



Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations



Report of the Third Project Steering Committee:

Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the ABNJ

July 6th-8th 2016
Rome, Italy

ABNJ-Tuna-2016-PSC-Rep



The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

All rights reserved. FAO encourages reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Non-commercial uses will be authorized free of charge. Reproduction for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, may incur fees. Applications for permission to reproduce or disseminate FAO copyright materials and all other queries on rights and licences, should be addressed by e-mail to copyright@fao.org or to the Chief, Publishing Policy and Support Branch, Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 2016

For bibliographic purposes, please reference this publication as:

FAO. 2016. *Report of the Third Project Steering Committee: Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the ABNJ, Rome, Italy, 6th–8th July 2016*. Rome. 43pp.

List of Acronyms

AIS	Automatic Identification System
BMIP	Bycatch Mitigation Information Portal
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CLAV	Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels
CMM	Conservation and Management Measures
COFI	Committee on Fisheries
CPC	Contracting party and cooperating non-contracting party
CSM	Compliance Support Mission
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EAFM	Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management
EMS	Electronic Monitoring Systems
FAD	Fish Aggregating Device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFA	Pacific Islands Fisheries Forum Agency
FTBOA	Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPCU	Global Programme Coordination Unit
GR	Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels
GSC	Global Steering Committee (Common Oceans ABNJ Program)
HCR	Harvest Control Rule
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
IMCSN	International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network
ISSA	International Seafood Sustainability Association
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IUU fishing	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing
IW-LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network
MCS	Monitor, Control and Surveillance
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
MSE	Management Strategy Evaluation
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (US)
OPAGAC	Organización de Productores Asociados de Grandes Atuneros Congeladores
OPP	Ocean Partnerships Project (Common Oceans Project by the World Bank)
OSPESCA	Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Organization of the Central American Isthmus
PA	Precautionary Approach
PMU	Project Management Unit
PNA	Parties of the Nauru Agreement
PSM	Port State Measures
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RBM	Rights-Based Management
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organization
RP	Reference point
SPC	Pacific Community
TAG	Technical Advisory Group (Common Oceans Program)
t-RFMO	One of the tuna RFMOs, i.e. CCSBT, IATTC, ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC
UNEP	UN Environment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VDS	Vessel-Days Scheme
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Table of Contents

I.	Opening of the Meeting	5
II.	Election of the Chair	5
III.	Adoption of the Agenda and the Terms of Reference for the Project Steering Committee	5
IV.	Progress of the Common Ocean ABNJ Tuna Project	5
	A. Component 1. Promotion of sustainable management (including rights-based management) of tuna fisheries, in accordance with an ecosystem approach	6
	B. Component 2. Strengthening and harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to address Illegal, Unregulated and Reporting Fishing (IUU)	8
	C. Component 3. Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing.....	11
	D. Component 4. Information and best practices dissemination and M&E.....	13
V.	Review of the project results matrix and project indicators.....	14
VI.	Proposals for new activities.....	14
VII.	Annual Work Plan and Budget	16
VIII.	Any other business	17
IX.	Closing of the meeting.....	17
	Annex I. List of participants.....	18
	Annex II. Agenda of the Meeting	20
	Annex III. List of documents.....	21
	Annex IV Template for Presentation of Proposals for new activities under the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project	23
	Annex V: Statement of Expenditures for total Project Resources (including financial transactions up to June 30, 2016	25
	Annex VI: Differences original and revised allocations	27
	Annex VII. Annual workplan covering 01 July 2015 to 30 June 2016	29

I. Opening of the Meeting

1. The third meeting of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project was held in FAO Headquarters in Rome from 6th to 8th July 2016. A total of 31 participants attended the meeting. The list of participants is provided in Annex I.
2. Jacqueline Alder, Common Oceans/ABNJ Global Program Coordinator, welcomed the participants and opened the meeting. She highlighted that, after two years of execution, first lessons were started to be drawn and used for the development of new FAO-GEF projects.

II. Election of the Chair

3. The outgoing Chair of the PSC left his position with IOTC, and Teo Feleti, Executive Director of WCPFC, was nominated and elected new Chair of the PSC.

III. Adoption of the Agenda and the Terms of Reference for the Project Steering Committee

4. The PSC adopted the Agenda provided in Annex II. The list of documents presented to the PSC is provided in
5. Annex III.

IV. Progress of the Common Ocean ABNJ Tuna Project¹

6. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator presented the main lessons learned from the second year of implementation of the project and highlighted that:
 - a. The adoption of Harvest Strategies to implement the precautionary approach by t-RFMOs, the possible application of EAFM, the promotion of compliance at all levels and the management of sharks fisheries continue to be the most transformational activities of the Project;
 - b. Some project Outputs are disconnected from the Outcomes, as it was noted during the Inception meeting;
 - c. Partnership is an important element of the Project but requires constant communication to function correctly. One of the partner t-RFMOs was not represented during the meeting, illustrating the difficulty of the partnership.
 - d. The FAO framework was not well suited for such a complex project and most of the first year of implementation was used to overcome these challenges.
7. A major budget revision is under preparation (section VII) as well as an in-depth review of the Project indicators (section V).
8. Communication activities remain a weak point with only 40,000 USD dedicated for communication in the initial budget. Recognizing the importance of communication activities, the budget will be revised to reallocate funds to communication for the second half of the Project.
9. The progress of the project was presented by FAO and the different Executing Partners under each of the four components of the project.

¹ A short title for the Outputs is used throughout this section. Please refer to the Project Document for a full title of the output.

-
10. The PSC noted that one t-RFMO is not fully engaged in the partnership and recommended that further efforts are made to bring ICCAT onboard.

A. Component I. Promotion of sustainable management (including rights-based management) of tuna fisheries, in accordance with an ecosystem approach

11. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator presented a draft Theory of Change prepared for component 1 which links the outputs to medium level outcomes and to the Project outcomes. He stressed that while this exercise should have been carried out during the design phase of the Project, it was still a very useful exercise at this point of implementation in order to better understand the Project's intervention logic as well as risks and assumptions.

Output 1.1.1. Capacity Building on Harvest Strategy

12. WWF presented the progress under Output 1.1.1 that aims at building capacity of coastal States for a better understanding of the scientific process around harvest strategies, harvest control rules and reference points and better decision making. Two workshops have been held since the start of the project, [one in Sri Lanka in 2014 targeting Indian Ocean coastal States](#) (18 developing IOTC CPCs participated) and [one in Panama in 2015 targeting IATTC developing Members](#) (12 developing IATTC CPCs participated).
13. Some delays were experienced for selecting the venue of similar workshops for ICCAT and WCPFC developing members, but a workshop for the Atlantic will be held in Ghana end of August 2016, and a second one for the Western Pacific is currently planned to be held in Indonesia in November same year.
14. Finally, the PSC noted that this capacity building exercise should not be limited to developing countries, and that the workshops should also be open to developed countries, even if the project cannot fund their participation.

Output 1.1.4. Science management dialogue

15. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 1.1.4., an output closely linked to Output 1.1.1., which supports the dialogue between science and management and the development of harvest strategies through, for example, testing of candidate harvest control rules. The Project is encouraging a more formal structure or body under which the dialogue could take place in each t-RFMO, and which would avoid delays in the decision making and ensure clear communication lines with the respective Commissions. Under the IOTC for example, a technical committee has now been created to which the scientific working group on MSE can present progress and pose specific questions to delegates.
16. The Global Coordinator highlighted that the target of the Project to have Harvest Strategies for all 23 stocks under the management of the five t-RFMOs will not be achieved. Not all t-RFMO members are equally interested in adopting harvest strategies and the formal adoption of harvest strategies for every major stock requires support from all the t-RFMO members, something that cannot be guaranteed by the Project. This determines the accountability ceiling of the Theory of Change after which the Project does not have control.
17. The PSC noted that strong and broad advocacy towards all the different actors of the sector, as well as the incentive provided by eco-labeling and certification, can accelerate the development and adoption of harvest strategies.
18. The PSC noted that WCPFC has adopted a workplan for the adoption of harvest strategies for skipjack, yellowfin, bigeye and albacore.

19. The PSC noted that a joint t-RFMO Working Group on MSE will be held under the auspices of ICCAT in 2016, and that the project had offered its support.
20. The PSC noted the good progress made under Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.4, which contributed to the adoption of IOTC Resolution 16/02² *On harvest control rules for skipjack tuna in the IOTC area of competence* and IATTC Resolution C-16-02³ *Harvest Control Rules for tropical tunas (Yellowfin, Bigeye and Skipjack)*.

