replication of project results (e.g. outside of region) so far.

RQ6 - Cross-cutting dimensions (gender and ESS)

26. A very brief Gender Action Plan was produced at the design stage but not developed further during inception. Consequently, there have been few direct benefits to women through project activities (the project mostly has a technical focus). Direct support for gender has been limited and dedicated gender expertise was absent.

27. 'Low' rating for ESS was given at the project design stage and remains the case at the MTR point

Conclusions

Relevance

28. The project is highly relevant in helping to meet especially regional and global priorities but less so national priorities. Ownership of the project was not initially as high as it should have been due to limited engagement during the design phase but has improved.

Effectiveness

29. There has been mixed progress at the MTR point (not unusual), with good delivery on fisheries elements (led by GFCM), especially on technical activities and data collection (including on legislation) and VMS, and important contribution to the establishment of an FRA for the Otranto Channel in the Adriatic Sea. However, limited delivery on broader environmental activities (led by UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC) with many activities behind schedule and some lacking clarity and what their longer-term use and impact might be. It is difficult to assess progress towards the project objective and outcomes, but some good progress has been made with uptake of new approaches and improved information and tools for fisheries and environmental management and increased promotion of these.

Efficiency

30. Overall efficiency has been mixed (typical for project at mid-term point), with both positive and negative factors contributing to efficient delivery of the project.

Factors affecting performance

Design and readiness

31. The project's design had weaknesses, particularly its results Framework, lacking coherence and clarity, which has made the execution of project activities challenging and, in some cases, it handicapped the interpretation and communication of the aims and results of the project. The 'readiness' to start implementation presented a challenge at national level due to confusion over project aims, recovery from COVID, and inexperience of GFCM with GEF projects at start of the project.

Project implementation and oversight

32. Overall, good support from FAO as the lead GEF IA, but oversight and managerial and technical support provided by UNEP/MAP to SPA/RAC has been limited and should be increased. FAO and UNEP, as the two GEF IAs, appeared to have allowed GFCM and SPA/RAC and UNEP/MAP to largely operate independently - at the MTR point, the project can be characterised as two essentially separate projects with little alignment.

Project management and execution

33. The capable GFCM team has done a good job in delivering the project up to the MTR point. However, the SPA/RAC and UNEP/MAP teams have been less successful with delivery, largely because of delays on starting their project activities due to late signing of the funding transfer agreements, although SPA/RAC has made attempts to catch up by allocating more staffing resources and utilising consultants to deliver many activities. Consultation and coordination between UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC and GFCM on project activities has been limited and needs to be improved, and the project does not ‘showcase the GFCM/MAP approach’ that is promoted in the Project Document.

Financial management and co-financing

34. Financial management appears to have been straightforward and without problems (apart from the ICA and PCA) but the picture regarding co-financing is unclear and needs to be addressed.

Partnerships and Stakeholders

35. Despite a very basic SEP, the project has created valuable opportunities for stakeholder participation but engagement of environment NFPs has been inconsistent, and coordination between the fisheries and environment NFPs has remained largely ad hoc and needs to be improved. The project aimed to ‘bring together fisheries and environment sectors’ to work together more closely in the Mediterranean but to date this has been limited.

Communications/knowledge management

36. Insufficient attention was given to the development and communication of key project messages at inception and the project’s KMC Plan has been only minimally developed. Capacity and the required attention to undertake KMC activities effectively has been insufficient, or has suffered from overlapping roles and responsibilities within the GFCM team. Furthermore, KMC has suffered from an insufficiently coordinated approach between UNEP/MAP, SPA/RAC and GFCM, who have operating largely independently of each other.

M&E

37. M&E implementation has been generally adequate, but it has been handicapped by a confusing Results Framework with poorly formulated outcomes and associated non-SMART indicators, which need to be reviewed and revised. Reporting has focused on the activity and output rather than outcome and impact levels, and coverage of cross-cutting issues, such as gender and stakeholder engagement, remains weak. The consistency and coordination of reporting between SPA/RAC and UNEP/MAP as well as with GFCM has been limited at times.

Sustainability and replication and catalysis

38. It is considered too early to make a clear judgement on the sustainability of the project’s results, but most controllable risks are likely to be addressed before the end of the project and there will be continued commitment from GFCM, UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC which are all institutionally stable and most national partners see the value of the project results. However, a sustainability plan will need to be developed in the next year. There has no obvious replication or catalysis of project results to date, and this needs to be considered in the KMc activities over the next year.

