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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABNJ</td>
<td>Areas beyond national jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Automated information system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBNJ</td>
<td>Biological diversity beyond national jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSBT</td>
<td>Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEST</td>
<td>Central Eastern Summer Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>Deep-sea fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF Project</td>
<td>ABNJ deep-sea fisheries under the ecosystem approach project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBSA</td>
<td>Ecologically or biologically significant areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eNGO</td>
<td>Environmental NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environmental Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF-7</td>
<td>Seventh replenishment of resources of the GEF trust fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFCM</td>
<td>General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATTC</td>
<td>Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICES</td>
<td>International Council for the Exploration of the Seas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTC</td>
<td>Indian Ocean Tuna Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>International Seabed Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSF</td>
<td>International Seafood Sustainability Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFO</td>
<td>Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAFC</td>
<td>North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPFC</td>
<td>North Pacific Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIM</td>
<td>Operational partners implementation modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFMO</td>
<td>Regional fisheries management organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>Significant adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAFO</td>
<td>South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOFA</td>
<td>Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRFMO</td>
<td>South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VME</td>
<td>Vulnerable marine ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCPFC</td>
<td>Western &amp; Central Pacific Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The inception workshop of the areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) Deep-Sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach (DSF) Project was held virtually in two sessions using the video conferencing tool “Zoom” on 24 August 2020 and 26 August 2020. The workshop was attended by representatives and potential project partners, including seven Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs), the GEF Secretariat and two industry organizations.

The primary objective of the inception workshop was to update the project partners on the project’s scope, including objectives, components and outputs and to review the projects delivery structure, including the roles of the Implementing Agency and Executing Agency. The timeline for the development of the DSF Project was also discussed.

The inception workshop participants took note and commented on the outputs and activities that are being developed by the project design team, recognizing that this is still work in progress which will require further discussions and inputs. The participants also took note of the respective roles of GEF implementing and executing agencies, but were unable to make suggestions as to suitable and acceptable executing agencies for the DSF Project. Participants took note of the DSF Project timeline, recognizing that it could be affected by the Covid-19 pandemic.
OPENING OF THE MEETING

The inception workshop of the ABNJ DSF Project was held virtually in two sessions using the video conferencing tool “Zoom”. The two sessions followed the same agenda but were scheduled at different times to allow for participation from different time zones. Session 1 started at 10.00 on 24 August 2020 and session 2 at 21.00 on 26 August 2020 (CEST). The workshop was attended by representatives and potential project partners, including seven Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) and two industry organizations. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) project design team organized and led the sessions that were also attended by other FAO staff. The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) Secretariat attended session 1. An invitation was extended to the International Seabed authority (ISA) who planned to attend but withdrew just prior to the workshop. The list of participants is given in Appendix 1.

The workshop was opened by Mr William Emerson, Lead Development Coordinator for the DSF Project at FAO. Mr Emerson welcomed the participants on behalf of the FAO and introduced the FAO project design team consisting of himself, Mr Tony Thompson and Ms Lena Westlund. He noted the importance of this meeting to formally introduce and discuss the DSF Project to potential partners and to explain the development of the project to date and the participatory nature of the project design process.

The project design team and participants introduced themselves. Mr Emerson moderated the workshop and Ms Lena Westlund asked approval from participants to record the meeting to assist in the drafting of the report. There were no objections and the meeting was recorded. The Agenda was presented and “any other business” was added as the last agenda item (Appendix 2).

Mr Emerson noted that a voice-over presentation for Agenda Item 4 and an associated questionnaire were sent to participants on 13 August 2020 to assist participants in preparing for this Inception Workshop.

DEEP-SEA FISHERIES PROJECT

Mr Emerson presented the Common Ocean Program (Phase II) and its structure of five projects, including the DSF Project (Agenda Item 2; Appendix 3a, 4, 5). In the second session, Mr Emerson summarized comments made by Mr Chris Severin (GEF Secretariat) during the Workshop’s first session. Mr Severin noted that that industry participation was an important consideration for GEF when reviewing projects. He also noted that consideration should be given to including the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to partner the project and work with outputs relating to biodiversity and multi-sectoral frameworks.

The links between the five projects was also discussed noting that FAO implements the Common Oceans Program, the tuna and global coordination projects as well as the DSF Project. It was noted that the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) and Sargasso Sea Commission secretariats are holding discussions to promote more collaboration. It was commented that the DSF and the Sargasso Sea Projects should also consider some joint activities. With regard to collaboration with the Tuna Project, see ‘Additional discussions’ below.
Mr Emerson presented the role of partners in the project, explaining the DSF Project’s common vision, shared roles and responsibilities, role of implementing and executing agencies, and joint planning and implementation (Agenda Item 3; Appendix 3b).

There were several points of discussion and a summary is presented here.

It was explained that the project was seeking more partners that would help deliver the project’s objectives, and noted that the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES) should have already been included in the list of potential partners shown in the presentation. Further, RFMOs are the responsible body for managing deep-sea fisheries in the ABNJ and as such are key partners to the DSF Project. However, the DSF Project partnerships are not limited to RFMOs; other partners, in particular the fishing industry, are important in supporting sustainable fisheries and catalysing change.