Output 1.1.5. Formulation of plans for implementation of an ecosystem approach to fisheries.

21. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 1.1.5 which supports the development of plans for implementation of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM). The Project will support a Joint Meeting of tuna RFMOs on the Implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management, initiated by ICCAT, which will be held in December 2016 in Rome. ICCAT has advanced the considerations of EAF plans and has made a comparison on the different t-RFMO approaches to implement EAFM, and on proposing possible ways to operationalize it. While many t-RFMO have bycatch reduction programs, consideration of the impacts on the broader ecosystem arisen from the fishing activity as well as their social and economic outcomes is still lacking.
22. The PSC noted that the target of the Project under this output is probably too optimistic, but that if processes are in place for the formal adoption of EAFM, this would already be an achievement.

Output 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 Rights based management

23. These two outputs had the objective of reviewing the Rights Based Management system developed in the Western Pacific, *i.e.* the Vessel Day Scheme (VDS) of the Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA) and disseminating the review's conclusions and lessons. Due to the delays in the approval and start of the Project, PNA undertook the review of the VDS without the support of the Project.
24. Recommendations of the review are not yet endorsed by the PNA Ministers, but once endorsed, the PSC noted that the Project is still in a position to use resources under 1.2.2. to share lessons learned from the VDS and its review with other t-RFMOs, through workshops organized by WWF.
25. The PSC recommended that the Project liaise with the new CEO of PNA to discuss possibilities of disseminating lessons learned on the VDS, and the benefits of an RBM scheme, in particular for coastal States.
26. The PSC noted that the Common Oceans ABNJ Deep Seas Project was also working on RBM, and there might be possibilities for synergies on this subject.

² <http://www.iotc.org/cmm/resolution-1602-harvest-control-rules-skipjack-tuna-iotc-area-competence>

³ <https://www.iattc.org/PDFFiles2/Resolutions/C-16-02-Harvest-control-rules.pdf>

B. Component 2. Strengthening and harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to address Illegal, Unregulated and Reporting Fishing (IUU)

27. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator presented the draft Theory of Change developed for Component 2 which aims at reinforcing MCS and compliance of Members States with RFMO requirements.

Output 2.1.1 Best practices in MCS

28. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.1 which aims at developing a document on Best Practices for Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS) which would be endorsed by all t-RFMOs. ISSF will be a main partner for the development of these best practices which will include review of implementation options, effectiveness, burden, *etc.* of the different MCS tools and will be reviewed by an advisory group.

29. The PSC noted that progress has been slow under this particular output, but that more time will be dedicated to it by the PMU in the coming months, according to the workplan in Table 1.

Table 1. Workplan for the development of the MCS Best Practices (Output 2.1.1).

Invitation to t-RFMO Secretariats, Compliance Chairs to participate in the Advisory Group	July 31 st 2016
Distribution of first draft of annotated outline	August 15 th 2016
Adoption of draft annotated outline	August 31 st 2016
Completion of first draft of MCS Best Practice documents	December 31 st 2016
Review by Advisory Group	January 31 st 2017
Expert Consultation on MCS Best Practices	March 31 st 2017
Adoption of the final MCS Best Practices document	June 1 st 2017

Output 2.1.2 Sharing of Experiences in MCS

30. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.2 with aims at the creation of a subnetwork of the [International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network](http://www.imcsnet.org)⁴ (IMCSN) focused on tuna fisheries. The PMU made a presentation at the 5th Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop earlier this year, which received positive comments from the t-RFMOs present. The subnetwork shall include a core group of MCS experts, including compliance personnel of t-RFMOs, which will act as advisory group for the development of the MCS Best Practices (Output 2.1.1).

31. The PSC noted that the subnetwork shall not duplicate collaborative efforts already developed in various regions, but shall take advantage of these and integrated them. CCSBT and CCAMLR are currently members of the IMCSN but all t-RFMOs could join.

32. The PSC recommended that the work initiated for the formalization of the subnetwork between the Project and the IMCSN is finalized as soon as possible, in order to be able to start the activities under this output.

Output 2.1.3 Certification-based program for training in MCS

33. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.3 which aims to strengthen the capacity of developing countries by providing careers development opportunities to MCS officers through the establishment of a MCS certification-based course. The development of the

⁴ <http://www.imcsnet.org>

curriculum has been slower than expected, in particular as the consultant hired for this work had serious health issues during the year. However, he had provided a first draft which will be circulated to PSC members.

34. The PSC noted that this is one of the most important activities of the Project and recommended that more time is allocated to progress within the best delays and that means to ensure long-term sustainability need to be identified (e.g. linkages with Universities and Regional Fisheries Improvement Programs).
35. The PSC also noted that an adequate national legal framework is necessary for MCS officers to enforce national and regional regulations. In particular, the PSC noted that some IOTC CPCs benefited from assistance by the project to update their national legislation. This assistance is also available to any other developing members of the other t-RFMOs under Output 1.1.2.
36. FFA presented the work done in the Pacific, where a Certificate IV in fisheries enforcement and compliance is now in place with the University of the Pacific in Fiji. In total 39 people were trained in 2014 and 2015, but the package has been revised as a six weeks course was too long for officers. Online content was developed, and in 2016 18 MCS officers started using this online facility, and currently the programme contains four courses that should be taken within one year, with two weeks of face to face course and the rest being online.
37. Lessons showed that the course needed to be more adapted to the target group, *i.e.* practitioners or managers. The development and delivery of the curriculum needs to include several key experts and the industry. The course could be franchise and contextualize according to the different regions.

Output 1.1.2. Support to improve compliance by t-RFMO members.

38. IOTC presented progress achieved under Output 1.1.2, in particular through IOTC Compliance Support Missions (CSMs) undertaken to assist developing CPCs to improve their compliance towards IOTC Conservation and Management Measures. CSMs consist in *in situ* assessment of compliance performance, which leads to the establishment of a scoreboard, as well as tailored assistance and training, together with the development of a roadmap for the members to follow and report on. IOTC is now starting cooperation with ICCAT, to share its experience of CSMs and to develop joint missions for countries that are members of both t-RFMOs. The Project supports this cooperation and will provide funding to ICCAT Department of Compliance head to participate in the next IOTC CSM.
39. The PSC noted that the IOTC scoring procedure is only grading compliance as compliant *versus* non-compliant, with all CMMs having the same weight. The PSC recommended developing some weighting scheme depending on the importance of the CMM to reflect a better measure of compliance. The PSC recognized that transparency and confidentiality are important principles to observe when it comes to compliance. WCPFC presented their compliance monitoring scheme which assesses compliance of each CPC with CMMs in place.
40. The PSC commended the IOTC Secretariat for developing this approach further with its Members, and recommended that the Project continues supporting similar initiatives with all interested t-RFMOs.
41. OPAGAC presented progress of the EMS pilot in collaboration with the Seychelles Fishing Authority and further validation of information by a Seychellois student with the University of Alicante in Spain, participating to capacity building. Under this activity data from onboard observers, EMS, sampling, oversampling and logbook will be analyzed and compared.
42. The PSC noted that it is still seems difficult with EMS to get a good estimate of the catch composition onboard purse seiners, and that additional data source, such as onboard observers,

is still required. However, it noted that the use of EMS could relieve observers of some tasks onboard, and that they could focus on other activities.

43. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator reminded the PSC that a wide range of activities to improve compliance of RFMO CPCs with Conservation and Management Measures could be implemented under this output.

Output 2.1.4 Legal framework for Port State Measures

44. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.4, in particular the legislative templates which were recently finalized⁵.
45. The PSC noted that the document has now been published and has been used already, even before its publication by FAO and IOTC. It also noted that this document will be a key tool for the capacity building work of FAO in the context of the Port State Measures Agreement that recently entered into force.
46. The PSC noted the latest development of the IOTC electronic Port State Measure application, made to facilitate communication between all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Port State Measures. The application was finalized and was deployed in Seychelles in early July 2016. Training is needed for the different users, including for the industry.