Key recommendations (see main report for additional and sub-recommendations)

39. Recommendation 1: Streamlining, rationalising and consolidating project technical elements

- General (applies to overall project) - Cut or reduce activity sets which are of lower priority and refocus on those likely to contribute most to overall aims of project and have most impacts and consider reducing some indicator targets to make the aims of the project more realistic. Following the recommended review of the above suggested activity sets, reformulate/rearrange relevant project outputs and activities in Results Framework, project workplan and budget and discuss and obtain endorsement at 2026 PSC.
- Component 1 - (i) Clarify to stakeholders how socio-economic data collected by project will be used in fisheries management decision-making and (ii) undertake joint lesson learning workshop with FishEBM Black Sea project on the collection of (a) socio-economic and (b) stakeholder mapping data.
- Component 2 - Consider 3-4 months No Cost Extension (NCE) for VMS work in Montenegro and Albania.
- Component 3 - (i) Consider additional trials of eDNA barcoding if funding and time available; (ii) cut further activities to identify, develop and pilot measures to manage/ eradicate NIS due to funds, time and scale of problem; (iii) develop plan and materials to promote uptake of key messages from studies undertaken under

Component 3, particularly products published by SPA/RAC under Outputs 3.2 and 3.3 (tied to KMC, Recommendation 2).

- Component 4 – (i) discuss, agree and document a common understanding of ‘NAP+’ and whether the project should: (a) focus on just upgrading NAPs with additional fisheries inputs (NAP+), and/or (b) support early stages of the on-going (already established) processes to develop national Blue Economy Strategies/Plans in selected countries (Tunisia, Libya and Morocco); and (ii) develop clear written plan for SPA/RAC work under Component 4 for the remainder of project and consider the deliverables, targets, milestones and needs for 6-month NCE to allow SPA/RAC to deliver agreed activities.

40. Recommendation 2: Strengthening KMC (Component 5) and wider dissemination of project messages and results

- Strengthen KMC leadership and technical capacity at GFCM and designate a single overall KMC lead for the project, and strengthen institutional KMC capacity within SPA/RAC.
- Develop and implement a joint KMC strategy for the project with a better developed, more strategic vision clearly identified.
- Establish a clear and consistent narrative for the FishEBM Med project, explicitly distinguishing it from other GFCM and SPA/RAC and UNEP/MAP initiatives.
- Strengthen joint KMC activities between GFCM and SPA/RAC.
- Undertake at least one structured ‘lesson learning’ exercise covering project experiences, processes and results.
- Organize a ‘wrap up’ meeting of both the FishEBM Mediterranean and FishEBM Black Sea projects.

41. Recommendation 3: Improving project coordination and cooperation/collaboration between UNEP/MAP, SPA/RAC and GFCM and environment and fisheries agencies on project activities

- Improve collaboration and coordination between GFCM, UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC and between environment and fisheries NFPs.
- Capture activities/frameworks to promote cooperation at national and regional levels in the project’s Results Framework through creating a new Output (or possible Outcome) with associated activities, indicators and targets, and ensure new project coordination and management arrangements are documented in an updated project organogram.[Suggested actions at national and regional levels covered in main report].

42. Recommendation 4: Strengthening partnerships and stakeholder engagement, and addressing gender issues

- Partnerships and stakeholder engagement – (i) jointly review and revise project Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) to reflect current set of key partners and stakeholders, and link to revised KMC plan (see above) for more effective dissemination of results; (ii) ensure key project stakeholders (listed in the SEP) are kept regularly informed of project results, developments and opportunities (again linked to the KMC plan); and (iii) explain use of data from stakeholder mapping to groups from which data was collected and their likely future involvement in fisheries management decision-making to ensure common understanding and to manage future expectations.
- Gender – (i) Recruit dedicated gender expert and establish clearer project responsibility for gender mainstreaming; (ii) ensure all future project activities consider opportunities to mainstream gender and fully document these activities in project reporting (PIR, PPR, etc); and (iii) review all project KMC products and identify where gender considerations can still be integrated and then, where possible, address these, particularly for issues which would impact on women, e.g., CCA workshop report and regional guidelines.

43. Recommendation 5: Improving project management and sustainability of project results

- Transfer responsibility for some technical areas covered by the GFCM PTM/PC – gender, socio-economic and KMC – to other GFCM staff - to enable the TPM/PC to focus on project management for remainder of project.
- UNEP/MAP to invest more staff time in project monitoring and oversight and providing technical support to SPA/RAC including clarifying the role of UNEP-MAP ‘Project Manager’
- Review and simplify the project reporting lines between SPA/RAC and UNEP/MAP, SPA/RAC and GFCM and UNEP/MAP and GFCM and ensure these are documented and fully identify and properly report on all co-financing (GFCM to lead on this).

44. Recommendation 6: Strengthening the project M&E and reporting framework

- Review and revise the project Results Framework to make project outcomes clearer and replace the project outcome indicators with a set of ‘SMARTer’ project outcome indicators (including 2-3 gender-related indicators) with associated baselines and targets. As part of this exercise add an additional Output to capture ‘cooperation between GFCM and SPA/RAC’ with associated indicators and targets and add another Output to cover the project’s M&E and reporting activities and include the standard set of activities (e.g. PIR, MTR, TE) to meet the request from the GEF, and update GEF Core Indicators 2 and 8 with new calculations (reported in PIR for 2026).