The DSF Project is implemented by FAO, but the executing agency(ies) has not yet been selected. According to GEF (GEF, 2017) requirements, project implementation (project design and oversight) should be separated from project execution (management and administration of project day-to-day activities). In Phase I, FAO received an exemption and acted as both the implementing and executing agency. FAO are identifying options for possible executing agency(ies), but noted that there are no institutions at the global level with the mandate and expertise to facilitate coordinated management of ABNJ deep-sea fisheries at this scale. The effective execution of the DSF Project will require an executing agency with a thorough knowledge of deep-sea fisheries at the global level and a solid working relationship with the range of partners, especially RFMOs and industry. It was noted that, with the exception of General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) (an FAO Article XIV body), the other deep-sea RFMOs are independent of FAO and operate under their own separate Conventions/Accords. Mr Emerson clarified that it was possible for a partner to be the executing agency, but the organization would be required to undergo a fiduciary assessment as part of FAO’s operational partners implementation modality (OPIM) requirements.

Workshop participants understood the reasoning for the separation of responsibilities but were unable to make suggestions as to suitable and acceptable executing agencies. It was felt that RFMOs would not have the capacity to take on this role and that such an arrangement is outside of their mandate and unlikely to be acceptable to contracting parties, in particular considering the important global dimensions of the project: it would be unlikely that they could bring the work together at a global level. It was also felt that there were no Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) with sufficient knowledge of high seas bottom fisheries that would be acceptable to all partners. There was an appreciation that FAO would be the most appropriate body to provide the necessary support and expertise to execute the project, especially owing to their work with the first project and their duties to promote responsible fisheries at the global level.

It was noted that the Tuna Project in the first phase utilized several executing agencies, each looking at specific aspects of the project. However, tuna RFMOs and the tuna fisheries differ substantially from the deep-sea RFMOs.

Options for project execution will continue to be explored with the intention to resolve this by end of 2020. It is unclear what would happen if FAO were unable to find executing agencies...
that would be acceptable to partners, GEF and FAO. Mr Emerson said that FAO will make best efforts to identify an executing agency(ies). The matter would then be considered by GEF.

**PROJECT OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES**

The presentation on project outputs and activities was given by Mr Tony Thompson under agenda item 4 (Appendix 3c). The project design team has worked on identifying outputs and activities by further elaborating on the project concept note. The presentation explained the currently proposals noting that this is work in progress with a need for further discussions and inputs. A voice-over presentation and a questionnaire had been circulated before the meeting.

*Questionnaires*

Questions were raised regarding the circulated questionnaires. It was explained that the primary purpose of the questionnaires was to help identify areas of interest to partner organizations and to develop their in-kind contributions. This will assist in the preparation of the in-kind funding amounts and to develop project activities funded directly through GEF support. This will ensure that the in-kind regional activities are supported where required, discussed among regions, and developed into global actions to benefit sustainable deep-sea fisheries overall. The questionnaire also asks partners to identify experts for “output teams”. These suggested informal output teams will assist with the identification of project activities during project development, advising the FAO project design team (see also below under ‘Next steps’).

**Component 1 - Governance and regulatory frameworks**

The outputs and activities in Component 1 were introduced, noting that they had been updated since the circulation of the voice-over presentation

*Output 1.1.2 – national obligations*

A question was raised if partners would assist the project’s work with national administrations to update legal regimes in GEF eligible countries, if and as required. The project design team clarified that this work would be undertaken by project experts working directly with the GEF eligible countries.

**Component 2 – Effective management**

*Output 2.1.1 – science-management interface*

Questions were raised regarding the importance of the RFMO performance reviews and if the project could improve upon these when examining confidentiality and transparency. In answering this, it was felt that the performance reviews would provide a starting point to examining confidentiality and transparency but that the purpose of the project was not to improve upon the results of the performance reviews which were undertaken against specific terms of reference. However, the project’s interest would be broader and encompass regional comparisons and global requirements for confidentiality and transparency taking into account guidance given by international instruments and uptake in national legislation and by delegations.
General comments were that industry, flag states, and RFMOs require both confidentiality and transparency, but that this is a dynamic process with more information being shared now than historically (Automated Information System (AIS) and Global Fishing Watch for example). Industry welcomed an open review of this important issue, particularly if it would help restore consumer confidence in the deep-sea fishing industry.

Discussing the proposed work on strengthening the science-management interface, it was felt that industry should be added to the frameworks to be developed under Activity 1. However, after some thought, it was felt better to add a new output (2.1.1bis) to better highlight the importance of industry contributions to sustainable fisheries (see below).

**Output 2.1.1bis – industry contributions**

Participants from industry asked if the project will be undertaking work on the contributions that industry could make to assist RFMO management, science and compliance work. It was felt that current contributions from industry could be better utilized and industry were seeking ways to improve their contributions to sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation. It was mentioned that there have been occasions when information provided by the industry has been used in ways to later restrict their fishing opportunities. It was explained that the project has outputs relating to the science-management interface (2.1.1), to mechanisms promoting compliant behavior (2.1.3) and more generally to data collection on data-limited stocks (2.2.3), as well as on deep-water sharks (2.3.1) and VMEs (2.3.2). Participants explained that, though these are required, there is a need to work at a more fundamental level on frameworks to allow for more industry participation and exchange. It was recognized that there is currently no output dealing with this, and this should be added as a fourth output to outcome 2.1 on effective decision making.

Industry were also receptive to the project working on improving communication strategies regarding the development of conservation and management measures (CMMs) and reporting on the implementation of CMMs and to explore if this could be simplified. This would likely be an additional activity under the new output (2.1.1bis) and could involve project component 4 on communication strategies.

