



[Home](#) [RoadMap](#)

# Common Oceans - Sustainable utilization and conservation of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction

[Review PIF and Make a recommendation](#)

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10548

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Common Oceans - Sustainable utilization and conservation of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction

**Agencies**

FAO, UNEP, UNDP

**Date received by PM**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/17/2020

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

PFD

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

## **Agency Response**

### **Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes components included in this program, has been adequately described.

- 1) However, please ensure that the child projects all will be developing tangible, quantifiable targets. the current wording in the concepts included, are all rather generic and have a tendency to highlight output indicators that are not quantifiable.
- 2) Please ensure that there is conformity between the way the child project concepts are listing agencies at the top of the page
- 3) Please ensure that all child projects clearly elaborate on their delivery towards, and links with, the SDG 14 targets (and others as appropriate). This set of investments are to further deliver towards the global shared resource of the ABNJ, therefore it is critical to spell out the clear linkages and deliverables towards the global discourse.
- 4) Please include as part of the outreach delivery of each child project, that they will produce info packages that will be able to inform national governments and regional entities, such as EU and UN, political decision making process.
- 5) Please insert where appropriate, in the program description and the child project descriptions linkages to the ongoing BBNJ process.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): partly addressed.

- 1) Cross sectoral Child project includes outputs that are formulated more as processes and are too lengthy. on the other hand, the outcomes includes are formulated more like outputs, even though still too lengthy. Please adjust
- 2-5) Addressed

New review comment: It seems that the UNDP child project mistakenly is listing countries, where it should have said GLOBAL, as all these child projects are dealing with issues in the open ocean. Please edit.

17th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

22nd of April 2020 (cseverin): Please correct the program commitment deadline, it should be December 5, 2021 and not 12/13/2021

23rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

**23 Apr 2020**

Addressed

**17 Apr 2020**

Addressed and revised versions uploaded

## **Earlier response**

**1) Tuna:** Immediate outcomes and outputs have been reformulated and indicators have been added to the outcomes listed in the table “Projects Components and Finance”

**DSP:** Indicators will be further elaborated during PPG, in addition to those presented in detail in Annex 1.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** We have strengthened all indicators to ensure that they are more specific and measurable. For example, we have highlighted the number of capacity building sessions that will be undertaken in each Pilot region; the number of participants we wish to reach; the number of institutional mechanisms that will be identified and co-developed with regional partners; the number of participatory capacity-building events that will be organized. We have also highlighted the anticipated number of side events to be carried out at high-level meetings such as the UN BBNJ meetings and other Oceans and Sustainable Development-relevant events (for example, the UN Ocean Conference). See the Project Components and Financing Table, pages 1-7.

**Sargasso Sea:** Quantified targets are identified already under the Project Outputs and will be further elaborated and quantified in the Results Framework during the PPG process before final submission.

**GCP:** Output 1.2.1 and 1.3.1 edited to include products that can be measured as well as their dissemination/downloads; Output 2.1.1 ; 2.1.2 and 2.3.1 have a basis for measurable targets (downloads of products); 2.2.1 can measure number trained with tools and tool uptake/use

2)

We have agreed to a consistent way to list the agencies.

3)

**Tuna:** This has been addressed under **Engagement with the Global / Regional Framework in section 3.**

**DSP:** Linkages mentioned in Outcome 2.3 under 2d; SDG 14.5 in Note 1 of Annex 1; SDG 14.4 in Note (3) of Annex 1. Added SDG 14.2 under core indicator 5 in Note 2 of Annex 1. Section on SDGs added in 3 “Engagement with Global/Regional frameworks.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** For the Cross sectoral project we have included text the 2030 Agenda and associated Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework; and upcoming UN Decade of Action and UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development. These processes will reiterate the importance of integrated, cross-sectoral management to achieve a global sustainable resource use

**Sargasso Sea:** Page 4 of the Concept Document for Sargasso Sea clearly lists each of the SDG 14 targets that this project will be addressing.

**GCP:** Page 7 paragraph edited to include and provide more specifics on SDGs.

4)

**Tuna:** Added text under page 14, Component 4

**DSP:** Added text under Component 4 of 2d.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** We have inserted relevant text under Engagement with the Global/Regional Framework. See pages 16-17.

**Sargasso Sea:** Appropriate wording has been added in the Project Components Table and in the descriptive Component 4 text on P. 14 to the effect of “Information packages will be developed and disseminated which target appropriate government bodies and regional entities (both for participating partners and for the BBNJ community as a whole) and provide descriptions and updates on management and decision-making processes”.

**GCP:** Page 13 text added.

5)

At the program level, there are clear connections to the BBNJ process. See, in the PFD, paras 50, on the baseline: paragraphs 78 through 81. Paragraph 121 on the role of outcome 3.2. Paragraph 145 on the multi-sectoral coordination preparation under the BBNJ. See all projects outcomes of the Cross-Sectoral Project, listed in

the summary table on page 59. Section 7, paragraph 204, on the contributions of the Program to capacity building for better participation of eligible countries in the BBNJ process.

Finally, note on page 65, paragraph 226, how the third project is fully focused on the support to future BBNJ participants. Furthermore, the fourth project, on the Sargasso Sea, can be viewed as a pilot of cooperative management across initiatives and sectors of a unique marine ecosystem.

**Tuna:** References included in page 15.

**DSP:** Whereas there are some linkages, the DSF project is not there to support the BBNJ process. Sentence added under 3 “Other international bodies”.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** Linkages to the BBNJ process may be found throughout the Cross-Sectoral Project. In particular, Outcome 2.3 focuses on providing support to the BBNJ process (see page 14).

**Sargasso Sea:** Addressed in Sargasso Child project on pages 15, 16 and 19.

**GCP:** Page 13 text added as noted above includes reference to BBNJ process; other paragraphs provide linkages to the BBNJ already in the document.

#### **Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly,

- 1) Please ensure that government financing is not tagged as OTHERS, but correctly as Governments or whatever the correct descriptor may be.
- 2) Please carefully go through cofinancieng list, it seems that some cofinanieng sources have been listed as grant financing, while also being described as recurrent expenditure. This may indeed be correct, but please carefully go through the co-financing section.
- 3) Please at time of Endorsement, do not bunch the cofinancing into consolidated cofinanicng lines, but rather have single lines for the different financiers.
- 4) Please expand on the supporting description of how investment mobilized was identified for each of the entries. the text included is too generic at this time.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

22nd of April 2020 (cseverin): Please address following points:

1. Please note that "government" co-financing is considered only for the recipient country governments, as such co-financing from European Commission and NOAA should be listed as "donor Agency".
2. Similarly for the co-financing from "Governments of France New Zealand Portugal Netherlands Singapore European Commission Norway Sweden", which should be included as donor agency co-financing.
3. Please confirm and explain that the in-kind co-financing from "UNDOALOS IOC/UNESCO CBD Secretariat IMO UNDP World Tourism Organization Pacific Islands Forum..." is investment mobilized. Where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized ". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines.

23rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

#### **Agency Response**

**23 Apr 2020**

All points addressed, thank you. On point 3 specifically: these sources come from a number of ongoing projects managed by the institutions clustered in the table. These are mostly grants (change made in the portal). The Agency will make sure that these sources are accurately split at CEO Endorsement.

#### **Earlier response**

**1)**

Noted and done.

**2)**

Noted and done.

**3)**

Noted, single lines for each co-financier to be presented at CEO endorsement.

4)

**Tuna:** The individual instances of the investment mobilized have been identified

**DSP:** The co-financing table has been revised. Upon further reading of GEF guidelines, co-financing has been reclassified.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** We included a footnote to elaborate on the investment mobilized. See page 7.

**Sargasso Sea:** The following Footnotes have been added to the Child project co-financing table with a line briefly describing the nature of the co-finance.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, please include the ppg costs to the annex A that has been included in the program document entry. Currently Annex A only includes the project amount and fees, not the PPG. It would be helpful if the matrix included all financing requested.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Solutions found, hence comment is addressed

**Agency Response** Done in the matrix included Annex A of the PFD.

The STAR allocation?

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

#### **Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Program does not include request for ppg funds, these request on the other hand sit in the child projects and they are in coherence with the GEF guidance.

### **Agency Response**

#### **Core indicators**

#### **6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): No, please reassess following indicators:

- 1) Core indicator 8. Even though the expected delivery will be substantial towards achieving this indicator (~26 %), the size of the fisheries that will primarily be part of this set of investments, namely deep sea fisheries and in particular tuna fisheries, are representing very large amounts of landed fish annually, hence a larger amount of fish moved from being over-exploited to more sustainable harvesting levels would be expected. Please consider if there is scope to increase the delivery towards core indicator 8.
- 2) Core Indicator 11. This investment is to target the ABNJ, hence it seems that an expected ~17000 of beneficiaries of this investment may be a relatively conservative estimate, please consider if this can be increased.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

1)

Mathematically, there is no room for further expansion, as most of the current catch (e.g. 83% of the total catch of tuna) comes from stocks that are already fished at sustainable levels, compatible with management targets levels (e.g. Maximum sustainable yield in many cases). So the catch that can be moved from overfished to 'more sustainable harvest' is that 17% remaining, or 893,000 mt, to which we add the 50,000 mt identified by the Deep-Sea Project. The only way to increase the

number of mt would be to increase the total catch, which would not be sustainable. As it is written, it essentially says that the totality of the catch will be at sustainable levels after the project, an ambitious goal.

2)

Figures have been revised for the projects to the extent feasible.

**Tuna:** Figures were increased. A more precise estimate will require updated figures for levels of employment in the processing sector, which are not available at this stage.

**DSP:** Figures were increased. We included a section in 2b on gender and increased number of beneficiaries

**Cross-sectoral Capacity** In agreement with the need for greater ambition, we have increased the number of target beneficiaries to 3,500 for the Cross-Sectoral Project (aiming for 50% participation by women and 50% by men). It is important to note, also, that these beneficiaries will be “opinion leaders” who will, in turn, influence others. See pages 10 and 20.

**Sargasso Sea:** Sargasso Child project provided 9,000 of the total indicated 17,000 beneficiaries of the ABNJ programme.

**GCP:** The work in Component 3 may connect to women entrepreneurs – but that would be one (optimistically) so I don’t think GCP can add to the figure already there.

#### **Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** 3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

#### **Agency Response**

#### **Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly,

- 1) Please add references to the TWAP findings on the ABNJ and interconnectivity between LMEs and the ABNJ space.
- 2) Please add references to and explain links to global frameworks, such as the SDGs, and in particular SDG 14, but also others are relevant, the High Level Panel of sustainable Ocean Economy and the Friends of Ocean Action. Moreover, certain well-functioning regional frameworks, such as WCPFC, Nauru Agreement would also be good to add reference to and explain their functionality, as part of the justification.
- 3) under thematic Area a, please consider to reference existing innovative financing schemes that function within the LMEs and that may offer certain lessons learned that potentially can be deployed in the ABNJ space, such as the Meloy Fund and the Seychelles Blue Bond.
- 4) in para 80, please consider to reference the WCPFC, as an example of a well functioning mechanism to facilitate cooperation between the regional level and country level.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

**1)**

**PFD** Wording added on page 21, as part as addressing the baseline

**Cross-sectoral Capacity** We added relevant text under 2. Project Overview and Approach b) Describe the existing or planned baseline investments, including current institutional framework. See page 12.

**2)**

There is no collaboration in the traditional sense between the PNA and the WCPFC. The Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) form a subset of the membership of the WCPFC that, conscious that they have the most abundant tuna fishery in the world and 70-75% of the catches in the region come from their EEZs, giving the PNA a strong negotiating position vis-à-vis the distant-water fishing nations seeking licenses. This does not happen in other oceans, where most fishing takes place in the ABNJ. The PNA translate the WCPFC regular quota recommendations (coming from WCPFC scientific recommendations) to a Total Allowable Effort for the PNA EEZ's that then gets auctioned among distant-water fishing nations, in a system called Vessel-Day Scheme. The scheme has been very successful in generating additional income for the PNA countries, but it is an allocation of rights mechanism, not a system that would ensure sustainability per se, nor a mechanism for collaboration with WCPFC.

Anyway, if we want to cite examples of regional collaboration in the tuna world, we have ten years of collaboration between ICCAT and the Sargasso Sea Commission, soon to expanded to contacts with NEAFC, to collaborate in a more multi-sectoral preservation of a unique ecosystem.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** We have highlighted how the project will work towards supporting regional and global entities (and their Member States) to progress towards the implementation of a new BBNJ agreement, and towards global targets, such as SDG14 (specifically targets 14.2, 14.5, 14.4 and 14.C). The project will also pursue practical and catalytic outcomes, and stimulate stronger, more coordinated linkages across relevant global processes through direct engagement with global and regional ocean groups and dialogues, such as High Level Panel on Sustainable Ocean Economy and Friends of Ocean Action.

**Sargasso Sea:**

The following text has been added on P. 16 of Sargasso Child under the section on Engagement with the Global / Regional Framework: “The Project also aligns with the findings of the High-Level Panel on Sustainable Ocean Economy through a number of their Blue Papers as shown below”: A short table of comparison is then provided.

3)

**FAO| Thematic Area a0 is under “Root Causes, Drivers and Barriers” so, instead, we added the following text under “Section 1.a. 2) the baseline scenario and any associated baseline program/ projects”:**

There are innovative financing solutions, creating incentives for sustainability in Areas Within National Jurisdiction (AWNJ) that can provide examples and lessons that can be adapted at the ABNJ. We mention here two of them: the Meloy Fund and the Seychelles Blue Bonds.