- Strengthen reporting in PIRs and PPRs on gender and stakeholder engagement.

- UNEP/MAP, SPA/RAC and UNEP to urgently extend the ICA and PCA as once these agreements finish no further transfers of GEF payments can occur between UNEP to UNEP/MAP and from UNEP/MAP to SPA/RAC so project activities associated with UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC will cease.

45. Recommendation 7: Agree on No Cost Extensions for critical elements of project to ensure delivery and maximise impact and sustainability of project results

- Identify key project activities which may need No Cost Extensions (NCE) for up to 6 months (ending June 2027) with a revised Results. Activities for consideration of a NCE include: KMC, VMS, NAP+/BE Plans, piloting of IUU data collection.

46. The overall rating at the MTR point is MODERATELY SATISFACTORY, but the project has the potential to be SATISFACTORY by end of project if changes are made.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement and partnerships

Finding 4.16: A project Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was prepared at the design stage and is well aligned with relevant frameworks, but this was not expanded with necessary detail at inception and remains largely descriptive and insufficiently operationalized.

Finding 4.17: The project created multiple opportunities for stakeholder engagement, although this has been uneven across countries and stakeholder groups (for instance, there has been limited involvement of NGOs, women’s groups, and the private sector), and stakeholder engagement has remained largely activity-driven rather than strategic. There was a mixed/limited involvement of key partners and stakeholders at the design stage leading to poor ownership and lack of understanding and expectations. However, GFCM, UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC all have well established relationships with key project partners which has supported project execution.

Finding 4.18: Coordination between the project’s fisheries and environmental National Focal Points (NFPs) has varied significantly between countries but has remained limited and largely ad hoc.

(i) Stakeholder Engagement Plan

220. An outline Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was developed during the design phase, which was intended to guide engagement with actors relevant for the management of fisheries and the marine environment in the Mediterranean. The SEP aligns with key policy frameworks, including FAO and UNEP’s Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) and its PANTHER principles (Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination, Transparency, Human dignity, Empowerment and Rule of law), the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF Guidelines), and the GFCM 2030 Strategy and its Regional Plan of Action for Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (RPOA-SSF). It also reflects UNEP/MAP principles, which emphasize the central role of civil society, the private sector, and other stakeholders in environmental governance, as well as the importance of inclusive and participatory decision-

making processes. The SEP identifies a broad range of relevant stakeholder groups, including government administrations, research institutes, fishers and fish workers, NGOs and civil society organizations, private sector actors, and intergovernmental organizations. The plan does acknowledge the often-invisible role of women in fisheries, particularly in post-harvest activities, consistent with the SSF Guidelines' emphasis on gender equality and social inclusion in the fisheries sector³³ but gender considerations are not operationalized through specific actions, targets, or monitoring indicators.

221. However, the SEP remains largely descriptive and insufficiently operational to guide systematic stakeholder engagement during implementation. Although the document identifies broad categories of stakeholders, it does not clearly identify the specific institutions, organizations, or stakeholder groups to be engaged in each country or at regional level. The stakeholder mapping referred to in the document has not been translated into a clear engagement strategy identifying priorities. Engagement approaches are described in generic terms (e.g. workshops, meetings, exchanges) with limited differentiation by stakeholder type, level of influence, or purpose of engagement. The plan also provides limited clarity on how stakeholder inputs feed into fisheries or marine environment management decisions or GFCM and UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC governance processes. Monitoring indicators mainly track the number of activities and stakeholders engaged rather than the quality, inclusiveness, or influence of engagement. In addition, the SEP is not clearly linked to the Knowledge Management and Communications (KMC) plan. As a result, while the project team (GFCM and UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC) often has practical knowledge of key actors, stakeholder engagement continues to rely largely on ad hoc interactions rather than on a fully operational stakeholder engagement strategy or platform.

(ii) Partnerships - engagement with national institutions

222. The project's key participating national government institutions have been involved in various project activities across countries, but this has varied enormously. In some cases, the project has supported improvements in national data collection and analytical capacity. For example, in Lebanon, the project has contributed to strengthening the capacity of national institutions to collect and analyze fisheries data as part of surveys-at-sea conducted and handled by the National Council for Scientific Research Lebanon (CNRS). Interviews indicate that these generated high-quality and reliable data on fish stocks, providing a strong scientific basis for decision-making within the Directorate of Fisheries. The activity also contributed to significant capacity building, with the Ministry staff improving skills in data collection and species identification, and CNRS teams gaining valuable experience through close collaboration with GFCM experts.³⁴ In other cases, capacity building has supported national fisheries legislation. For example, participation of Tunisian representatives in the workshop on strengthening national legislation in line with GFCM recommendations provided practical insights on reviewing legislation and identifying gaps. Stakeholders reported that the knowledge gained is being used to inform ongoing revisions of fisheries legislation.

