

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

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

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

Date of screening: October 11, 2011

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4581

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Global

PROJECT TITLE: ABNJ Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: WWF, International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (t-RFMOs), BirdLife International

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

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

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

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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 megafauna in the Pacific ocean and seasonal exclusion zones for fishing might be possible as part of bycatch reduction and ecosystem based management.

4. The choice of t-RFMOs (one for RBM, one for IUU and two for bycatch 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.

5. 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.

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