***Meloy Fund***

The Meloy Fund for Sustainable Community Fisheries is an impact investment fund that incentivizes the development and adoption of sustainable fisheries by making debt and equity investments in fishing-related enterprises that support the recovery of coastal fisheries in Indonesia and the Philippines, offering an opportunity for local fishers to secure more sustainable livelihoods. The Fund’s investors and partners include the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Conservation International, the US Agency for International Development (USAID), among others.

In addition to providing a reasonable financial return, the Fund is projected to have a positive impact on the lives of 100,000 fisher household members, and place 1.2 million hectares of coastal habitats under improved management over its ten-year life.

To achieve sustainability in overfished environments, fishers must reduce fishing effort such that fish stocks may recover. To enable this transition, the Meloy Fund will employ two primary value creation strategies: 1) investing in supply chain and production efficiencies, waste-reduction, aggregation, and value-added processing that either reduce costs or improve revenues for local fishermen and 2) investing in fishing-related activities, including ocean-based aquaculture, that can be tied to explicit reductions in fishing pressure, allowing recoveries of stock to take place.

In addition to the above, the Fund may pursue alternative strategies to financing fisheries recovery, including investing in ecotourism, green infrastructure, and climate-smart products, among others.

***Seychelles Blue Bonds***

On October 2018, the Government of Seychelles announced the issuance of the world’s first sovereign Blue Bond. The blue bond is a debt instrument issued by governments, development banks or others to raise capital from impact investors to finance marine and ocean-based projects that have positive environmental, economic and climate benefits. The blue bond is inspired by the green bond concept, which people are more familiar with.

As the economy grew and fisheries became more exploited, the Seychelles recognized the need to rebuild and sustainably utilized fish stocks through improved governance and management of the sector. However, the costs of transitioning to sustainable fisheries can be substantial for a small island state, both in terms of management costs and the socio-economic losses as fish stocks are recovering.

Seychelles was keen to explore innovative financial instruments for its development agenda, particularly since its graduation to a high-income country, which limits its access to grants and donor aid.

The sovereign blue bond was issued with a ceiling value of US\$15 million, with a maturity of 10 years. The blue bond, as well as the program of marine and ocean-related activities it will support, was prepared with assistance from the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility.

The main beneficiaries are Seychellois whose livelihoods depend on marine resources and the ocean. This includes artisanal and semi-industrial fishers, operators in tourism and seafood value chains, including aquaculture; national and local institutions engaged in the management of marine resources, including fishers' associations and government entities. Ultimately, the general population will benefit from a healthier marine environment and increased food security.

The project will strengthen Seychelles' resilience to the impacts of climate change. This will be made possible with the expansion of the marine protected areas network to 30% of their EEZ and the promotion of sustainable fisheries through proper control and management as the project's ecosystem-based adaptation approach. The project complements the debt-for-nature swap that Seychelles did in 2015 with The Nature Conservancy in exchange for greater ocean protection and climate change adaptation. This project will also help Seychelles to diversify its economy and reduce its vulnerability to climate change by adopting climate-smart ocean economies. This will be through the expansion of the seafood value chains.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** Relevant text has been added under 2. Project Overview and Approach d) Describe the project's incremental reasoning for GEF financing under the program, including the results framework and components. See page 15.

4)

**PFD** The paragraph 80 that you refer talks about the collaboration between an RFMO (NEAFC) and OSPAR as an example of cross-sectoral collaboration. The relationship between WCPFC and the Nauru Agreement is not really a cooperation.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** The WCPFC is invited to participate in and to co-finance the project, and is being considered as a pilot region for this project, among other regions, together with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat. See co-financing table (page 8), Annex B (pages 18-19), Annex 1 (page 21).

## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please include as part of the baseline that this project will be building on, the current global discourse on the topic of ABNJ, in fora such as HLP, FOA and SDG 14 in general.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

**PFD** This Program will build directly on, and contribute to, the public debate and discourse on the actions needed to address conservation and sustainable use of the ocean. As such is aligned with the philosophy and the concepts behind the actions of the High Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy and Friends of the Oceans (see further details in the text added to the baseline section 1.2 a)

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** For the cross sectoral project these have been mentioned in the project concept as mentioned above.

**Sargasso Sea:** Already Addressed in Sargasso Child Concept Note

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly.

1) please strengthen the private sector engagement strategy description during the program and project preparation, including long-term sustainability strategy

2) Please ensure to include linkages between the child projects and the program as such to the ongoing BBNJ process

3) It is not enough that the program includes specific wording on IWLEARN and its delivery towards supporting a number of IWLEARN activities. this should also be included in each of the child projects. Please recall that each investment (the child projects) should be allocating a minimum of 1% of the GEF IW funding towards supporting production of a website that follows IWLEARN guidance, atleast two experience notes, participation in IWCs held during the project implementation period as well as topical and regional events hosted by IWLEARN during project period.

4) Please work on the program/project outcome and output level indicators. as currently listed (eg om pp 80), all outcome level indicators are very generic. For a global program, with substantial grant financing as this one, clear quantifiable stress reduction deliverables are expected, not only assessments, tools and roadmaps developed.

5) for UNEP child project. The project descriptions indicates that the regions of engagement will be decided during project preparation. However, the project brief includes a detailed assessment of Abijan and Nairobi Convention and Permanent commission for South Pacific. It is believed that there may be other regions that are more appropriate for illustrating cross sectoral cooperation and coordination, such as Bay of Bengal, Western Central Pacific, Caribbean.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly Addressed:

1,2,3 & 5: ADDRESSED

4) As indicated above, the cross sectoral child project results framework have two issues that needs to be addressed: 1) the outcomes and outputs are extremely lengthy and wordy. please shorten and make more precise, 2) the sentences inserted under outputs, seems to be outcomes and the sentences included under outcomes reads as outputs. Please change this.

17th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

**17 Apr 2020**

Addressed and revised version uploaded in the roadmap section

#### **1)PFD: Added at the end of section 1.a.3. There is also new text under Section 4 “Private Sector” :**

In the preparation of the Program and the activities to be conducted under the projects, the private sector continues to play a key role, as it was the case during the design and execution of the GEF-5 Progra. As a notable example, the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), that gathers participating seafood processors, retailers, scientists and WWF in a foundation that has been very proactive in supporting the scientific recommendations at the RFMOs, and in conducting work towards developing actions towards mitigating bycatch of fisheries, primarily purse-seine fisheries, and supporting a number of other direct interventions, including direct co-financing.

ISSF was joined by organizations of fishing vessels owners, such as CEPESCA (Confederación Española de Pesca) and OPAGAC (Organización de Productores de Atún Congelado) and, more recently, TUNACONS (Tuna Conservation Group).

