

# Sustainable management of tuna fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10622

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Sustainable management of tuna fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the areas beyond national jurisdiction.

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

11/24/2021

**Review completed by PM**

2/3/2022

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

## 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however, please correct the CEO document submission date. The portal shows 6/18/20.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

#### **Agency Response**

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

#### **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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following comments.

1) The results framework only includes process related qualitative targets. Please make sure these targets are reformulated into qualitative targets.

2) The results framework should also include quantifiable stress related targets, please formulate these and insert.

3) Ensure that the figures included in the GEF Core Indicator section are reflected in Table B.

4) Ensure, to the extent possible, that the quantified targets set out in the Annex A Project Results Framework are present in Table B.

5) please provide strong justification on the nearly 20% drop in core indicator 8 target, compared to at program approval level.

6) please make sure that it is clear when reading the results framework that the project will be allocating atleast 1 % of the GEF grant to support IWLEARN activities. Further, it should be much clearer in the description of component 4, what the 1% will cover. Among other the section should include: the 1% of teh GEF grant that will be gong towards supporting IWLEARN activities, will among others support development of atleast 2 experience notes, 1 results note, participation in global and regional IWLEARN events and ICWs running during the implementation of the project. Furthermore, the 1% of the GEF grant will also ensure that regional and national stakeholders participate in the IWCs, as determined feasible and valuable.

7) reading alignment with national priority section, it appears as if national activities are planned for this investment. If this is the case, please submit LOEs for these countries.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address following comments:

1) Please include the financing type (i.e. technical assistance or investment) for Component 3. it is blank at the moment.

2) Budget table in Annex E is not readable when downloaded in pdf form. Please modify. One way to do this may be to present the budget per outcome instead of per output, so the table will be slimmer, it will fit within the margins and will be readable).

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

## **Agency Response**

### **FAO 8th of February 2022:**

1) The financing type (technical assistance) has been selected for Component 3 in Table B.

2) Budget table in Annex E in the Portal has been reformatted to make it readable when downloaded in pdf form. Kindly note, the reformatted budget in Excel has also been uploaded in the roadmap of the submission for ease reference.

-----

1) Agreed. All project outcomes and outputs have quantitative targets now, which are reflected the in the results framework and Table B.

2) Agreed. All project outcomes have quantitative targets now in line with the key project indicators, focusing on stress reduction, these changes were included in the results framework and Table B.

3) Agreed. Relevant GEF Core indicators (Core 7.4, Core 8, Core 11) are reflected in the results framework and Table B.

4) Agreed. Quantified targets from the Results Framework have been added to the Table B.

5) A separate document further explains the reasons for the drop. The document has been attached to the roadmap of the submission (name of the file **Changes in Tuna Indicator 8 Explained 26Jan22.docx**). The Project is still targeting sustainability for all major tuna catches, a 100% of them. But the confusion arises when we need to measure this in absolute tons of catch as catches, to be sustainable, need to come down for some stocks.

Following updated stock assessments in 2020, some stocks changed from non-sustainable to sustainable in 202, while other stocks have moved to the unsustainable status. As a smaller amount of the total catch is coming from stocks that are now categorized as unsustainable, there is a reduction of the indicator target value when measured in number of tons.

For the project document, Annex L presents fully detailed calculation. The sources of the numbers are the official stock assessments of the scientific bodies of the RFMOs, as compiled in the ISSF publications attached and in its online database. Note that the ISSF does not conduct the assessments, they simply compile the official RFMO scientific assessments in a convenient and accessible form. The two Status of the Stocks publications were used in the calculations in the example.

For our calculations, the definition of what the sustainability is at any point in time, we focused on fishing mortality, or fishing pressure, relative to the optimal fishing mortality as estimated by the mathematical models, as a way to identifying stocks that are not being utilized sustainably.

So, when we looked at the situation at the beginning of 2020 or 2021, we added up the most recent available catches from the stocks that were considered, in their last assessment, as being subject to overfishing, that is, experiencing a fishing mortality higher than the optimal fishing mortality (the mortality rate associated with the maximum sustainable yield).

In 2021, following the latest assessments, some stocks moved from the unsustainable status either because catches went down, or populations experienced some growth in size, or both.

Keep in mind that these numbers are subject to uncertainties as the sustainable levels are re-assessed statistically together with the stocks and even the catches are the result of estimation rather than direct enumeration. Fisheries is not like forestry or agriculture where you can directly observe the standing stocks, so they are subject to interannual variability.

