



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Project Title: Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)			
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID: ¹	4581
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	614525
Other Executing Partner(s):	T-RFMOs (Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), and Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)) and member countries, Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Organization of the Central American Isthmus (OSPESCA), Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA), Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Governments of Fiji and Ghana, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), BirdLife International (BLI), International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Industry	Submission Date:	September 16, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 	FAO Program: Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)	Project Agency Fee (\$):	2,445,564

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-4 (select)	4.1: ABNJ (including deep-sea fisheries, oceans areas, and seamounts) under sustainable	Output 4.1: Demonstrations for management measures in ABNJ (including deep-sea fisheries, oceans areas)	GEF TF	10,601,918	<u>59,485,382</u>

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	management and protection (including MPAs from BD area)	with institutions			
IW-4 (select)	4.2: Plans and institutional frameworks for pilot cases of ABNJ have catalytic effect on global discussions	Output 4.1: Demonstrations for management measures in ABNJ (including deep-sea fisheries, oceans areas) with institutions	GEF TF	9,572,292	<u>53,124,566</u>
(select) BD-2	2.1: Increase in sustainable managed seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2.1: National and sub-national sea-use plans (at least in the areas of competence of two t-RFMOs) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEF TF	5,634,986	<u>31,273,198</u>
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)		Project Management costs	GEF TF	1,363,740	<u>6,921,954</u>
Total project costs				27,172,936	150,805,100

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To achieve efficiency and sustainability in tuna production and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ, through the systematic application of an ecosystem approach in tuna fisheries for : (i) supporting the use of sustainable and efficient fisheries management and fishing practices by the stakeholders of the tuna resources, (ii) reducing illegal, unreported and unregulated [IUU] fishing, and (iii) mitigating adverse impacts of bycatch on biodiversity.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Promotion of Sustainable Management (including Rights-based Management) of Tuna Fisheries, in Accordance with an Ecosystem Approach	TA	<p>1.1. Improved management decision making concerning tuna and associated species in the areas under the jurisdiction of the five Regional Fisheries Management Organizations for tuna (t-RFMOs), through enhanced engagement and motivation of the stakeholders, including the tuna industry at all levels.</p> <p>1.2. An efficient and effective RBM system has been</p>	<p>1.1.1 At least ten developing coastal states agree to harvest strategy framework plans at the national level, that supports the development of the t-RFMO harvest strategies, through capacity building of least 160 national fisheries personnel.</p> <p>1.1.2 Increased capacity of ten coastal developing states to comply with t-RMO member states obligations</p> <p>1.1.3 Bycatch and catch data gaps in the</p>	(select)	7,726,556	41,727,771

		<p>designed, tested and implemented in one t-RFMO region with greater management control exercised over fishing fleets and increased economic revenue flows to Small Island Developing States</p>	<p>northern Indian Ocean tuna-directed driftnet fisheries effectively filled through engagement of fishing communities and CSOs using co-management approaches</p> <p>1.1.4 Regional Action Plans developed, agreed (through MSE science management dialogue reports containing revised and new CMMs, HCRs and RPs) and involving at least 250 personnel from t-RFMO G77 Member States.</p> <p>1.1.5 Integrated Ecosystem Evaluations and Plans prepared for each t-RFMO to support an EAF.</p> <p>1.2.1 Pilot enhanced Rights Based Management system in the Western Pacific Ocean (PNA VDS) implemented</p> <p>1.2.2 Lessons learned from RBM pilot implementation shared globally</p>			
<p>Component 2: Strengthening and Harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to Address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU)</p>	TA	<p>2.1 Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) systems, particularly those addressing IUU fishing and related activities, are strengthened and harmonized over all five t-RFMOs</p> <p>2.2. The number of illegal vessels operating in one t-RFMO is reduced by</p>	<p>2.1.1. Global Best practices for MCS in tuna fisheries prepared and agreed by the five t-RFMOs</p> <p>2.1.2. MCS practitioners IUU reporting capacity is enhanced through training in regional cooperation, coordination, information collection and exchange of 100</p>	GEF TF	9,260,501	65,705,782

		<p>20% from the baseline at project start.</p>	<p>MCS professionals</p> <p>2.1.3. Ten G77 National Fisheries offices effectively implement and enforce national and regional MCS measures through training in a new competency based certification program by 160 national fisheries staff from IOTC/WCPFC regions</p> <p>2.1.4. PSM Agreement legislation drafted for ten coastal developing states</p> <p>2.1.5 CLAV and GR harmonized to provide a complete record and search tool for tuna vessels authorized to fish in all t-RFMO regions</p> <p>2.2.1 Pilot trials of electronic observer systems aboard tuna longline vessels successfully completed in Fiji with lessons learned and best practices disseminated to sub regional organizations and t-RFMOs for upscaling.</p> <p>2.2.2 Pilot trials of electronic observer systems aboard tuna purse seine vessels successfully completed in Ghana with lessons learned and best practices disseminated to all t-RFMOs for upscaling.</p> <p>2.2.3 Integrated MCS system in FFA</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			2.2.4 Fully compliant Best practices on Traceability / CDS systems developed through assessments of 10 G77 tuna fishery supply chains with weak links identified and recommendations made for improvements to existing systems made available to all five t-RFMOs and their Members.			
3. Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing	TA	<p>3.1 WCPFC and IATTC integrate improved bycatch mitigation technologies and practices into their regular management planning process at regional and national levels</p> <p>3.2. Bycatch mitigation best practices adopted by at least 40% of the tuna vessels operating in the two t-RFMOs' areas.</p>	<p>3.1.1 Harmonized and integrated bycatch data collection on sharks from WCPFC and IATTC regions including four additional species assessment (including species risk assessments) and results used for priority setting and development of robust pan pacific Conservation and Management Measures..</p> <p>3.1.2. A t-RFMO shark data inventory and assessment methods catalogue prepared for one ocean basin with results made available globally</p> <p>3.1.3. Management decision making processes enhanced and accelerated through all t-RFMOs, their Members, the fishing industry and other stakeholders having access to all relevant material on bycatch management</p>	GEF TF	8,041,542	28,622,808

			<p>measures and practices in tuna fisheries available in multiple languages through a Global Bycatch Management and Information Portal</p> <p>3.2.1. Longline sea trials in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans demonstrate the effectiveness of seabird mitigation measures by two different fleets in IOTC and ICCAT critical fishing areas which result in bycatch mitigation best practices integrated into the two RFMOs' management planning processes and uptake of bycatch mitigation best practices by at least 40% of the tuna vessels from baseline at project start in two t-RFMO areas.</p> <p>3.2.2. Purse seine sea trials in one ocean basin demonstrate the effectiveness of small tuna/shark mitigation measures and results disseminated to other ocean regions.</p>			
4. Information and Best Practices Dissemination, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	TA	4.1 Evidence that "best practices" from the project are being taken up and replicated elsewhere	4.1.1. Information, best practices, technical reports on individual components and communication material prepared and delivered to be published on ABNJ web portal demonstrated through monthly updates and publishing of best practices. Project results presented at global decision-making	GEF TF	780,597	7,826,785

			<p>meetings for possible catalytic adoption.</p> <p>4.1.2 Synthesis of immediate project results, compilation of catalytic results globally, and projection of feasible next steps toward transformation for the next 5 years</p> <p>4.1.3 One percent of IW budget is allocated to IW:LEARN activities during project implementation demonstrated through publishing of 2 project experience notes and 25 key government representatives and project staff supported to participate in GEF IW Biennial Conferences, learning exchanges and key meetings relevant to the project</p> <p>4.2.1. Midterm and final evaluations carried out and reports available</p>				
	(select)	4.2: Project well monitored and evaluated		(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
	(select)			(select)			
Subtotal					25,809,196	143,883,146	
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					GEF TF	1,363,740	6,921,954
Total project costs						27,172,936	150,805,100

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	cash & in-kind	25,000,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)	in-kind	1,300,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)	in-kind	6,285,000
Multi-lateral Agency	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)	in-kind	4,334,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)	in-kind	2,500,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)	in-kind	6,347,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)	in-kind	2,000,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA)	in-kind	370,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)	in-kind	186,000
National Government	Government of Fiji	in-kind	335,600
National Government	Government of Ghana	in-kind	1,118,000
National Government	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	in-kind	45,000,000
Multi-lateral Agency	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)	in-kind	992,500
Foundation	BirdLife International (BLI)	in-kind	2,900,000
Foundation	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)	in-kind	2,297,000
Foundation	Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)	in-kind	150,000
Foundation	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	cash & in-kind	15,000,000
Private sector	International Seafood Sustainability Association (ISSA)	in-kind	19,790,000
Private sector	Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association and associates	in-kind	14,900,000
Total Co-financing			150,805,100

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	International Waters	Global	21,194,890	1,907,540	23,102,430

FAO	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	5,978,046	538,024	6,516,070
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				27,172,936	2,445,564	29,618,500

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	6,698,695	611,872	7,310,567
National/Local Consultants	2,135,615	1,139,079	3,274,694

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

There are few differences between the PIF and project design. The project objective remains the same. Outcomes and outputs have been slightly modified to reflect further project preparation, participatory inputs associated with the logical framework workshop and specific activities supported under the Project. Co-financing has increased from an initial estimate of USD 148,200,000 to USD 150,805,100.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: NA

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: NA

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The project risk table was revised during project preparation. The updated Risk Matrix is attached below.

Table 1. Risks and Proposed Mitigation Measures to the Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) Project

Risks	Rating	Risk Mitigation Measures
The great number and diversity of stakeholders will constrain efficient coordination and implementation of the Project's activities	M	The Program's fourth Project (Global fisheries coordination and knowledge management) includes the establishment of global networks and partnerships that will contribute to fostering collective and harmonized approaches and actions among all stakeholders. Moreover, a Global Steering Committee (GSC) and Global Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will be set up under the Program for the specific purpose of ensuring the efficient coordination of the Project's different activities. At the project level preparation supported a broad stakeholder consultation process and the proposed institutional arrangements are highly inclusive. Coordination will be facilitated through the establishment of a Project Steering Committee (PSC) that will meet on an annual basis and have regularly scheduled videoconferences complemented with ad hoc consultations when required.
Changes in decision makers, or other political events beyond the control of the Project lead to changes in policies and/or support for project objectives and activities.	M	The Project's priorities are in line with what all stakeholders have agreed in the Kobe Course of Action (see section 2.1 above), and are hence strongly anchored in existing policies. Through stakeholder participation in all phases of the project formulation cycle, national and regional support has been secured already at the preparation stage and will be strengthened/broadened during preparation and all along implementation.
Gridlock in the RFMO Commissions	L-M	There is a risk that the consensus based decision making process can contribute to not fully achieving objectives. The combined efforts FAO, industry associations and NGOs support will be used to overcome reluctance of some t-RFMO members to support Commission decision making processes.
Increases in maritime security threats (e.g., piracy) will adversely influence tuna fisheries.	L	The geographical areas selected for project-supported activities involving the participation of industrial fleets are characterized by the presence of government (French and U.S.) or private (Spanish) security measures operating in the affected areas. This appears to be a significant deterrent and does not appear to be a major risk.
Lack of industry interest	L	The project has large industry associations as partners with a track record in promoting responsible fisheries and robust conservation

		measures. This will facilitate other like-minded associations participating in the project.
Adverse climate change (CC) impacts compromise the Project's achievements, particularly concerning the ecosystems and biodiversity.	L	Climate change considerations are presently taken into account in all of the t-RFMO precautionary decision frameworks (as are other sources of uncertainty) affecting fishery management decisions. Similarly, the assessment/monitoring of CC impacts (and other 'ecosystem' related impacts on the fisheries) are presently supported by all the t-RFMOs. In the Project, CC management practices for particularly vulnerable ecosystems will be developed and promoted through Management Strategy Evaluations (MSE) which account for plausible CC scenarios (supported under 1.A) and will be a major input in the development of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries EAF plans (sub-component 1.B).