**Output 2.2.3 – value chain studies**

The proposed output and activities relating to value chains and socioeconomic dimensions were well received and demonstrated that the project will address topics that are needed but do not fall within the direct remit of the RFMOs. To further develop the project activities in this area, a scoping study will be undertaken as of the project design process. There was interest from participants in including “decent work” and it was confirmed that decent work and gender-disaggregated information will be part of the scoping study, with a particular aim of highlighting “good” employment conditions and opportunities for developing countries.

It was noted that distant water fishing fleets from Spain and the Netherlands employ crew from Peru and Indonesia and that the Covid-19 situation has resulted in some additional challenges that could also be considered by the project under this output.

FAO already has programmes on decent work and social responsibility in fish value chains that the project design team will consider when developing this output further and to explore synergies. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) were interested to explore if they could specifically support certain aspects
It was further noted that this DSF Project also serves to raise cross-sectoral awareness on a range of issues including the human element of the ecosystem approach.

**Output 2.3.2 – VMEs and significant adverse impacts (SAIs)**

It was noted that there appeared to be limited reference to exploratory bottom fisheries in the DSF Project. It was explained that the project did intend to work with exploratory fisheries, particularly under output 2.3.2 activities 1, 2, 3, and 6 (see Appendix 3). There may also be considerations under outputs 2.3.1 on impacts to deep-water sharks and potentially under output 2.2.2 on data-limited stocks.

**Component 3 – Cross-sectoral impacts**

The scope of Component 3 was discussed with respect to assessing the impacts on deep-sea fisheries from other sectors, including if there could be interactions across deep-sea fisheries, from tuna fisheries, and from non-fisheries sectors. It was explained that the intention was to include all of the above in this cross-sectoral component, but to keep the focus on impacts on deep-sea fisheries rather than a holistic cross-sectoral planning approach. However, it was felt that a cross-sectoral marine spatial planning approach with a focus on the use of deep-sea fisheries resources within and across sectors could be useful. It was noted that the spatial information on deep-sea fisheries required for spatial planning is being supported in other project outputs, particularly outputs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 under outcome 2.3 “DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed”.

The impacts on certain fisheries conservation measures was also discussed. For example, are impacts on vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) from non-fisheries sectors considered? The project design team regards the VME regulations as a component of the bottom fisheries sector, and so impacts on fisheries closures, such as VMEs, would be considered in the project in terms of developing frameworks under output 3.1.2.

It was also noted that this cross-sectoral output would have to consider extended continental shelf claims, as well as the ongoing negotiations for a new international treaty under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) on biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (referred to as the BBNJ process). The latter is considered under output 3.1.2 in terms of greater integration between the fisheries sector and the BBNJ process. The project design team was uncertain how to incorporate some of these aspects into the project. However, participants felt that the project offered a unique forum for discussion in that it was not subject to protocols that govern RFMOs or even States. It was therefore urged that the project should explore topics that may be difficult to discuss elsewhere owing to sensitivities. These would be treated on a case-by-case basis.

**Output 3.1.1**

It was suggested to change the wording of this output slightly and to replace “Threats to” with “Impacts on”. This was agreed (Appendix 5).

**Output 3.1.2**

It was noted that environmental NGOs are not currently included in the project. It was explained that this was partly due to this second phase being more fisheries focused than the first phase and partly because environmental NGOs have not come forward requesting
partnership. Other ocean resource users, such as the ISA are being approached and it is hoped
they will become partners. The involvement of CBD in the project was also raised, and
participants wanted to know a little more about the “mapping” process for ecologically or
biologically significant areas (EBSA). This possibility will be examined, especially in light of
CBD’s involvement in the first phase. The input from the non-fisheries sector is essential in
output 3.1.2 and desirable in output 2.3.1. The project will continue to explore working with
those organizations that have an interest in promoting multi-sectoral resource use and
sustainable DSF, which includes the identification and reduction of impacts on biodiversity
from deep-sea fisheries.

Component 4 - Knowledge management and communication

Knowledge management and communication is an important part of the DSF Project
and supported by the Global Coordination Project under the Common Oceans Program
(Appendix 4). The project will identify challenges and promote the project’s successes
within the field of deep-sea fisheries. Another area of the project’s communications
focus is to promote messaging to wider stakeholder audiences, beyond the conventional
key target audiences of the RFMO contracting parties and the industry. It was appreciated
that RFMO Secretariats have limited capacity to explore this, both in terms of finance and
staff availability. In general, it was felt that a review of RFMO websites, with respect to
reaching wider stakeholder audiences, would be regarded as positive and project support
would be welcome.

A question was raised about the promotion of a Kobe-like process within the DSF Project.
The Kobe process originated in a meeting held in Kobe, Japan in 2007 and is a joint tuna
RFMO process bringing together the tuna RFMOs (IATTC, IOTC, WCPFC, CCSBT and
ICCAT) to play a role in assisting the tuna organizations to deliver a more consistent
sustainable and science-based approach to sustainable tuna fisheries management (tuna.org,
2011). The Kobe process was encouraged and supported under the Tuna Project (phase 1).
There is no equivalent arrangement in deep-sea fisheries that brings Contracting parties
together. It was noted that the DSF Project, both under the first phase and intended
activities under the second phase, will hold technical meetings to further science-based
fisheries management, for example, a review of the implementation of the DSF Guidelines.
However, and unless partners express a wish for this during project development, there is
no plan for the project to undertake activities to introduce a Kobe-like process for deep-
sea fisheries.