223. However, engagement of environmental ministries, principally through their environmental NFPs has been inconsistent and, in some cases, very limited to date. This is largely due to the very delayed start to the UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC project activities (see X.X), but also a lack of clarity regarding roles and expectations, combined with competing priorities, high workloads, and inter-ministerial coordination challenges, which has reduced the effective involvement of some environmental NFPs in the project up to the MTR.

(iii) Relationship between GFCM and UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC

224. As mentioned, although there was a previous agreement between GFCM and UNEP/MAP, there was no specific written partnership agreement developed for this specific project. It was assumed that the two partners would work closely together and collaborate on project activities, but coordination between the groups has been limited.

225. It was initially envisaged that a joint work plan with shared budgets would be developed for a sub-set of common activities and there would be regular consultation on activities by each party, especially because many of the SPA/RAC related activities were to include fisheries perspectives.

226. Unfortunately, although there has been contact between the GFCM PMU in Rome and the SPA/RAC team in Tunis and vice versa, the lines of responsibility were unclear and cooperation and collaboration did not happen to any meaningful extent. For instance, the CCA workshop organised by SPA/RAC (under Component 3) only involved GFCM late in planning when the agenda, format and dates had already been decided (even though it involved a fisheries element), and as a result few fisheries sector individuals were able to attend, and the workshop's outcomes are unlikely to be taken up by fisheries agencies (due to low/no ownership). Based on MTR interviews, UNEP/MAP staff did not seem to be aware of this poor collaboration between SPA/RAC and GFCM. Similarly, GFCM was unaware of UNEP/MAP project activities except for those reported to the TPM/PC when the PPRs or annual PIRs were being put together³⁵. The limited communication and coordination between the three key bodies involved – GFCM (Rome), UNEP/MAP (Athens) and SPA/RAC (Tunis) – is probably partly a reflection of a design weakness which has lacked sufficiently detailed coordination mechanisms, consultation procedures or reporting arrangements between the executing partners. The limited visibility of certain activities partly due to broader project governance arrangements affecting all partners rather than being attributed to any single institution.

227. Part of the problem appears to be that UNEP/MAP believed that since SPA/RAC were to carry out much of the UNEP/MAP funded project activities, coordination and collaboration should be between GFCM and SPA/RAC with UNEP/MAP 'taking a back seat' - despite being the official executing partner and having overall responsibility for the delivery of the GEF funds provided to UNEP/MAP. However, MTR interviews with SPA/RAC staff indicated that they understood they were managed by and reported to UNEP/MAP and not by GFCM. In other words, as highlighted above, there was confusion among UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC staff over roles and responsibilities and who was in charge, and the arrangement for collaboration and coordination between UNEP/MAP and GFCM, including management of different elements of the FishEBM Med project was not clear.

228. Unfortunately, cooperation, collaboration, joint planning and exchange between the key parties was not specifically written into the project at the design stage - it was just assumed that this would occur, which did not happen as they operated largely independently and the assumption was clearly an error of judgement at the design stage. With hindsight the arrangement should have been set out formally in an expanded section of the Project Document (and should be for any future FAO/GFCM and UNEP/MAP ventures). The MTR also suggests that a new output and indicator is added to a revised Results Framework that specifically addresses these cooperation and collaboration issues, so that these are formalised, measured and tracked to ensure they occur.

229. Another issue mentioned to the MTR which may have affected collaboration between UNEP/MAP and GFCM was a question over who has the higher responsibility for fisheries management in the Mediterranean. Clearly this rests with GFCM as the Regional Fisheries Management Organisation for the Mediterranean (and Black Sea). However, fish are an integral part of the larger marine ecosystem, and their management needs to be considered in the wider context (and fisheries are addressed under Barcelona Convention), and environmental impacts such as pollution and invasive species (more the remit of UNEP/MAP) will affect fisheries management. Consequently, UNEP-MAP can provide contributions to fisheries management governance.

(iv) Coordination and collaboration between fisheries and environment NFPs

230. The project aimed to promote coordination and collaboration between fisheries and environment administrations on the management of fisheries and the marine environment in the Mediterranean. However, no structured joint activities were planned to foster coordination and collaboration, and engagement remains

limited although varies by country. In some cases, most collaboration and exchange between NFPs occurred during annual PSC meetings. In Lebanon, for example, collaboration between environmental and fisheries administrations is weak, reflecting existing institutional fragmentation, duplication of mandates, and competition between ministries. Consequently, project activities were largely implemented separately by each NFP. For instance, apparently only the environmental NFP was invited to the project's NIS workshop (Output 3.3), while the fisheries counterpart was not. Similarly in Libya and Albania there have been little or no collaboration between the two NFPs, and communication between the two focal points in Tunisia occurs but remains limited, as each has developed its own vision of project activities. In contrast, Morocco and Montenegro have much closer relations between the fisheries and environmental authorities (even though there have been delays over designation of the environmental NFP for the project), although collaboration has not been extensive to date, in part due to the delays over beginning the SPA/RAC led project activities.

