



# GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT\*

GEF Program ID:	4580		
Country/Region:	Global		
Program Title:	Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)		
GEF Agency:	FAO, UNEP and World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-4; IW-4; BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$45,412,844
Co-financing:	\$222,741,000	Total Project Cost:	\$268,153,844
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Nicole Glineur	Agency Contact Person:	Kevern Cochrane

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	N/A
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	N/A
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	Yes, FAO, as the coordinating agency, has a comparative advantage in handling ABNJ fisheries issues and ABNJ marine ecosystems as they relate to biodiversity and conservation. Its Committee of Fisheries (COFI) is the only global inter-governmental forum addressing fisheries on a global scale.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	no
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	
<p>Program Consistency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes  IW global  BD ABNJ global set aside</p> <p>1. Based on the guidance note on programmatic approach, sent to the Agencies in February 2011, treatment of PPG and fees is reflected in para 8 &amp; 12. Both PPG for the PIFs and the Agency fees for the PIFs are calculated separately outside the program amount requested at work program inclusion, though the amount of fee is provided in the PFD based on the number of PIFs under the program. Total resources exclude fees and PPG and do not add up to \$49.5M. Please adjust accordingly. Amounts need to be corrected including in Annex A:  2. table B project 1 and tuna PIF show different amounts: table B should read \$30 M and \$138.5 M co-financing, please adjust tables A,C,D accordingly  3. Please correct table D WB IW (\$3M +) and BD (\$7M+) resources of which the amounts have been inverted and adjust table A &amp; B accordingly  4. The PFD should clearly indicate how the \$500,000 FAO program coordination budget will be used.</p> <p>[9/8/11] Addressed.</p>
	<p>7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?</p>	<p>Section A: please delete last sentence of para 2 and first sentence of para 3 which are not relevant to the program. The over-fishing/over-capacity dimension and BD stresses on related ecosystems, including the prey/predator dimension need to be addressed. The section fails to demonstrate at the end the transformational impacts expected for each project: how do these 4 projects respond to the challenges?</p> <p>Section C: the BD dimension should be better emphasized and articulated.</p> <p>Section F:  Project 3 needs to better factor in the BD aspects and needs to be fine-tuned. For example:  The expected outcome, through providing the links between coasts, EEZ, and ABNJ as well as improved management, is to secure healthy ocean ecosystems, biodiversity conservation (including various modalities of protection) and food security through and sustainable fisheries. The outcome will have measurable short-term milestones for poverty alleviation, regional security, fisheries mortality and bycatch reduction to sustainable levels. Achieving success of this</p>

importantly the biodiversity underpinning these goods and services. This will be achieved mainly by: (i) mapping global marine hotspots from coast to high seas, which will be used for identifying priority seascapes hotspots accompanied by required multi-sector investments and technical assistance, (ii) improving the operational effectiveness of types of marine protected areas and fisheries, including the preparation of marine profiles along with conservation and business development plans, and (iii) mobilizing consensus around governance issues in the ocean, including the showcasing of early "Sub-Project Grant" results in the priority seascapes and the dissemination of lessons from "Challenge Grants".

The main transformational changes will be: (i) development and testing implementation of various types of seascape protection that leads to sustainable conservation in close collaboration with countries, fishers, and the private sector; (ii) move away from the "race to fish" towards efficiency, conservation and less destructive exploitation through the demonstration of fisheries management effectiveness in five priority seascapes; (iii) shifting discussions about ocean's governance from supplying niche, small upscale markets for sustainable fish, or command-and-control paradigms, to fostering rights-based management to drive economic growth in developing countries, protect food security and save biodiversity.

The associated global environmental benefits include conservation of the most threatened marine species and biodiversity hotspots and more effective fisheries management outcomes. To achieve these, investments will focus on relevant GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies and recognized global priorities (e.g. rights-based and ecosystem approaches to fisheries management, identifying areas in need of enhanced management including EBAs and VMEs, and relevant strategic plan objectives and programs of work as contained in decisions by the CBD COP). The most significant gains relating to marine biodiversity and ecosystem services can be made by using marine spatial planning. A detailed intervention strategy will be developed for each of the priority geographies where the Ocean Partnership Fund will invest. To ensure maximum impact from investments, a science-based global priority setting framework that considers biodiversity, ecosystem services, human well-being benefits, threats and opportunities related to ocean ecosystems will be used in order to select a small number (2-4) of regions for initial investments. In addition to the science-based priorities, potential opportunities leading to prompt results will be harnessed and coordinated with GEF 5 marine Biodiversity and International Waters investments in countries adjacent to Fund priority geographies, ecological connectivity to coastal biodiversity and ecosystem processes, existing enabling