In all cases, the participation of the private sector initiatives is not limited to providing direct support to the activities planned. As part of the overall strategy to push for a durable positive impact, the Program will continue to work to have private sector to work within delegations at the RFMOs and, in some cases, as observers, to create a favorable environment for the adoption of conservation and management measures. Formal adoption of measures addressing issues hampering sustainable management is the first step to ensure a permanent change. The second step is to ensure that member States implement effectively those measures and the private sector also has a role working with the administrations of the State where they conduct operations to promote compliance with regulations.

**DSP:** Added a short section under section 3 called “Private sector”.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** This has been strengthened in the Cross-Sectoral project. See page 15.

**Sargasso Sea:** Sargasso Child project identifies a number of PS linkages – these will be further explored and strengthened during PPG.

2)

**PFD:** There has been multiple linkages identified and described, as indicated above with the current and the coming BBNJ process, throughout the PFD.

**Tuna:** no comment

**DSP:** Added some text to DSF CN in Component 4

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** Linkages to the BBNJ process may be found throughout the Cross-Sectoral project, building on strong participation in the BBNJ process by the ABNJ Capacity Project in phase I of the Common Oceans Program. See in particular, page 13.

**Sargasso Sea:** Already covered in Sargasso Sea Child Concept

**GCP:** This is done throughout the PIF – see above for similar response.

3)

**Tuna** Text added in the relevant section.

**DSP:** Added section on outreach in Component 3

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** The Cross-Sectoral project describes in detail its involvement in the IW process, including participation in IW topical/regional meetings (not just the Biennial IWC). See the Project Components and Financing Table, Outcome 2.2 targets, page

**Sargasso Sea:** Appropriate text has been added under the Sargasso Child Component 4 description on P. 16 (“1% of the child project budget will be dedicated to GEF IW portfolio learning activities through engagement in a range of IW:LEARN activities such as biennial GEF IW Conferences, website support, thematic meetings (annual LME meeting), etc.”) as well as briefly highlighted in the Project Components Table.

**GCP:** Text inserted – see page 13 Component 2.

4)

**FAO:** PFD text has been modified to reflect the modifications provided by the child projects.

**Tuna:** Outcome reformulated, and output level indicators added

**DSP:** We decided to leave the outputs as we have them in the DSF CN, as we feel they are appropriate and quantifiable. As mentioned, indicators will be further elaborated during PPG, building on those presented in Annex 1.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** As noted above, more quantifiable outcome and output indicators have been included in the Cross-Sectoral project. See the Project Components and Financing Table, pages 1-7.

**GCP:** No comments at this stage.

5)

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** The regions noted by GEFSEC—Bay of Bengal, Western Central Pacific, Caribbean, have been added to the existing list of possible regions (Pacific Islands region, Abidjan Convention, Nairobi Convention, Permanent Commission for South Pacific). As well, a preliminary set of criteria for selecting suitable regions has been developed. This is found, especially, in Annex 1. See Annex B (pages 18-19) and Annex 1 (page 21).

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly, as described above, please reassess the impacts of the program, to both indicator 8 and 11.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

**Agency Response** Please see response to part I comment 6.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, there is scope (and need) for innovative solutions within the ABNJ space to drive towards sustainability.

- 1) Please expand on the importance of private sector and its role for the sustainability of the proposed investments under this program.
- 2) please expand on the importance outreach plays in order to activate the consumer base, towards triggering behavioral change, both in relation to advocacy and consumer habits.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

**Agency Response**

1)

**PFD:** Text was added at the end of section 1.a.3, in particular on the role of innovations in financing mechanisms. There is also text in Section 4, Private Sector.

**GCP:** text was added on baseline of innovative financing mechanisms.

2)

**PFD: Added at the end of section 1.a 7):**

Outreach is a key instrument in support of international cooperation initiatives with the purpose to achieve behavioural changes among people.

Much like businesses using advertisement to increase product sales, this type of communication uses high quality content, or storytelling by its current name, carefully designed to resonate powerfully with strategically selected target audiences, inspiring loyalty and advocacy.

Typically, action would be organised around a campaign that focusses on a particular issue of public concern, such as plastic pollution in the oceans, with the aim to meaningfully engage the audience by offering them concrete options. This is to encourage citizens or consumers to take action in a direction that will lead to outcomes that are part of key strategic objectives of the initiative in question.

Such action can be geared towards activities galvanising people's political engagement, inviting citizens to put pressure on decision makers to make choices in favour of outcomes in line with the strategic objectives. Action can also offer consumers options to change their behaviour in ways that would lead to desired outcomes. A typical example would be a campaign to incite people to buy certified fish.

It should be noted that for this type of outreach to be effective, i.e. to have a real impact people's behaviour, it is important to tailor the outreach efforts. The more beneficial the activities are to the targeted audience, the greater the retention will be. This requires highly specialized and labour-intensive operations are needed, including audience analyses to identify relevant actions. At the same time, robust and equally high-specialized operations are required to be able to measure if the outreach activities have effectively led to desired changes in people's behaviour.

**DSP:** A section on outreach added to Section 4, but we are not sure the ABNJ DSF have much of a consumer base (mostly high end).

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** Not relevant for this project, no action.

**Sargasso Sea:** The following text has been added to Component 2: Improved Knowledge Base to Support a Collaborative, Adaptive Ecosystem-Based Stewardship Approach on P. 12 – “Where appropriate, the project will use this EDA process to develop closer links with the Private Sector, engaging them into the discussions on threats and root causes as a prelude to development of the SAP (see below)”. Further text has been added to Component 3: Development of a Strategic Action Programme for addressing Threats and Strengthening the Stewardship and Conservation of the Sargasso Sea Ecosystem on P. 14 – “The Project will engage with the Private Sector where appropriate in helping to define the feasible actions to address impacts with their root causes in that sector” and “As with defining the appropriate actions to address and mitigate impacts, the SAP development process will include close engagement with and input from the Private Sector as important potential partners thus ensuring their full engagement and contribution to the immediate and longer term sustainability of actions committed to under the SAP”.

#### **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, maps have been included in previous submission too and it seems that portal now captures comments entered.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly

1) Please explain why local communities is not a stakeholder that will be part of this program. It indeed seems counterintuitive when on pg 69 para 2, the importance of engagement with local communities has been highlighted. Please strongly consider to include local communities.

2) In para two under civil society Org, please include UNESCO IOC. unless they should be included in a separate category, that would also include the IFIs. Please consider if it would be appropriate to include a new category, that could include relevant UN bodies and the IFIs. It should be noted that a number of the IFIs, have specific strategies focused on ocean financing, hence IFIs may indeed be very relevant towards sustaining and building on this program and its child projects and the outputs and outcomes they will deliver.