231. Unfortunately, there were limited opportunities built into the project's design to ensure joint actions between the environment and fisheries NFPs and their respective agencies, with 'activity sets were very much divided up between UNEP/MAP and GFCM' during the design period according to one interviewee. Overall, MTR interviews indicated that, while communication channels between NFPs were functional, collaboration under the project has been ad hoc and limited.

232. A related issue which has affected the project (and the FishEBM Black Sea project) is that knowledge of the GEF and GEF processes is generally poor in national fisheries agencies (as opposed to environmental agencies). In such cases it is useful to ensure the national GEF Operational Focal Points, which are usually based within national environmental agencies, are involved in the project. Interviews indicated that they have largely remained disengaged despite consistent efforts to involve them³⁶.

(v) Engagement with local-level stakeholders including SSF and fisher groups

233. Local stakeholder engagement has varied across countries depending on institutional contexts and internal constraints.

234. Small-scale fisheries (SSF) dominate the Mediterranean fisheries sector in terms of employment, providing livelihoods for most fishers in the region. However, they remain underrepresented in revenue generation and policy making, including within the regional GFCM decision-making processes. These communities often face limited access to markets, social services, and alternative livelihood opportunities, making them particularly vulnerable to environmental and economic shocks. Furthermore, participatory processes for engaging community level stakeholders in fisheries management decision-making are uncommon, which has reduced the effectiveness of past fisheries management efforts. Small scale fisher groups are a particular focus for the project by GFCM, which has had relatively little direct contact previously and the project's stakeholder mapping exercise (Output 1.4), is intended to gain a much better understanding of this group for more informed and participatory decision-making at internal GFCM. One of the benefits of the project is that it should enable greater representation of the views and needs of local fisher groups in GFCM decisions on the management of Mediterranean fish stocks which directly affect them, which has not occurred to any extent before (largely through a single national government representative who may or may not have consulted SSF groups).

235. The project has sought to engage small-scale fishers (SSF) primarily through regional knowledge exchange and capacity-building activities, notably under the SSF Forum (Output 1.4), and the collection of socioeconomic data (under Output 1.1), led by GFCM. In Türkiye, for example, stakeholder engagement has been relatively strong, facilitated by existing relationships between fisher associations and national fisheries agencies (Sür-Koop (national fisheries cooperative in Türkiye) supporting stakeholder engagement and national socioeconomic survey in Türkiye). Organizations such as Sur Koop have played an active role in the project's implementation, particularly in the collection of socio-economic data, awareness-raising, and information exchange. MTR interviews indicated that fisher stakeholder groups have become more receptive

to participating in surveys and sharing data, reflecting growing trust and awareness of the benefits of improved fisheries management. In Tunisia, engagement has centred more around participation in project workshops and forums, particularly the SSF Forum and capacity-building activities. These have provided practical support to fishers in addressing emerging challenges. The NIS workshop for instance enabled participants to share firsthand experiences, learn how to manage and valorise NIS, and explore new market opportunities, including through value chain development.³⁷ As noted by an interviewee in Türkiye, engaging in project activities such as the SSF Forum, contributed to a better understanding of the negative effects of NIS, and options for how to address them including development of potential new markets (e.g. for lionfish). Similarly, in Albania, fishers were engaged in the collection and analysis of socioeconomic and local ecological knowledge (LEK) as part of the process to establish the FRA in the southern Adriatic Sea (Output 3.1).

236. The project has also included workshops aimed at strengthening collaboration between scientists and fishers, such as participation in a workshop on the European eel, which contributed to improving dialogue, knowledge sharing, and the dissemination of scientific advice on fisheries management. The Forum also supported the development of regional networks among fishers and promoted the exchange of best practices based on country experiences.³⁸ Direct involvement of local fisher groups has also included the project's gear selectivity testing activities. Several countries have participated in project workshops to date and reported positive experiences of the SSF groups to the MTR, including Lebanon, Türkiye, Morocco and Tunisia. Representation of local fisher groups appears to have been particularly strong in Morocco.