Additional discussions

A question was also raised concerning joint activities with the Tuna Project, especially
as regards to the contribution that the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
(ISSF) makes to sustainable management of the tuna fisheries. It was explained that this
had been considered in the context of the DSF Project, but expanding the ISSF mandate to
include deep-sea fisheries was an expensive option and there seems little demand for
it within the deep-sea fisheries sub-sector. The project will however keep this, and
other collaborative activities, under review.

The GEF Secretariat, during session one, raised the figures given in the GEF Core Indicators
table of the project concept note (GEF, 2020). There were concerns that the area of
marine habitat under improved practices (excluding protected areas) was excessive,
but it was explained that the size of the areas in the ABNJ are vast and cannot be related to
those on land. Nevertheless, it was agreed that GEF-7 core indicator 5 needed more
explanation regarding the meaning of “improved”. There was also a wish to see if the value
of 50 000 tonnes for globally
over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels could be increased. It was noted that this represented almost 25 percent of the annual DSF catch, which was the baseline metric used. However, an improved value may represent the exploitable biomass which would be several times higher, though more difficult to acquire as standing stock size is not known in many deep-sea fisheries.

It was also explained that the project’s achievements are monitored through indicators and targets defined in the project’s results matrix, and an example was shown on screen. This will be undertaken through regular monitoring and evaluation activities and during project’s terminal evaluation which is carried out by independent consultants. It was pointed out that the most important indicators are at the outcome level, which is beyond the direct control of the project but is where real change would occur.

NEXT STEPS

Agenda item 5 was presented by Mr William Emerson who explained the next steps in the project development (Appendix 3d). The DSF Project document will be developed during 2020 and 2021. The aim is to have GEF Secretariat clearance of the project document by June 2021. In order to meet this deadline, the project document will need to be submitted for internal FAO clearance by early 2021. This timing may, however, be affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. Moreover, several partners have indicated that it may be difficult for them to confirm their in-kind contributions by the end of 2020 as decisions would be needed by their constituent bodies and the timeline would hence be dependent on related meeting schedules. The project itself is expected to be launched in early 2022.

Output teams

The purpose of the proposed output teams was discussed. The intention is to select 3–4 experts per output to advise the project design team on suitable activities that will lead to up-scaling of the regional in-kind contributions. This will guide the identification of project activities especially those to be funded by the GEF financial contribution. It is envisaged that the project design team will develop drafts of activities for each output and that these will be reviewed by the output teams who will make suggestions. The output team workload is expected to be minimal, probably reviewing 2–3 page documents once a month during project development. Members should represent a range of expertise and could be drawn from managers, scientists, compliance, secretariat or industry.

Project activities and in-kind contributions

It was appreciated that the project has drafted a set of proposed activities that would help to deliver the outputs and lead to the uptake of the outcomes. However, the identification of relevant in-kind activities by RFMOs, industry and other partners still requires some coordinated work. The questionnaires were designed in part to do this. To provide initial inputs, the project design team will draft up in-kind and project activities under each output and circulate to partners for their review. It was felt this would provide a structure to the process and help in project development. It was noted that this draft will need to be shared widely as part of the participatory development process.
Project partners

The project design team will contact confirmed project partners individually to further discuss engagement and project design. These discussions will be complemented by inputs from the output teams discussed above.

In addition to those partners that are already confirmed, it was suggested to follow-up with Fisheries Council of Canada (who participated in the inception workshop) to discuss their potential interest in contributing to the project and becoming a partner. Moreover, CBD should be informed of the project and contacts with ISA should be renewed.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

It was noted that the Covid-19 pandemic has affected fisheries and will also affect project design and implementation. This should be reflected in the project document.

The representative from the Fisheries Council of Canada thanked the project for the invitation to attend the Inception workshop and will discuss possible collaboration with colleagues.

MEETING CLOSURE

Session 1 was closed 12.15 on 24 August 2020 and session 2 was closed at 23.00 on 26 August 2020 (CEST).
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**APPENDIX 1: PARTICIPANTS**

**Session 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFCM</td>
<td>Miguel Bernal</td>
<td>Senior fishery officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAFC</td>
<td>Darius Campbell</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPFC</td>
<td>Peter Flewwelling</td>
<td>Compliance Manager</td>
<td>North Pacific Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAFO</td>
<td>Lizette Voges</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOFA</td>
<td>Thierry Clot</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRFMO</td>
<td>Craig Loveridge</td>
<td>Acting Executive Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICES</td>
<td>Wojciech Wawrzynski</td>
<td>Head of Science Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICFA</td>
<td>Ivan Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEALORD</td>
<td>Charles Heaphy</td>
<td>Resource Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIODFA</td>
<td>Ross Shotton</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Oceans Tuna Project</td>
<td>Emelie Martensson</td>
<td>Communications Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathrin Hett</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Chris Severin</td>
<td>IW Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Rishi Sharma</td>
<td>Senior Fisheries Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Emerson</td>
<td>ABNJ Deep-sea Fisheries Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAFO</td>
<td>Fred Kingston</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann Mencher</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICFA</td>
<td>Ivan Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Council of Canada</td>
<td>Kate Docking</td>
<td>Manager, Policy and Regulatory Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Rishi Sharma</td>
<td>Senior Fisheries Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Emerson</td>
<td>ABNJ Deep-sea Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Thompson</td>
<td>Fisheries consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lena Westlund</td>
<td>Project development consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lena Westlund</td>
<td>Project development consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: AGENDA