		<p>interest and the potential for amplification of successful models.</p> <p>Project4: please align title with title in framework The GEB presented are vague and need to be reworked entirely</p> <p>Section J. Please delete unknown column in table. Section J is about the institutional structure of the program including coordination and monitoring. As they are not relevant, please delete all description of FAO and partners. Re. GSC: it is suggested to include the World Bank.</p> <p>Section K: NFAs and FFA should be listed after RFMOs</p> <p>Section M: please move the World Bank paras under the baseline section and quantify</p> <p>[9/8/11] Addressed.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, the program adequately addresses IW-4 and BD-1 and BD-2 focal area objectives
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the program is consistent with relevant global agreements. The program will closely adhere to, in particular, Articles 116 and 119 of UNCLOS on conservation and management of high seas living resources. The program will also closely mirror FAO guidelines like IUU and Code of Conduct. Additionally, the program respond to guidance from the CBD, especially concerning EBSAs, and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets - specifically Targets 6 and 11. Lastly, national strategies will be satisfied through close cooperation with the five tuna RFMOs.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	Yes, for example, one key outcome of the program is strengthened capacity and harmonization of the countries, RFMOs, and the private sector to mainstream biodiversity in their activities, which will produce success in both fisheries and marine ecosystem conservation. Also the overarching coordination and knowledge management project will contribute to exchanges and capacity development at the global scale. These coordinated efforts will ensure program sustainability.
	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>The PFD baseline scenario describes the fisheries situation well. However there is a need for a better explanation of the ecological and conservation issues of the host marine ABNJ ecosystems</p> <p>The baseline section needs to include the baseline for 3 missing IA and</p>

<p>Program Design</p>		<p>regional seas programs), World Bank (Ocean Initiative see section M paras), and CI (CEPF etc.). On p.10 please delete the sentence referring to GOBI as it duplicates info in section 10 and they are not part of the executing partners.</p> <p>[9/8/11] Please also add the methodology that will be used for targeting Marine Hotspots to CI's baseline per Output 3.1.</p> <p>[9/12/11] Addressed.</p>
	<p>12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) <b>will not</b> materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?</p>	<p>The baseline partner projects are sufficient but largely contingent on GEF funding with the exception of the tuna and ocean fund projects.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>The four expected projects under this program are all based on incremental reasoning with various partners.</p>
	<p>14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Project 2: output 2.1 should be fine tuned: e.g. Efficient tools and practices are developed and applied to improve ABNJ deep-sea fisheries management and biodiversity conservation, in full compliance with an ecosystem approach. Output 2.4 should be in line w/ the March meeting's decision to focus on use of existing data versus gathering or generation of data requiring research, please fine tune output accordingly e.g. use of available data in management of deep-sea fisheries and protection of related ecosystems, including VMEs and EBSAs, within the two Southern Indian Ocean and Southeast Atlantic regions. Alternatively leave as is but include the name of the donor which will fund the broad-based information data. Output 2.5 is a repeat of output 2.4. Output 2.6 what will the M&amp;E system monitor and evaluate? Table A output BD1 1.1 should be factored in. This proposed project can only be included in the ABNJ program if operational issues which have arisen in the development of the PIF are resolved.</p> <p>Project 3: component should just feature the title. Leveraging rights-based management to catalyze transitional reform of marine fisheries should be one of the outputs. Please fine tune the outcome: e.g. Protection of ocean goods and services is enhanced through improved management of marine fisheries and biodiversity. Output 3.1 is part of the CI baseline, please qualify it as a CI contribution. Output 3.2 please fine tune: e.g. Marine profiles, conservation and business plans. with investment niches clearly defined. are prepared for five</p>