237. On the other hand, stakeholder engagement has been relatively unstructured, with limited systematic involvement of local actors in project design and decision-making processes. For instance, consultation with many stakeholder groups during the project design phase was very limited – even with national agencies – with many interviewees indicating that their involvement was mainly indirect through a national representative. In addition, barriers such as language barriers and availability of translation/interpretation, particularly for Turkish, has limited access to information and the technical complexity of materials and further affected the depth and effectiveness of stakeholder participation.

238. Up to the MTR there had been little opportunity for local groups to engage with the SPA/RAC and UNEP/MAP activities due to the late start of their project activities. Most interaction has occurred in relation to inputs to: (i) various technical reviews by consultants, e.g., review of 'State of waste management practices on fishing vessels in the Mediterranean Sea: Review of common sources, regulatory frameworks, and port waste reception facilities' (UNEP/MAP-SPA/RAC 2025) where relevant groups were asked to fill in a questionnaire; (ii) attendance at regional workshops such as that on CCA held in Türkiye in December 2025, although the extent of direct inputs from local stakeholder groups is unclear (national government agencies were more directly involved in these workshops; (iii) and initial moves to establish national stakeholder platforms intended to support the development of the proposed 'NAP+' process in some countries (which had not been formerly established with a first meeting by the MTR).

(vi) Private sector engagement

239. Opportunities for direct engagement with larger private sector commercial fisheries have been relatively limited. In the Mediterranean most fisheries are small-scale, multi-species and multi-fleet, and private sector engagement primarily relates to fishers and their organizations rather than large commercial industrial companies. While some commercial actors were indirectly involved in project activities, such as commercial vessels participating in surveys and the provision of fisheries equipment (e.g. VMS and monitoring systems and for gear selectivity trials), private sector engagement has not been a central component of the project, although there are entry points for connection with the project, e.g. through interest in markets for blue crab (an NIS). Unfortunately, it was not possible for the MTR to interview any commercial fisheries operators and

stakeholders so the extent to which this group is committed to adopting new practices promoted by the project remains unclear.

(vii) Engagement with European Commission and EU member countries

240. Although many of the countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea are EU member countries and active in its fisheries with concerns about the environmental status of the Sea, the European Commission has not been directly involved in the project, and neither have EU member countries had direct involvement (although indirectly through support for some external multiple partner initiatives that the project has been involved with, such as the Italian fisheries agency support for the surveys to establish the Otranto Channel FRA). The MTR was informed that there was little interest from the European Commission before and immediately after the project started and did not wish to be associated with the project. However, the MTR was unable to interview the relevant person from the Commission to get their views.

C. Gender Equality

Gender

Finding 6.1: Gender was considered at the project design stage. However, the gender analysis and the project's Gender Action Plan (GAP) remained largely conceptual and had little influence on the design of project activities, resulting in limited integration of gender considerations in the project.

Findings 6.2: The GAP was not further developed at project inception and remains insufficiently operationalized. The project has few targeted actions to provide gender benefits and specific gender activities has not been systematically developed and mainstreamed in the project.

Finding 6.3: Institutional capacity to develop and promote gender-related activities has been limited, with gender expertise and responsibilities largely resting with the TPM/PC (as the gender focal point for GFCM) for the GFCM-led activities, and, until recently, for SPA/RAC resting with the whole project team (which lacks a designated gender focal point, and the UNEP/MAP gender focal point had been little involved up to the MTR). The lack of dedicated gender expertise has constrained systematic gender mainstreaming across project components.

(i) Gender design

259. Outline gender considerations were included at the design stage based on a gender analysis (literature review, largely reliant on secondary data and analysis of broader rural/agricultural contexts, with limited fisheries-specific evidence) and a brief Gender Action Plan (GAP) outlined in the main part of the Project Document (not the usual separate, more developed GAP as an annex). However, these elements were not sufficiently developed into a clear and operational gender strategy and plan of activities from project inception. The proposed actions in the GAP for each component were not translated into concrete, operational activities, resulting in very limited integration of gender considerations across the project. For instance, the project has largely lacked defined gender indicators and targets, clear gender-relevant responsibilities, and a dedicated budget for gender activities required to effectively guide gender integration. However, some actions were partially taken forward, such as the integration of gender considerations in socio-economic data collection, value chain analysis, and support to SSF organizations.

(ii) Limited integration of gender in implementation

260. While the project acknowledges that fisheries in the Mediterranean are male-dominated, gender considerations have not been systematically integrated into the project, and the project has created limited

targeted opportunities to actively engage women. Women's involvement in fisheries in the Mediterranean is marginal and largely informal (e.g., in post-harvest processing, distribution, marketing and sales, manufacture and repair of fishing gear), but these were not targeted under the FishEBM project.

261. Women's participation in the management of the wider marine environment issues, such as biodiversity, is greater but even the UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC element of the project lacks focus on gender. This was confirmed by the MTR by both fishery and environment NFPs stating that gender considerations were largely absent from the project (one interviewee even stated that "women's inclusion is not a priority"), although women are relatively well represented at the level of the administration and as project NFPs, and both the GFCM and SPA/RAC teams have a high proportion of women, including the most senior position, that of the TPM/PC.