AGENDA

INCEPTION WORKSHOP

24 and 26 AUGUST 2020

1. Introductions

2. Deep-sea Fisheries (DSF) Project
   a. Common Oceans Program
   b. DSF Theory of Change

3. Project partners
   a. Common vision
   b. Shared roles and responsibilities
   c. Implementing and executing agencies
   d. Joint planning and implementation

4. DSF Project outputs and activities
   a. Component 1: Governance and regulatory frameworks (Outputs 1.1.1 – 1.1.3)
   b. Component 2: Effective management (Outputs 2.1.1 – 2.3.2)
   c. Component 3: Cross-sectoral impacts (Outputs 3.1.1 – 3.1.2)
   d. Component 4: Knowledge management and communication (Output 4.1.1)

5. Next steps

6.

7. Any other business

8. Conclusion
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Agenda item 2: Deep sea fishery project
DSF Project Concept Note (approved July 2020)

Theory of Change – DSF Project Components and longer term benefits

- Deep-sea fish stocks at or above levels supporting MSY and fished sustainably
- Deep sea marine ecosystems healthy with biodiversity protected
- Socio-economic benefits from DSF maximised
- Integrated multi-sectoral management of ABNJ

Outcome 1.1 Outputs
- Reduced IUU fishing in deep sea fisheries

Component 1 Governance - strengthening and implementing regulatory frameworks

Outcome 2.1 Outputs
- Increase in number of fish stocks having known status and supporting sustainable DSF

Component 2 Strengthening effective management of DSF

Outcome 2.2 Outputs
- Reduction in significant adverse impacts from DSF on biodiversity

Component 3 Improving understanding and management of cross-sectoral impacts on DSF

Outcome 2.3 Outputs
- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

Component 4 Knowledge management, communication, and M&E

Outcome 3.1 Outputs

Outcome 4.3 Outputs
Conclusion

The Common Oceans Program has its own Theory of Change (ToC)

Each project has its ToC that support the program ToC

Outcomes are what the project wants to achieve but they are beyond the direct control of the project

Outputs are what the project can achieve through in-kind and project activities

Participatory discussions with potential partners helped develop the outcomes and outputs
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Agenda item 3: Partner principles

- Common vision
- Shared roles and responsibilities
- Joint planning and implementation
DSF Project partners
(provisional and looking for more!)

Funding:
US$5 million from GEF for 5 years
Co-funding estimate US$60 million

Implementing Agency
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Common vision

Common vision that aligns with Project’s desired outcomes, in particular:

1) Deep-sea fish stocks at or above levels supporting MSY and fished sustainably

2) Deep sea marine ecosystems healthy with biodiversity protected

3) Socio-economic benefits from DSF maximized

4) Integrated multi-sectoral management of ABNJ
Common vision

... and how the outcomes will be achieved:
- More project studies that collect "original" information (including identifying constraints to data collection and assessments)
- Work more at the science-management interface to ensure common understanding and support
- Focus effort where the project can make the greatest contribution:
  - Ecosystem modelling and ecosystem health
  - Data-poor stocks
  - Deepwater sharks
  - VMEs and SAIs
- Cross-sectoral activities affecting DSF
- Clear messaging to support the work of the DSF Project and RFMOs

Shared roles and responsibilities

Partner contributions to the Project’s objectives, usually through in-kind (partner) and project (GEF) contributions:

- **In-kind contributions** are contributions from the Partners’ work and activities that support the project’s objectives.

- **Cash funding** supports additional work (not normally undertaken by the partners) that adds value to the in-kind funding.
Activities that can be supported by GEF funding

- Workshops for international collaboration
- Training programmes (GEF eligible countries)
- Infrastructure support (GEF eligible countries)
- Partnership coordination
- Hire of expert consultants for project work
- Production of technical documents (e.g. FAO series, project series)
- Development of guidelines (e.g. DSF Guidelines) and field guides
- Technical work supporting RFMOs (but not part of core activity, e.g. trialling new technology, bycatch studies)
- Support for compliance activities (especially Port State Measures)
- Support to States for drafting legislation

Implementing and Executing agencies

GEF Implementing Agency (FAO) is responsible for the implementation of the project, which entails oversight of project execution. GEF implementing agencies are accountable to the GEF Council for their GEF-financed activities.

