

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: October 11, 2011

Screeener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Douglas Taylor; Meryl Williams
Consultant(s): Lev Neretin

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4580

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Global

PROJECT TITLE: ABNJ Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (PROGRAM)

GEF AGENCIES: FAO, UNEP and World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Conservation International, Global Oceans Forum, IUCN, WWF

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes the new focus on Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) proposed in this Program, especially the proposals to strengthen management of fisheries within the context of biodiversity conservation. The program proposed builds on the experience of the tuna fisheries management organizations and other regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs).
2. Despite their immense size, ABNJ have been some of the last places on Earth to receive attention from the Convention on Biological Diversity, although they have been partially covered by fisheries management arrangements through the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the formation of several regional fisheries management organizations that also cover some extra-territorial waters. Biodiversity conservation and fisheries management in the vast areas and volumes of ocean in ABNJ present formidable challenges. While STAP supports the PFD selection of action on existing and immediate fisheries threats, we note that the PFD makes no attempt to situate these threats within a wider framework of ocean uses, threats and governance options, such as from deep sea mining and marine pollution. Indeed, the PFD is mainly a summary of the component PIFs rather than an intellectual framework within which the other parts fit. For this reason and the next point, STAP recommends Minor Revision.
3. One of the principal barriers cited in the PFD is lack of effective governance of tuna and deep sea fisheries especially in ABNJs. Different PIFs propose different approaches to improving governance, which is appropriate given the different nature of the fisheries. In areas affected by fisheries, the PFD proposes that these challenges should be tackled, for tuna fisheries, by rights-based fisheries management (RBM) married to ecosystem approaches and, for, deep sea fisheries, by innovations including an area based management. However, STAP would have preferred the PFD to address the broader conceptual framework encompassing the different governance options and addressing the challenges of multi-level governance. A major conceptual weakness of the Program lies in the lack of a documented model of how fisheries governance, including RBM, is expected to work at different levels (regional, national and sub-national) from both the economic and political economy perspectives. The proponents are encouraged to develop and explain such a model in the full Program documents. A more comprehensive framework will also help the expected outcomes of the Program to be more clearly visible to participating countries, fishing industries and stakeholders including conservationists.
4. The PFD and associated PIFs address the issue of fisheries management primarily from the supply side of the market, and yet the market demand side is a major driver of all the ABNJ fisheries, with increasing pressure caused by the overfished state of many fisheries within national borders. Most reviews of of deep-sea fisheries, including the most

recent one by Norse et al. (Marine Policy 36:307-320, 2011) conclude that the species fished and the ecosystems inherently yield low sustainable production. The Program does not address the management options in pilot areas when scientific evidence suggests that negative impacts on ecosystems will far outweigh positive gains from deep-sea fisheries. How does the Program intend to address the issues of the demand side of the market for ABNJ fisheries by reducing global demand for these products?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.