Output 2.1.5 Harmonization of the Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels and the Global Vessel Record

47. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.5 on the Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels (CLAV), an initiative taken in 2007 by the t-RFMOs in the context of the Kobe process. The CLAV combines the records of authorized vessels of each t-RFMOs into [one global online database](#)⁶, which, since last year, is automatically updated daily. Review of the CLAV data led to significantly increased data quality.
48. The PSC noted that the contract of the consultant in charge of the review of the records in the database recently ended, and that the PMU will discuss with the t-RFMO Secretaries if they would like to see this activity extended until the end of the Project.

Output 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 Pilot trials of Electronic Monitoring Systems (EMS)

49. The PMU, together with the Governments of Fiji and the ISSF, presented the progress achieved under Output 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 on the two pilot EMS activities, in Fiji on board longliners, and in Ghana on board purse seiners. The objective of these outputs is to facilitate the integration of this new technology into domestic Monitoring Control and Surveillance activities and to improve compliance with, and enforcement of, international, regional and national regulations.
50. In Fiji, the PSC noted that development in the last year have been slow, in particular because the resources of the Fisheries Department had to be redeployed as a consequence of the damages cyclone Winston caused on the islands. However, it also noted that several compliance issues have been identified through the system, and that Fiji is working with the industry to address those.
51. The FTBOA emphasized that under the framework of this pilot, and as agreed in the MoU drafted between the industry and the government of Fiji, images from the EMS cannot be used for court proceedings. The FTBOA also highlighted that the MoU was not signed yet, and that this was a

⁵ Swan, J. 2016. *Implementation of port State measures – Legislative template, framework for procedures, role of regional fisheries management organizations*. Rome, FAO. (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5801e.pdf>)

⁶ <http://tuna-org.org/GlobalTVR.htm>

challenge for the continuation of the deployment of the EMS. FTBOA also expressed that they would appreciate to receive trip review reports quickly.

52. The PSC noted the renewed commitment of Fiji and the cooperation of the Industry and recommended that the MoU between the Government of Fiji and the industry should be signed within the best delays, so not to delay the next deployment of EMS.
53. In Ghana, the PSC noted that progress was a bit slower than expected, but currently all active purse seine vessels are equipped with EMS provided by the Project. During the last year, some issue were raised with tampering of the system, a challenge that needs to be addressed with the industry partners.
54. For both pilots, the PSC noted that more work was needed on the integration of provisions related to EMS in the Fijian and Ghanaian legal framework and that sound business analysis to explore sustainability, costs, burden, and confidentiality rules will be required.
55. The PSC noted that during the [Eighth GEF Biennial International Water Conference](#) held from 09-15 May 2016 in Sri Lanka, Fiji, Ghana, Seychelles and BirdLife had the opportunity to meet and exchange views on their respective pilot activities, but that a more focused exercise of lessons and experience sharing would be useful.

Output 2.2.3 Integrated MCS system FFA

56. The FFA Secretariat presented the progress achieved under Output 2.2.3 which aims at increasing the capacity of FFA members at national and regional level to conduct fisheries intelligence analyses.
57. The PSC noted that FFA is producing intelligence reports that are sent to Members, but there is limited feedback or action by FFA Members based on the reports. This is due to the lack of capacity and human resources in the countries, where often there is no separate investigation unit. The National Fisheries departments also need assistance from the attorney general offices. Some of these elements, including chain of custody, are included in the FFA MCS course.

Output 2.2.4 Assessment of Catch Documentation Schemes

58. The PMU presented the progress achieved under Output 2.2.4 and the publication of the final document⁷ under this output. The document identifies 23 principles on which a CDS should be based.
59. The PSC welcomed the completion of the study and noted that this output generated strong international interest, including amongst t-RFMOs.
60. The PSC further noted that WCPFC and IOTC have started discussions on implementing CDS, and that a CDS Working Group has been created in IOTC.

C. Component 3. Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing

Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 Development of pan-Pacific shark management plans

61. The Technical Coordinator-Sharks and Bycatch of the Project presented progress under Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.
62. The PSC noted achievements, in particular:

⁷ **Hosch, G.** 2016. Design options for the development of tuna catch documentation schemes. Rome, FAO (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5684e.pdf>).

- a. New observer data standards were agreed at WCPFC in December 2015;
 - b. A t-RFMO shark data browser was developed and shared with all t-RFMOs. The development of an automated application is being explored;
 - c. Bycatch Data Exchange Protocols are being trialed in 2016 within WCPFC and IOTC;
 - d. Shark post-release mortality tagging is ongoing. Activities were slowed down by the prohibition of setting around whale shark in the WCPFC area;
 - e. The Southern Hemisphere Porbeagle Assessment started in July 2015, and is ongoing and shall be concluded in March 2017;
 - f. Whale shark safe release guidelines were adopted by the WCPFC in December 2015; and
 - g. A pan-Pacific Bigeye Thresher Assessment started in 2016 and shall be finalized in August 2016.
63. The PSC noted that IATTC is developing an activity to improve shark data collection in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. Concerns about the shark population in the EPO are growing, in particular in Central America. The objectives of the proposed study includes i) to report on data available, ii) to report on challenges and provide recommendations on improvements needed, iii) to assist IATTC in implementing the recommendations, iv) to develop a shark database suitable for stock assessment and v) to build capacity on shark data collection and analysis.

Output 3.1.3 Global Bycatch Management Information System (BMIS)

64. SPC [presented progress](#) achieved under Output 3.1.3 under which the BMIS will be redesigned.
65. The PSC noted that the redevelopment of the BMIS has started and the new interface shall be completed by December 2016.
66. The PSC noted that a joint analysis of turtle mitigation effectiveness started with [a first workshop in February 2016](#). This was possible thanks to confidentiality agreements with Japan, Taiwan Province of China and Reunion, to access observer data, in addition to confidentially-held fishery observer data from Pacific Community (SPC) member countries. A second workshop is planned in November 2016.

Output 3.2.1 Mitigation of seabird mortality

67. Birdlife presented the progress achieved under Output 3.2.1 which aims at developing at-sea trials of seabird mitigation measures to demonstrate their effectiveness. During the last year, national awareness was improved with several training workshops for skippers and observers held in China and Korea and additional at-sea trials onboard Korean longliners. Port-based outreach activities were initiated in South Africa and Namibia, where port based officers were hired, and capacity building activities for data analysis are planned with two regional workshops to be held for some of ICCAT and IOTC developing member countries. Discussions are being held with the Brazil and South African government and industry to test Electronic Monitoring Systems as a tool to monitor seabird bycatch mitigation measures. However, challenges have arisen due to mix perception of the system as a tool to monitor compliance.
68. The PSC noted that a country visit to Taiwan, Province of China was planned soon, which will have to be funded from non-GEF resources due to non-eligibility for GEF-funding, and that the need for a port based officer in Mauritius should be assessed.
69. The PSC further noted that the main transformational impact of these activities were the uptake of mitigation measures by the longline fleets.

Output 3.2.2 Mitigation of bycatch of small tunas and sharks

70. ISSF presented the progress achieved under Output 3.2.2 which aims at developing mitigation measures on board tuna purse-seine vessels. ISSF activities in this field started in 2010/2011 and since then research cruises, five of which received support from the Project (equipment), have been undertaken in cooperation with the industry to test mitigation measures onboard purse seiners. In addition, since July 2015, seven skippers workshop were held gathering 464 participants.
71. The PSC noted that currently, the most accepted mitigation measure for purse seiners was the use of non-entangling FADs, and that scientists were looking into the use of natural biodegradable materials for FADs and data from FAD echo-sounder buoys providing further information on the species and size composition of schools, in particular with the European fleets.
72. The PSC acknowledged the significant amount of co-financing by ISSF to the Project, but also that the partnership with ISSF provides access to components of the private sector, with which it would have been difficult to work with otherwise. Finally, ISSF also supported the BMIS in its early stage and the Joint Tuna RFMO Bycatch Technical Working Group.

Output 1.1.3. Estimation of bycatch rates in gillnet fisheries in the Northern Indian Ocean.

73. WWF Pakistan presented progress achieved under Output 1.1.3 which aims at better estimating bycatch rates of the gillnet fisheries in the northern Indian Ocean. The activity has been up scaled during the last year, and important partnerships have been secured in particular with Sri Lanka with whom an MoU should be signed and joint activities developed. Bycatch and catch data gaps have been identified and data collection is ongoing in Pakistan. In particular 32 crew-observers deployments were done as of June 2016, *i.e.* 6.4% coverage, eight AIS transponders were installed on gillnetters which are now tracked, observers have been trained and have been releasing entangled whale sharks, manta rays, marine mammals and thousands of turtles.
74. The PSC noted that the gear conversion from gillnet to longline will not eliminate bycatch and that in parallel, mitigation measures for gillnetters should be developed and crew should be trained.
75. The PSC acknowledged that this output could support Pakistan to improve its compliance with IOTC CMMs, encouraged WWF Pakistan to strengthen collaboration with national scientists and the Pakistani government and noted that AIS is not an IOTC requirement while VMS is.
76. The PSC noted that most of the activities under this output are taking place within EEZs and that the linkages and relevance to ABNJ should be clarified.