GEF Executing Agency undertakes the execution of the project, including the management and administration of the project’s day-to-day activities. Execution functions are financed by the Project. The project’s executing agency is responsible for the implementation of the agreed project results and operational oversight of the Project’s activities.
Joint planning and implementation

Partners are involved and participate in:

- Project planning
  - Project activities developed collaboratively with partners (though a guiding draft has been developed by the project team).
  - Use of Output advisory teams
- Project Steering Committees (yearly)
- Project evaluation (midterm and final)

Appendix 3c

Agenda item 4: Outputs and activities
Inception Workshop Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Deep Sea Fisheries (DSF) Project
   a. Common Oceans Program
   b. DSF Theory of Change
3. Project partners
   a. Common Vision
   b. Shared roles and responsibilities
   c. Implementing and executing agencies
   d. Joint planning and implementation
4. DSF Project outputs and activities
   a. Component 1: Governance and regulatory frameworks (Outputs 1.1.1 - 1.1.3)
   b. Component 2: Market governance (Outputs 2.1.1 - 2.2.2)
   c. Component 3: stock assessment and advice (Outputs 3.1.1 - 3.1.2)
   d. Component 4: Knowledge management and outreach (Outputs 4.1.1 - 4.1.2)
5. Next steps
6. Conclusion

Voice-over presentation and questionnaire

The circulated voice-over presentation allowed partners to become acquainted with the work of the Deep Sea Fisheries project. This helps identify:

- the outputs of most relevance to partners
- assist in the calculation of co-funding amounts
- assist in the selection of experts to advise the project in developing and implementing its outputs

A questionnaire was sent to partners to guide the above
ABNJ Deep-Sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach Project’s Inception Workshop

Component 1
Governance - strengthening and implementing regulatory frameworks

Outcome 1.1 - Wider adoption, enforcement and compliance of international obligations relating to sustainable fisheries (stocks and impacts)

Output 1.1.1 - Gaps in regional obligations to (i) manage fish stocks and (ii) reduce fisheries impacts on biodiversity identified (updated) and corrective measures developed

Activities
1. Scoping study on international obligations on data-limited stocks and bycatch
2. Support for implementation of relevant international instruments
3. Capacity building for strengthened and compatible conservation and management measures

Output 1.1.2 - Measures to address national legal and regulatory gaps in international legally binding and voluntary Instruments including FAO voluntary guidelines related to fisheries management piloted in selected countries

Activities
1. Confirm regional findings at national level if relevant
2. Develop national strategy and action plan to address gaps
3. Reflect or implement measures in national legal frameworks

Output 1.1.3 - Gaps in existing capacity to strengthen compliance and enforcement identified and training provided

Activities
1. Develop action plan for gaps identified in regional and national workshops
2. Implementation of action plan and delivering compliance and enforcement capacity building

Component 2
Strengthening effective management of DSF

Outcome 2.1 - Effective decision-making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts

Outcome 2.2 - Improved advice supporting science-based fisheries management

Outcome 2.3 - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed

Component 3
Cross-sectoral

Outcome 3.1 - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability

Component 4
Information sharing

Outcome 4.1 - Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences
Component 2
Strengthening effective management of DSF

Outcome 2.1 - Effective decision-making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts

Output 2.1.1 - Frameworks to improve science-management interface and exchange strengthened

Activities
1. Strengthen communication frameworks between management, science and compliance committees
2. Support implementation strategies for EAF and PA
3. Analyse RFMO confidentiality and transparency rules and ensure they are fit-for-purpose

Output 2.1.2 - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

Activities
1. Strengthen collaboration for industry support to RFMO management, compliance and science processes
2. Communication strategies for uptake and reporting of RFMO regulations by industry

Output 2.1.3 - Analysis of existing and potential incentive mechanisms to promote and reward compliant behaviour

Activity
1. Identify and promote fisheries management systems that offer "rewards" for compliance
   [Promoted under other activities]

Component 2
Strengthening effective management of DSF

Outcome 2.2 - Improved advice supporting science-based fisheries management

Output 2.2.1 - Ecosystem and stock productivity models developed to support scientific advice (including demersal and small pelagic species and climate change effects)

Activities
1. Develop and utilize productivity models to predict fish yields under changing environmental conditions
2. Scope and develop data collection opportunities by commercial fishing vessels to help understand oceanographic processes and climate change

Output 2.2.2 - Support provided to RFMOs to improve scientific advice on data-limited stocks

Activities
1. Support and develop fit-for-purpose data collection programs
2. Develop and apply assessment methodologies appropriate to management plans
3. Develop frameworks for providing scientific advice under uncertainty
4. Undertake surveys to support assessments

Output 2.2.3 - Value chain and socioeconomic analysis undertaken on selected DSF and information disseminated

Activity
1. Undertake value chain analyses of key deep sea species (e.g., orange roughy, alfonsino, Pacific amonhead)
2. Undertake socio-economic analyses on selected value chains with an emphasis on fair and decent working conditions and opportunities for developing countries
3. Review relevance of above to work of RFMOs and the implementation of paragraph 33 of the FAO DSF Guidelines
Component 2

Strengthening effective management of DSF

Outcome 2.3 - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed

Output 2.3.1 - Impacts of DSF on deepwater sharks assessed and mitigation proposed

Activities

1. Support and develop fit-for-purpose data collection programs
2. Support and undertake impact assessments on deepwater shark populations
3. Examine the effectiveness of mitigation options

Output 2.3.2 - Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved

Activities

1. Develop methodologies to improve the identification of VME areas during commercial fishing operations
2. Review of implementation of FAO DSF Guidelines
3. Develop methodologies to quantify gear-specific impacts to VMEs
4. Develop methodologies for the long-term monitoring of VME health
5. Continued support to the FAO VME Database
6. Support the detailed mapping of DSF by effort and gear

Component 3

Improving understanding and management of cross-sectoral impacts on DSF

Outcome 3.1 - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability

Output 3.1.1 - Threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors operating in the deep seas identified and information made available

Activities

1. Identify threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors
2. Develop methodologies to determine the significance of threats on DSF from other sectors