H = High (greater than 60 per cent probability that the outcome/result will not be achieved).

M = Medium (30 to 60 per cent probability that the outcome/result will not be achieved).

L = Low (probability of less than 30 per cent that the outcome/result will not be achieved).

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives NA

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

This Project is unique in that it draws together a large and diverse group of partners and stakeholders, with often competing interests, who play important roles in tuna fisheries and biodiversity conservation. Project design has built on this institutional foundation and will serve to both strengthen and diversify existing collaborative arrangements to promote more sustainable and coordinated approaches to managing the resources. Broad-based cooperation and synergies to optimize the use of scarce capacity and resources, are essential for achieving the global objective of sustainable management of tuna fisheries and conservation of biodiversity in the ABNJ. The project strategy also reflects the very real differences in strength and capacity of the individual partners and their willingness/ability to put in place the measures so critically needed in order for tuna fisheries to be sustainable. Accordingly, there is a causal chain embedded in the strategy for this project that links key stakeholders into a collective forum for action. One or two RFMOs or Member States have agreed to test different types of measures to move toward (a) RBM and better understanding of economic and ecosystem benefits lost under business as usual; (b) use of satellite-based MCS systems to reduce IUU fishing and improve traceability; (c) various data acquisition and monitoring to support more efficient and sustainable decision-making by RFMOs; and (d) reduction of bycatch for ecosystem sustainability. With aggressive facilitation and training, successful experiences will be shared among RFMOs, private sector, NGOs, and their Member States to build confidence economically and socially that the pilots can be up-scaled elsewhere. The improvements in global traceability, data access that should prevent business as usual exceptions from being issued by the organizations, and the success of pilot measures, (when coupled with active constituency building in Member States provided by NGO and private sector partners) should catalyze action in all five tuna-RFMOs over time as barriers for inaction are removed and the path ahead for transformation becomes more politically feasible and economically attractive. The ultimate objective of efficiency and sustainability for tuna production and biodiversity conservation in ABNJ rests on this causal chain brought about by this first GEF project.

The project partners are the five t-RFMOs, the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Organization of the Central American Isthmus (OSPESCA), Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA), Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA), Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), Birdlife International (BLI), International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), members of fish harvesting and processing industries and FAO. Inclusiveness and broad-based stakeholder consultation and

participation have been major design features of the full-size Project.

In addition to supporting project activities involving all t-RFMOs there are a number of pilot activities in selected t-RFMOs member countries. These are Fiji and Ghana (Sub-component 2.D Innovative Satellite-based Vessel Monitoring System and Electronic Observer System Longline and Purse Seine Pilot Demonstration Activities), and the Republic of South Africa (Sub-component 3.C Uptake of Longline and Purse Seine “Best Practices”).

All partners participated in project preparation through meetings, workshops and regular communications with the project preparation team. A brief description of the main partners that will be involved in project implementation follows below.

Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) is responsible for the management of southern bluefin tuna throughout its distribution.

Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) is responsible for the conservation and management of tuna and other marine resources in the eastern Pacific Ocean. The Convention Area adjoins the area of competence of the WCPFC.

International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) is responsible for the conservation of tunas and tuna-like species in the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent seas. The tuna species of primary concern are the Atlantic bluefin, skipjack, yellowfin, albacore and bigeye.

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) is an intergovernmental organization established under Article XIV of the FAO constitution. It is mandated to manage tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean and adjacent seas. The tuna species currently under the management mandate of IOTC are the yellowfin, skipjack, bigeye, albacore, southern bluefin and longtail tunas.

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC). The area covered by the WCPFC represents almost 20% of the Earth’s surface. The Commission seeks to ensure, through effective management, the long-term conservation and sustainable use of highly migratory fish stocks (i.e. tunas, billfish, marlin) in the western and central Pacific Ocean. The Pacific Ocean is home to some of the world’s most abundant populations of tuna species, such as albacore, skipjack and yellowfin.

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). FFA is an important regional fisheries body for tuna. The agency aims at strengthening national capacity and regional solidarity so that its 17 Pacific Island members can manage, control and develop their tuna fisheries adequately. Its formal role is advisory and focuses on the EEZs of the member countries. As tuna are migratory, their management needs to be addressed both in ABNJ and within the related EEZs. FFA can play an important role in bridging the EEZ and ABNJ dimensions.

Isthmus Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Organization of the Central American (OSPESCA). A sub-regional fishery organization located in El Salvador, OSPESCA was created in 1995 for the purpose of promoting the sustainable development and coordination of fishery and aquaculture sector in the broader framework of Central American political integration through the definition, approval and implementation of policies, strategies, programs and projects.

Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA). The Nauru Agreement Concerning Cooperation in the Management of Fisheries of Common Interest (Nauru Agreement) is an Oceania subregional agreement between the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu. The eight signatories collectively control 25-30% of the world's tuna supply and approximately 60% of the western and central Pacific tuna supply. Historically, the Nauru Agreement and other joint fishery management Arrangements made by the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (usually referred to as PNA) have been concerned mainly with the management of tuna purse-seine fishing in the tropical western Pacific. From its initial enactment in 1982, the implementation of the Nauru Agreement was coordinated by the FFA. However, a separate PNA Office was created in 2010, based in Majuro, Marshall Islands.

Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The SPC (sometimes Pacific Community), is a regional intergovernmental organization whose membership includes both nations and territories. It aims to "develop the technical, professional, scientific, research, planning and management capability of Pacific Island people and directly provide information and advice, to enable them to make informed decisions about their future development and well-being." The SPC headquarters is in Nouméa, New Caledonia.

National Fisheries Authorities. National Fisheries Authorities are responsible for ensuring, through proper conservation and management measures, that the living resources of the fishing zones under their jurisdiction are not

endangered by over-exploitation. They may also have additional responsibilities associated with international agreements/obligations related to exploitation and management of resources on the high seas.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The NOAA is the lead U.S. federal government agency charged with science and stewardship of that country's living marine resources. As a member of three of the world's t-RFMOs, NOAA plays an active role in the provision of data, science and management of shared stocks of tuna and tuna-like species and the ecosystem impacts associated with the target fisheries. NOAA hosted the third global conference of t-RFMO Commissioners (Kobe III) in La Jolla in July 2011. The recommendations focused on improving scientific information, ensuring sustainable management of tuna and tuna-like stocks, and addressing compliance and IUU. Kobe III welcomed the scientific recommendations pertinent to bycatch, and it is likely that they will be considered for endorsement at the next annual meeting of the five t-RFMOs.

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP). It was created in order to halt the drastic decline of seabird populations in the Southern Hemisphere, particularly albatrosses and petrels procellariids. The Agreement requires that measures be taken by signatory governments (Parties) to reduce bycatch (by the use of mitigation measures), protection of breeding colonies and control and removal of introduced species from breeding islands. Currently ACAP protects all the World's albatross species and seven southern-hemisphere petrel species. The Agreement marks the increasing international commitment to protect albatrosses and petrels, and is a considerable step forward in the fight to protect these charismatic seabirds. It is supported by a Secretariat located in Hobart, Tasmania.

BirdLife International (BLI). The BLI is a global partnership of conservation organizations aimed at conserving birds, their habitats and global biodiversity. BLI works on reducing bycatch in global fisheries, including assessment of known and potential impacts of bycatch on seabirds, and development of best-practice mitigation. BLI has played a key role in the development and implementation of IPOA-Seabirds, and the development of the supporting FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries – Best Practice to reduce incidental catch of seabirds in capture fisheries. Since 2004, BLI has been working with the five t-RFMOs to assist in reducing bycatch of vulnerable albatross and petrel populations in their fisheries. In addition, BLI established the Albatross Task Force in 2005 which works in seven countries and directly with fishers and fishery managers to implement best-practice mitigation.

International Seafood Sustainability Association (ISSA). The International Seafood Sustainability Association ("ISSA") is a non-profit corporation whose main purposes are to inform and educate its members on emerging policies and practices to benefit marine ecosystems on a worldwide basis and to promote sustainable fishing practices and fisheries, both wild and farmed, through a variety of conservation activities, including dissemination to the industry of the results of the scientific research by worldwide conservation organizations. ISSA companies are involved in fishing and fish processing.

International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF). The ISSF is a global partnership between the tuna processing/trading industries, the world's leading fishery scientists and WWF. ISSF represents more than 70 per cent of the world's shelf stable tuna production and includes major purchasers of all species of tunas, except bluefin. The Foundation's mission is to undertake science-based initiatives for the long term sustainable use of tuna stocks, reduction of bycatch and promotion of ecosystem health. It is working to promote sustainable use of all tuna stocks by focusing on improving conditions on the water through direct action, applied science and advocacy. It has contributed significantly to concrete progress in the areas of bycatch reduction, improved MCS, elimination of IUU fishing and implementation of RBM.

Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). The MSC is an independent non-profit organization that sets a standard for sustainable fishing. Fisheries that wish to demonstrate they are well managed and sustainable against the science-based MSC standard are evaluated by a team of experts who are independent of both the fishery and the MSC. Seafood products can display the blue MSC ecolabel only if that seafood can be traced back through the supply chain to a fishery that has been certified against the MSC standard. The MSC's mission is to use its ecolabel and fishery certification program to contribute to the health of the world's oceans by recognising and rewarding sustainable fishing practises, influencing the choices people make when buying seafood, and working with partners to transform the seafood market to a sustainable basis.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF). The WWF is a global conservation organization with offices around the world, promotes sustainable fisheries management (including rights-based) within fishing communities, markets, associations, governments and inter-governmental institutions, to reduce excess fishing capacity as well as bycatch. WWF is actively involved in the Kobe process of strengthening t-RFMOs and is directly engaged with all of them. The Fund

also promotes policies aimed at protecting habitats of biologically important marine species. WWF is a partner in the Sub-Saharan Fisheries Partnership with the U.S.A., World Bank and FAO, for helping African fisheries to become more sustainable. Its global Smart Fishing Initiative (SFI) provides an integrated framework for transformation of fisheries by focused fisheries, market, and financial strategies implemented dozens of participating countries. In addition, it runs a Smart Gear Competition designed to reward innovations for reducing bycatch.

Industry (Fishing vessel owners associations, purse seine and longline fishing companies engaged in fisheries of the WCPFC, IATTC, ICCAT and IOTC).

Specific Roles and Responsibilities of the Partners

Tuna RFMOs. All five t-RFMOs will share the technical lead to: (i) develop regional action plans (through MSE science management dialogue reports containing CMMs, HCRs and RPs) for priority tuna stocks in their respective ocean regions and for drafting CMMs (Output 1.1.4). SPC (as service provider) will provide technical support to WCPFC with respect to HCRs and RP for priority stock(s) in the WPO, (ii) develop EAF evaluations and plans for priority fisheries (Output 1.1.5) and (iii) disburse GEF funds to increase the capacity of ten coastal developing states to comply with t-RMO member states obligations (Output 1.1.2). In addition, IOTC will lead the technical development and harmonization of the CLAV (Output 2.1.5), WCPFC and IATTC will lead the development of a t-RFMO shark data inventory, assessment methods catalogue and completion of four new Pacific shark assessments (Output 3.1.1 and 3.1.2). ICCAT will provide policy and scientific advice to Ghana (Output 2.2.2).

Support to the Project from t-RFMOs will come in the form of in kind technical assistance associated with their t-RFMO regular program of activities in support of compliance, stock assessment, resource management, data management and information sharing in support of Components 1, 2 and 3 through salaries, office space and utilities.

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). The FFA will: (i) take the technical lead on the development of the integrated MCS system in FFA (Outputs 2.2.3), (ii) provide in kind policy and legal support to the Fiji fisheries administration in the pilot testing and implementation of electronic observer systems (Output 2.2.1), (iii) provide policy and technical support to PNA countries in support of the review and implementation of a revised vessel day scheme (Output 1.2.1) and (iv) provide support to the development of training curricula (Output 2.1.3).

Support to the Project from FFA will come in the form of in kind technical assistance associated with their FFA's regular program of activities in support of compliance, data management, policy and legal advice to FFA members and information sharing in support project Components 1, 2 and 3 through salaries, office space and utilities.

Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The SPC will: (i) provide technical leadership in the development of a Global Bycatch Management and Information Portal capable of supplying information for management decision-making (Outputs 3.1.3), (ii) support to development of regional action plans (through MSE science management dialogue reports containing CMMs, HCRs and RPs) for priority tuna stocks in the WPO (Output 1.1.4) and EAF evaluations and plans in the WPO (Output 1.1.5), (iii) provide support to Fiji pilot trials of electronic observer systems (observer data) (Output 2.2.1).

Support to the project from SPC will come in the form of in kind technical assistance associated with their SPC's Oceanic Fisheries program of activities in support of compliance, data management, stock assessment, information sharing in support of Components 1 and 2. The SPC will also support the Project through providing technical services to Subcomponent 3 A (Improved Information on Bycatch) and travel.

Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Organization of the Central American Isthmus (OSPESCA). OSPESCA in cooperation with FAO will support the updating, expanding and improving the reliability of national and regional vessel registries in OSPESCA countries in support of the Global Record (Output 2.1.5).

OSPESCA support to the Project will come in the form of salaries for government staff, office space and utilities associated with development and maintenance of national vessel registries and participation in workshops and training activities associated with Output 2.1.5.

FAO. FAO's technical role in the Project will be to provide overall support to each of the four component areas of work including backstopping from its Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and Economics Division and its Resources Use and

Conservation Division especially where it relates to more effective implementation of its global fisheries instruments. FAOs Governing body, the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) will be used as a forum for discussion of key aspects of project implementation and to raise issues of global significance. More specifically, FAO will provide technical support to t-RFMOs with respect to: (i) development of national harvest strategy framework plans for ten developing coastal states (output 1.1.1), (ii) development of regional action plans (through MSE science management dialogue reports containing CMMs, HCRs and RPs) for priority tuna stocks in each ocean region and for drafting CMMs (Output 1.1.4), (iii) development of EAF evaluations and plans for priority fisheries (Output 1.1.5), in cooperation with t-RFMOs, (iv) development of a third party review, assessment and implementation of enhancements to the PNA purse seine Vessel Day Scheme and global sharing of lessons learnt (Outputs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2), (v) in cooperation with t-RFMO compliance committees, lead the preparation of a comparative study of t-RFMO MCS measures and practices; (vi) convene an Expert Workshop on MCS best practices (both Output 2.1.1); (vii) support to MCS training (Output 2.1.2); (viii) in cooperation with IOTC and FFA, facilitate the development and trialling of a new training in a competency based certification program for MCS compliance professionals (Output 2.1.3); and (ix) work directly with IOTC members to prepare a needs assessment on PSM and deliver training in PSM and technical assistance in drafting of PSM compliant legislation (Output 2.1.4), (x) provide technical support to IOTC in the development of the CLAV and harmonization with the Global Record (Output 2.1.5), (xi) support OSPESCA in support of enhancement of national and sub-regional vessel registries (Output 2.1.5), (xii) support the development of pilot trials of electronic observer systems for vessels engaged in purse seine and longline fishing in Fiji and Ghana (Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2), (xiii) set up the LOA with FFA for delivery of Output 2.2.3, (xiv) provide technical support and facilitate the development of best practices for traceability/CDS system improvements in 10 G77 countries (Output 2.2.4) with support from MSC and WWF and others, (xv) set up the LOAs with t-RFMOs for delivery of Output 1.1.5, (xvi) set up the LOAs with SPC and WCPFC for delivery of Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.3 and (xvii) set up the LOA with BirdLife International for delivery of Output 3.2.1.

Support to the Project will come primarily in the form of provision of technical and administrative services in support of both the technical Components 1, 2 and 3 and certain aspects of Component 4 (Information Dissemination and Best Practices, and support to project management).

Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA). The PNA in cooperation with FAO, FFA and WCPFC will have the technical lead for the development of a third party review, assessment and implementation of enhancements to the PNA purse seine Vessel Day Scheme (Output 1.2.1) supported by FAO, FFA and WCPFC.

Support to the Project will come in the form of PNA member salaries, travel to regular PNA meetings during which Output 1.2.1 will be discussed, office space and utilities associated with workshops.

Fiji Fisheries Administration: The National Fisheries Authorities of Fiji in cooperation with FFA, SPC, WCPFC and FAO will provide administrative and technical support to lead the pilot trials of electronic observer systems aboard tuna longline vessels (Output 2.2.1).

Support to the Project will come in the form of salaries for government coordination and fishery observers and office space and utilities.

Ghanaian Fisheries Administration: The National Fisheries Authorities of Ghana in cooperation with ICCAT, ISSF, WWF and the fishing industry will provide technical and administrative support to lead the pilot trials of electronic observer systems aboard tuna purse seine vessels (Output 2.2.2).

Support to the Project will come in the form of salaries for government coordination and fishery observers and office space and utilities.

Industry. Industry partners in the Project consist mainly of the participating fishing associations (ISSA, PITIA, FTBOA) and fleets of vessels working in (i) the longline (Fiji) fishery (Output 2.2.1), (ii) the purse seine (Ghana) fisheries (Output 2.2.2), longline fishing fleets fishing out of South African fishing ports and participating in the BirdLife International led implementation of bycatch best practices (Output 3.2.1), and (iv) ISFF tuna purse seine fleets demonstrating and testing small tuna / shark bycatch mitigation measures in the Western Pacific Ocean (Output 3.2.2).

Industry will make available their vessels as a platform for at sea testing and demonstrating of various fishing activities and the participation of officers and crew in training workshops. The industry will also provide technical inputs into pilot project design and testing protocols.

Project support from the industry will be primarily in the form of: vessel time, salaries associated with industry observers and assuming all the costs following the start-up phase (i.e., licenses, technical backup and O&M of the VMS equipment placed on the participating vessels and its coordination).

BirdLife International (BLI). The BLI will have technical leadership for implementation of long line sea trials in the Atlantic and Southern Indian Oceans (Output 3.2.1) through provision of birdlife bycatch mitigation equipment, development of experimental mitigation gear, promotion of technology transfer through covering salaries for the technology transfer instructors and coordinators, covering the costs of basic economic analyses, pre and post cruise workshops, information dissemination and covering the costs of salaried personnel and travel to t-RFMO meetings. FAO will set up the LOAs with BirdLife International.

Support to the Project will come in the form of vessel time, equipment, salaries, office space and utilities associated with workshops, at sea testing and demonstration and information dissemination.

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (also known as CMS or Bonn Convention) aims to conserve terrestrial, aquatic and avian migratory species throughout their range. It is an intergovernmental treaty, concluded under the aegis of the United Nations Environment Programme, concerned with the conservation of wildlife and habitats on a global scale. Since the Convention's entry into force, its membership has grown steadily to include 119 (as of 1 April 2013) Parties from Africa, Central and South America, Asia, Europe and Oceania. As the only global convention specializing in the conservation of migratory species, their habitats and migration routes, CMS complements and co-operates with a number of other international organizations, NGOs and partners in the media as well as in the corporate sector. The (CMS) will also partner with the project, especially regarding conservation of migratory species threatened by tuna fishing. Relevant activities and parallel financing will be determined during project implementation, and potentially confirmed in a memorandum of understanding between FAO, EAs, and CMS.

International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF). The ISSF will provide technical leadership for: (i) the development of training curricula and implementation of training programs in ten G77 countries to support the development of t-RFMO harvest strategies (Output 1.1.1), and (ii) support the development and dissemination of purse seine Best Practices in the Indian Ocean (Output 3.2.2).

Project support from the ISSF will be primarily in the form of coordination of the programme of with ISSA industry partners, salaries and workshops in support of Project Components 1, 2 and 3.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). In light of NOAA's significant presence in supporting the sustainable management of tuna and other associated species its contribution to the Project, either directly or indirectly, will cover most of the project's sub-components. Support will come primarily in the form of salaries, travel expenses and vessel time associated with (i) capacity building, (ii) monitoring and research related to tunas and associated species and (iii) strengthening the t-RFMOs. Support will come from contributions through its Pacific Islands Regional Office, Pacific Islands Science Center, Southeast Fisheries Science Center and Headquarters. NOAAs support will be spread primarily across the t-RFMOs for which the USA is a member and in general support to the effective implementation of global and regional instruments that contribute to sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation.