		<p>intention is to make a transformational impact. Suggest to limit the grants to a maximum of 5 with the private sector as a priority focus. Output 3.5 should be fine tuned: e.g. website for hotspots, seascapes, improved biodiversity conservation and fisheries management actions, lessons and forum for replicating and scaling-up opportunities is established .</p> <p>Project 4. Please rename e.g.: Global coordination for marine ABNJ. Basically GEF funding should be allocated to promote effective global and regional coordination, and exchange of information on ABNJ to ensure sustainable fisheries and and conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the oceans. This should include platforms for advocacy for policy reforms, networking, and outreach towards high level decision makers, including Ministers of Finance, Fisheries, and Environment. The North-East Atlantic regional experience with NEAFC and the OSPAR Commission; the Sargasso Sea Alliance, and the South Pacific and the Indian Ocean regions with recently endorsed new ocean frameworks should be factored in the operational work of the ABNJ program. A working meeting between these parties, the t-RFMOs/countries, the fishing industry, the IAs, EAs and GEFSEC could be organized at the program's inception. Kind reminder that at the March meeting, as reflected in the co-chair's summary, there was unanimous consensus that there was a need to focus the program on sustainable management of deep sea fisheries and conservation of BD vulnerable deep ecosystems and species, using available knowledge and information (e.g. known priority VMEs and EBSAs) related to ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries and BD conservation management and scientifically-based decision, within the funding and time availability coupled with the aim of demonstrating transformational changes leading to implementable results. To maximize impacts limited available funding cannot be allocated to a program which claims that it will resolve all the cross sectoral issues. Hence the outcome should be fine tuned to reflect this focus this e.g.: Global and regional coordination, including exchange of information, on marine ABNJ and advocacy for decision makers, to ensure sustainable fisheries and sustainable conservation and protection of globally significant biodiversity in the oceans, are fully effective. All other activities should be funded through co-financing from partners.</p> <p>[9/8/11] Addressed.</p>
	<p>15. Is there a clear description of:  a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and  b) how they will support the</p>	<p>Overall good but also needs to explain the benefits associated with improved marine biodiversity and ecosystem health.</p> <p>The emphasis of the last sentence is not directly relevant to GEF funding and the ratio is high. Suggest to fine tune; e.g. To ensure an active and productive</p>

	additional benefits?	<p>Challenge Grant window in the Ocean Partnership Fund will earmark funds for high potential project ideas proposed by them and ones involving them by actors such as the privates sector.</p> <p>[9/8/11] Addressed.</p>
	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	tRFMO participation has been strong in the design of the tuna PIF. Stakeholder participation has been considered in the development of the other PIFs and the PFD since the March Washington meetings.
	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>Yes, potential major risks are accounted for. The risk on impacts from climate change should not just relate to issues at the ecosystem and biodiversity level, it should also account for changes in tuna and deep-sea fisheries migration patterns.</p> <p>[9/8/11] Addressed.</p>
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, one MSP project of the ABNJ program is handling global coordination.
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	At this stage yes
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	<p>Program co-financing ratio is 1:4.6 at the moment. Please detail the co-financing from Birdlife, CI, Global, IUCN, RFMOs</p> <p>World Bank, CI, and partners co-financing should respectively reflect a minimum contribution in grant of \$10M, \$10M, and \$20M</p> <p>Proposed Project 2/deep sea: co-financing should be increased to reflect a 1:4 ratio or the GEF contribution can be reduced accordingly</p>

		<p>kind portion</p> <p>[9/8/11] The listed in-kind co-financing from FAO in Table C (\$34.35M) differs from the in-kind co-financing listed in Section L (\$34.95).</p> <p>The overall ABNJ Program co-financing has increased from 1:4.6 to 1:5.0</p> <p>[9/12/11] Addressed.</p>
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	
	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	[9/8/11] FAO has adequately responded to the questions/comments by the World Bank and UNEP.
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	<b>27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?</b>	<p>Please address administrative glitches:e.g. insert GEF program ID#, include World Bank and UNEP in other GEF agencies instead of other executing partners ,number outputs, etc.</p> <p>PFD would be recommended for clearance upon addressing of all comments in the text. A summary table of how and where the comments have been addressed would be helpful.</p> <p>[9/8/11] Please move the Global Coordination project to the MSP section of Annex A. Recommendation will be granted once small issues above are addressed. Thanks.</p> <p>[9/12/11] All issues have been addressed and recommendation of the PFD is being granted at this time.</p>
	28. Items to consider at subsequent	

	CEO endorsement.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 04, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 08, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

**REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL**

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.