3) the section omits important stakeholders such as European Space Agency and NASA, please consider to include where appropriate.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

**Agency Response**

1)

**PFD**

**Added to Section 2, Stakeholders:**

***Local communities***

Local communities, in the cases where their well-being depends on the activities in the ABNJ, will be considered as stakeholders and will be included in the consultative process. However, given the nature of the ABNJ space, the impact on local communities is more indirect, affecting, for example, communities that supply

labor to the industry, like workers at landing ports or workers further down the supply chain in processing facilities. In many cases, the interests of local communities are already incorporated into the management initiatives, and are active, as constituencies of RFMO member States.

Also, the Sargasso Sea is also relevant to fisheries at the community level outside the geographical project area but in the countries that are partners in the project. There is a local fishery for glass eels in Hispaniola (Haiti and DR) but not in the Bahamas.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** National governments and local communities are very important in the work of the Cross-Sectoral project. While working on capacity building in different regions and with a range of regional entities, it will be essential to consider the perspectives of the national entities, and their localities, on the opportunities and issues, and to consider specifically the connectivity between EEZs and ABNJ and impacts on local communities. On page 17, we mention building on and strengthening local innovations and good capacity building practices while filling gaps for global participation.

**Sargasso Sea:** Text added on P. 7 of Sargasso Child on description of fisheries related to Sargasso Sea reads “The Sargasso Sea is also relevant to fisheries at the community level outside the geographical project area but in the countries that are partners in the project. There is a local fishery for glass eels in Hispaniola (Haiti and DR) but not in the Bahamas. Only limited information exists on the extent of harvesting in Algeria or Morocco. The latter has indicated that all fishing is done by a commercial aquaculture firm. There is similar lack of knowledge on who fishes in Algeria. There are some indigenous communities (such as the Amazigh) are on the coast of North Africa and the PPG will aim to explore whether there is any overlap with these”.

2)

**PFD:** We can add IOC, but under other international organizations, as they are not a civil society organization. **Added to Section 2, Stakeholders:**

#### *Other UN organizations*

Apart from the UN specialized agencies that are directly engaged as implementing agencies, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO (IOC-UNESCO), a body with functional autonomy within UNESCO, is the only competent organization for marine science within the UN system. The purpose of the Commission is to promote international cooperation and to coordinate programs in research, services and capacity-building, in order to learn more about the nature and resources of the ocean and coastal areas and to apply that knowledge for the improvement of management, sustainable development, the protection of the marine environment, and the decision-making processes of its Member States. In addition, IOC is recognized through the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) as the competent international organization in the fields of Marine Scientific Research (Part XIII) and Transfer of Marine Technology (Part XIV).

In particular, IOC is at the core of the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development (2021-2030) to support efforts to reverse the cycle of decline in ocean health and gather ocean stakeholders worldwide behind a common framework that will ensure ocean science can fully support countries in creating improved conditions for sustainable development of the Ocean. IOC will coordinate the Decade's preparatory process, inviting the global ocean community to plan for the next ten years in ocean science and technology. IOC will be a partner in the Cross-Sectoral Child Project.

#### *International Financial Institutions (IFIs)*

International financial institutions and, in particular, multilateral development banks (MDBs) who provide financing and professional advising for the purpose of development will be essential stakeholders for the projects. MDBs could finance projects in the form of long-term loans at market rates, very-long-term loans (also known as credits) below market rates, and through grants, and could be instrumental in implementing some of the innovative financing mechanisms to be proposed under the Global Coordination Project. What follows are some examples of initiatives:

PROBLUE is a new Multi-Donor Trust Fund, housed at the World Bank, that supports the development of integrated, sustainable and healthy marine and coastal resources. With the Blue Economy Action Plan as its foundation, PROBLUE contributes to the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 (SDG 14) and is

fully aligned with the World Bank's twin goals of ending extreme poverty and increasing the income and welfare of the poor in a sustainable way. PROBLUE focuses on four key areas:

- The management of sustainable fisheries and aquaculture
- Addressing threats posed to ocean health by marine pollution, including litter and plastics, from marine or land-based sources
- The sustainable development of key oceanic sectors such as tourism, maritime transport and off-shore renewable energy
- Building government capacity to manage marine resources, including nature-based infrastructure such as mangroves, in an integrated way to deliver more and long-lasting benefits to countries and communities

Cross-cutting issues such as poverty, livelihoods, gender, climate change and maximizing finance for development, are interwoven throughout the program.

The Action Plan for Healthy Oceans and Sustainable Blue Economies from the Asian Development Bank, along with a new ADB Oceans Financing initiative, supports the protection and restoration of marine ecosystems and promote inclusive livelihood opportunities. Supporting ADB's developing member countries to improve ocean health and achieve Sustainable Development Goal 14. The Action Plan focuses on four areas: creating inclusive livelihoods and business opportunities in sustainable tourism and fisheries; protecting and restoring coastal and marine ecosystems and key rivers; reducing land-based sources of marine pollution, including plastics, wastewater, and agricultural runoff; and improving sustainability in port and coastal infrastructure development.

The European Investment Bank (EIB) Clean Oceans Initiative supports the development and implementation of sustainable, viable and low carbon projects that reduce pollution in the oceans, with a particular focus on plastics. The goal is to finance €2 billion in public and private sector projects by 2023. The initiative has already met more than a third of this target.

The initiative was launched in October 2018 by the Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the European Investment Bank and Kf W, the German promotional bank.

**DSP:** No action

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** UNESCO is a key partner in the Cross-Sectoral project, especially in terms of knowledge management, and the eventual creation of a clearinghouse mechanism under the BBNJ agreement. Other UN agencies are invited as well.

**Sargasso Sea:** n/a to Sargasso Child project.

3)

**PFD Added to the Section 2 on Stakeholders:**

Both the European Space Agency and NASA have committed their participation in the Program. NASA has pledge participation of the Sargasso Sea project as part of their pilot COVERAGE program approved by international Committee for Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS).

**Also added references to private sector as Stakeholders:**

As mentioned in other sections, other private sector potential partners have been the International Coalition of Fisheries Association (ICFA) and the Sealord Group Ltd, SEABOS and SEAPACT, as initiatives focusing on ensuring transparency and sustainability in fishery products reaching the markets. Bureau Veritas and Vulcan proposing traceability and data acquisition and analysis solutions

*International Financial Institutions (IFIs)*

International financial institutions and, in particular, multilateral development banks (MDBs) who provide financing and professional advising for the purpose of development will be essential stakeholders for the projects. MDBs could finance projects in the form of long-term loans at market rates, very-long-term loans (also known as credits) below market rates, and through grants, and could be instrumental in implementing some of the innovative financing mechanisms to be proposed under the Global Coordination Project (for a description of some of the current initiatives see Section 1.2.a on Baseline of current initiatives)

**Sargasso Sea:** NASA is a potential co-financier to the Sargasso Sea Project activities and this partnership will be further developed during PPG. The NASA COVERAGE project, which has been endorsed/supported by the International Committee on Earth Observation Satellite (CEOS), is piloting its activities in the Sargasso Sea

**GCP:** Stakeholders are relevant to GCP

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, please make sure that each of the child projects all will include gender involvement plans and in general adhere to the GEF Gender policies.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

**Agency Response**

**Noted**

**DSP:** Added a section to 2b

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** The Cross-Sectoral project emphasizes achieving gender parity between women and men participating in the project (goal is to achieve 50% participation by women, and 50% by men). This builds on the experiences of the ABNJ Capacity Project in Phase I, where close to 50% gender parity was achieved. See pages 10 and 20.