6) Agreed. As it was the case in the first Tuna Project, we are fully committed to IW:Learn activities. IW:Learn commitment was inserted in project results framework and in Table B.

7) There are no activities planned yet for specific countries, so we listed some potential activities that could be conducted in some locations. Once these locations are confirmed we could request additional expressions of support, although potential countries have indicated their agreement through the RFMOs. Noted in the prodoc.

**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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) Please make sure that GEF implementing agency WWF US is listed as such, and not a CSO.

2) Co-financing letters for each entity providing co-finance are uploaded to the portal. A letter from Conservation International, indicating co-finance of \$587,272, is uploaded to the portal but is not included in the co-financing Table C. Please revise accordingly.

3) Please provide the exchange rate utilized to calculate co-financing from the International Whaling Commission (GBP ?1.350 million to USD) and from the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (AUD 3 million to USD).

4) The co-financing letter from the Pacific Community indicates an in-kind contribution of US\$450,000 and a grant contribution of \$105,000. These contributions are aggregated and listed as in-kind/recurrent expenditures. Please clarify whether this \$105,000 should be listed as grant.

5) Of the \$185,085,531 of co-financing, only \$3,753,000 (2%) 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).

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please ensure that WWF-US and CI are categorized as Donor Agencies

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

### FAO 8th of February 2022:

WWF-US and CI have been categorized as Donor Agencies.

---

- 1) The label for WWF US has been changed to GEF implementing agency WWF.
- 2) Co-financing letters Revised. One additional co-financing letter from Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), has been added. Updated letters, fixing some minor issues, from PEW and CI have been updated.
- 3) The exchange rates used were the official UN exchange rates (retrieved through the FAO's Country Office Information Network) applicable at the moment of submission of letters were applied.  
1 GBP = 1.344086 USD  
1 USD = 0.74399996 GBP     11/2021  
1 AUD = 0.7194245 USD  
1 USD = 1.39 AUD     11/2021
- 4) The co-financing commitment from the Pacific Community has been reviewed. The attached letter (available in the roadmap of the submission with the name [SPC-REVISED Final](#)), defines a commitment of 555,000 USD in-KIND. We cannot find the separation between in-kind and grant mentioned in your comment.
- 5) After discussing with partners the GEF definition of co-financing, all co-financing is consistent with the guidelines about 'in-kind' co-financing, that is, being part of recurrent operational costs associated with the support of activities under the Project.

### 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** 20th 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** 20th 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

- 1) it is noted that core indicator 8 has dropped close to 20% from the target value at program level approval. Please provide additional documentation to this large drop.
- 2) Under the Table C sub-heading, please include the methodology behind the calculated targets for core indicator 11.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

- 1) See explanation above for comment in point 2 (5) of the project structure/design section in the GEF review.

2) The description of the calculations is already incorporated in the Agency ProDoc attached in the roadmap of the submission (as Annex F). This includes graphs and tables which cannot be copy/pasted in the portal. For this reason a summary has been inserted in the Portal (text box below the GEF7 CIs section), while for the extended explanation we kindly ask you to refer to the attached Prodoc (Annex F).

## **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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response NA**

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

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

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following:

1) Please include other associated baseline projects on which this project builds (i.e., elaborate on the last sentence of the description: "Finally, there exists considerable potential to build and expand on the aforementioned groups and develop closer ties with the activities supported elsewhere in the private sector, the UN and IFIs." Please provide examples of what these activities are.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

New information was added. This is a compilation of examples of multiple recent activities that can be followed as examples for innovation applied, creation and strengthening of incentives or new financing mechanisms, grouped by whether they reflect technical innovation, financing solutions or contributions from IFIs.

**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**

20th 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) 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)?

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

## **Agency Response**

1) We agree that more detail was necessary. New text was added focusing on how the Projects is aligned with the main principles of the GEF PSES.

2) Text has been added, in addition to the description of the actions to mitigate the impact of covid on the scheduled activities, to describe to what extent the Project can contribute to restore the balance with natural systems. Nevertheless, the concerns seems to be more focused on food systems that implied closer contact with wildlife than fisheries in the high seas.

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

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

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly.