D. Component 4. Information and best practices dissemination and M&E

Output 4.1.1 Key messages and progress

77. The PMU presented progress achieved under Output 4.1.1, in particular it was highlighted that the project is communicating at different levels to various audiences and is benefitting from the assistance of the communication team of ISSF.
78. The PSC noted that Communications are still a weakness of the Project, and encouraged the PMU to strengthen communication efforts in relevant regional and global fora.

Output 4.1.2. Synthesis of immediate project results

79. The PMU presented progress achieved under Output 4.1.2 which aims at documenting project progress and compiling catalytic results globally.

Output 4.1.3. IW:Learn

80. The PSC acknowledged project participation in the 8th GEF International Waters Conference held in Sri Lanka from May 09-13 2016. The Project was present with a strong delegation including three PMU members (Fogelgren, Clarke and Hett) and six project partner representatives including WWF, Fiji, Ghana, BirdLife South Africa, and Seychelles. The Project contributed four presentations to the FAO-led workshop on the Open Oceans. In addition, the Project organized an EMS experience exchange to provide a first opportunity for the two electronic monitoring system (EMS) pilots currently ongoing in Ghana and Fiji and under preparation in Seychelles and South Africa to exchange experiences and discuss challenges since the activities have started.

Output 4.2.1 Midterm and final evaluations

81. The Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) team introduced the rationale for the Mid Term Evaluation, which is a requirement of GEF and will assess performance, key challenges and opportunities to further enhance implementation of the Project. The MTE will adhere to international standards and will be participatory, inclusive and confidential. The MTE Team encouraged PSC members to engage actively in the evaluation. The MTE will look at relationships with the other Projects of the Common Oceans ABNJ Program, but not at the Program as a whole.
82. The PSC noted the timeline for the MTE and the field visits planned for September and October and a first draft report for the end of 2016 to be circulated for comments by PSC members.

V. Review of the project results matrix and project indicators

83. As discussed during the previous PSC meeting, concerns were raised on the project indicators. Many of the indicators provided in the Project document are not well correlated with the objective of the outcomes or are not in line with SMART⁸ criteria. A consultant with experience was hired to assist with the review of the indicators, and a draft set of revised indicators was presented to the PSC.
84. The PSC noted the document describing revised indicators, baseline, target and sources of information and that additional work will be needed to refine indicators. A full review of the indicators will be undertaken in the framework of the MTE.

VI. Proposals for new activities

85. The PSC discussed a process by which to consider support of new and expanded activities under the Project, within the limits of the flexibility afforded by savings realized during the execution of the Project. The PSC agreed that the PMU will compile a list of the proposals for additional activities received within three weeks after the end of the PSC, according to the following process:
- a. For activities that are aligned with existing outputs, partners are invited to present a description of the expanded activities (together with the additional Project funding) with special emphasis on how the additional activities will contribute to generate significantly

⁸ SMART: Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound

- higher results than the intended outcome, and maximize the use and impact of scarce GEF resources and co-financing.
- b. For new activities, *i.e.* those that do not conform to existing outputs, partners are invited to present new proposals following the revised template proposed in PSC02 and reproduced in Annex IV, paying special consideration to the GEF eligibility criteria as described in the template.
86. The PMU will analyze the proposals received, and circulate the results of this analysis to PSC members for their comments. The analysis, including recommendations for possible priorities, will be based on how well the proposals conform to the following guidelines.
- a. To what extent a new activity can be considered transformational or how it contributes to the transformational nature of an existing outcome. For example, activities that have an impact regarding mainstreaming sustainable management tuna fisheries and conservation of biodiversity in t-RFMOs, including fulfillment of their mandate and adoption of new Conservation and Management Measures;
 - b. To what extent a new activity is technically sound and executable, and has already secured the support of essential partners or documented that the underlying technology is available and reliable;
 - c. To what extent a new activity builds upon new insights that arise from work already underway and reinforces existing work streams in ways that could not have been foreseen before the Project started;
 - d. To what extent a new activity addresses global environmental issues affecting all t-RFMOs, and contributes to extend globally the benefits of lessons learned at a national or regional level.
 - e. To what extent a new activity enhances the chances of success by promoting complementary and synergistic roles of the partners and other Projects under the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project, including the active participation of Project partners that have not been directly involved in the execution of Project activities.
 - f. To what extent a new activity maintains a balance between the support provided among the major technical components of the Project.
87. The analysis will be mindful of the possible recommendations from the mid-term evaluation team that might have budgetary implications, and might require allocation of existing resources.
88. Following consideration of the comments by PSC members, the PMU will circulate a final version of the budget revision that includes modification necessary to address new activities.

IATTC Shark Sampling

89. IATTC presented a proposal for a new activity, *i.e.* a shark sampling program in the Eastern Pacific Ocean, in collaboration with OSPESCA, targeting the multi-species artisanal fisheries in the region. The objective of the proposal be to develop an experimental design for a long-term shark fishery and biological sampling program that could be operated subsequently out of IATTC field offices in Central America. This proposal is based on a recommendation from IATTC Scientific Advisory Committee. The activity will start with a workshop to develop a shark sampling pilot study, followed by a the implementation of the pilot and the analysis of the data collected, and will last until mid-2018.
90. The PSC acknowledged the large gaps in shark fishery and biological data in the EPO and the necessity to enhance data collection,. Therefore, the PSC agreed with the proposal to become a new activity under the Project.

VII. Annual Work Plan and Budget

Status of expenditures for Year 2

91. The status of expenditures is provided in Annex V.

Budget revision

92. The revised budget allocations per project output and differences to original allocations are presented in Annex VI. Approximately 1 million USD will be available for new activities under section VI. Full details are available in document 'ABNJ_TUNA_2016_PSC_08 Notes on proposed Budget Revision'.

Workplan and budget for the second year

93. The PMU presented the annual work Plan and budget that covers the period July 2016-June 2017.

94. The PSC acknowledged the work already done during the second year and endorsed the annual work plan and the budget for the third year of the project with minor modifications (Annex VII).

VIII. Any other business

Progress of the Common Oceans Program

95. The PSC noted that the four projects of the Common Oceans Program are now all in implementation phase, and invited representatives from each of the projects to present the current situation. In particular, the PSC noted:

- the [Deep-seas Project](#) (Sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation of deep-sea living marine resources and ecosystems in the ABNJ), implemented by FAO and UNEP, present opportunities for collaboration with the other Common Oceans projects, in particular with the Tuna Project regarding Monitoring, Control and Surveillance and market based incentives.
- the [Oceans Partnership for sustainable fisheries & biodiversity conservation](#), led by the World Bank, entered its operational phase recently. The Project offers flexibility of implementation to the executing partners. Project results will be more relevant to potential investments by the private sector rather than to policy changes at the RFMO level.
- The [Capacity Project](#) (Strengthening global capacity to effectively manage ABNJ) translates some of the experiences of the other Common Oceans projects into lessons learned and experiences that could be applied in the development of future approaches for multi-sectoral management of ABNJ, and contribute to the communication of these experiences and lessons to the relevant audiences.

Time and place of the fourth PSC meeting

96. The PSC noted that its next and fourth meeting will take place at FAO HQ, in Rome, from July 10-12, 2017.

IX. Closing of the meeting

97. The meeting was closed on July 8, 2016, by the Chair who thanked all the participants for their support and collaboration, and the PMU of the Project.