**GCP:** Text is there on page 11.

## **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly,

- 1) please ensure that the section specifically included description of the private sector entities that currently is planned to be part of the program and the child projects.
- 2) please ensure that the section includes description on the strategy the program and the child projects will be deploying for ensuring private sector, especially the tuna and deep sea fishing primary fisheries industry, as well as secondary industry and the rest of the supply chains, including retail linkages.
- 3) entities such as Vulcan, that are highly active in the data management area within the ABNJ space, it seems odd that they are not included in the private sector description. please add.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

1)

We will add the private sector entities mentioned in the child projects.

**Tuna:** Mentions added in the PFD

**DSP:** added in Section 3

**Sargasso Sea:** These are in the Sargasso Child. The Full Child Project Document will also elaborate further on this as other PS partners may be identified

**GCP:** Specific references to SEAPACT and SEABOS made – page 11.

2)

**PFD** Added at the end of section 1.a 3)

In the preparation of the Program and the activities to be conducted under the projects, the private sector continues to play a key role, as it was the case during the design and execution of the GEF-5 Progra. As a notable example, the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), that gathers participating seafood processors, retailers, scientists and WWF in a foundation that has been very proactive in supporting the scientific recommendations at the RFMOs, and in conducting work towards developing actions towards mitigating bycatch of fisheries, primarily purse-seine fisheries, and supporting a number of other direct interventions, including direct co-financing.

ISSF was joined by organizations of fishing vessels owners, such as CEPESCA (Confederación Española de Pesca) and OPAGAC (Organización de Productores de Atún Congelado) and, more recently, TUNACONS (Tuna Conservation Group).

In all cases, the participation of the private sector initiatives is not limited to providing direct support to the activities planned. As part of the overall strategy to push for a durable positive impact, the Program will continue to work to have private sector to work within delegations at the RFMOs and, in some cases, as observers, to create a favorable environment for the adoption of conservation and management measures. Formal adoption of measures addressing issues hampering sustainable management is the first step to ensure a permanent change. The second step is to ensure that member States implement effectively those measures and the private sector also has a role working with the administrations of the State where they conduct operations to promote compliance with regulations.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** As noted earlier, the Cross-Sectoral project, includes outreach to private industry.

**Sargasso Sea:** Component 3: Development of a Strategic Action Programme for addressing Threats and Strengthening the Stewardship and Conservation of the Sargasso Sea Ecosystem now includes the text “The Project will engage with the Private Sector where appropriate in helping to define the feasible actions to address impacts with their root causes in that sector.

**GCP:** This is covered on page 11 Component 3.

3)

**PFD Added in Section 4. Private Sector engagement:**

Private sector involvement also is a potential source of innovative and game-changing solutions. The Program will explore the possibility to be a vehicle for replication and upscaling of innovative solutions that are being developed. Two of those initiatives exemplify the innovative use of online solutions to have better access to information about fisheries and their products.

**Skylight** is a company established under the umbrella of **Vulcan, Inc.** to look for innovative solutions to monitor behavior of vessels using remote sensing technology. Skylight approach involves combining a comprehensive vessel database, satellite analytics with proprietary machine learning algorithm to identify patterns of behavior consistent with illegal fishing. Such a system, accessible via a simple web interface is accessible to support enforcement and compliance operations in real time with a low capital investment and low-cost interoperability.

Another company, **Bureau Veritas**, has pioneered the use of electronic certificates for vessels around the world that can reduce administrative burdens, and increase the security of the certification process. Electronic certificates issued in lieu of paper certificates following agreement with both the flag administration and the ship manager. Certificate authenticity and validity can be verified via a secure online web portal using a QR code, URL or search via the certificate's unique tracking number.

Bureau Veritas has also launched in 2018 Origin, a first traceability label to give consumers end-to-end proof of a product's journey, from origin to end. Built on blockchain technology, Origin offers a way for consumers to access information on each stage of a product's journey, using QR code in-store to see the full history of each product, and make informed purchase decisions.

Food industry players throughout the value chain also benefit from this cost-effective solution. Brands and retailers are able to better control supply chains, through better visibility as well as real time management of product recalls.

**Also added in this section:**

As mentioned before, ISSF was joined by organizations of fishing vessels owners, such as CEPESCA (Confederación Española de Pesca), OPAGAC (Organización de Productores de Atún Congelado) and, more recently, TUNACONS (Tuna Conservation Group).

**And**

The International Coalition of Fisheries Association (ICFA) and the Sealord Group Ltd are co-financing partners to the project and will be actively involved with testing innovative technologies such as underwater camera and electronic monitoring systems, collecting data important to understanding climate change and fishery interactions, and in participatory discussions regarding ideas for improved adaptive management under and EAF.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** The Cross-sectoral project will engage with Vulcan as they could be a key partner on the knowledge management component. See page 15.

**Sargasso Sea:** Component 2: Improved Knowledge Base to Support a Collaborative, Adaptive Ecosystem-Based Stewardship Approach now includes the text “The project will explore the opportunities to engage with remote sensing expertise and existing programmes in order to facilitate better capture of data and long-term monitoring of the area”. The project will specifically explore the possibility of long-term partnerships with remote sensing service providers such as Vulcan, that are highly active in the data management area within the ABNJ space, See <https://www.vulcan.com/areas-of-practice/technology-science>”

**GCP:** there are already major references to the involvement of private sector.

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Please provide proof of the risk analyses undertaken at child project level as well as program level , like done for Sargasso Sea.

17th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

**Agency Response**

**17 April 2020**

Please note that risks screenings or certifications have been uploaded for all projects as provided by the Agencies as per each systems.

*As regards FAO's certifications please see additional explanatory note in the roadmap section.*

*In line with FAO's Environmental and Social Safeguards, the projects have been screened against Environmental and Social risks and rated as **low risk** (certifications resulted from the checklist built in FAO's system available in roadmap section). No FAO safeguards were triggered. The risk level will be further re-confirmed at PPG following FAO's policy and stakeholder engagement processes. The Agency will make sure that all mitigation measures vis a vis any potential adverse impact are duly considered in the ceo-endorsement package.*

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however,:

1) please note that child projects can not be executed by the same agency that is functioning as the implementing agency for that specific project. Only exception to this is the coordination project.