It is not clear when reading the section what will happen without the GEF investment and what will happen additionally due to the GEF investment. Therefore, please respond to following: ?With/Without the GEF increment [...] will/will not happen?.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** We agree. The section was significantly expanded describing to what extent the absence of GEF investment would affect the progress of fisheries management in the ABNJ, and on coastal areas as well.

**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**

20th of December 2021 (Cseverin): No. The section is worrisome thin. Please expand considerable in paragraphs that makes it possible to understand what GEBs will be delivered, of both process and stress reduction and in both qualitative and quantitative results.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** We agree, relevant information was not submitted on November 21 by mistake. Text was added focusing on the delivery on the GEBs .

**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**

20th 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**

20th 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**

20th 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address below points:

- 1) Please better tailor the stakeholder plans to the project
- 2) 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?

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

1) The Section 2 has been merged with the contents of the original Annex I2, to present more clearly the relationship between the stakeholders identification and the action to foster the active participation and engagement of the identified stakeholders.

2) Agreed. New text has been added describing the role of the Global Coordination Project in the delivery of knowledge management to stakeholders. The GCP will coordinate delivery of Project and Program lessons learned, and help establish two-way communication channels with stakeholders.

### **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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response NA**

#### **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**

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response NA**

#### **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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response NA**

#### **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**

20th 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) Possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects is also elaborated upon and relevance to global/regional frameworks and initiatives is articulated. But coordination with Non-GEF 'projects?' in the ABNJ is not present. If coordination with such projects is planned, please elaborate accordingly (or describe why not).

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

- 1) A section was added after the Table describing the main benefits of coordination in areas of common interest, also with the intention to identify possible synergies.

2) Examples of non-GEF initiatives in the ABNJ that have been contacted in the Tuna I, with expectation that similar coordination contacts will continue in the future, supplemented with GCP efforts 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following points:

1) The proposed investment is a global investment, however, when reading this section it appears that project activities will be taking place in a number of countries, which is also indicated in the referenced table. Please note that if project activities are to take place in countries, then LOEs needs to be uploaded.

2) The section needs to be much clearer in describing the project's alignment with the global discourse and how this investment will support deliver towards the multiple frameworks listed.

3) If investments indeed is planned for being implemented in countries, please bring the countries listed in the table forward to this Consistency with National Priorities section and articulate how the project is consistent with national strategies and plans of these countries. This may be best done in table format.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

#### **Agency Response**

1) The activities are essentially channelled through the RFMOs, and the countries listed as potential locations for activities have all indicated their support to the Project activities through their RFMOs. In any case, no final determination of countries have been made for possible activities, something that will depend on several factors, including the COVID-19 situation.

2) and 3) Agreed on both points. A section has been added showing how the Project is aligned with major international obligations that have become part of the national priorities for member States.

#### **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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, Please address following points

- 1) This section asks for a description of a KM approach that includes a clear timeline and corresponding set of deliverables. Please amend accordingly.
- 2) As part of this KM section, please make specific reference to the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be allocated to support IWLEARN activities, such as production of a website, production and delivery of minimum 2 experience notes and 1 results note, while also ensuring that the PCU partakes in regional and global IWLEARN events, such as the IWCs that will take place during project implementation.
- 3) Given its importance to establish baseline knowledge, please upload the terminal evaluation of Tuna-I to the portal as an annex.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): partly, point 1 and 2 cleared, however, but as it is not possible to identify the TE of Tuna 1 in the portal, the 3rd point can not be cleared.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Cleared, TE has been uploaded.

### **Agency Response**

**FAO 1st February 2022**

The terminal evaluation of the ABNJ Tuna Project GEF ID: 4581 is uploaded in the roadmap of the submission. The file is labelled as [ID4581-ABNJ\\_Tuna\\_Terminal\\_Evaluation\\_Final.pdf](#)

**FAO 26 January 2022**

- 1) The KM section has been amended accordingly and now has a timeline and set of deliverables on knowledge management.
- 2) New language on the 1% GEF grant allocation in support of IW:LEARN activities and elaboration on planned activities, has been added to the section.