262. However, there have been a small number of project activities which have sought to provide benefits to women. These include the inclusion of women in the NIS workshop, and it was reported to the MTR that those participating later applied knowledge on NIS (e.g., blue crab valorisation), organized training sessions for women, and promoted more sustainable fishing practices within their communities. One interviewee reported being inspired by a woman restaurateur who demonstrated how NIS (e.g. blue crab) can be used in food recipes, and this experience encouraged her to experiment in her own restaurant. The project has also addressed gender issues less directly through its socio-economic surveys under Output 1.1 (although it is unclear to what extent this data is used to inform gender-responsive programming in fisheries management), and on value chain analysis and stakeholder engagement processes. Unfortunately, a key activity set proposed by the project which would have directly benefited women – Output 1.5: Participation in the regional network of SSF platforms reinforced in order to provide social protection support to its members – has been poorly delivered by the project and not led to any noticeably increased social protection for women in target countries.

(iii) Limited institutional capacity and absent coordination between GFCM and SPA/RAC

263. There is little coordinated or joint project work between GFCM and SPA/RAC on gender-related aspects. Institutional support for gender has been constrained on both sides: within GFCM, responsibility has largely rested with the TPM/PC, with no dedicated gender expertise available and FAO did not provide specific gender support to GFCM; and SPA/RAC does not have a designated gender focal point for the project or specific gender expertise in house, and the UNEP/MAP gender focal point was not aware of the project and had not been actively engaged with it at the MTR point. This probably partly explains the absence of a structured and proactive approach on gender.

D. Knowledge Management

Knowledge management and communications – institutional arrangements

Finding 4.19: Knowledge management and communication have been constrained by fragmented institutional arrangements, limited strategic guidance from FAO and UNEP-MAP, and weak project positioning within GFCM, delays over KMC products generated by SPA/RAC, resulting in an insufficiently coordinated KMC approach.

(i) Institutional arrangements for KMC

241. This is the first GEF project to be executed by GFCM whose communication practices have traditionally focused on overall institutional and more 'programme-level' KMC activities rather than specifically designed for individual projects. Consequently, understanding and identification of project-specific KMC approaches, means, relevant stakeholders, capacity needs and activities has not been clearly defined, creating challenges in positioning and consistently communicating the FishEBM Mediterranean project aims, results and key messages.

242. While a KMC specialist was recruited by GFCM, implementation of project KMC activities has remained highly dependent on the GFCM institutional communications team, whose members are organized by thematic areas and cover multiple GFCM programmes and lack experience of project-level KMC. This arrangement has resulted in a fragmented approach to KMC, with no single point of leadership. In practice, the KMC specialist has worked closely with the TPM/PC to identify communication priorities but has had to rely on multiple thematic focal points within the communications team for sources of information, stories, etc, for project KMC and dissemination.

243. KMC capacity support for the project has also been limited at UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC. At SPA/RAC responsibilities have been largely concentrated in a single individual staff member working across multiple projects, which has constrained effective implementation of KMC activities (as noted by interviewees “one person at SPA/RAC, working across multiple projects, is not sufficient”). In addition, SPA/RAC lacks a dedicated budget for FishEBM project communications, further limiting its ability to support visibility and outreach efforts with one SPA/RAC interviewee stressing that “we are doing what we can given the limited resources”.

244. FAO has provided support to align KMC products with corporate communication standards and dissemination of selected materials through FAO platforms (e.g. IUU-related content³⁹) but review of or guidance on KMC activities, materials or products has been limited (apart from technical inputs from the FAO LTO).

245. Institutional support for project KMC by UNEP/MAP has also been limited up to the MTR, and in the MTR’s view uncertain and confusing. As mentioned above, up to the MTR the MedProgramme platform had not been properly available to the FishEBM project for distribution of KMC products and guidance on technical KMC issues has not been consistent as the UNEP/MAP Project manager only had Terms of Reference for his involvement in the FishEBM project confirmed in September 2025.