2) Please make sure that there is conformity between all child projects, in the way the list lead agencies and GEF agencies. currently this is not the case.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

#### **Agency Response**

1)

**FAO:** Noted

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** Not applicable

**Sargasso Sea:** Not applicable; Sargasso Child project will not be executed by UNDP but by an external entity that UNDP is presently in final stages of identifying.

**GCP:** Noted.

2)

**FAO:** we have worked with the Child Projects to list this in a consistent manner.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): Partly

1) Please enrich description with inclusion of reference to TWAP findings, the HLP process and the Friends of Ocean Action. Moreover, other global initiatives and players such as the ocean investment programs from EIB, ADB and IBRD should be highlighted here too.

2) the section seems to be focused on the FAO hosted global processes, where as other processes such as UNESCO IOC decade on ocean science have been omitted.

3) Since this is a global program and associated child projects, will be supporting delivery of the SDGs, these should be highlighted here too, as that is a process that has been endorsed by the global community and countries specifically.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

1)

#### **PFD Added at the end of the Section 1.a. 2) the baseline scenario and any associated baseline program/ projects:**

##### ***GEF Transboundary Waters Assessment Program***

Recognizing the value of transboundary water systems and the fact that many of them continue to be degraded and managed in fragmented ways, the indicator-based GEF Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme (GEF TWAP) was developed. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the implementing agency with a number of strategic partnerships. Each partner engages a broad network of experts that evaluate transboundary water systems thematically or geographically, and comparatively, within each water system category.

The Programme aims to provide a baseline assessment to identify and evaluate changes in these water systems caused by human activities and natural processes, and the consequences such have on dependent human populations. In the assessment of Open Water systems<sup>[1]</sup><sup>1</sup>, the TWAP emphasizes the connectivity between multiple processes operating in the ABNJ, including connectivity with processes taking place in areas within national jurisdiction (AWNJ). This is especially evident in the case of fisheries for highly migratory species that include resources that straddle ABNJ and AWNJ, making a strong case for compatibility of conservation and management measures, as provided in Article 7(2) of the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement

The TWAP consists of five independent indicator-based assessment and the linkages between them, including their socioeconomic and governance-related features. The TWAP delivers the first baseline assessment of all the planet's transboundary water resources, providing benchmarks of the current state of water systems to inform policy, encourage knowledge exchange, identify and classify water bodies at risk and increase awareness of the importance to protect transboundary waters at relatively low risk and mitigate the states of systems at moderate to highest risk. The TWAP assessment is the first global assessment that uses quantified indicators of system states, pressures and impacts under three broad themes: biophysical, socioeconomic, and governance. Results are summarized into five relative levels of system risk - lowest, low, moderate, high, and highest - which are amenable to system and regional scale comparisons.

Through its assessments, the TWAP contributes significantly to the national and global strategies to fulfill the SDG.

##### ***High Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy***

The High Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy is a unique group of world leaders from around the globe committed to developing, catalyzing and supporting solutions for Ocean health and wealth in policy, governance, technology and finance. Its goals include:

---

- Catalyze, develop and support solutions for Ocean health and wealth
- Establish a new global contract between the sea and humanity
- Leverage the implementation of SDG 14 and all SDGs
- Amplify the voice of vulnerable coastal and island communities reliant on the Ocean
- Highlight the value-creation potential of balancing economic production and Ocean protection
- Harmonize and multiply the impact of multiple Ocean initiatives
- Champion a roadmap for building a Sustainable Ocean Economy.

This diversity extends to the Expert Group, Advisory Network and Secretariat who support the Panel with analytical work, communications and stakeholder engagement. The Secretariat is based at World Resources Institute, which has created a team of globally-recognized experts on Ocean economics, governance, technology and science.

The Panel will produce a final report and suite of recommendations that constitute a roadmap for aligning economic development – especially in the developing world – with protecting the natural capital of the Ocean.

The goal is for top decision-makers around the world to recognize that economic production and Ocean protection must be mutually supporting, and that striking the right balance between use and conservation of the Ocean will lead to stronger productivity, job creation, food security, and regional stability at the same time.

The High Level Panel has commissioned a series of 16 “Blue Papers” (each of 20-30 pages long) to explore pressing challenges at the nexus of the ocean and the economy. These Blue Papers will summarise the latest science, and state-of-the-art thinking about innovative ocean solutions in technology, policy, governance, and finance realms that can help to accelerate a move into a more sustainable and prosperous relationship with the ocean.

The Blue Papers are being released between November 2019 to June 2020 and made available as an edited HLP Blue Paper Compendium ahead of the UN Ocean Conference in Lisbon in June 2020.

### **Friends of the Ocean Action**

Friends of Ocean Action is a coalition of over 50 ocean leaders who are fast-tracking solutions to the most pressing challenges facing the ocean. Convened by the World Economic Forum, in collaboration with the World Resources Institute, its members come from business, civil society, international organizations, science and technology.

Since it was launched at the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting 2018, alongside the High Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy, the Friends of Ocean Action has grown to include 51 Ocean leaders as members. This group includes, to date, CEOs and heads of 12 globally recognised businesses with large ocean footprints; the heads of 9 key international organisations with ocean responsibilities; leaders of and specialists at 20 leading ocean science and research institutions, NGOs and foundations and social enterprises; and 10 public figures who are leaders of the ocean agenda. These members were chosen for their collective knowledge and networks, which means they can reach almost any global decision-maker, geography and industry sector; and are best placed to drive positive, systemic change.

Through their networks, the Friends of Ocean Action are mobilising action on:

- 1) Ending plastic pollution through the Global Plastic Action Partnership;
- 2) Expanding Marine Protected Areas;
- 3) Ensuring food security from the Ocean;
- 4) Addressing illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing through
  - a. ratification of the Port State Measures Agreement , and
  - b. commitments from retailers on transparency in seafood supply chains;
- 5) Decarbonising the maritime and shipping sector and helping it adopt science-based targets;
- 6) Creating an open platform for Ocean data; and
- 7) Scaling finance for Ocean innovations.

These ‘Action Tracks’ are focused on designing and delivering solutions to meet many of the targets of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 14 and those of other SDGs. Each track of work requires concerted, public- private cooperation across geographies and sectors, which members or ‘Friends’ are helping to mobilise through their unique networks and influence. As such, the Friends are recognised as an informal platform for advancing action and creating informed policy on the Ocean, and for promoting systemic change.