Annex I. List of participants

Birdlife International

Bronwyn Maree
Seabird Bycatch Project Coordinator
bronwyn.maree@birdlife.org.za

CCSBT

Robert Kennedy
Executive Secretary
rkennedy@ccsbt.org

FAO Project Management Unit

Alejandro Anganuzzi
Global Tuna Project Coordinator
alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org

Janne Fogelgren
Operations Officer
janne.fogelgren@fao.org

Kathrin Hett
Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
kathrin.hett@fao.org

Julien Million
Tuna Fisheries Expert
Julien.million@fao.org

Debora Piscitelli
Administrative Assistant
Debora.piscitelli@fao.org

FAO

Jacqueline Alder
Common Oceans ABNJ Program Coordinator
Jacqueline.alder@fao.org

Matthew Camilleri
Fishery Liaison Officer
matthew.camilleri@fao.org

Nicolas Gutierrez
Lead Technical Officer
Nicolas.gutierrez@fao.org

Chris O'Brien
Coordinator ABNJ Deep Seas Project
Chris.O'Brien@fao.org

Barbara Cooney
Senior Advisor
FAO GEF Unit
barbara.cooney@fao.org

Geneviève Braun
Programme Officer
FAO GEF Unit
Genevieve.braun@fao.org

Judith Swan
Legal Expert – FAO Consultant Output 2.1.4
judithswan@gmail.com

Fiji, Government of

Netani Tavaga
Coordinator Fiji EMS Pilot
tavaga.netani@gmail.com

Fiji Tuna Boat Owner Association

Brett Haywood
blu@sequest.com.fj

Ghana, Government of

Raymond Babanawo
Project Coordinator
babsraymond@yahoo.ca

GEF

Nicole Glineur
Senior Environmental Specialist
nglineur@thegef.org

Global Oceans Forum

Biliana Cicin-Sain
Director, Center for the Study of Marine
Policy, University of Delaware
bcs@UDel.Edu

Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission

Alexandre Aires-Da-Silva
Senior Scientist
alexdasilva@iattc.org

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Gerard Domingue
Compliance Coordinator
gerard.domingue@iotc.org

International MCS Network

Harry Koster
Executive Director
hkoster@imcsnet.org

**International Seafood Sustainability
Foundation**

Susan Jackson
President
SJackson@iss-foundation.org

Gerald Scott
ISSF Scientific Advisory Committee member
gpscott_fish@hotmail.com

Papa Kebe
Ghana ABNJ Tuna project Coordinator
papa.amary@gmail.com

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration**

Chery Mc Carty
Foreign Affairs Specialist
cheri.mccarty@noaa.gov

**Organización de Productores Atunero
Congeladores (OPAGAC)**

Miguel Herrera
miguel.herrera@opagac.org

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency

Megan Streeter
Training Officer
megan.streeter@ffa.int

**Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission**

Feleti Teo
Executive Director
Feleti.Teo@wcpfc.int

Aaron Nighswander
Finance and Administrative Manager
aaron.nighswander@wcpfc.int

Shelley Clarke
Technical Coordinator Sharks and Bycatch
Shelley.Clarke@wcpfc.int

Annex II. Agenda of the Meeting

Third Project Steering Committee Annotated Agenda

1. **OPENING OF THE MEETING**
2. **ELECTION OF THE CHAIR**
3. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_01rev2)**
4. **PROGRESS OF THE COMMON OCEANS TUNA PROJECT (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_02)**
 - A. **Component 1: Strengthening governance (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_03)**
 - i. Support to implementation of precautionary approach (Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.4)
 - ii. Implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (Output 1.1.5)
 - iii. Rights-Based Management (Outputs 1.2.1, 1.2.2)
 - B. **Component 2: Reducing IUU fishing (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_04)**
 - i. Support to MCS and compliance (Outputs 1.1.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.3 and 2.2.3) (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_inf_01 and inf_03)
 - ii. PSM Legislative template (Output 2.1.4) (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_inf_02)
 - iii. CLAV (Output 2.1.5) (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_inf_04)
 - iv. Electronic Monitoring Systems in Fiji (Output 2.2.1) and Ghana (Output 2.2.2)
 - v. Electronic Monitoring Systems in Seychelles
 - vi. Catch Documentation Scheme Best Practices (Output 2.2.4) (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_inf_06)
 - C. **Component 3: Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_05)**
 - i. Sharks: data collection and assessment (Output 3.1.1 and 3.1.2)
 - ii. Bycatch Mitigation Information System (Output 3.1.3)
 - iii. Bycatch Mitigation measures for seabirds on board longliners (Output 3.2.1)
 - iv. Bycatch Mitigation measures on board purse seiners (Output 3.2.2)
 - v. Bycatch in North Indian Ocean gillnet fisheries (Output 1.1.3)
 - D. **Component 4: Dissemination of information and M&E (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_06)**
 - i. Project communication and knowledge management (Output 4.1.1 and 4.1.3)
5. **REVIEW OF THE PROJECT INDICATORS (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_07)**
 - i. Review of Project indicators
6. **MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_12)**
 - i. Introduction of the MTE team
 - ii. Workplan for the MTE
7. **ANNUAL WORK PLAN AND BUDGET**
 - i. Status of expenditures
 - i. Budget Revision (ABNJ_TUNA_2016_PSC_08)
 - ii. Work plan and budget for Project Year 3 (July 2016 – June 2017) (for endorsement, ABNJ_TUNA_2016_PSC_09)
8. **PROPOSALS FOR NEW ACTIVITIES**
 - i. Compliance in the IO (WWF) (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_10)
 - ii. NPOA Sharks (WWF) (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_11)
9. **OTHER BUSINESS**
 - i. Cooperation with other Projects under the Common Oceans Program
 - ii. FAO activities of relevance for the Project partners
 - a. Open database and Common Toolbox for Tuna Fisheries (ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_inf_05)
 - iii. Time and place for the 4th PSC meeting

Annex III. List of documents

Meeting documents

ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_01	Provisional Agenda
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_02	List of Documents
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_03	Component 1: Strengthening of sustainable fisheries management, including precautionary approach and ecosystem approach to fisheries - Summary of progress -
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_04	Component 2: Strengthening and Harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to Address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU) - Summary of progress
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_05	Component 3: Reducing Ecosystem Impacts of Tuna Fishing Activities - Summary of Progress
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_06	Component 4: Component 4: Information and Best Practices Dissemination and M&E - Summary of progress -
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_07	Review of the Project Indicators
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_08	Notes on the proposed Budget Revision
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_09	Work Plan and Budget for Project Year 3
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_10	New Proposal by WWF: IOTC Compliance Reporting Initiative
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_11	New Proposal by WWF: Development and piloting of National Plan of Action for Sharks Evaluator
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_12	Brief on the Mid Term Evaluation

Information documents

ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_Inf_01	Development of a Curriculum for a Certification-Based Capacity Building on Monitoring, Control And Surveillance
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_Inf_02	Implementation of port State measures - Legislative template, framework for procedures, role of regional fisheries management organizations
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_Inf_03	E- Compliance Reporting system
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_Inf_04	CLAV. The Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels. A one year Report of the CLAV
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_Inf_05	Open database and Common Toolbox for Tuna Fisheries
ABNJ_Tuna_2016_PSC_Inf_06	Design Options for the Development of Tuna Catch Documentation Schemes

Annex IV Template for Presentation of Proposals for new activities under the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project

Proposing Project Partner:

Collaborating partners:

Title of the proposed activity:

Introduction/Context

Briefly describe the context and the current situation that the activity will address as well as any relevant activities which are already ongoing, keeping in mind that GEF is focusing its funding on supporting new activities that provide incremental benefits above an existing baseline, and that are in line with national, regional and international development goals, strategies, plans, policy and legislation.

Objective of the proposal including global benefits:

Briefly describe the objective associated with the activity and how this objective will be achieved (i.e. the implementation strategy), including global environmental benefits and how the results will be disseminated. Describe how the proposed activity will contribute to the overall objective and outcomes of the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna project. The proposal should include the following elements: put emphasis on how it is eligible towards the following criteria:

1. A description of the existing baseline: what is the current issue that the new activity will address
2. Incremental value of the activity: how the activity will provide a benefit beyond the current baseline.
3. Global environment benefit: To what extent the benefits would be replicable outside the scope of the activity.
4. Innovation, sustainability and scalability: How innovative is the activity, how will it be sustainable after the end of the project and to what extent can be scaled up to extend the benefits to larger areas.
5. Co-financing: high co-financing ratio in cash and in-kind.

Propose indicators, baseline and target values for the activity keeping in mind the SMART⁹ criteria.

Description of planned activities, feasibility, technical specifications and responsibilities:

Present a list of the activities as detailed as possible together

Workplan:

Present a list of the activities as detailed as possible together

⁹ Specific - Measureable - Achievable and Attributable - Relevant and Realistic - Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted

Indicative Budget: Present an indicative annual budget by categories. Add as many rows as necessary.