246. Overall, KMC approaches have evolved gradually rather than being clearly defined at inception (“KMC is being built with time”). Although some ad hoc support has been provided through different channels, KMC efforts have remained fragmented and have not constituted a structured or coordinated KMC support framework. As a result, both GFCM and SPA/RAC have sought support elsewhere. For instance, SPA/RAC participated in an IW:Learn workshops on journalism and storytelling, as well as MedProgramme workshops on constructive journalism.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	125845	270000	

Indicator 2.1 Marine Protected Areas Newly created

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
		270000	

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Otranto Channel FRA	N/A	Others			270,000.00	

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
	125845		

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Ain Al Ghazala (Libya)	N/A	Others		26,074.00					
Al-Hoceima National Park (Morocco)	555547509	National Park		19,600.00					
Butrinti (Albania)	181966	National Park		754.00					
Cap Lindles (Algeria)	555698157	Strict Nature Reserve		4,283.00					
Farwa lagoon (Libya)	N/A	Others		4,605.00					
Fethiye-Gocek (Turkey)	N/A	Habitat/Species Management Area		34,011.00					
Foça (Turkey)	N/A	Habitat/Species Management Area		5,178.00					
Habibas Islands (Algeria)	19751	Natural Monument or Feature		2,680.00					
Îles Kneiss (Tunisia)	15198	Others		5,850.00					
Karaburun-Sazan (Albania)	12446	National Park		12,428.00					
Kotorsko Risanski Zaliv	N/A	Protected Landscape/Seascape		2,386.00					

(Montenegro)									
La Galite Archipelago (Tunisia)	109053	Others		6,465.00					
Palm Islands Nature Reserve (Lebanon)	13388	Habitat/Species Management Area		470.00					
Platamuni (Montenegro)	N/A	Others		1,061.00					

Indicator 7 Shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Shared water Ecosystem	Mediterranean Sea	Mediterranean Sea	Mediterranean Sea	
Count	1	1	1	0

Indicator 7.1 Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation (scale of 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Mediterranean Sea	4	4	4	

Indicator 7.2 Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional management institution(s) (RMI) to support its implementation (scale of 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Mediterranean Sea	4	4	4	

Indicator 7.3 Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees (IMC; scale 1 to 4; See Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Mediterranean Sea	1	1	3	

Indicator 7.4 Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products(scale 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Mediterranean Sea	1	1	4	

Indicator 8 Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)
238,000.00	238,000.00	142,180.00	

Fishery Details

Sardina pilchardus	145,000
Engraulis encrasicolus	45,000
Merluccius merluccius	23,000
Parapenaeus longirostris	8,000
Solea solea	5,000
Mullus barbatus	4,000
Nephrops norvegicus	4,000
Squilla mantis	2,000
Aristeus antennatus	1,600
Aristaeomorpha foliacea	200
Pagellus bogaraveo	100

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	5,000	152,000	90,559	
Male	5,000	353,000	326,981	
Total	10,000	505,000	417,540	0

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)

Recipient Country Government	Albania	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	1,500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Albania	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,522,757.00	
Private Sector	Catapult CX	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	11,150,000.00	
Other	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,650,000.00	
Private Sector	CLS - Collete Localisation Satelites	Grant	Investment mobilized	27,000.00	
Private Sector	CLS - Collete Localisation Satelites	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	37,200.00	215,500.00
Other	Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Bari (CIHEAM)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	16,078,937.00	16,078,937.00
Other	National Center for Marine Science (CNRS)	Grant	Investment mobilized	125,000.00	
Other	La Conférence Ministérielle sur la Coopération Halieutique entre les Etats Africains Riverains de l'Océan Atlantique (COMHAFAT)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,300,000.00	
Other	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,000,000.00	2,688,815.00
Other	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)	Grant	Investment mobilized	6,000,000.00	3,731,939.00
Other	GFW – Global Fishing Watch	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,300,000.00	2,300,000.00
Donor Agency	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,633,341.00	1,225,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Libya	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00	5,000.00

Recipient Country Government	Morocco	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,048,434.00	143,678.16
Private Sector	MetOcean Telematics	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	105,400.00	
Recipient Country Government	Montenegro	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	1,500,000.00	2,461,096.28
Recipient Country Government	Republic of Turkey	In-kind	Investment mobilized	2,000,000.00	1,525,000.00
Other	SPNI – Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,008,000.00	
Private Sector	Studio Lasso d.o.o.	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	195,000.00	
Other	Mediterranean Action Plan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,779,115.00	3,567,493.00
Other	University of Alicante	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	800,000.00	800,000.00
Civil Society Organization	WWF Mediterranean Marine Initiative	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	3,767,470.00	1,799,369.00
Total Co-financing				72,027,654.00	6,166,862.00

Comments

* Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Bari (CIHEAM) 16,078,937.00 (Grant = 13,678,937; in-kind = 2,400,000)

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Low	Low	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The project was rated as ‘low’ risk during the design phase. As a result, no Environmental and Social Risk Analysis and Environmental and Social Management Plan was attached to the Project Document. There have been no significant changes to either the design or operation of the project since it was approved by the GEF, consequently in the MTR view, the risk rating remains ‘low’.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Tracking Tool	GEFID10560_Core Indicators_MTR_FAO_Regional
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10560_MTR_FAO_Regional
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	FAO ES Risk Identification – Screening Checklist-FishEBM MED
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	FishEBM MED_ESS_risk_certification_FAO