

Project Evaluation Series

**Terminal evaluation of
“Global sustainable fisheries
management and biodiversity
conservation in the areas beyond
national jurisdiction”
ABNJ Program coordination**

**Project code: GCP/GLO/541/GFF
GEF ID: 4580**

Management response

Overall response to the evaluation

The Project Management is very grateful to Mr SV Divvaakar for his work on the evaluation that has provided a series of valuable lessons and recommendations. We also appreciate the dedication that allowed the work to be completed and delivered under severe time constraints.

We found many of the conclusions of the evaluation in agreement with our own assessment of the lessons learned during the implementation of the Program, and served as a basis for the design of the second phase of the Program. This is evident by the high degree of agreement of Management with the recommendations submitted, as reflected in the Table below.

It is clear that FAO has learned and evolved from the implementation of the Common Oceans ABNJ Program and that, combined with the suggestions provided by the Program and projects evaluations, will be to provide a better framework to achieve Program goals during a second phase.

Management response to the terminal evaluation of “Global sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in the areas beyond national jurisdiction” ABNJ Program coordination					July 2020
Evaluation Recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Time frame (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
Recommendation 1. To FAO Program Management Unit. Before detailing individual projects, finalize a Programme Partnership Framework document with an agreed Program Theory of Change to guide the selection of appropriate projects, activities, roles, responsibilities and mutual accountability arrangements among implementing agencies and executing partners.	Accepted	The design of a second phase is based on a Theory of Change that was developed by all potential partners. As part of the Coordination arrangements for this second phase, a fully specified Partnership Strategy will be developed describing relationships among the implementing agencies.	FAO Program Management Unit	Second phase	N
Recommendation 2. To FAO and GEF SEC. Provide guidance on the desired cross-sectoral balance between fisheries governance and biodiversity conservation aspects and clarify scope for engagement with other economic sectors impacting ecosystem services and biodiversity in context of the BBNJ negotiations.	Accepted	The partners, in discussing the scope of the future work on the ABNJ, have agreed to focus on fisheries management issues and on cross-sectoral coordination that might affect cumulative impacts on biodiversity in the ABNJ. Due to the inter-governmental nature of the negotiations, the second phase of the Program will have a limited ability to influence directly the outcome of the BBNJ negotiations, which would have concluded by the start of the Program. However, capacity building and knowledge on matters relevant to the new agreement, including cross-sectoral matters will be provided to relevant audiences to allow Parties to become more effective participants once the future agreement enters into force.	FAO and GEF SEC	Second phase	N

<p>Recommendation 3. To FAO Program Management Unit. Improve stakeholder consultation with national stakeholders (RFMO members besides regional institutional secretariats) in design and allocate commensurate program preparation resources from co-financing</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Extended consultations are already on-going with the RFMO members, so that there is continuing feedback from key stakeholders during the design phase. A full and detailed consultation will not be feasible with every RFMO member due to the large number of Parties involved.</p>	<p>FAO Program Management Unit</p>	<p>Second phase</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 4. To FAO Fisheries Department. Sufficiently resource a Full-sized Project for Programme Coordination, and develop clear terms of reference for Programme Leader (Executive, not Coordinator), and Program Steering Committee with clear descriptions of role, responsibilities and powers. Program Coordination Project should be directly tasked with centralized knowledge management, Communications and Outreach, and Monitoring arrangements including full time focal points in all projects.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>A full-size Global Coordination Project has been included in the design of the second phase with those recommended features. The Program Coordinator is expected to be a full-time position and maintaining close contact with the projects, promoting collaboration, but without interfering with the technical activities of the child projects.</p>	<p>FAO Fisheries Department</p>	<p>Second phase</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 5. To FAO Program Management Unit. Develop clear work plans, budgets and specific results (process and outcomes) indicators for knowledge management, expert networks and communities of practice contributions guidance and quality assurance.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Knowledge management (KM) aspects will be managed at the child project level, supporting some of the more technical KM products. At the Program level, KM is centralized at the Global Coordination Project (GCP), seeking to synthesize lessons learned at the project level for more global audience. The GCP KM, Communications and outreach will also support the child project teams with their communication needs.</p>	<p>FAO Program Management Unit</p>	<p>Second phase</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 6. To GEF SEC. Issue clear and unambiguous guidelines on co-financing with</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Noted by the PMU</p>	<p>GEF SEC</p>	<p>Second phase</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>requirements of supporting details and breakdowns of in-kind contributions and recurrent public expenditures. At the same time, be flexible on the minimum co-financing targets for transnational programs which have only grant or in-kind contribution avenues.</p>					
<p>Recommendation 7. To FAO-GEF Coordination Unit. Include in the Program document the TORs of GEF Coordination Unit, including requirements for a brief note on review and quality checks of Progress Reports submitted by PMU. Have more stringent appraisal mechanisms at program level, including Programmatic level Indicators for processes and results.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Noted by the PMU, who appreciated the occasions when the Coordination Unit supplied feedback on Progress Reports. Regarding ToR for the GEF Coordination Unit – duly noted by the GEF Coordination Unit. Regarding more stringent appraisal mechanisms at program level, our appraisal is tied closely to that of the GEF’s and when this program was written, reviewed and approved, the GEF was just beginning to understand better what an effective “program” is. In the past six years, the GEF has come a long way in making its programmatic approaches more robust, as will be reflected in the design of the new ABNJ program just approved.</p>	<p>FAO-GEF Coordination Unit</p>	<p>Second phase</p>	<p>N</p>