Budget in USD	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year4 ¹⁰	TOTAL
Staff/Consultants					
Subtotal Staff/Consultants					
Workshops/Training ¹¹					
Subtotal Workshops/Training					
Travel					
Subtotal Travel					
Procurement					
Subtotal Procurement					
General operating expenses (printing, workshop material, etc.)					
Subtotal GOE					
TOTAL					

Co-financing

Please indicate the expected co-financing of the proposing partner and other contributors.

Please keep in mind GEF definition of co-financing as follows: *Project resources that are committed by the GEF agency itself or by other non-GEF sources and which are essential for meeting the GEF project objectives.*

¹⁰ End date of the Project: 14th January 2019

¹¹ Including travel costs for participants

Annex V: Statement of Expenditures for total Project Resources (including financial transactions up to June 30, 2016)

Output	Total Budget (as currently in FPMIS)	Prior years expenditures**	Budget this reporting year in AWP/B (as approved by PSC2)	Current year total expenditures (d=b+c)	Total expenditures cumulative (e=a+d)	Delivery (in %)
1.1.1 HS - Capacity building	1,390,095	1,298,347	260,000	0	1,298,347	93.4%
1.1.2 Compliance improvement	1,187,462	107,559	500,000	13,544	121,103	10.2%
1.1.3 Gillnet bycatch	562,278	596,555	250,000	0	596,555	106.1%
1.1.4 MSE development	2,508,906	122,142	900,000	39,196	161,338	6.4%
1.1.5 EAF evaluations and plans	408,866	0	150,000	0	0	0.0%
1.2.1 Review-Pilot VDS	541,359	0	0	0	0	0.0%
1.2.2 RBM lessons learnt	170,224	267,359	0	0	267,359	157.1%
2.1.1 Global best MCS practices	164,796	0	100,000	0	0	0.0%
2.1.2 Capacity building MCS	351,781	0	150,000	0	0	0.0%
2.1.3 MCS staff trained	733,205	-9398.02	300,000	4,972	-4,426	-0.6%
2.1.4 PSM legislation for ten countries	1,036,013	19,884	150,000	7,875	27,759	2.7%
2.1.5 CLAV and GR harmonized	400,920	146,512	50,000	7,328	153,841	38.4%
2.2.1 EOS Fiji LL	2,105,966	2,533	350,000	207,900	210,433	10.0%
2.2.2 EOS Ghana PS	2,371,199	1,576,610	300,000	0	1,576,610	66.5%
2.2.3 Integrated MCS FFA	206,419	401350	75,000	0	401,350	194.4%
2.2.4 Assessment supply chains for CDS	926,523	267,752	100,000	16,763	284,516	30.7%
3.1.1 Sharks data	629,669	1,460,040	356,000	0	1,460,040	231.9%
3.1.2 Shark assessment and management	1,164,243	813,125	188,000	0	813,125	69.8%
3.1.3 BMIS	1,614,836	1,200,835	464,750	0	1,200,835	74.4%
3.2.1 Seabird mitigation LL	1,533,837	160,979	470,000	-6,240	154,739	10.1%
3.2.2 Purse-seine trials bycatch mitigation	2,089,839	642,759	580,000	0	642,759	30.8%

Output	Total Budget (as currently in FPMIS)	Prior years expenditures**	Budget this reporting year in AWP/B (as approved by PSC2)	Current year total expenditures (d=b+c)	Total expenditures cumulative (e=a+d)	Delivery (in %)
4.1.1 Dissemination of results	104,039	3,010	100,000	8,264	11,274	10.8%
4.1.2 Results and next steps*	0	0	80,000	0	0	0.0%
4.1.3 IW:LEARN	207,949	26,850	45,000	6,489	33,339	16.0%
4.2.1 Evaluations	224,162	0	0	0	0	0.0%
5.1.1 Project Management	1,230,200	589,622	249,600	313,767	903,389	73.4%
5.1.2 Global Project Coordinator	1,368,880	555,467	278,576	281,254	836,722	61.1%
5.1.3 Global Tuna Specialist	1,207,980	1416.42	241,596	0	1,416	0.1%
5.1.4 M&E Specialist	155,450	110,666	0	97,041	207,707	133.6%
5.1.5 PMU travel	261,887	75,327	45,519	11,150	86,477	33.0%
5.1.6 Inception workshop	101,628	56,979	0	121	57,100	56.2%
5.1.7 PSC Meetings	158,826	70107.89	39,707	15,017	85,125	53.6%
5.1.8 ICRU Charges	53,500	-10,470	0	2,475	-7,994	-14.9%
Unassigned transactions ¹²		1,843,342	0	1,148,793	2,992,136	
Total	27,172,937	12,397,262	6,773,748	2,175,710	14,572,973	53.6%

¹² Transactions which cannot be linked unless a budget revision will be processed in FPMIS

Annex VI: Differences original and revised allocations

Output	Short name	Original (only activities)	Revised (only activities)	Difference (green = increased budget)
1.1.1 WWF	HS - Capacity building	1,390,094	1,418,780	28,686
1.1.2 FAO/t-RFMOs	Compliance improvement	1,188,162	2,098,459	910,297
1.1.3 WWF	Gillnet bycatch	562,278	596,120	33,842
1.1.4 FAO	MSE development	2,548,612	2,548,288	324
1.1.5 FAO	EAF evaluations and plans	408,866	679,650	270,784
1.2.1 FFA/PNA	Review-Pilot VDS	593,676	7,550	586,126
1.2.2 WWF	RBM lessons learned	170,224	461,626	291,402
	Total	6,861,912	7,810,473	948,561
2.1.1 FAO	Global best MCS practices	204,503	507,550	303,047
2.1.2 FAO	Capacity building MCS	351,781	351,850	69
2.1.3 WCPFC/IOTC	MCS staff trained	733,205	1,167,174	433,969
2.1.4 IOTC	PSM legislation for ten countries	1,036,013	131,823	904,190
2.1.5 IOTC	CLAV and GR harmonized	400,920	255,800	145,120
2.2.1 Gov Fiji	EMS Fiji LL	2,158,283	1,264,922	893,361
2.2.2 WWF/Ghana	EMS Ghana PS	2,371,199	2,021,941	349,258
2.2.3 FFA	Integrated MCS FFA	206,419	249,900	43,481
2.2.4 FAO	Assessment supply chains for CDS	926,523	854,218	72,305
	Total	8,388,846	6,805,178	1,583,668
3.1.1 WCPFC/IATTC	Sharks data and assessments	1,612,250	1,607,550	4,700
3.1.2 WCPFC	Shark data and methods inventory	1,221,667	631,050	590,617
3.1.3 SPC	BMIS	918,091	1,204,550	286,459
3.2.1 BLI	Seabird mitigation LL in IO and AO	1,586,154	1,507,450	78,704
3.2.2 WWF/ISSF	PS mitigation small fish	1,958,558	1,974,552	15,994
	Total	7,296,720	6,925,152	371,568
4.1.1	Dissemination of results	143,746	522,839	379,093
4.1.2	Results and next steps	0	0	0
4.1.3	IW:LEARN	211,949	211,949	0
4.2.1	Evaluations	258,453	230,761	27,692
	Total	614,148	965,549	351,401

Output	Short name	Original (only activities)	Revised (only activities)	Difference (green = increased budget)
	Project management (PM)	1,363,740		1,363,740
	PM against Outputs	2,647,569		2,647,569
5.1.1	Project Management		1,649,000	1,649,000
5.1.2	Coordinator		1,330,000	1,330,000
5.1.3	Tuna Officer		325,000	325,000
5.1.4	M&E		532,000	532,000
5.1.5	PMU Travel		275,000	275,000
5.1.6	Inception Workshop		97,073	97,073
5.1.7	PSC Meetings		168,000	168,000
5.1.8	GOE		290,510	290,510
	Total		4,666,583	4,666,583
		27,172,935	27,172,935	0