- Plastic Pollution – Global Plastic Action Partnership (GPAP)
- Marine Protected Areas
- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing
- Securing Sustainable Food from the Ocean
- Eliminating Harmful Fisheries Subsidies
- Ocean Data
- Financing Ocean Innovation
- Maritime and Shipping Sector

#### ***Initiative from IFIs***

#### **World Bank (WB)**

**PROBLUE** is a new Multi-Donor Trust Fund, housed at the **World Bank**, that supports the development of integrated, sustainable and healthy marine and coastal resources. With the Blue Economy Action Plan as its foundation, PROBLUE contributes to the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 (SDG 14) and is fully aligned with the World Bank’s twin goals of ending extreme poverty and increasing the income and welfare of the poor in a sustainable way. PROBLUE focuses on four key areas:

- The management of sustainable fisheries and aquaculture
- Addressing threats posed to ocean health by marine pollution, including litter and plastics, from marine or land-based sources
- The sustainable development of key oceanic sectors such as tourism, maritime transport and off-shore renewable energy
- Building government capacity to manage marine resources, including nature-based infrastructure such as mangroves, in an integrated way to deliver more and long-lasting benefits to countries and communities

Cross-cutting issues such as poverty, livelihoods, gender, climate change and maximizing finance for development, are interwoven throughout the program.

#### **Asian Development Bank (ADB)**

The **Action Plan for Healthy Oceans and Sustainable Blue Economies** from the **Asian Development Bank**, along with a new ADB Oceans Financing initiative, supports the protection and restoration of marine ecosystems and promote inclusive livelihood opportunities. Supporting ADB's developing member countries to improve ocean health and achieve Sustainable Development Goal 14. The Action Plan focuses on four areas: creating inclusive livelihoods and business opportunities in sustainable tourism and fisheries; protecting and restoring coastal and marine ecosystems and key rivers; reducing land-based sources of marine pollution, including plastics, wastewater, and agricultural runoff; and improving sustainability in port and coastal infrastructure development.

#### **European Investment Bank (EIB)**

The **EIB Clean Oceans Initiative** supports the development and implementation of sustainable, viable and low carbon projects that reduce pollution in the oceans, with a particular focus on plastics. The goal is to finance €2 billion in public and private sector projects by 2023. The initiative has already met more than a third of this target.

The initiative was launched in October 2018 by the Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the European Investment Bank and Kf W, the German promotional bank.

**Tuna:** No new additions

**DSP:** Not relevant to DSF. No action

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** As noted, this has already been done, in part, in the Cross-Sectoral project. It will be important to also include the financing agencies, especially in terms of capacity enhancement and regional action in the specific regions that will be selected during the PP process.

**Sargasso Sea:** There are no relevant EIB, ADB or IBRD actions for the Sargasso Sea

**GCP:** References added

---

[1] IOC-UNESCO and UNEP (2016). Open Ocean: Status and Trends, Summary for Policy Makers. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi

2)

**PFD** In the referenced Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities, we see the following paragraphs:

- Para 240. A number of UN-related process, some of them FAO but not all.
- Para 241. CBD
- Para 242. A GEF, UNDP, IOC, UNEP joint workshop
- Para 243. BBNJ process support
- Para 244. Sargasso Sea Commission

This seems to indicate a focus distributed among several global initiatives. In any case a reference was added to the IOC Decade on Ocean Science that is more fully described in the Section on Stakeholders. So, to be added:

Also of note is the contribution that IOC UNESCO Decade on Ocean Science, starting on 2021, will make to research on science that will improve the general knowledge on ocean processes.

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** The Cross-Sectoral project includes reference to the Decade on Ocean Science, and collaboration with IOC and these processes. See page11.

**Sargasso Sea:** The following text has now been added on P. 17 under Engagement with the Global / Regional Framework – “Cognizant of the United Nations Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainability (2021-2030), the Project will also engage with IOC of UNESCO as they support efforts to reverse the cycle of decline in ocean health and gather ocean stakeholders worldwide behind a common framework that will ensure ocean science can fully support countries in creating improved conditions for sustainable development of the Ocean (see ‘The Science We Need For The Ocean We Want’ at <https://www.oceandecade.org/> The Child Project Outcomes and Outputs will be particularly relevant to certain Decade activities and focus such as Clean Oceans (Where sources of pollution are identified and removed), Healthy & Resilient Ocean (Where marine ecosystems are mapped and protected), Predicted Oceans, Sustainable Productive Oceans (Where society has the capacity to understand ocean conditions), (To ensure the provision of food supply), and Transparent & Accessible Ocean (With open access to data, information and technologies)”.

3)

**PFD Added in this section**

The Program, and its constituent child projects focus on supporting countries in delivering their SDGs, in particular SDG 14, in those aspects that are related with the ocean health in the ABNJ. Para 69 on baseline. The theory of change behind the Program is very much based on the delivery of the SDGs

**DSP:** Done and added text in section 3

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** As noted earlier, the Cross-Sectoral project has noted, in several parts, how the project may support delivery of the SDGs. This will be developed in more detail in the PP process.

**Sargasso Sea:** For FAO to address at program level – there is already info on p.5 in the Sargasso Child on project's contribution to SDG 14.

#### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): partly, the program is including mentioning of IW:LEARN, however the child projects need to elaborate further on utilizing IW:LEARN for KM purposes, as mentioned above.

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

#### **Agency Response**

**The child projects have addressed the comment:**

**Tuna:** Text added

**DSP:** Added text on Outreach in Section 3

**Cross-sectoral Capacity:** As noted earlier, the Cross-Sectoral project's Knowledge Management is aligned with GEF requirements and will work in cooperation with the IW: LEARN process.

**Sargasso Sea:** For Sargasso Child, dealt with above under Item 3 of the Secretariat Review and the appropriate text on linkage with IW:LEARN has been added to the Child Project.

**GCP:** Added to Component 2 – see page 13.

#### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

Term sheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

3rd of April 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comments and resubmit

16th of April 2020 (cseverin): No, please address and resubmit ASAP

17th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, program is recommended for technical clearance

22nd of April 2020 (cseverin): Please address the above points on program commitment deadline and cofinancing and resubmit ASAP

24th of April 2020 (cseverin) Yes, program is recommended for technical clearance

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

##### **Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

##### **PIF Recommendation to CEO**

#### **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) make up 40% of the surface of our planet, 64% of the surface of the oceans and nearly 95% of its volume. The biodiversity and ecosystems of ABNJ are subject to multiple anthropogenic threats, including overfishing, IUU fishing, pollution, habitat loss and degradation, and climate change impacts. The project will contribute to the sustainable use of ABNJ natural living resources and strengthened biodiversity conservation in the face of a changing environment.

The Program consists of five child projects – two global projects that will promote sustainable management of tuna and deep-sea fisheries, a third project that seeks to build capacity to improve cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination on key ABNJ issues at global level, a fourth project that examines geographically focused multi-sectoral governance and a fifth project that will ensure effective coordination, communication, partnerships, lesson learning and knowledge management between the other child projects and support innovative financing initiatives for sustainable use of ABNJ resources across the Program.

This common oceans program will, among others, improve management of 12 mio Ha of marine protected Areas and move 943,000.00 tons of globally over-exploited fisheries to more sustainable levels. Furthermore, it will promote more comprehensive processes and integrated approaches to the sustainable use and management of the ABNJ, building on the results and lessons of the GEF-5 ABNJ Program and complementing the ongoing efforts of various partners, parallel initiatives and political processes.