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP). The ACAP will contribute to the Project primarily through technical assistance to development of the Global Bycatch Management and Information Portal (Output 3.1.3). Specifically, ACAP will contribute by providing: (i) the results of regular reviews of research undertaken on seabird bycatch mitigation measures and the production of best practice advice in English, French and Spanish; (ii) species assessments on over 30 species that are maintained and updated as appropriate through a database maintained by the ACAP Secretariat, with inputs provided by ACAP Parties and researchers on an annual basis and serve as inputs into ecological risk assessments; and together with BLI, (iii) preparation and maintenance of mitigation fact sheets, which

provide detailed information on mitigation measures that can be used to minimise the incidental mortality of seabirds caused by fishing operations (Output 3.1.3 and 3.2.1).

Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). The MSC will support the Project primarily through contributions to Output 2.2.4 in the form of outreach and training on traceability requirements, and identification and mitigation of supply chain risks.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF). The WWF will use its global presence and linkages to ISSF and MSC to promote and support all work being developed under components 1, 2, 3 and 4. They will provide technical oversight to the project through their involvement in the PTO and other arrangements associated with the project and the ABNJ program in general. Using its role as a global environmental NGO, WWF will play an overarching coordinating role within the project for enhancing and furthering cooperation and collaboration of CSOs with UN agencies and the project partners.

WWF will be responsible for delivery of Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.4, 1.2.2, 2.2.4, 3.2.2.). More specifically, WWF will lead: (i) development of on the job training in support of the development of t-RFMO harvest strategies for 10 G77 countries (Output 1.1.1), (ii) filling of bycatch and catch data gaps in the northern Indian Ocean tuna-directed driftnet fisheries through engagement of fishing communities and CSOs using co-management approaches (Output 1.1.3), (iii) global sharing of Lessons Learnt from pilot enhanced RBM system in the Western Pacific Ocean (Output 1.2.2), (iv) pilot trials of electronic observer systems aboard tuna purse seine vessels in Ghana (Output 2.2.2), (v) purse seine sea trials in one ocean basin to confirm the effectiveness of small tuna/shark mitigation measures (Output 3.2.2).

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The socio-economic importance of tuna fisheries in countries varies significantly by geographical area. The locations where tuna fisheries are extremely important from a socio-economic point of view are the small island nations in the Pacific and Indian Oceans as well as in the western central Atlantic. In other parts of the developing world – such as in Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Mexico and Ecuador – the tuna canning industry plays an important role as a provider of employment. Because most of the world's tuna stocks are either fully or over-exploited, there are attendant socio-economic impacts associated with lost employment opportunities, reduced incomes and food insecurity. Moreover, given present trends these impacts are likely to worsen particularly in the SIDs and less developed states that have access to fewer options to mitigate social impacts.

Accordingly, the project goal is to achieve the sustainable and profitable tuna fisheries and by so doing address the aforementioned adverse socio-economic impacts and result in major socio-economic benefits for the populations involved. Specifically, this will be addressed in two ways. First, through reducing loss of wealth from tuna fisheries associated with poor or ineffective management practices and systemic IUU fishing. Second, support is given to Pacific Small Island Developing States to enhance the accrual of revenues through use of rights based approaches and, to promote and raise awareness of the potential to replicate RBM in other regions. Accordingly, it is expected that the Project (and the ABNJ Program) will contribute to employment, nutrition and trade resulting in benefits to people in both developing and developed countries that depend on jobs in tuna fisheries as well as in associated activities such as boat construction, gear manufacture and pre and post-harvesting of tuna. Moreover, tuna certification schemes supported by the Project, whenever deemed feasible, would include social criteria for working conditions in the tuna industry and would therefore promote better life quality for tuna plant workers (mostly women) and their families, thus generate decent and fair jobs for employees and their dependents. For the Pacific region alone, it has been estimated that projected fees accruing to Pacific Island countries from the purse seine fishery could increase by USD60-70 million annually if management can be improved. Strengthening the Pacific Island management schemes and promoting similar management models to other regions has the potential for a catalytic effect on revenues being retained by coastal small island developing states.

The project also recognizes that project interventions may impact on men and women in different ways and this has to be understood and taken into consideration. Special efforts will be devoted to the involvement of women at the institutional level in organizational development efforts and capacity building. Accordingly, the project will be guided by principles of equitable development and will pay attention to gender and promote gender equality and equity through

the systematic compliance with FAO's stated commitment to and policy on mainstreaming a gender perspective into its normative work and field activities.

Project planning, development and implementation will be done in a participatory and gender-sensitive manner with the stakeholders and target beneficiaries. As the GEF Agency, FAO work will systematically examine and address women's as well as men's needs, priorities and experiences as part of the development of policies, normative standards, programmes, projects and knowledge building activities, so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated.

Furthermore, FAO will also address gender through the project's public imaging and ensuring that branding is gender-sensitive and project posts, recruitment of consultants, formulation of letters of agreement, etc are all carried out with due regard to FAOs stated policy on gender mainstreaming and equitable development.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

In light of the scale and diversity of the task at hand, only a coordinated, long-term partnership among all the stakeholders would lead to the achievement of the project objective. To ensure that project resources are used effectively in the short term (5 years) and will lead to an impact, a decision was taken early in project preparation to focus on activities that, in addition to generating progress in the short-term, potentially promise a significant and long-term impact. Thus, many of the activities proposed for support under the initial five-year phase consist of reinforcing technical expertise, increased capacity, technological solutions, development and dissemination of best practices, and promotion of a sound institutional and policy framework that ensures that existing resources are more effectively utilized in achieving their intended goals and objectives. These needs and corresponding activities were reflected in project design and, in the view of the project partners, arguably represent the only cost-effective approach available to reach the project objective. At a more technical level, cost-efficiencies are expected to be generated by promoting: (i) working through existing institutional frameworks and processes that have already been agreed to and appears promising (e.g., t-RFMOs, Kobe III and relevant Working Groups); (ii) working in a collaborative approach with a large number of key stakeholders to promote coordinated approaches to the issues that affect the sector and avoid duplication and overlap; and (iii) promoting greater capacity and participation of G-77 participants in t-RFMO decision making processes that, among other decisions, would promote increased implementation of conservation management measures based on agreed Harvest Control Rules and Reference Points at the level of the member states.

The project is also addressing cost effectiveness through the use of innovative technologies to resolve some of the most serious issues associated with monitoring and reporting of catches and bycatch. For example, data collected by at-sea observers are essential for day-to-day management of fisheries. However, in many fisheries, there is insufficient observer coverage due to lack of trained personnel, limited onboard accommodation space and safety, and in some cases a general unwillingness of one or more stakeholders to be observed. Other factors that have been cited are insufficient shore based national capacity to monitor fishing operations. Moreover, the general trend towards industry contributing to the costs of observer programs has met resistance with increasingly higher operating costs (fuel and labour in particular) being cited as a reason against user pay programs. Notwithstanding, the absence of adequate observer coverage can severely constrain: (i) detection of infractions committed by during fishing; and (ii) an assessment of the scope of the problems through comparison catches and behaviours of monitored vessels and unmonitored fishing operations. A major technological innovation in this project is the demonstration and testing of alternatives to conventional at human at sea observers. Electronic observer systems (EM systems) have the potential to reduce costs for observers while at the same time providing critical information on catches and discards. EM systems are compact, automated solutions designed to operate on fishing vessels including those where traditional alternatives (such as onboard observers) would be too costly or logistically challenging. EM tools are used to profile a wide variety of fishing activities, including identification of catch, bycatch and discards by fishing time and location. If this pilot is successfully demonstrated, it has the potential to revolutionize the way at sea monitoring is conducted in ABNJ fisheries.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

This global tuna Project is an integral part the “Global Sustainable Fisheries Management and Biodiversity Conservation in the ABNJ” Program. As such, the Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and activities (sub-component 4B: Monitoring and Evaluation) should constitute a “module”, self-standing but fully integrated into the overall M&E system put into place at the Program level. The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted USD 789,526 (see table in the end of this section below).

The Project M&E will be conducted in accordance with FAO and GEF policies and guidelines. Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the Project Results Matrix (Appendix 1). The GEF Biodiversity and International Waters tracking tools will be completed and updated at the time of the mid-term and final evaluations. The monitoring and evaluation system will also facilitate learning and generation of knowledge necessary for replication and scaling-up of the technologies tested and promoted in the field and best practices.

With the complexity of multiple components and the projected multiple catalytic actions that should result, the full story of policies and regulations adopted, actions undertaken, and institutional changes catalyzed will be assembled into a results and lessons learned document during the last year of the project. This will clarify the links and progression toward the desired transformation made during this first operation of a series needed over more than a decade to fully transform tuna fisheries management in ABNJ and set the stage for next steps. The M&E system will facilitate communication of results and best practices which will be communicated through the ABNJ portal, at international conferences and meetings on oceans and the ABNJ FAO’s global and IW:LEARN (see section 4.7 Communication and Visibility). The monitoring and evaluation system will also facilitate learning and generation of knowledge necessary for the preparation of follow-on phases for the scaling-up of the technologies promoted in the field where relevant.

Oversight and monitoring responsibilities

The GEF Coordination Unit will provide oversight of the project. The FAO Budget Holder (BH), Lead Technical Officer (LTO) will monitor the progress of the project largely through the review of recording and verification of inputs, including financial disbursements and technical levels-of-effort, and the Project Progress Reports (PPR), Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) (see below) and periodic supervision and backstopping missions. Financial inputs (disbursements) will be largely drawn from FAO’s financial management system, as well as from the results-based financial reports prepared by project partners. Technical progress will be monitored through the PPRs and PIRs, and reports produced by the project. The monitoring system will specifically compare financial disbursements to technical activities programmed in the annual results-based Work Plans and identify and assess any significant discrepancies between the two. Independent supervision/project oversight missions will be organized annually by the GEF Coordination Unit.

Day-to-day monitoring of the project will be carried out by the Global Tuna Project Coordinator with support from the M&E Officer.

WWF and project partners responsible for or contributing to the achievement of outputs will be involved in the monitoring and evaluation activities related to the respective outputs.

Monitoring of project implementation will be driven by the preparation and implementation of a results-based annual work plan and budget (AWP/B). The preparation of the AWP/B will represent the product of a unified planning process. As a tool, it will identify the actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details to monitor their implementation including specific monitoring tasks and supervision activities.