Output 3.1.2 - Frameworks to better mitigate and manage cross-sectoral impacts on DSF developed

Activities

1. Develop collaborative frameworks to help assess and mitigate cross-sectoral impacts
2. Support and develop a Marine Spatial Planning approach for DSF
3. Increased integration of the fisheries sector into the BBNJ process
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Agenda item 5: Next steps

ABNJ Deep Sea Fisheries Project

Concept Note  Dec 2019 – Jun 2020
Project Development  Jul 2020 – Jul 2021
Project Execution  Jan 2022 – Dec 2026

Inception Workshop

Agenda item 5 – Next steps
Next steps

- The DSF Project will be developed during 2020 and early 2021
- Project documented submitted in early 2021
- Project expected to start around January 2022

---------------------------------------------------------------------

- Project funded baseline consultancies in 2020 will provide background to the current global situation (used for Results Framework and project monitoring)
- Output “teams” to be selected by September 2020
- Partner in-kind contributions (preliminary) by October 2020
- Budget and co-financing letters by end 2020
- Validation workshop in late 2020/early 2021 to finalise details of participatory preparation activities

Baselines

The project works to strengthen the current situation. Baseline studies are used to identify the current situation. The following are proposed:

1. The uptake of the ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) and the precautionary approach (PA) by deep sea RFMOs through their science and management committees
2. Current technologies for recording information on-board fishing vessels
3. Monitoring effective compliance in RFMOs by the reporting of infringements
4. Value chains and socio-economic studies
5. Bycatch and discard reporting and the collection of biological information on commercial vessels
6. Vulnerable marine ecosystems: identification, impacts and health
7. Spatial monitoring of bottom fisheries
8. Potential impacts on deep sea fisheries from other sectors
9. RFMO website review
APPENDIX 4: COMMON OCEANS PROGRAMME AND PROJECT DESIGN

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

Global Coordination Project for the Common Oceans ABNJ Program

5 Projects

- Common Oceans - Sustainable utilization and conservation of biodiversity in areas beyond national
- Deep-sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach
- Strengthening the stewardship of an economically and biologically significant high seas area – the Sargasso Sea
- Building and Enhancing Sectoral and Cross-Sectoral Capacity to Support Sustainable Resource Use and Biodiversity Conservation in Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
### APPENDIX 5: DSF PROJECT THEORY OF CHANGE

**Output 1.1.1** - Gaps in regional obligations to (i) manage fish stocks and (ii) reduce fisheries impacts on biodiversity identified (updated) and corrective measures proposed.

**Outcome 1.1** - Wider adoption, enforcement and compliance of international obligations relating to sustainable fisheries (stocks and impacts).

- Reduced IUU fishing in deep-sea fisheries

**Output 1.1.2** - Measures to address national legal and regulatory gaps in international legally binding and voluntary Instruments including FAO voluntary guidelines related to fisheries management piloted in selected countries.

**Output 1.1.3** - Gaps in existing capacity to strengthen compliance and enforcement identified and training provided.

**Output 2.1.1** - Frameworks to improve science-management interface and exchange strengthened.

**Outcome 2.1** - Effective decision-making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts.

- Increase in number of fish stocks having known status and supporting sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.1bis** - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.2** - Platform for sharing new and innovative approaches and technologies for improved monitoring, reporting and information sharing developed.

**Output 2.2.1** - Ecosystem and stock productivity models developed to support scientific advice (including demersal and small pelagic species and climate change effects).

**Outcome 2.2** - Advice supporting science-based fisheries management improved.

- Reduction in significant adverse impacts from DSF on biodiversity

**Output 2.2.2** - Support provided to RFMOs for improving scientific advice on data-limited stocks.

**Output 2.3.1** - Impacts of DSF on deepwater sharks assessed and mitigation proposed.

**Outcome 2.3** - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed.

- Value chain and socioeconomic analysis undertaken on selected DSF and information disseminated

**Output 2.3.2** - Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved.

**Output 3.1.1** - Impacts on Threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors operating in the deep-seas identified and information made available.

**Outcome 3.1** - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 3.1.2** - Frameworks to better mitigate and manage cross-sector impacts on DSF developed.

**Output 4.1.1** - Key successes in achieving the project objective's focal areas identified and messaging disseminated.

**Outcome 4.1** - Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 4.1.2** - An operational project M&E system implemented.

### Project Components

- **Component 1**: Governance - strengthening and implementing regulatory frameworks
- **Component 2**: Strengthening effective management of DSF
- **Component 3**: Improving understanding and management of cross-sectoral impacts on DSF
- **Component 4**: Knowledge management, communication, and M&E

---

**Outcome 2.3** - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed.

- Value chain and socioeconomic analysis undertaken on selected DSF and information disseminated

**Output 2.3.2** - Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved.

**Output 3.1.1** - Impacts on Threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors operating in the deep-seas identified and information made available.

**Outcome 3.1** - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 3.1.2** - Frameworks to better mitigate and manage cross-sector impacts on DSF developed.

**Output 4.1.1** - Key successes in achieving the project objective's focal areas identified and messaging disseminated.

**Outcome 4.1** - Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 4.1.2** - An operational project M&E system implemented.

---

**Output 2.1.1** - Frameworks to improve science-management interface and exchange strengthened.

**Outcome 2.1** - Effective decision-making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts.

- Increase in number of fish stocks having known status and supporting sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.1bis** - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.2** - Platform for sharing new and innovative approaches and technologies for improved monitoring, reporting and information sharing developed.