Annex VII. Annual workplan covering 01 July 2015 to 30 June 2016

	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Component 1 Promotion of Sustainable Management (including Rights-Based Management) of Tuna Fisheries, in Accordance with an Ecosystem Approach												
Output 1.1.1 MSE – Capacity building	Lead: WWF			Budget allocation for Year 3: 600,000 (Five Year Total 1,418,780 ¹³)								
Planned work: Complete the first round of training workshops for the Atlantic and Western and Central Pacific Oceans by the end of 2016. The second round of workshops is proposed to begin in the Indian Ocean, and a new curriculum will be developed with ongoing revisions to ensure relevance. The next round of workshops will be interactive and will build on the new simulations being developed across the different oceans. We will also include complementary strategies for engagement to ensure proposals capturing the elements of harvest strategies are brought forward to the relevant RFMOs.												
Training curriculum revision												
Directed training of fisheries admin personnel on t-RFMO processes and development of harvest strategy framework plans (three additional workshops)												
Output 1.1.4 MSE - Development	Lead: FAO			Budget allocation for Year 3:: 250,000 (Five Year Total 2,548,288)								
Planned work: Project is supporting three science-management dialogues (ICCAT, IOTC, and WCPFC) scheduled. In addition, it is supporting preparatory work in IOTC, including participation in the Working Party on Methods for scientists from developing countries. IATTC has requested support for a workshop on application of new software to MSE applications in data-poor situations.												
Support to Science Management dialogues in t-RFMOs (dates tentative)										IOTC		
Support to MSE development												
Support for a global meeting on MSE												
Workshop on MSE in data poor situations												

¹³ Five year budget total as Budget revision in ABNJ_TUNA_2016_PSC_08

	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
1.1.5 Integrated Ecosystem Evaluations and Plans prepared for each t-RFMO to support an EAF.	Lead: FAO with ICCAT			Budget allocation for Year 3 150,000 (Five Year Total 679,650)								
Planned work: A joint t-RFMO meeting on the implementation of the ecosystem approach is planned for December 2016. Next steps to be defined during the joint meeting.												
Joint t-RFMO meeting led by ICCAT (tentative)												
Output 1.2.1 Pilot enhanced Rights Based Management system in the Western Pacific Ocean (PNA VDS) implemented	Lead: FAO with PNA			Budget allocation for Year 3 0 (Five Year Total 7,550)								
Planned work: The activities anticipated to be covered by the Project have already been executed. There is still an opportunity to facilitate up-scaling and replication by assisting in presenting an unbiased review of the conditions that enabled PNA Members to benefit from the VDS. No activities planned for 2015-16.												
Output 1.2.2 RBM discussions at the RFMO-level, and disseminating lessons learned from the RBM pilot implementation shared globally	Lead WWF			Budget allocation for Year 3 100,000 (Five Year Total 461,626 ¹⁴)								
Planned work: No work planned for year 3.												

	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Component 2 Strengthening and Harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to Address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU)												
Output 2.1.1 Global Best practices for MCS in tuna fisheries prepared and agreed by the five t-RFMOs	Lead FAO			Budget allocation for Year 3 100,000 (Five Year Total 507,550)								

¹⁴ This include funds for WWF and FAO

<p>Planned work: A compilation of Global Best Practices for MCS in tuna fisheries will be developed in collaboration with ISSF and other interested parties to facilitate adoption and implementation of harmonized MCS practices in tuna fisheries. A draft is expected by the end of the year, to be then reviewed by a Working Group composed of officers from the compliance/MCS sections from the t-RFMOs and other interested parties. If necessary, a dedicated Expert Consultation to provide further input might be organized in 2016.</p>												
Develop first draft of Best Practices												
Review by the compliance/MCS sections from the t-RFMOs												
Expert consultation												➔
Output 2.1.2 MCS network				Lead FAO				Budget allocation for Year 3: 150,000 (Five Year Total 400,000)				
<p>Planned work The Project will support for establishing a 'sub-network' of the International MCS Network following collaborative arrangements with officials of the network in terms of support and moderation of the discussions. MCS personnel involved in MCS and compliance issues from t-RFMO members will be invited to participate.</p>												
Set-up network (tentative)												
Start facilitated discussions (tentative)												➔

		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Output 2.1.3 Competency based certification program for MCS		Lead: FAO			Budget allocation for Year 3: 300,000 (Five Year Total 1,167,174)								
Planned work The curriculum and a training strategy for a 6-8-week course with a core global component of basic skills, supplemented by regional issues will be developed before the end of 2015. This training strategy will incorporate lessons learned during the two courses implemented by FFA in the Pacific. .													
Further development of training curriculum including regional considerations					■	■	■	■	■	■			
Organize and implement first course											■	■	■
Support to FFA MCS capacity building activities					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Output 2.1.4 PSM legislative template		Lead: FAO			Budget allocation for Year 3: 0 (Five Year Total 131,823)								
Planned work The template is available online http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5801e.pdf . Distribution and use in FAO PSM-related capacity building activities will continue.													
Dissemination of the template to stakeholders					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■





	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
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	Lead: IOTC						Budget allocation for Year 3: 15,000 (Five Year Total 255,800)					
Planned work After the successful completion of the revision of the CLAV, work to identify and address issues and inconsistencies will continue in collaboration with t-RFMOs												
Improving data quality in collaboration with RFMOs												
Output 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.	Lead: FAO with Fiji						Budget allocation for Year 3 350,000 (Five Year Total 1,264,922)					
Planned work Installation of equipment on 10 additional longline vessels in July-August 2016 and 15 in January-February 2017 Second training Session for additional land-based observers Review of 100 trips in 12 months Signature of MoU between MOFF and FTBOA/FOFA Integration of EM data into the SPC regional database Review of legal framework for better integration of EM data. Starting development of a business plan.												
Installation of equipment	█	█										
Conduct trials	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█ →
Training for land-based observers on software, and collection of compliance and biological data		█										
Preparation of specialized training material for the collection of data				█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█ →
Review reports on compliance and biological catch data	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█ →
Business plan for continuation of activities after Project										█	█	█ →

	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
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 all t-RFMOs for up-scaling	Lead: WWF with Ghana			Budget allocation for Year 3: 400,000 (Five Year Total 2,021,941)								
Planned work. Continue with conducting trials and the analysis of the completed trials, strengthen staff capacity to interpret data and streamline the operationalization of the EM program through training and technical assistance, and advance with "Making the Business Case."												
Installation of equipment												➔
Conduct trials												➔
Data Analysis												➔
Review												➔
Land-Based Observer Training												
Making the Business Case												
Output 2.2.3 Integrated MCS system in FFA	Lead: FFA			Budget allocation for Year 3: 47,200 (Five Year Total 249,900)								
Planned work: Continuing support for a Data Analyst position contributing to the production of intelligence reports and risk assessments of IUU fishing												
Real time assistance to national MCS officers and national MCS data analysis trainings												➔
Integrated analysis of MCS data with updates, development of Standard Operating Procedures and of tools and models to automate MCS data analysis												➔

	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Output 2.2.4 Best practices on Traceability / CDS systems	Lead:FAO			Budget allocation for Year 3: 10,000 (Five Year Total 854,218)								
Planned work. Publication and dissemination of the final Technical Report in July/August 2016. Output has been successfully completed.												
Publication of the document through FAO's Fisheries Technical Paper series	■	■										
Dissemination of the document			■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Output 1.1.2 Increased compliance	Lead FAO			Budget allocation for Year 3: 260,000 (Five Year Total 2,098,459)								
Planned work The project will continue supporting Compliance Support missions with the IOTC Secretariat for the Members of the Commission, supporting the exchange of experiences with other RFMOs staff. The Project will continue to support t-RFMO compliance activities, as requested.												
Compliance support missions in the IOTC region (tentative)				■	■					■	■	
Support t-RFMO Compliance activities	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	▶
Development of IOTC eMaris electronic reporting facility	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	▶
EMS pilot Seychelles	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	▶

	Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Component 3 Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing												
Output 3.1.1 Shark data Improvement and Harmonization:	Lead WCPFC with IATTC						Budget allocation for Year 3: WCPFC: 411,000 IATTC: 116,394 (Five Year Total 1,525,000)					
<p>Planned work: WCPFC: Work in Year 3 will involve completing and consolidating the outcomes of the inventory work undertaken in Years 1 and 2. This will include production of a scientific paper based on findings from the Global t-RFMO Shark Browser prototype, and potentially an “app” based on the prototype. IATTC will continue to compile metadata and integrate holdings with existing databases. IATTC landings data collection protocols will be developed and trialled if additional funds can be made available. An initiative to summarize bycatch data across the t-RFMOs with the production of Bycatch Data Exchange Protocol (BDEP) templates by WCPFC and IOTC (CCSBT already produces this) will continue. ABNJ Tuna Project collaborators will advocate in t-RFMO bycatch working groups for public sharing and combining holdings into a global dataset. Ongoing tagging studies of post-release mortality in sharks are underway by ABNJ Tuna Project partners and will continue. These, and a workshop planned under Output 3.1.3, will inform development of an complementary experimental design to be implemented in the WCPO toward the end of Year 3 (or early in Year 4) with existing funds under Output 3.1.1 IATTC: Work in year 3 will include continuing activities begun in Year 2 as well as new activities. EPO shark databases identified in the MetaData report will continue to be incorporated into a shark database for use in stock assessments. Research papers describing these shark datasets will be produced and presented at the IATTC SAC meeting, May 2017. Assistance to IATTC Member States on shark data collection and distribution of materials for identification of species of sharks in the EPO will continue. <i>2nd Workshop on Data Limited Assessment Methods Shark Species</i> will be organized and delivered. Coordination between WCPFC and IATTC and their members will continue through the Pan-Pacific Shark and Bycatch Technical Steering Group and the ABNJ Tuna Project-Sharks and Bycatch Consultative Committee.</p>												
Pan-Pacific Shark and Bycatch Technical Steering Group (via skype, in blue) and ABNJ Tuna Project-Sharks and Bycatch Consultative Committee (at WCPFC Annual Commission meeting, in green)		█			█	█		█		█		
Global shark data inventory: produce peer-reviewed paper from prototype and pursue development of an “app” for auto-updated public use				█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Continue to support Bycatch Data Exchange Protocol as a common format for all t-RFMOs; work toward public posting and data sharing	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Develop experimental design for shark post-release mortality tagging study							█	█	█	█	█	█
IATTC: Capacity building for IATTC member States on data collection and analyses of shark species <i>2nd Workshop on Data Limited Assessment Methods Shark Species</i>							█	█				

		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Output 3.1.3 Global Bycatch Management and Information System and Mitigation Workshops	Lead WCPFC with SPC	Budget allocation for Year 2: 455,000 (Five Year Total: 1,197,000)											
<p>Planned work: BMIS content update and expansion is underway but system and website re-design have been held up by changes in personnel at SPC and delays in contracting procedures. A technical consultant will start work soon and under an accelerated work plan it may be possible to launch the new version by the end of 2016. Further enhancement work is scheduled to continue through 2017Q4. The second (and final) joint analysis workshop on sea turtle mitigation effectiveness will be held in Hawaii in November 2017 and management implications will be considered based on the results. An expert workshop to design a shark post-release mortality study (to be carried out with funding under Output 3.1.1) is tentatively planned for January 2017.</p>													
Redesign of the BMIS													
Populating of re-designed BMIS													
Planning and holding workshops analysing data on the effectiveness of bycatch mitigation for Pacific sea turtles and Pacific sharks													
Dissemination of outcomes from sea turtle workshop, including consideration of conservation and management measures													
Planning and holding expert workshop on experimental design of shark post-release mortality tagging study													
Initiate shark post-release tagging study													

		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Output 3.2.1 Seabird mitigation long liners	Lead BirdLife	Budget allocation for LOA4: Year 3 USD 250,000 (excluding Electronic Observer Scheme and Namibia Instructor) (Five Year Total 1,507,450)											
<p>Planned work:</p> <p>A <i>The use of best practice seabird bycatch mitigation measures is enhanced and accelerated, and additional methods to monitor the uptake, use and effectiveness of these measures are tested</i></p> <p>Work in year 3 will include the continued implementation of awareness workshops and observer training sessions. Upon successful buy-in of the local pelagic longline fishery and government departments, a Memorandum of Understanding will be signed in order to allow the tending for the provision of specialist services relating to Electronic Observers Systems (previously referred to as Electronic Monitoring), and the two pilot studies will be initiated (one in Brazil and one in South Africa). Implementation of the sampling strategy and port visits the port-based seabird bycatch mitigation outreach pilot in Cape Town will be developed and initiated. The Namibian Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Instructor will begin to characterize the local pelagic fishing in Namibia, make contact with the relevant stakeholders and engage in at-sea data collection and sea trials to test mitigation measures.</p> <p>B <i>The capacity of national institutions to manage and conduct analyses of seabird bycatch data and the effectiveness of bycatch mitigation measures is strengthened, and assessment methods are harmonised to facilitate a joint tuna RFMO assessment of the current bycatch mitigation measures contained in the relevant Conservation and Management Measures</i></p> <p>During year 3, the two regional seabird bycatch assessment workshops will be held. A review of the current approaches used by national institutions to assess seabird bycatch, as well as their capacity needs, will be undertaken. The first of two regional bycatch assessment workshops, which serve to strengthen capacity and work towards the global assessment workshop in 2017, will be conducted.</p>													
A Seabird bycatch mitigation outreach, liaison and training													
A Develop and implement pilot initiatives in South Africa and Brazil to assess the viability of using Electronic Monitoring Systems for monitoring seabird bycatch and mitigation													
A Design and implement trial of port-based visits of vessels in South Africa for outreach and monitoring in relation to seabird bycatch and mitigation													
B Regional seabird bycatch data analysis workshops, including training and data preparation													




		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Output 3.2.2 Purse-seine trials of bycatch mitigation	Lead WWF with ISSF	Budget allocation for Year 3: 600,000 (Five Year Total 1,974,552 ¹⁵)											
Planned work: Sea trials will take place in the second half of 2016, with results disseminated in 2016 and beyond													
Purse Seine sea trials AO, PO, IO												↓ →	
Results analysis												↓ →	
Incorporation of results into best practices												↓ →	
Workshops to disseminate best practices												↓ →	

		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
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	Lead WWF with WWF-Pakistan/SFI Cooperating Partners: MFD (Pakistan),IFRO/Shilat Iran and MOFW, Oman/IOTC	Budget allocation for Year 3 325,000 (Five Year Total 596,120 ¹⁶)											
Planned work: Scale-up the observer program in Pakistan and continue dialogue with Iran on replicating the approach. Pilot AIS on Pakistan fleets and digital observer technology with Maldives yellowfin tuna fleet. Convert several gill-nets to long-line, and exchange experiences between Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Work with IOTC on addressing capacity gaps in the Northern Indian Ocean through workshops and other training.													

¹⁵ Amounts including procurement through FAO

¹⁶ Total amount available under Execution Agreement

Capacity building workshop	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	→		
RFMO compliance program				■	■	→				■	■		
Evaluation of alternative gear configurations	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				→
Stakeholder consultations				■	■					■	■		
Synthesizing data to t-RFMO by reporting to science committee of IOTC				■	■					■	■		→

		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Component 4 Component 4: Information and Best Practices Dissemination and M&E													
Output 4.1.1 Communications	Lead FAO	Budget allocation for Year 3: 150,000 ((Five Year Total 522,839)											
Planned work: The PMU will continue to communicate project key messages, progress, results and best practices. Communication with Project and Program Partners will continue.. Project information on the Common Oceans website will be updated and amended. A Communications Intern will join the PMU in August 2016 to strengthen communication efforts.													
Communication of project key messages, progress, results and best practices													
Communications with Project and Program Partners													
Output 4.1.3 IW:Learn	Lead FAO	Budget allocation for Year 3: 30,000 ((Five Year Total 211,949)											
Planned work: No GEF IW:Learn Conference expected to take place in Project Year 3. First Project Experience Note will be prepared following the Mid-term evaluation, Learning exchange meetings between EMS pilots													
Participation in GEF International Waters conference													
Project Experience Note													
Learning exchange meetings between EMS pilots													

		Q3-2016			Q4-2016			Q1-2017			Q2-2017		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
Output 4.1.2 Synthesis of immediate project results, compilation of catalytic results globally	Lead FAO	Budget allocation for Year 3: Total allocated under PMU costs											
Planned work: The PMU will continue to compile information on progress for the different Project outputs and prepare Project progress reports and the PIR as required.													
Monitoring and documentation of project progress		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Preparation of PPRs and PIRs		█						█					█
Output 4.2.1 Midterm and final evaluations	Lead: FAO Office of Evaluation	Budget allocation for Year 3: 113,000 (Five Year Total 230,761)											
Planned work: The Mid-Term Evaluation will start at the Project Steering Committee 2016. Field visits are planned for September/October 2016. Final report expected by December 2016.													
Mid Term Evaluation		█	█	█	█	█							
Final Evaluation													█