Following the approval of the Project, the project’s first year work plan and budget (AWP/B) will be adjusted (either reduced or expanded in time) to synchronize it with FAO financial reporting requirements. In subsequent years, the AWP/B and budget will follow an annual preparation and reporting cycle as specified in section 4.5.3 below.

Indicators and information sources

To monitor project outputs and outcomes specific indicators have been established in the Results Framework (see Appendix 1). The framework’s indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO’s monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats data collected will be of sufficient

detail to be able to track specific activities, outputs and outcomes and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis, if possible, or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

Key indicators at the outcome level include:

Outcome 1.1 Improved management decision making concerning tuna resources in the areas under the jurisdiction of the five Regional Fisheries Management Organizations for tuna (t-RFMOs), through enhanced engagement and motivation of the stakeholders, including the tuna industry shown by 23 stocks covered by CMMs with HCRs and RPs and 98% of global catch is by full Members of t-RFMOs

Outcome 1.2 An efficient and effective RBM system has been designed, tested and implemented in one t-RFMO region with greater management control exercised over fishing fleets and increased economic revenue flows to Small Island Developing States

Outcome 2.1. Harmonization and adoption of MCS best practices across all t-RFMOs strengthens the capacity of t-RFMOs and States to detect and deter IUU fishing shown by at least 25 MCS measures supported under the project being considered by t-RFMOs.

Outcome 2.2. Implementation of best practices reduces the number of illegal vessels operating by 20% in one t-RFMO and has a positive catalytic effect on IUU fishing in other t-RFMO regions shown by an increase of the number of “black-listed” tuna vessels from 49 to 61 in t-RFMO Commission documents.

Outcome 3.1. WCPFC and IATTC integrate improved bycatch mitigation technologies and practices into their regular management planning process at regional and national levels.

Outcome 3.2. Bycatch mitigation best practices adopted by at least 40% of the tuna vessels operating in the two t-RFMOs’ areas.

The main sources of information to support the M&E will be: (i) Technical Reports and “Best Practices” for “on the water” pilots; (ii) t-RFMO Committee Reports and Annual Reports and papers presented to the t-RFMO Scientific Committees; (iii) Draft EAF Plans and Legislative Review Reports (iii) Workshop reports and lists of participants in trainings and workshops and science-management dialogues (iv) Project Progress Reports prepared by the PMU with inputs from WWF and project partners; (v) consultants reports; (vi) mid-term and final impact and evaluation studies completed by independent consultants; (vii) financial reports and budget revisions; (viii) FAO technical backstopping reports (FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department) and supervision mission reports (carried out by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit).

Under the guidance of the Global Tuna Project Coordinator and the FAO LTO, and in close collaboration with the project partners concerned, the collection of baseline data will be carried out by project staff and compiled into a base document for each pilot (sub-components 2D and 3C) in accordance with the indicators established to monitor “on the water” impacts and performance of the technologies and practices tested. To assess and confirm the congruence of outcomes with project objectives, physical inspection and/or surveying of activity sites and participants will be carried out. This latter task would often be undertaken by the PMU supported by the FAO LTO.

Reporting schedule

Specific reports that will be prepared for the project as a whole are: (i) Project Inception Report ; (ii) Results-based Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B); (iii) Project Progress Reports (PPRs); (iv) annual Project Implementation Review (PIR); (v) Technical Reports; (vi) Co-financing Reports; (vii) GEF Biodiversity and International Waters Tracking Tools (on submission of the project for CEO endorsement and updated at the mid-term and final evaluations); and (viii) Terminal Report. Reports will be distributed to the tuna Project Steering Committee (PSC), ABNJ Global Steering Committee (GSC).

Project Inception Report. After approval of the Project and signature of the Execution Agreement, an inception workshop will be held. Immediately after the workshop, PMU will prepare a Project Inception Report in consultation with the Project Team Oversight (PTO) and other project partners. The report will include a narrative on the

institutional roles and responsibilities and coordinating action of project partners, progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. It will also include a detailed First Year AWP/B and a plan with all monitoring and supervision requirements. The draft report will be circulated in FAO and to the PSC for review and comments before its finalization and submission to the GSC through the GPCU. The budget holder will upload the final version of the Inception Report on the ABNJ portal and on FAO's Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS).

Results-based Annual Work Plan and Budget. The PMU will submit to the LTO and BH an AWP/B (more detailed description under 4.5.1) which will be divided into monthly timeframes detailing the activities and progress indicators that would guide implementation during the year of the Project. As part of the AWP/B, a detailed project budget for the activities to be implemented during the year should be included together with all monitoring and supervision activities required during the year. A draft five-year work plan is provided in Appendix 2. The AWP/B will be approved by the PSC. The budget holder will upload the AWP/B onto the FPMIS.

Project Progress Reports. The PMU will submit six-monthly Project Progress Reports to the FAO budget holder and Lead Technical Officer. The reports are used to identify constraints, problems or bottlenecks that impede timely implementation and ensure that appropriate remedial action is taking in a timely manner. PPRs will be prepared based on the systematic monitoring of output and outcome indicators identified in the Project Results Matrix. It will also report on projects risks and implementation of the risk mitigation plan. The BH and LTO will review the progress reports and circulate them to the Project Team Oversight, the FAO Project Task Force and GEF Coordination Unit for comments and clearance prior. The BH will submit the draft final version to the GEF Coordination Unit for final approval and uploading on the FPMIS.

The six-monthly PPRs will be submitted to the GEF Coordination Unit as follows:

- the period 1 January – 30 June and to be submitted no later than 31 July; and
- the period 1 July – 31 December to be submitted no later than 31 January.

Project Implementation Review. The PTO supported by BH with inputs from the PMU will prepare an annual Project Implementation Review (PIR). The PIR will cover the period 1 July to 30 June and will be submitted no later than 31 July to the FAO GEF Coordination Unit for review and approval. The FAO GEF Coordination Unit will clear and the PIRs to the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office as part of the Annual Monitoring Review report of the FAO-GEF portfolio. The GEF Coordination Unit will also upload the PIR onto the FPMIS.

Technical Reports. Draft technical reports should be cleared by project partners responsible for the preparation of the report before being reviewed by the PMU. The PMU will submit the draft reports to the PTO for review and clearance (and consultation with WWF and/or FAO task forces and TAG, as required). The cleared reports will then be sent by PMU to the PSC for information and to the GPCU for further distribution and publication. The GPCU will send the reports to FAO GEF Coordination Unit for information and publish the reports on the ABNJ workspace as well as on the ABNJ Portal following procedures established by the Communications team. The budget holder will upload the technical reports on the FPMIS. GSC, TAG and other project partners will receive automatic email alerts including links to the reports for their information.

Co-financing Reports. The PMU will be responsible for collecting the required information and reporting on co-financing provided by the partners on an annual basis. The PMU will compile the information received from the executing partners and transmit in a timely manner to the LTO and BH. The report, which covers the period 1 July through 30 June, is to be submitted on or before 31 July and will be incorporated into the annual PIR.

GEF-5 Tracking Tool Reports. In accordance with GEF M&E policy, the tracking tools for the Biodiversity and International Waters Focal Areas will be prepared by the project preparation team and included as part of the project documentation submitted to the GEF Secretariat at the time of CEO endorsement. The tracking tools will be updated on two occasions: at the of project's mid-term and final evaluations. The tracking tools will be submitted with the annual PIR and evaluation reports to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office as part of the Annual Monitoring Review (AMR). The GEF Coordination Unit will upload the tracking tools on the FPMIS.

Terminal Report. Within three months of the project completion date, the PMU will submit to the PTO, BH and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit for review and clearance a draft Terminal Report, including a list of outputs and description of activities undertaken by the Project, “lessons learned” and any recommendations to improve the efficiency of similar activities in the future. The draft report will be shared with the final evaluation mission. The final version of the Terminal Report will specifically include the findings of the final evaluation as described above. A final project Steering Committee meeting is expected to take place mid 2018.

Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

Table 2: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Summary

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budgeted costs (USD)
Inception Workshop	PMU, LTO, BH, PTO and FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Within three months after CEO endorsement	USD 101,625
Project Inception Report (including first year AWP/B)	PMU in consultation with LTO and other project partners Cleared by PTO and BH	Two months after workshop	-
Measurement of project indicators (progress and performance indicators, outcome, GEF tracking tools); Field based impact monitoring	PMU with the respective project partners.	Continually	M&E Officer (part-time) USD 166,449 Travel USD 34,291 IW-Learn USD 70,555
Supervision missions	FAO GEF Coordination Unit and independent consultants	Annual or as required	Covered by Agency fee
Project Steering Committee	PMU, BH, PTO	Annual	USD 176,444
Project Progress Reports	PMU with inputs from all executing partners, approval by LTO, PTO, and BH, final approval by FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Semi-annual	-
Review Project Implementation Review, including report on co-financing	LTO, supported by PTO and PMU the PMU; cleared and submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEFSEC	Annual	Paid by GEF agency fee
Technical reports	Consultants/contractors submitted in draft to PMU Cleared by PTO	As appropriate	-
Technical Support and Backstopping Missions	FAO Units (e.g., FI, LEG)	Regular	Paid by Agency Fee

Mid-term Evaluation	FAO Evaluation Office and external consultants in consultation with the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 108,401 for external consultants plus agency fee for paying expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Final evaluation	FAO Evaluation Office and external consultants in consultation with the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 115,761 for external consultants plus agency fee for paying expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Biodiversity and International Waters tracking tools	Global Tuna Coordinator, with support from LTO and WWF	At time of mid-term and final evaluations	Financed by GEF Fee
Terminal Report	PMU/LTO/BH/FAO GEF Coordination Unit	At least three months before end of project	USD 16,000
TOTAL			USD 789,526

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO TCI-Director@fao.org		September 16, 2013	Frank Chopin	+3906 5705 5257	Frank.Chopin@fao.org
Barbara Cooney FAO GEF Coordinator Email: Barbara.Cooney@fao.org Tel.+3906 5705 5478					

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
<p>PROJECT OBJECTIVE To achieve efficiency and sustainability in tuna production and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ, through the systematic application of an ecosystem approach in tuna fisheries for: (i) supporting the use of sustainable and efficient fisheries management and fishing practices by the stakeholders of the tuna resources, (ii) reducing illegal, unreported and unregulated [IUU] fishing, and (iii) mitigating adverse impacts of bycatch on biodiversity.</p>	Number of tuna stocks with inadequate conservation and management measures to curb overexploitation	Eight out of twenty three tuna stocks have inadequate conservation and management measures in place to curb overexploitation	Enhanced conservation and management measures in place for all 23 tuna stocks	Scientific Committee reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient political will • Sufficient and timely co-financing • Increases fuel prices will not affect industry participation • Political stability • Climate change impacts adequately accounted for in fisheries management • Changes in maritime security threats (e.g., piracy) influencing tuna fisheries are adequately accounted
	t-RFMO compliance reports	Estimates indicate that IUU fishing accounts for as much as \$23.5 billion worldwide and may represent up to 20 per cent of all of the wild marine fish caught globally but figures for tuna fisheries are not known.	Harmonized and strengthened MCS systems in place for all t-RFMOs	t-RFMO Commission Reports	
	Number of fisheries adopting on the water best practices for reducing bycatch	Some measures in place but low uptake and adoption of best practices by fishing fleets	At least four fisheries adopting on the water best practices for reducing bycatch	t-RFMO Scientific Committee reports	
<p>Component 1: Promotion of Sustainable Management (including Rights-Based Management) of Tuna Fisheries, in accordance with an Ecosystem Approach</p>					
Outcome 1.1. Improved management decision making concerning tuna resources in the areas under the jurisdiction	Number of stocks of targeted species with CMMs that embody	1 stock covered by CMMs that embody precautionary fishery management (green	23 stocks covered by CMMs with HCRs and RPs	t-RFMO reports MSE dialogue reports	Developing Coastal States remain committed to project objectives.