**Output 2.2.1** - Ecosystem and stock productivity models developed to support scientific advice (including demersal and small pelagic species and climate change effects).

**Outcome 2.2** - Advice supporting science-based fisheries management improved.

- Reduction in significant adverse impacts from DSF on biodiversity

**Output 2.2.2** - Support provided to RFMOs for improving scientific advice on data-limited stocks.

**Output 2.3.1** - Impacts of DSF on deepwater sharks assessed and mitigation proposed.

**Outcome 2.3** - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed.

- Value chain and socioeconomic analysis undertaken on selected DSF and information disseminated

**Output 2.3.2** - Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved.

**Output 3.1.1** - Impacts on Threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors operating in the deep-seas identified and information made available.

**Outcome 3.1** - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 3.1.2** - Frameworks to better mitigate and manage cross-sector impacts on DSF developed.

**Output 4.1.1** - Key successes in achieving the project objective's focal areas identified and messaging disseminated.

**Outcome 4.1** - Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 4.1.2** - An operational project M&E system implemented.

---

**Output 1.1.1** - Gaps in regional obligations to (i) manage fish stocks and (ii) reduce fisheries impacts on biodiversity identified (updated) and corrective measures proposed.

**Output 1.1.2** - Measures to address national legal and regulatory gaps in international legally binding and voluntary Instruments including FAO voluntary guidelines related to fisheries management piloted in selected countries.

**Output 1.1.3** - Gaps in existing capacity to strengthen compliance and enforcement identified and training provided.

**Output 1.1.1bis** - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.1** - Frameworks to improve science-management interface and exchange strengthened.

**Outcome 2.1** - Effective decision-making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts.

- Increase in number of fish stocks having known status and supporting sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.1bis** - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.2** - Platform for sharing new and innovative approaches and technologies for improved monitoring, reporting and information sharing developed.

**Output 2.2.1** - Ecosystem and stock productivity models developed to support scientific advice (including demersal and small pelagic species and climate change effects).

**Outcome 2.2** - Advice supporting science-based fisheries management improved.

- Reduction in significant adverse impacts from DSF on biodiversity

**Output 2.2.2** - Support provided to RFMOs for improving scientific advice on data-limited stocks.

**Output 2.3.1** - Impacts of DSF on deepwater sharks assessed and mitigation proposed.

**Outcome 2.3** - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed.

- Value chain and socioeconomic analysis undertaken on selected DSF and information disseminated

**Output 2.3.2** - Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved.

**Output 3.1.1** - Impacts on Threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors operating in the deep-seas identified and information made available.

**Outcome 3.1** - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 3.1.2** - Frameworks to better mitigate and manage cross-sector impacts on DSF developed.

**Output 4.1.1** - Key successes in achieving the project objective's focal areas identified and messaging disseminated.

**Outcome 4.1** - Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 4.1.2** - An operational project M&E system implemented.

---

**Output 1.1.1** - Gaps in regional obligations to (i) manage fish stocks and (ii) reduce fisheries impacts on biodiversity identified (updated) and corrective measures proposed.

**Output 1.1.2** - Measures to address national legal and regulatory gaps in international legally binding and voluntary Instruments including FAO voluntary guidelines related to fisheries management piloted in selected countries.

**Output 1.1.3** - Gaps in existing capacity to strengthen compliance and enforcement identified and training provided.

**Output 1.1.1bis** - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.1** - Frameworks to improve science-management interface and exchange strengthened.

**Outcome 2.1** - Effective decision-making strengthened to increase sustainability and reduce impacts.

- Increase in number of fish stocks having known status and supporting sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.1bis** - Frameworks to improve industry contributions to sustainable DSF

**Output 2.1.2** - Platform for sharing new and innovative approaches and technologies for improved monitoring, reporting and information sharing developed.

**Output 2.2.1** - Ecosystem and stock productivity models developed to support scientific advice (including demersal and small pelagic species and climate change effects).

**Outcome 2.2** - Advice supporting science-based fisheries management improved.

- Reduction in significant adverse impacts from DSF on biodiversity

**Output 2.2.2** - Support provided to RFMOs for improving scientific advice on data-limited stocks.

**Output 2.3.1** - Impacts of DSF on deepwater sharks assessed and mitigation proposed.

**Outcome 2.3** - DSF impacts on biodiversity quantified, assessed and managed.

- Value chain and socioeconomic analysis undertaken on selected DSF and information disseminated

**Output 2.3.2** - Identification of VMEs and understanding of gear-specific SAIs from bottom fisheries improved.

**Output 3.1.1** - Impacts on Threats to sustainable DSF from other sectors operating in the deep-seas identified and information made available.

**Outcome 3.1** - Improved integration of cross-sector activities to maintain biodiversity and resource sustainability.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 3.1.2** - Frameworks to better mitigate and manage cross-sector impacts on DSF developed.

**Output 4.1.1** - Key successes in achieving the project objective's focal areas identified and messaging disseminated.

**Outcome 4.1** - Knowledge generated and shared to raise awareness of project objectives, activities and achievements among stakeholders and target audiences.

- Increased understanding and transparency among stakeholders leading to improved multi-sectoral coordination

**Output 4.1.2** - An operational project M&E system implemented.