For ease reference, in terms of baseline for activities under the Tuna I the following were activities undertaken under the IW:Learn :

International Waters Conferences IWC8. The 8th GEF International Waters Conference (IWC8) was held in Sri Lanka from May 09-13 2016. The Project was present with a

strong delegation including three PMU members and six project partner representatives including WWF, Fiji, Ghana, BirdLife South Africa, and Seychelles. The Coordinator of the Ghanaian EMS pilot, presented the work in a session on Modern Data and Tools for International Waters. The Project contributed with four presentations to the FAO-led workshop on the Open Oceans. In addition, the Project organized an EMS experience exchange to provide a first opportunity for the two EMS pilots that were ongoing in Ghana and Fiji, and were under preparation in Seychelles and South Africa (cancelled later on), to exchange experiences and discuss challenges since the activities had started. For the 9th International Waters Conference (IWC9) took place from November 03-08, 2018 in Marrakesh, Morocco. Kathrin Hett and Emelie Martensson represented the project on behalf of the PMU. In addition, Papa Kebe and Alexander Adu-Antwi attended for the Ghanaian EMS pilot. The Project contributed with content, including posters, brochures, video material and a USB-key, to the booth allocated to the Common Oceans ABNJ Program. Two news item covering the programmatic activities can be found on the Common Oceans website [here](#) and [here](#), as well as on the FAO-GEF website. The activity was also promoted on social media via FAO's corporate Twitter accounts @FAOFish and @FAOClimate, labelled with the hashtags #CommonOceans and #GEFIWC9.

Experience notes and IW:Learn newsletter contributions:

? Project Experience Note, was completed and submitted to the GEF IW:Learn in March 2019: ?Mainstreaming the Management and Conservation of Sharks and Bycatch in Pacific High Seas Tuna Fisheries?.

Four news articles were prepared for the IW:Learn website and newsletter:

? ?Improving Management of Tuna fisheries on the Highs Seas? in June 2018

? ?Taking Stock of Pacific Sharks? in February 2019

? ?Using Innovative Technologies to Strengthen the Monitoring of Fisheries Operations at Sea? in October 2019

? ?Not a Drop in the Ocean? in December 2019

Learning exchange:

A learning exchange between the different electronic monitoring pilots This exchange took place in Accra, Ghana on 05 February 2018 with the Ghanaian Government, representatives from the Government of Fiji and the Fiji Fishing Industry Association (FFIA).

3) Terminal evaluation of Tuna-I has been uploaded as a separate pdf file in the portal.

### **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**

20th 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**

20th 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

## **Agency Response NA**

### **Project Results Framework**

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

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): partly, please address comments as indicated above, ensuring that there is coherency between the core indicator framework and the results framework. Further, it is important that the results framework includes both stress and process indicators and that these are quantifiable.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response** Agreed. The Result Framework has been modified to highlight the consistency with the core indicators, just as the Table B.

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

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

## **Agency Response NA**

### **Council comments**



**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 20th of December 2021**

(cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response NA**

**STAP comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 20th of December 2021**

(cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response NA**

**Convention Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**Agency Response NA**

**Other Agencies comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**Agency Response NA**

**CSOs comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**Agency Response NA**

**Status of PPG utilization**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 20th of December 2021**

(cseverin): PPG status reported on

**Agency Response NA**

**Project maps and coordinates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 20th 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**

20th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above comments and resubmit.

1st of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please upload the missing TE of Tuna 1 to the portal.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**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 achieve responsible, efficient and sustainable tuna production and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ in the face of a changing environment. To this end, the project will (a) strengthen management of tuna fisheries; (b) strengthen monitoring, control and surveillance to improve fisheries data and compliance with conservation management measures, and to tackle illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing; and (c) reduce the environmental impacts of tuna fisheries.

Without the GEF increment, movement toward more sustainable and coherent management of

ABNJ would be much slower and achieved in a less effective, integrated manner, with more limited prospects of impact. And there would be considerable additional risks to biodiversity conservation and maintenance of ecosystem services as a result of such a slower, more fragmented approach.

Global environmental benefits will be achieved through measurable improvements in the status of the tuna stocks in the areas under the jurisdiction of five t-RFMOs; reduction in non-compliance behavior and IUU fishing; meaningful reduction in the threats to bycatch species in the areas under the jurisdiction of five t-RFMOs, especially for sharks, marine mammals, sea turtles and seabirds; adopting lessons learned and applying them to other regions through south-south and north-south cooperation strategies; harnessing the power of industry groups / associations and civil society organizations; and moving the catches from globally over-exploited marine tuna fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (by 724,000 tons to 0 percent of catches from major commercial tuna stocks). 11,784 people (3,380 female and 8,404 male) will directly benefit from the project.