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
of the five Regional Fisheries Management Organizations for tuna (t-RFMOs), through enhanced engagement and motivation of the stakeholders, including the tuna industry at all levels	precautionary fishery management (green quadrant) and HCR and RP. Percentage of global tuna catches by full t-RFMO members	quadrant) and HCR and RP. Catch of tunas by full t-RFMOs members is only 88% of global catch	98% of global catch is by full Members of t-RFMOs		
Output 1.1.1. At least ten developing coastal states agree to harvest strategy framework plans at the national level, that supports the development of the t-RFMO harvest strategies, through capacity building of least 160 national fisheries personnel.	Number of coastal developing state partners that have adopted new or revised national harvest strategy plans for tuna fisheries management	Currently, 0 national harvest strategy plans have been developed or revised through the project. Substantial lags exist between agreement of regional & international arrangements, & their implementation at the national level	National harvest strategy plans adopted or revised by 10 coastal developing states for tuna fisheries management	Project progress reports National reports submitted to t-RFMOs	Developing Coastal States remain committed to regional management arrangements Countries willing to host & participate in training and plan development workshops & make staff available for attachments. Appropriate national personnel able to participate Number of plans incorporating biodiversity reported in GEF Tracking Tool TT) National specialists available to take part Countries willing to
	Number of national fisheries management personnel with increased capacity and new skills in fisheries management and policy	New skills needed as CMMs become more comprehensive, sophisticated & complex, & the threat of IUU fishing increases	160 national fisheries management personnel with increased capacity and new skills in fisheries management, planning & policy	National reports to t-RFMOs Project progress reports	

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
					host & participate in workshops & make staff available for attachments.
Output 1.1.2. Increased capacity of ten coastal developing states to comply with t-RMO member states obligations	Number of additional national fisheries staff participating in t-RFMO capacity building activities	t-RFMO capacity Building Fund is insufficient to support priority countries and fisheries in critical areas of the Commissions scientific and technical work 2013 numbers of national fisheries staff participating t-RFMO capacity building funds	160 additional national fisheries staff from t-RFMO coastal developing states participating in t-RFMO capacity building activities (covering all 5 t-RFMOs)	National reports to t-RFMOs	Developing Coastal States remain committed to regional management arrangements
Output 1.1.3. Bycatch and catch data gaps in the northern Indian Ocean tuna-directed driftnet fisheries effectively filled through engagement of fishing communities and CSOs using co-management approaches	Annual t-RFMO reports WWF reports	Limited reports on catches in the tuna directed drift gillnet fisheries in the N. Indian Ocean. Initial report on the driftnet fishery published but highlights significant data gaps	Data on fleet wide catches and bycatch in the gillnet driftnet fishery inform t-RFMO SC meetings and guide management interventions needed by the fishery	Project Progress Reports t-RFMO reports	NGOs and coastal fishers cooperate in data collection and co-management approaches
Output 1.1.4. Regional action plans developed, agreed (through MSE science	Number of regional action plans containing	Currently, no regional action plans exist	Five regional action plans containing CMMs, HCRs and	t-RFMO science and Commission reports	Consensus on HCRs, RP can be reached

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
management dialogue reports containing revised and new CMMs, HCRs and RPs) and involving at least 250 personnel from t-RFMO G77 Member States.	CMMs, HCRs and RPs agreed through multi country collaboration and submitted to respective t-RFMO commission meetings		RPs agreed through multi country collaboration and submitted to respective t-RFMO commission meetings		Coastal developing states retain interested to fully comply with t-RFMO obligations and other fisheries instruments
	Number of fisheries management personnel from t-RFMO G77 member States contributing to the development of regional action plans	Limited involvement of coastal developing states in management planning and decision-making processes No fisheries management personnel contributing to the development of regional action plans	250 fisheries management personnel from t-RFMO G77 member States. contributing to the development of regional action plans	Attendance logs and commission reports.	Number of regional plans incorporating biodiversity reported in GEF TT National specialists available to take part Countries willing to host & participate in workshops & make staff available for attachments.
Output 1.1.5. Integrated Ecosystem Evaluations and Plans prepared for each t-RFMO to support an EAF.	t-RFMO SC reports	Current plans address stocks of target stocks rather target stocks and associated species	EAF plans drafted in all t-RFMOs and submitted to t-RFMO Commissions	Commission reports.	t-RFMOs remain committed to Kobe Course of Actions
Outcome 1.2. An efficient and effective RBM system has been designed, tested and implemented in one t-RFMO region with greater	PNA reports FFA reports	t-RFMO members are sceptical about use of RBM in the high seas and opportunities through which coastal	PNA VDS is effective and operational with greater level of revenues accruing to	National Reports FFA Reports WCPFC Commission Reports	PNA/FFA SIDS remain committed to sub-regional management arrangements

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
management control exercised over fishing fleets and increased economic revenue flows to Small Island Developing States		developing states can participate.	PNA member countries		
Output 1.2.1 Pilot enhanced Rights Based Management system in the Western Pacific Ocean (PNA VDS) implemented	PNA reports on VDS status FFA reports on implementing arrangements	RBM in place but with acknowledged weaknesses	Robust Rights Based Management system in the Western Pacific Ocean (PNA VDS) implemented	Project records	PNA members continue to maintain solidarity on key issues
Output 1.2.2 Lessons learned from RBM pilot implementation shared globally	WWF Progress reports	Many t-RFMO Members are sceptical of the use of RBM for highly migratory species and fear criteria used for catch allocations No systematic RBM workshops presently organized for coastal developing states	Two RBM workshops highlighting social, economic and resource benefits to coastal developing states	Workshop reports	
Component 2: Strengthening and Harmonizing MCS to Address IUU					
Outcome 2.1. Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) systems, particularly those addressing IUU fishing and related activities, are strengthened and harmonized over all five t-RFMOs	t-RFMO Commission and Compliance Committee Reports	Most t-RFMO Members have implemented MCS measures to eliminate IUU fishing. However, some gaps & weaknesses exist at the national levels and measures are not	Ten G-77 countries national institutions strengthened through access to information and new MCS and through greater collaboration of MCS	t-RFMO compliance reports	t-RFMOs remain committed to Kobe Course of Actions

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
		harmonized and integrated at the RFMO level	professionals MCS measures (including minimum substantive criteria for vessel registries, access arrangements, cooperation in vessel surveillance and law enforcement) to eliminate IUU fishing are harmonized across all five t-RFMOs		
Output 2.1.1 Global Best practices for MCS in tuna fisheries prepared and agreed by the five t-RFMOs	FAO publication	No comparative studies addressing MCS best practices in tuna fisheries	MCS Best Practices Report published and submitted to all 5 t-RFMOs and COFI for endorsement	Expert consultation report	Consensus achieved through FAO expert consultation COFI Members endorse best practices
Output 2.1.2. MCS practitioners IUU reporting capacity is enhanced through training in regional cooperation, coordination, information collection and exchange of 100 MCS professionals	Number of MCS operation specialists workshop participants	New skills required as CMMs & MCS arrangements become more comprehensive, sophisticated & complex & the threat of IUU fishing increases	100 MCS operations specialists have enhanced networks, tools and best practices for detecting IUU fishing through participation in two workshops	MCS workshop reports GFETW participation records	National specialists available to take part Countries willing to host & participate in workshops & make staff available for attachments.
Output 2.1.3. Ten G77 National Fisheries offices effectively implement and enforce national and regional MCS measures through training in a new competency	Establishment of competency based certification program Number of certified	No competency based MCS training program for tuna fisheries in IOTC and WCPFC/FFA regions exists	New competency based certification program established	IOTC and WCPFC/FFA annual reports;	National specialists available to take part National specialists available to take part

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
based certification program by 160 national fisheries staff from IOTC/WCPFC regions	national fisheries staff from IOTC/WCPFC regions with increased capacities to effectively implement and enforce national and regional MCS measures	Insufficient capacity in the existing cadre of MCS officers to stem IUU fishing, enforce current regulations and implement best practices	160 certified national fisheries staff from IOTC/WCPFC regions with increased capacities to effectively implement and enforce national and regional MCS measures	Participation records	Countries willing to host & participate in workshops & make staff available for attachments.
Output 2.1.4. PSM Agreement legislation drafted for ten coastal developing states	National legislation	Currently no IOTC developing coastal state members have legislation compliant with IOTC PSM resolution which entered into force on 1 March 2011	Ten coastal states have PSM compliant legislation drafted	Legislative review reports	National specialists available to take part National specialists available to take part
	Number of IOTC coastal states fisheries department officers trained in policy, planning and PSM implementation	No IOTC coastal states fisheries department officers trained in policy, planning and PSM implementation	180 IOTC coastal states fisheries department officers trained in in policy, planning and PSM implementation.	Participation records	
Output 2.1.5 CLAV and GR harmonized to provide a complete record and search tool for tuna vessels authorized to fish in all t-RFMO regions	Number of records of vessels in the CLAV and global record	CLAV 89 % (estimated accurate listings) 0% tuna related vessels >100GT in GR	CLAV and GR harmonized to provide a complete record and search tool for tuna vessels authorized to fish in all t-RFMO regions and all tuna	IOTC reports FAO reports	COFI members remain committed to Global Record t-RFMOs remain committed to Kobe Course of actions

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
			related vessels in excess of 100GT have an IMO number and entered into the “Global Record of Fishing Vessels”		
Outcome 2.2. The number of illegal vessels operating in one t-RFMO is reduced by 20% from the baseline at project start.	Numbers of “black listed” vessels	49 “black listed” tuna vessels currently exist in Commission documents.	61 “black listed” tuna vessels exist in Commission documents.	RFMO compliance reports	t-RFMOs data sharing agreements in place
Output 2.2.1. Pilot trials of Electronic Observer Systems (EOS) aboard tuna longline vessels successfully completed in Fiji with lessons learned and best practices disseminated to sub regional organizations and t-RFMOs for up-scaling.	Fishing License conditions	Systems available and tested in some fisheries but not adopted as viable MCS tools for reducing IUU. Number of human observers to effectively monitor fishing vessels is insufficient	Fleet wide adoption of electronic observer systems in Fiji with results disseminated to sub-regional and regional organizations	Project reports Ministry of Fisheries (Fiji)	EOS hardware is robust for use on vessels Continued industry support for trials Business model and operational costs accepted by industry
Output 2.2.2. Pilot trials of electronic observer systems aboard tuna purse seine vessels successfully completed in Ghana with lessons learned and best practices disseminated to t-RFMOs for up-scaling.	Fishing License conditions	Systems available and tested in some fisheries but not adopted as viable MCS tools for reducing IUU. Number of human observers to	Fleet wide adoption of electronic observer systems in Ghana with results disseminated to sub-regional and regional organizations	Project reports Ministry of Fisheries (Ghana)	EOS hardware is robust for use on vessels Continued industry support for trials Business model and operational costs accepted by industry

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
		effectively monitor fishing vessels is insufficient			
Output 2.2.3. Integrated MCS system in FFA	Number of IUU reports	No actionable targeted intelligence reports/threat assessment presently generated by the FFA MCS cell	Integrated system procedures in place and thirty-three additional actionable targeted intelligence reports/threat assessments received.	Reports	Sub regional and regional management organizations continue to cooperate
Output 2.2.4. Fully compliant Best practices on Traceability / CDS systems developed through assessments of 10 G77 tuna fishery supply chains with weak links identified and recommendations made for improvements to existing systems made available to all five t-RFMOs and their Members.	Number of supply chains analysed	Zero tuna supply chains analysed	10 tuna supply chains analysed with gaps identified and new measures proposed	Technical reports	
		No best practices presently exist	Best practices for specific tuna supply chains published	FAO publication	
Component 3: Reducing Ecosystem Impacts of Tuna Fishing					
Outcome 3.1. WCPFC and IATTC integrate improved bycatch mitigation technologies and practices into their regular management planning process at regional and national levels.	CMMs based on pan Pacific assessments	Bycatch data between t-RFMOs not interoperable t-RFMOs operate independently Kobe Course of actions not implemented	WCPFC and IATTC implement Pan Pacific Shark Management Plan for tuna fisheries	Annual reports by Kobe TWG-Bycatch At least 2 t-RFMOs adopt harmonized data standards and fields (CMM or Data Rules)	Number /type of policies/regulatory frameworks adopted and implemented reported in GEF TT for biodiversity and IW

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
Output 3.1.1. Harmonized and integrated bycatch data collection on sharks from WCPFC and IATTC regions including four additional species assessment (including species risk assessments) and results used for priority setting and development of robust pan pacific Conservation and Management Measures..	t-RFMO Commission Reports	Kobe course of actions agree on need for harmonization and information sharing on bycatch but not carried out	Bycatch Data standards harmonized for sharks from IOTC and WCPFC	Annual reports by GEF ABNJ Shark and Bycatch Coordinator and each t-RFMO	t-RFMOs remain committed to Kobe Corse of actions
		WCPFC has committed to three assessments, all of which are funded	Four new pan Pacific species assessment (including species risk assessments)	t-RFMO Science Committee Reports	
		Stock status of sharks not known	CMMs drafted for sharks	t-RFMO Commission Reports	
Output 3.1.2. A t-RFMO shark data inventory and assessment methods catalogue prepared for one ocean basin with results made available globally		There is no detailed inventory of t-RFMO shark data and no assessment methods catalogue	Detailed inventory of t-RFMO shark data and no assessment methods catalogue	Annual reports by GEF ABNJ Shark and Bycatch Coordinator and each t-RFMO	t-RFMOs remain committed to Kobe Corse of actions
Output 3.1.3. Management decision making processes enhanced and accelerated through all t-RFMOs, their Members, the fishing industry and other stakeholders having access to all relevant material on bycatch management measures and practices in tuna fisheries available in multiple languages through a Global Bycatch Management and Information Portal	Comprehensive Bycatch Management Web Portal	WCPFC specific database only with significant data and knowledge gaps for all other ocean regions	Global Bycatch Management and Information Portal operational	Annual reports by WCPFC and the BMIS contractor (all years) and each t-RFMO (Years 2-5)	t-RFMOs remain committed to Kobe Corse of actions
Outcome 3.2. Bycatch	Percentage of the	ICCAT and IOTC	Threats to seabirds	t-RFMO Scientific	Bycatch mitigation

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
mitigation best practices adopted by at least 40% of the tuna vessels operating in the two t-RFMOs' areas.	tuna vessels operating adopting best practice bycatch mitigation measures	<p>have adopted new CMMs for seabird bycatch in 2011, but currently numbers of vessels actually using best practices may be close to 0 % although exact number is not known.</p> <p>Industry led purse seine bycatch mitigation technologies primarily tested in one ocean region only</p>	<p>from longline fishing abated through implementation of best practice mitigation measures by 40% of the tuna vessels operating in the IOTC and ICCAT fishing areas</p> <p>Threats to small tuna and sharks from purse seine fishing in the abated through demonstration and dissemination of best practice mitigation measures to tuna vessels skippers and crews</p>	<p>and Technical Committee and Commission reports</p> <p>BirdLife International Reports.</p> <p>ISSF reports</p>	technologies are practical, safe to use and vessel operators fully informed on their use and fine tuning.
Output 3.2.1. Longline sea trials in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans demonstrate the effectiveness of seabird mitigation measures by two different fleets in IOTC and ICCAT critical fishing areas which result in bycatch mitigation best practices integrated into the two RFMOs' management planning processes and uptake	Percentage of vessels implementing best practice seabird mitigation measures in IOTC and ICCAT	<p>One longline sea trial designed to promote effective mitigation measures has been conducted for ABNJ fleets in these oceans.</p> <p>The % of vessels currently implementing seabird bycatch mitigation best practices is not</p>	40% of the tuna vessels in IOTC and ICCAT from baseline at project start in two t-RFMO areas implement best practice seabird mitigation measures	Annual reports and papers presented to t-RFMO Scientific Committees	Third-party certification scheme adoption reported in BD TT

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
of bycatch mitigation best practices by at least 40% of the tuna vessels from baseline at project start in two t-RFMO areas.		known			
Output 3.2.2. Purse seine sea trials in one ocean basin demonstrate the effectiveness of small tuna/shark mitigation measures and results disseminated to other ocean regions	Completion of purse seine sea trials demonstrating the effectiveness of small tuna/shark mitigation measures and dissemination of results to other ocean regions	ISSF has conducted 4 research cruises in the Indian Ocean, one each in the eastern and western Pacific. No purse seine sea trials have been conducted yet.	Purse seine sea trials demonstrating the effectiveness of small tuna/shark mitigation measures completed in one ocean basin and results disseminated to other ocean regions	Annual reports and papers presented to t-RFMO Scientific Committees	Fish behaviour and operational patterns of vessels are similar for all ocean regions
Component 4: Information and Best Practices Dissemination, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)					
Outcome 4.1. Evidence that “best practices” from the project are being taken up and replicated elsewhere		No evidence	Replication of project best practices	t-RFMO Reports	Reports of actions at global decision-making fora reported in IW TT
Output 4.1.1 Information, best practices, technical reports on individual components and communication material prepared and delivered to be published on ABNJ web portal demonstrated through monthly updates and publishing of best practices. Project results presented at global decision-making meetings for possible catalytic adoption.	Regular updating of ABNJ Portal with information from this project Publication of best practices and presentation of project results at global decision-making meetings	No tuna project specific updates of ABNJ exist at present. No best practices exist at present	ABNJ Portal monthly updated with information from this project 4 best practices publications published on ABNJ Portal and project results presented at global decision-making meetings	ABNJ Portal updating statistics ABNJ Portal	

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
Output 4.1.2 Synthesis of immediate project results, compilation of catalytic results globally, and projection of feasible next steps toward transformation for the next 5 years		No synthesis or projection exists	Planned components lead to catalytic actions by RFMOs and select countries and these impacts of all project components are documented and expected steps in scaling-up over next 5-years is projected	Synthesis compiled and reasonable scaling-up interventions produced	RFMOs and countries will follow the project strategy and catalytic impacts will result and further progress toward transformation will be feasible.
Output 4.1.3 One percent of IW budget is allocated to IW:LEARN activities during project implementation demonstrated through publishing of 2 project experience notes and 25 key government representatives and project staff supported to participate in GEF IW Biennial Conferences, learning exchanges and key meetings relevant to the project	Project experience notes prepared and published on IW:Learn Number of key government representatives and project staff supported to participate in GEF IW Biennial Conferences, learning exchanges and key meetings relevant to the project	No project experience notes exist at present. No project staff have participated IW:LEARN activities.	2 project experience notes prepared and published on IW:Learn 25 key government representatives and project staff supported to participate in GEF IW Biennial Conferences, learning exchanges and key meetings relevant to the project	IW:LEARN BTORs of participating staff	
Outcome 4.2. Project well monitored and evaluated	Project reports	No Project monitoring and evaluation system in place	Project well managed addressing risks and challenges	Project reports	
Output 4.2.1. Midterm and final evaluations carried out	Project evaluation reports	No evaluations exist at present	Mid-term and terminal evaluations carried out	Evaluation reports	

	Indicators	Baseline	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
and reports available			and evaluation reports prepared and made available		

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

GEF Secretariat (and associated responses by the project preparation team):

Please correct project M&E (Component 4) so that the IW tracking tool is reported three times during project's life (inception, mid-term and closure). Please also add that the project will complete a BD tracking tool at same three times during project's life (inception, mid-term and closure).

Response by the project team

This issue has been addressed under Section I H above.

GEF Agencies:

There were no specific comments to address at the time of CEO endorsement.

Convention Secretariat:

There were no specific comments to address at the time of CEO endorsement.

STAP scientific and technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 11 October, 2011

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

Further guidance from STAP

STAP's advisory response to GEFSEC and FAO was "Minor Revision Required." STAP requested that the following issues be addressed in the full project document:

Regarding the four project components proposed, the first (Promotion of sustainable management (including RBM) of tuna fisheries in accordance with an ecosystem approach) is clearly the most important and challenging and has the potential to lever the greatest impact on the sustainability of tuna fishing, currently the most widespread and economically important fishing in ABNJ. To a large extent the project depends upon the success of introducing ecosystem focused RBM as the preferred method of improved governance and STAP's comments are largely confined to this component.

Response by the Project Team

FAO agrees with the STAP that component one is critical but believes that all components are important for the progression toward the transformation we all seek. Although there is superficially a 3 way split of the GEF resources between Components 1, 2 and 3, the contribution of GEF resources and emphases is much greater than the budget implies. For example, all of the bycatch work is related to applying an EAF approach. The emphasis on sharks recently a topic at CITES and CBD is heavily emphasized and involves two t-RFMOS (ie a pan-pacific approach) that enables the work to be carried out on sharks that encompasses their full geographical distribution. The EM pilot projects will also bring new sets of attention on target and bycatch species interacting with longline and purse seine fisheries.

Noting the importance of EAF, the project formulators have worked hard to ensure broad stakeholder involvement – often cited as a key component of EAF given the large international trade in tuna products. As a consequence, Components 1 and 3 are addressing sustainable management and the issues of EAF. It will take a while for a complete transition to EAF and likely Member States will need to adopt EAF for their own EEZs before they will be totally comfortable with the full concept in ABNJ. This project represents the first step in this transition.

However, coupling these two distinct elements into a five year project cycle is extraordinarily complex for a variety of reasons not the least of which is a desire by the t-RFMOs and their members to embrace RBM, something that needs to be a primary consideration given the consensus approach adopted by most t-RFMOs towards adoption of management measures. On the other hand, all t-RFMOs address EAF as a priority matter. As a consequence, FAO believes a degree of pragmatism is appropriate and that initially, de-coupling EAF and RBM and working on both elements at differential rates has the greatest probability of success.

(a). Essentially the success of the Program depends upon the hypothesis that ecosystem focused RBM is effectively established within the areas of competence of existing RFMOs in conjunction with wide adoption of instruments such as the Port State Measures Agreement. The PFD and PIF 4581, however, give almost no insight into what form(s) of RBM is being contemplated and the possible pathways by which a select number of RFMOs will develop their governance arrangements. STAP could not determine from the PIF what incentives were envisaged that would persuade the RFMOs to move to RBM and attract the fishing industry to comply with ecosystem focused RBM. In particular, little attention was paid to market incentives such as certification of sustainably fished stocks and trade access for guaranteed legally caught fish.

Response by the Project Team

FAO agrees with the point made by STAP. PSM implementation is the focus of much of the work in the IOTC region. FAO also notes that PSM is also being addressed under the OFM regional tuna project. FAO has placed emphasis on implementation of PSM within the IOTC noting that currently this is the only t-RFMO that has adopted a resolution on Resolution 10/11 On Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter And Eliminate Illegal, Unreported And Unregulated Fishing.

Port State Measures (PSM) implementation is the focus of much of the work in the IOTC region. FAO also notes that PSM is also being addressed under the Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) regional tuna project (GCP/RAS/267/GFF). FAO has placed emphasis on implementation of PSM within the IOTC noting that currently this is the only t-RFMO that has adopted a resolution on Resolution 10/11 On Port State Measures To Prevent, Deter And Eliminate Illegal, Unreported And Unregulated Fishing.

Regarding RBM, FAO has concerns with respect to the potential for implementing multi-country RBM in a short time frame and the degree to which consensus organizations such as t-RFMOs currently have support among their full membership to implement RBM. On the other hand, the sub-regional grouping of countries such as the PNA have requested support from the Project to further enhance the Vessel Day Schemes (VDS) for the purse seine skipjack fishery. By setting limits on the number of days purse seine vessels fish, the VDS is a form of rights based management to limit fishing within sustainable levels. However it also has an economic objective of creating competition between Distant Water Fishing Nations (DWFNs) to purchase units of fishing effort in days, at the highest possible price with subsequent benefit to developing countries. Incentives are clearly there for the PNA countries to work towards its effective implementation.

FAO notes the comment of STAP at the PIF stage concerning market incentives. Following submission of the PIF, FAO has included a third party certification body as a project partner. Moreover, several project activities are centered around fisheries which already have provisional certification (PNA free set school purse seine fishery for skipjack) or are in the process of seeking certification (e.g., Southern Pacific Albacore longline fishery). Moreover, the Project also has ISSF as a partner. ISSF has adopted conservation measures under its principle of governance and supports certification programs that meet the 2005 eco-labeling guidelines of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

(b). In the full project proposal and to assist M&E, STAP encourages the proponents to be more forthcoming on what forms of rights are being contemplated, and the likely pathways for achieving RBM systems in respective RFMOs, given their evident differences. Also, at the stage of full proposal/project development, the tuna-RFMOs chosen or volunteering for RBM development should be identified in order to permit greater specificity of planning and milestones for M&E. Once the two t-RFMOs are chosen, the elements for the ecosystem focus will also be able to be defined, as these differ to some extent from region to region. In the PIF, the ecosystem focus is as vague as the RBM measures, and yet this is another challenging area. The ecosystem approach with risk-based assessment, in PIF 4660 should be examined by the proponents of the present project. Likewise, this project could examine the feasibility of spatial planning approaches. Although tuna stocks are highly migratory, the ocean and its biodiversity are highly structured in time and space. For example, migration corridors have been identified for several mega-fauna in the Pacific ocean and seasonal exclusion zones for fishing might be possible as part of bycatch reduction and ecosystem based management.

Response by the Project Team

FAO notes the points raised by STAP. The selection of t-RFMO region is WCPFC and the approach taken is to strengthen existing efforts taken regarding the PNA VDS. The key t-RFMO region is WCPFC.

Although there is superficially a three way split of the GEF resources between Components 1, 2 and 3, the contribution of GEF resources and emphases to EAF is much greater than the budget implies. For example, all of the bycatch work is related to applying an EAF approach. The emphasis on sharks recently a topic at CITES and CBD, is heavily emphasized and involves two t-RFMOS (i.e. a pan-Pacific approach) that enables the work to be carried out on sharks that encompasses their full geographical distribution. The Electronic Monitoring (EM) pilot projects will also bring new sets of attention on target and bycatch species interacting with longline and purse seine fisheries. Noting the importance of EAF, the project formulators have worked hard to ensure broad stakeholder involvement – often cited as a key component of EAF given the large international trade in tuna products. As a consequence, Components 1 and 3 are addressing sustainable management and the issues of EAF.

The approach taken on Rights Based approaches is to strengthen existing efforts taken regarding the PNA VDS. A total cap on days is expected to be implemented in the region along with closure of FADs that can assist the rights-based scheme in sustaining populations of target species as well as reducing bycatch. For M & E purposes as identified by STAP FFA should be able to provide effectiveness data regarding periodic FAD closures. The periodic closures represent the start of implementing spatial management measures and contribute to the ecosystem focus STAP outlines. Risk based assessment will also form part of the workshops planned in each t-RFMO region. The opportunity for spatial planning approaches will be considered as part of a suite of tools that are available for managing bycatch interactions with commercial fishing operations.

FAO acknowledges the importance of a region-by-region approach. The approach taken has been to identify ecosystem components that can be effectively addressed within the scope of the project cycle and prioritized. These include: sharks (WCPFC-IATTC) and seabirds (IOTC-ICCAT regions). Additionally, the periodic FAD closures in the South Pacific have important ecosystem benefits.

FAO notes the possibility of spatial planning approaches as one of several important tools for managing bycatch and fish –fishing gear interactions.

FAO agrees with GEFSTAP regarding risk based assessments. These will form part of the workshops planned in each t-RFMO region. The opportunity for exploring more widespread spatial planning approaches is included in this first project in several ways. The associated certification opportunities provide spatial differences in management of ecosystems as do the expected albacore and seabird pilots. The periodic FAD closures described earlier are spatial management measures, and the biological monitoring/assessments supported in this project will provide critical information upon which future spatial planning can be justified. As with EAF, Member States need

more experience with spatial planning in their EEZs before they become more comfortable with the concept in ABNJ. This project helps kick-start the transition needed globally.

FAO notes the possibility and once again identified the periodic closure of FADs in the South Pacific as important pilots for bycatch reduction and ecosystem-based management.

(c). The choice of t-RFMOs (one for RBM, one for IUU and two for by catch reduction components) will be critical to the impact of the project. On the one hand, IATTC is likely the most advanced in terms of management arrangements, but the WCPFC is responsible for the largest tuna fisheries.

Response by the Project Team

The WCPFC has been selected as the primary focus for RBM. One of the EM system pilots intended to significantly increase the quality and quantity of bycatch information coming from Southern Pacific Albacore fishery (IUU) will be in the WCPFC region (Fiji), the other EM pilot is in the ICCAT region (Ghana). Bycatch reduction will focus on seabirds in two ocean regions (Southern Atlantic and Southern Indian Ocean) within the IOTC and ICCAT regions. The other bycatch reduction work will be in the WCPFC region and include addressing the problem of purse seine sets on whale sharks. IOTC has been selected as the focus of implementation of PSM.

FAO notes the points raised about IATTC and WCPFC and agrees with the comments. Having two adjacent RFMOs work collaboratively on bycatch species increases the probability that CMMs will cover their full geographic distribution.

(d). STAP questions whether the aim to improve ecosystem-based management across all 5 t-RFMOs will be achievable in the timeframe. MCS improvements may be more generally feasible across RFMOs as many of the same fishing countries are involved.

Response by the Project Team

FAO notes the comment of STAP and agrees that improved ecosystem-based management across all 5 t-RFMOs within the timeframe is questionable. Notwithstanding, threats to specific ecosystem components can be addressed by pilot management actions and processes of harmonization and standardization of data for specific bycatch components is achievable and will lay the foundation for future work. FAO also agrees that MCS improvements are more likely to be accomplished but is hopeful that step-by-step progress toward the Kobe Process agreed commitments can be made in this decadal scale transformation process being initiated by GEF and partners.

Council Members

There were no specific comments to address at the time of CEO endorsement.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 350,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stakeholder consultations and consensus building	37,839	37,839	0
Assessment of tuna resources and management scenarios associated with planned project activities	62,700	62,700	0
Capacity needs assessment at the national level	46,965	46,965	0
Identification and initial design of pilot demonstration systems and activities	144,050	144,050	0
Design and agreement reached on implementation, roles and responsibilities and final design of project completed	58,446	58,446	0
Total	350,000	350,000	0

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA