



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](mailto: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 2015

For bibliographic purposes, please reference this publication as:

FAO. 2015. *Report of the Second Project Steering Committee: Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the ABNJ, Rome, Italy, 28<sup>th</sup>–30<sup>th</sup> July 2015*. Rome. 34pp.

## Abbreviations Utilized

ACAP	Agreement for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
AREP	Advance Request of Entry into Port
BMIP	Bycatch Mitigation Information Portal
BTWG	Joint t-RFMO Technical Working Group on Bycatch
CBD	FAO Convention on Biodiversity
CCRF	FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CLAV	Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels
CMM	Conservation and Management Measures
COFI	Committee on Fisheries
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EAF	Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries
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 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
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
MSE	Management Strategy Evaluation
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (US)
OPAGAG	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
RP	Reference point
SPC	Secretariat of the 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	United Nations Environment Programme
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VDS	Vessel-Days Scheme
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

---

## Table of Contents

<b>I. Opening of the Meeting .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>II. Election of the Chair .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. Adoption of the Agenda and the Terms of Reference for the Project Steering Committee .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV. Progress of the Common Ocean ABNJ Tuna Project .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>A. Component 1. Promotion of sustainable management (including rights-based management) of tuna fisheries, in accordance with an ecosystem approach .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>B. Component 2. Strengthening and harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to address Illegal, Unregulated and Reporting Fishing (IUU) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>C. Component 3. Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>D. Component 4. Information and best practices dissemination and M&amp;E .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V. Review of the project results matrix and project indicators .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>VI. Proposals for new activities .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>VII. Annual Work Plan and Budget for the first year .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VIII. Any other business.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>IX. Closing of the meeting .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex I. List of participants.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex II. Agenda of the Meeting.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Annex III. List of documents .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex IV. Template for Presentation of Proposals for new activities under the Common Oceans/ABNJ Tuna Project.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex V. Annual workplan covering 01 July 2015 to 30 June 2016 .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## I. Opening of the Meeting

---

1. The second meeting of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project was held in FAO Headquarters in Rome from 28 to 30 July 2015. A total of 43 participants attended the meeting. The list of participants is provided in Annex I.
2. Jacqueline Alder from FAO, the Common Oceans/ABNJ Global Program Coordinator, welcomed the participants and opened the meeting.
3. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator, Alejandro Anganuzzi, introduced the different changes of staff associated with the Program and the Project that have taken place since the previous PSC. In particular, Jacqueline Alder is replacing Jeremy Turner as Global Program Coordinator and Budget Holder, and Nicolás Gutiérrez will be replacing Francis Chopin upon his transfer to the FAO Regional Office in Samoa, as Lead Technical Officer (LTO) in September 2015. In addition, he underlined that it was the first time that the coordinators of the four projects of the Common Oceans/ABNJ Program, which are now all operational, were brought together.

## II. Election of the Chair

---

4. The outgoing Chair of the PSC, Robert Kennedy, Executive Secretary of CCSBT, could not attend the meeting, and Rondolph Payet, Executive Secretary of IOTC, was nominated and elected as new Chair of the PSC.

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

---

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

## IV. Progress of the Common Ocean ABNJ Tuna Project <sup>1</sup>

---

6. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator presented the main lessons learned from the first year of implementation of the project. He highlighted the following:
  - a. Some activities are more transformational than others, *e.g.* the development of Harvest Strategies, the implementation of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management and the promotion of compliance;
  - b. Shark fisheries need to be recognized as fisheries like any other and need adequate management to ensure sustainability;
  - c. Some project Outcomes do not stem directly from the Outputs and activities, and strong commitment from the tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (t-RFMOs) is necessary to ensure their successful achievement;
  - d. Some original indicators do not serve Organizations as they are not correlated to their outcome or output, or are difficult to measure;
  - e. The administrative complexity of the project, in particular with the set up of contractual instruments, *i.e.* Execution Agreements, and with complex and cumbersome FAO rules and procedures, *e.g.* procurements rules, has been creating some delays in the implementation of the activities. Currently, new operating modalities for complex projects are being explored

---

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

- by FAO. It was also noted that the outsourcing of whole Project Outputs, as anticipated in the project document, proved not to be always possible. Thus, the considerable administrative work involved in executing these activities, will instead need to be absorbed by the PMU;
- f. Partnerships need nurturing to be effective, as well as better communication and coordination for increased effectiveness in delivering Project results;
  - g. Communication towards t-RFMOs and their member States, as well as to the general public needs to be strengthened, for example by more frequent attendance by the PMU at t-RFMO meetings.
7. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator also briefly highlighted the administrative status of the project in particular:
    - i) A major budget revision is being undertaken as described under section VII.B
    - ii) A review of indicators being undertaken as described under section V
    - iii) The strengthening of the PMU through an additional staff member, Julien Million, tuna fisheries expert.
  8. The progress of the project was presented by FAO and the different Executing Partners under each of the four components of the project.

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

### **Output 1.1.1. Capacity Building on Harvest Strategy**

9. WWF presented the progress under Output 1.1.1 that aims at building capacity for coastal States on Harvest Strategies. 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 CPCs participated). Both workshops were highly successful, based on questionnaires filled before and after the workshops, and resulted in an improvement of the understanding of Harvest Strategies by participants.
10. WWF would like to extend the project activities with dedicated workshops for ICCAT and WCPFC developing Member States, and is ready to work with the Secretariats of these t-RFMOs for the organization of such workshops.
11. The PSC noted that good progress have been made under this Output that translated into a better participation of coastal States in t-RFMOs meetings in relation to the development of Harvest Strategies and resulted in the adoption of IOTC Resolution 14/03 *On enhancing the dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers*.
12. As these workshops should be taking place at the early stages of the development of the Harvest Strategies, the PSC encouraged developing member States of ICCAT and WCPFC to liaise with their respective Secretariat and discuss the organization of such workshops in the Atlantic and the Western Pacific oceans.

### **Output 1.1.4. Science management dialogue**

13. FAO presented the progress achieved under Output 1.1.4., an output closely linked to Output 1.1.1. While Output 1.1.1 aims at empowering developing t-RFMO Members to participate more

actively in the development of Harvest Strategies, Output 1.1.4 supports the dialogue between science and management, a necessary step for the development of Harvest Strategies.

14. Science-management dialogues started in the four t-RFMOs that do not have Harvest Strategies in place, and are supported by the project. However, the dialogue is mostly limited to informal settings in all t-RFMOs which slow down the overall process. Considering a more formal subsidiary body, that could gather scientists and Commissioners, and that could report directly to the Commissions, would enhance the effectiveness of the process by allowing quicker decisions by the Commission on elements of the harvest strategies that require management input.
15. The PSC acknowledged that while the science management dialogue is critical for the development of Harvest Strategies, it is not always easy to convene additional meetings at the level of the Commission, especially for RFMOs with large number of CPCs. Therefore, it is recommended that science-management dialogue meetings are held in conjunction to Commission meetings, which are attended by official delegations, in general including both scientists and managers.
16. The PSC recognized that more consistency is required in between the different RFMOs, in particular to harmonize the concepts and terminology. In fact, some States are members of several of the t-RFMOs, and are confused about the different terminology used in each RFMO. The PSC recommended that a physical meeting of the Kobe joint Working Group on Management Strategy Evaluation is held with the support of the project during the first quarter of 2016 to address some of these issues, to share experience between RFMOs and to see how best the adoption of Harvest Strategies could be accelerated.
17. The PSC highlighted the need for champions and the critical role certification could play in generating support for the development of Harvest Strategies.

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

18. FAO 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). While this activity could be very transformational, currently it does not seem to be a priority for most RFMOs. However, ICCAT has made progress in recent years on the discussion about operationalizing the EAFM, developing an approach that has elements in common with the Harvest Strategy development, and is proposing to organize a global Joint Working Group, with the support of the project, to share experience on EAFM with all t-RFMOs.
19. The PSC recommended that the Joint Working Group on EAFM is held during the first quarter of 2016, noting that the ICCAT Secretariat will seek for endorsement by the SCRS and the Commission during their respective meetings in late 2015. The PSC further recommended to include experiences from the non-tuna world and to look at global consensus regarding broad operational objectives, *e.g.* UNCLOS and Aichi Biodiversity Targets developed under the CBD Framework.

#### **Output 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 Rights based management**

20. These two outputs are focusing on the Rights Based Management system that has been developed in the Western Pacific, *i.e.* the Vessel Day Scheme (VDS) of the Parties of the Nauru Agreement (PNA), in particular on its review and the dissemination of the review's conclusions.
21. PNA decided to undertake the review of the VDS without the assistance of the project. The review was finalized in September 2014, the recommendations were submitted to the PNA Ministers and are currently being implemented.

22. One of the sub-projects of the OPP is also related to the dissemination of the VDS experience, and on the implementation of the recommendations made by the review. The PSC recommended that the Project continues to work closely with OPP in order to better disseminate the lessons learned on the VDS, and the benefits of an RBM scheme.
23. The PSC noted that ISSF proposed the development of Best Practices for RBM approaches based on discussions within the Bellagio Framework<sup>2</sup>.

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

### **Output 2.1.1 Best practices in MCS**

24. FAO presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.1 which aims at developing Best Practices for Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS). A consultant has been identified to draft the Best Practices in close cooperation with the compliance personnel of the tremors and their members (see Output 2.1.2) and it is expected that a first draft should be available during the first quarter of 2016. The consultant will review the different MCS tools available currently, and will analyze how efficient they are and how easy they are to implement. The Consultant will also describe the application of innovative tools, *e.g.* Electronic Reporting System (ERS) and Electronic Monitoring System (EMS), *etc.*, which are being tested and are not yet part of the MCS toolbox of the t-RFMOs.
25. The PSC noted that NOAA highlighted their interest in MCS Best Practices given the current work of the presidential task force on IUU addressing similar issues.

### **Output 2.1.2 Sharing of Experiences in MCS**

26. FAO presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.2. During the inception workshop of the project, this output was modified to ensure a better focus on tuna fisheries through the creation of a subnetwork of the [International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network](#)<sup>3</sup> (IMCSN). The project contacted the IMCSN, through its Executive Director, to discuss the creation of such a sub-network which will provide an information sharing platform for MCS issues associated with tuna fisheries. This subnetwork will include t-RFMOs' Secretariats compliance personnel (t-RFMOs as well as other RFMOs), as well as compliance practitioners in t-RFMOs Members States.
27. The Executive Director of the IMCSN presented the activities of the Network to the PSC. In particular the IMCSN allows MCS practitioners to share experience and information, to raise awareness within the network and to strengthen national enforcement capacities in member countries.
28. The PSC recommended that the creation of the subnetwork is formalized through a Memorandum of Understanding between FAO and the IMCSN before the end of the year.

### **Output 2.1.3 Certification-based program for training in MCS**

29. FAO 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. A consultant has recently been contracted by the project to develop the curriculum of the course. Once developed, the project

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://iss-foundation.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/10/bellagio\\_framework\\_whitepaper\\_WEB.pdf](http://iss-foundation.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/10/bellagio_framework_whitepaper_WEB.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.imcsnet.org>



will work with academic institutions to study the possibility of integrating the course into their regular offering of courses under fisheries programs.

30. In addition, in September 2015, the project will support the second edition of the successful FFA MCS course which will be conducted with the University of the South Pacific. FFA and the University of the South Pacific are currently investigating opportunities to incorporate the course into a curriculum leading to an academic degree.
31. The PSC recognized the usefulness and need of such a course, as it would bring the different MCS components together, while in general, trainings are specific to one MCS tool only. This was considered of particular usefulness for small countries where often very small departments need to address a wide range of MCS related issues. The PSC also noted that a comprehensive training will not be useful only for tuna fisheries, but also for all types of fisheries, and that alternative means of delivery of the course could be explored, *e.g.* through senior MCS personnel.

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

32. 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 RFMOs. The Project supports this cooperation and will provide funding to ICCAT Department of Compliance head to participate in the next IOTC CSM.
33. The PSC noted that the 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.
34. 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.
35. 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 can be implemented under this output.

#### **Output 2.1.4 Legal framework for Port State Measures**

36. FAO presented the progress achieved under Output 2.1.4 for which the implementation strategy had been changed during the inception workshop. Instead of drafting PSM legislation for ten countries only, it was decided [to develop legal templates](#) that can be used by any country to integrate the provisions of the FAO Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA), and of the IOTC PSM CMM, *i.e.* Resolution 10/11. The preparation of the PSM template has been completed, has been reviewed internally at FAO, and will be reviewed externally before the end of the year.
37. Judith Swan, the Project PSM Consultant, presented the legal templates that she had prepared. She emphasized that the law was driving the implementation of the PSM by t-RFMO members, but that such implementation was facing challenges, in particular in terms of institutional capacity, collaboration between all agencies involved within a country, national priorities, *etc.* The template, as a generic approach, will facilitate the national implementation of the PSMA.

38. The PSC commended the project and Judith Swan for the work undertaken, especially when the number of ratifications and acceptances of the PSMA is progressing<sup>4</sup>. The PSC noted that the template has already been presented and used in the context of the FAO PSMA workshops and of national PSM trainings in Philippines and Tonga, and has been very well received.
39. The PSC noted that the template could be either published as one document, but it could have more impact if it was produced as three separate documents:
- An analysis of the role of t-RFMO, focusing on IOTC
  - The PSM template itself
  - The framework for the implementation of the Agreement
40. The IOTC Executive Secretary presented the Electronic PSM module which has recently been developed by the IOTC, and allows vessels to electronically fill in and submit the Advance Request of Entry into Port (AREP) and Port States to process, as well as reply to the AREP and share information. The system is now in testing phase, and is scheduled to be deployed towards the end of 2015, or early 2016 for IOTC CPCs.
41. The PSC recognized the excellent work done by IOTC with the development of this application which will assist members to better comply with the IOTC Resolution 10/11 and to better share information. The PSC noted that this application could be expanded to other tuna RFMOs, as well as to other RFMOs and even flag States.

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

42. FAO 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](#)<sup>5</sup>, which, until recently, was updated manually and at irregular intervals. The new system allows the automatic daily updates of the CLAV directly from the databases of each t-RFMO. In addition, the Project is supporting the review of the records in the database in order to identify data quality issues, missing data, duplications, *etc.*, that are reported back to the flag States by the Secretariats of the t-RFMOs for further verification and correction.
43. The PSC recognized the necessity of having a global register to further enhance monitoring of fishing fleet and deter illegal fishing activities, and noted that the automated updates were an important improvement to the CLAV. The PSC also noted that additional information could be incorporated or linked to the CLAV, but that should only be done upon an initiative of the t-RFMOs.
44. The PSC was informed that the Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels (GR) was still under development, and therefore the harmonization between the CLAV and the GR could not be done at present. However, the PSC recognized that the CLAV was a contributing step towards the creation of a comprehensive GR.
45. The PSC recommended that the work is pursued, recognizing that the CLAV will need to be maintained after the end of the Project, although arrangements for maintenance of the new procedures and for future data quality control will have to be discussed by the t-RFMOs.

---

<sup>4</sup> On 28 July 2015, 12 countries have ratified the FAO PSMA, and others countries are on the verge of ratifying the Agreement.

<sup>5</sup> <http://tuna-org.org/GlobalTVR.htm>

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

46. FAO, 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. The strong participation and commitment of the Fijian and Ghanaian industry in both pilots was highlighted. The EMS equipment was recently procured by FAO through an open tender procedure and the first systems will be delivered in August for installation of five first vessels in each location.
47. The PSC noted that FAO procurement procedures, while ensuring that the best equipment are provided to the project and maintaining a high level of transparency in the process, brought some delays in the implementation of these activities, and recommended that the PMU and FAO streamline these procedures for future procurement.
48. The PSC noted that the Fisheries Forum Agency (FFA) has implemented an EMS pilot study last year on board two Chinese longliners to assess whether it was possible to meet the requirements of the Regional Observer Programmed of the WCFPC, and that FFA was ready to assist the government of Fiji with this activity.
49. The PSC reiterated that EMS will not replace human observer programmes, but will complement them. In particular, EMS will allow to increase coverage and better assess the compliance with some t-RFMOs' CMMs, *e.g.* adoption of bycatch mitigation measures, as well as with the national legislation of coastal and flag States. The establishment of rules for the use of EMS data as a compliance monitoring tool, including data handling and sharing legal provisions for accepting EMS data as evidence will be an important step in the process.
50. The PSC recommended that the Government of Fiji and Ghana exchange information on these two pilot activities in order to share their respective experiences and lessons learnt during the implementation phase and the Project ensure that these experiences and lessons are shared more widely.

### Output 2.2.3 Integrated MCS system FFA

51. 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. For the implementation of this output, FAO has recently signed an LoA with FFA under which FFA will analyze data collected through logbooks, observers, inspectors and VMS, and provided feedback to FFA members on identified anomalies. FFA is also developing electronic reporting systems for observer data to be provided in real time.
52. The PSC noted that this technology is evolving quickly and that FFA tools are transferable to a number of developing States outside of FFA, but that not all national administrations are ready to use electronic information, and therefore, paper-based data reporting are still widely used and needed, *e.g.* for legal procedures.

### Output 2.2.4 Assessment of Catch Documentation Schemes

53. FAO presented the progress achieved under Output 2.2.4 which [aims at developing Best Practices for Catch Documentation Schemes](#) (CDS). This output had been reoriented after the Inception Workshop recommended not to limit focus on ten national tuna fishery supply chains, but to look at the [overall supply chain for tuna products](#) in order to provide general best practices that could be adopted by all t-RFMOs and their members. The work is being conducted

by a consultant, Gilles Hosch, who travelled extensively during the last few months to gain first hand experience on markets and chains of custody in order to develop the Best Practices.

54. Gilles Hosch presented his work, and described how IUU can be addressed by the development of comprehensive CDS, aiming at minimizing IUU fishing by raising barriers for non-certified products to enter the markets.
55. The PSC welcomed the work done so far and recognized that CDS can only work if flag and market States are applying the scheme, in which case it will allow to trace the movements of the catch and certify its legal origin.
56. The PSC noted that ICCAT is the only tuna RFMO that already has in place an electronic CDS (for Bluefin tuna), which is still being adjusted and that some of the other t-RFMOs were waiting for the Best Practices to be finalized to continue their discussions on the adoption of CDS for their fisheries. However, the need for harmonization of these potential future CDS has not yet been addressed, and should be discussed as soon as possible.
57. The PSC further noted that a CDS supplements an EMS, and that it is very different from catch reporting documents as the CDS main function is to certify that the fish entering the supply chain is fully legal, and to prevent IUU fish to enter the market. At the request of COFI, FAO is developing Guidelines for CDS for all fisheries, and the Project is cooperating and keeping the relevant Unit in FAO informed of the development of the Best Practices for tuna CDS.
58. The Global Tuna Project Coordinator updated the PSC about an activity discussed during the Inception Workshop to further develop the ICCAT eBCD. During the initial work on developing this activity, it became clear that it could not be carried out since FAO rules require that such contracts shall be tendered, which was not compatible with ICCAT requirements that the provider which developed the first phase of the eBCD, should also continue the work during the second phase. In addition, out of the five additional eBCD sub-activities proposed by ICCAT, only one was eligible for GEF funding, and for around 15% of the estimated total budget. ICCAT eventually decided to finalize the work without the financial support of the Project, using its own funding.
59. The ICCAT Secretariat expressed disappointment and informed the PSC that this has resulted in loss of time for the extension of the eBCD. The idea behind the proposed activity is to be able to extend the eBCD to other species and other areas, and ICCAT is willing to share the eBCD through the Project or the Kobe process with the other t-RFMOs.
60. The PSC noted that currently less than 0.5% of the global tuna catch is covered by the two CDS in place, *i.e.* Atlantic Bluefin tuna and Southern Bluefin tuna, and that there is ample scope to develop CDS systems for the other tuna species. The PSC noted that t-RFMOs should carefully consider the opportunity to develop a single global common CDS system based on a set of agreed-upon standards (to be defined), and that a harmonized common electronic CDS could be adapted to meet the specific rules and characteristics of the t-RFMOs and the supply chains in question.

### **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 PSC noted that sharks are often referred to as bycatch or non-targeted catch. However, this is not always the case and, in many instances, sharks are the target species. This recognition leads to the proposed development of management plans that would ensure sustainable fisheries for species that are pan-Pacific.

62. The Project Technical Coordinator on Shark and Bycatch, Shelley Clarke, presented [the progress achieved](#)<sup>6</sup> under these two outputs. An inventory of global shark data and data gaps is being conducted with publicly available information. In addition, IATTC will identify existing data sources among its members in order to develop a database to be used as a baseline. This should also allow the identification of constraints and improvements needed in [data collection](#). In order to better assess whale shark post-release mortality from purse seine nets, ten whale sharks will be tagged with satellite popup tags provided by NOAA. The results of this study will allow elaboration of guidelines for whale shark handling in purse seine fisheries. Finally, a [workshop on pelagic shark life history parameters](#), which reviewed 270 scientific papers on 14 key species, was held in April 2015.
63. The PSC noted the good progress under these outputs and that some of the activities were in line with two recommendations of the [ISSF meeting held in Keelung, Taiwan, Province](#) of China (27-29 January 2015) on harmonization of longline by-catch data collected by t-RFMOs, *i.e.* identification of important bycatch data fields for observer data on longline vessels and bycatch data exchange protocols.
64. The PSC further noted that four new shark stock status assessments will be conducted under the project, the first one for porbeagle shark. For this species, listed under CITES Appendix 2, the Project is supporting a southern hemisphere global assessment which will be conducted with the collaboration of all t-RFMOs and many of their member States countries. WCPFC will select the next three species on which stock assessments will be conducted.
65. The PSC recommended that the report of the global porbeagle assessment is circulated to other t-RFMOs.

### Output 3.1.3 Global Bycatch Management Information System (BMIS)

66. SPC [presented progress](#) achieved under Output 3.1.3 under which the BMIS will be redesigned and updated with the collaboration of ISSF, t-RFMOs and several experts. The BMIS will move from a mitigation-only tool to a management tool. It will include information on mitigation techniques, success, population-level assessments, national and international management schemes (*e.g.* CITES, CMS, *etc.*), e-Monitoring, bycatch data harmonization, *etc.* with the objective of facilitating exchange of bycatch data and mitigation measure information across all t-RFMOs. In addition, activities are planned to quantitatively assess a variety of marine turtle mitigation measures to reduce mortality and injury. Preparatory workshops will facilitate the interpretation and analysis of national data in order to define a baseline for marine turtle interactions and mortality rates and various mitigation options will be explored. This was proposed to ICCAT, but it was not possible to agree on modalities to share their marine turtle bycatch data. This will also be presented in the near future to WCPFC, IATTC and IOTC, and the members will be invited to share their data.
67. The PSC acknowledged that the inability of some countries to share bycatch data might delay the activity, and it was proposed that, in these cases, experts could collaborate directly with scientists in those countries to analyze their own data.
68. The PSC noted that Indian Ocean data on bycatch of marine turtles is quite limited, but the objectives of the marine turtle workshops are consistent with the terms of reference of the IOTC Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch and IOTC Resolution 12/04 *on the conservation of marine turtles*.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.wcpfc.int/node/21731>

### Output 3.2.1 Mitigation of seabird mortality

69. 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. As a consequence of administrative delays, the activities could not progress as much as planned. Activities carried out so far were focusing on the training of skippers and demonstration of best practices. Four workshops were organized, two in the [Republic of Korea, China](#) and [in Japan under CCSBT](#) and at-sea trials, a key component of the activity, are currently taking place with the Korean fleet.
70. The PSC noted that one of the main difficulties under this output was to provide adequate metrics for a baseline and indicators to measure progress. Therefore, while retaining the two-pronged approach based on fleet outreach and capacity building, Birdlife proposed to reformulate this output and to develop new, more appropriate, indicators. In particular, port-based outreach activities will be developed in South Africa, and in order to be able to more reliably assess the target of a 40% implementation of seabird mitigation measures in the Atlantic and Indian oceans, Birdlife proposed to try Electronic Monitoring Systems in South Africa and Brazil.
71. The PSC agreed on the new approach for this output and asked that, if necessary, the co-financing of Birdlife is revised in order to reflect these modifications.

### Output 3.2.2 Mitigation of bycatch of small tunas and sharks

72. ISSF presented the progress achieved under Output 3.2.2 which aims at developing mitigation measures on board tuna purse-seine vessels. The strategy consists of developing mitigation measures with scientists on board fishing vessels, and exchanging experiences and lessons learned with skippers and fishermen during workshops. The activities are focusing on drifting FADs as today around 40% of the global tuna catch is made under this type of FADs. The activities include the use of echosounder buoys to remotely assess the amount of small tuna (bigeye and yellowfin) under the FADs, acoustic and visual ways to determine species composition, and acoustic tagging and tracking. The Project provided the equipment and at-sea activities started in mid-June in the Eastern Pacific Ocean and four additional cruises are scheduled for 2015 in the Atlantic and Western and Central Pacific oceans. Additional cruises will take place in 2016.
73. The PSC recognized the difficulty of securing boat time for some planned cruises, and that ISSF had proposed to use Project funds planned for equipment for vessel days.

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

74. WWF presented progress achieved under Output 1.1.3 which aims at better estimating bycatch rates of the gillnet fisheries in the northern Indian Ocean. Important partnerships with Pakistan, India and the United Arab Emirates were developed and currently MoUs are signed with the governments of Pakistan, Iran and the Maldives. Collaborative activities are being developed with IOTC, in particular in relation with observer training programmes. Observer data have been collected and will be entered in a database and submitted to IOTC, and current observer deployments are being upscaled to reach the targeted coverage of 15%. The first results suggest a large bycatch issue for these fisheries. In parallel, awareness campaigns directed at fishermen were developed with the positive result that they are now releasing alive some of the species caught as bycatch, such as manta rays, sunfish, cetaceans, turtles, *etc.* from their nets. In addition, conversion from gillnet to longline gear is being tested on a few vessels.
75. The PSC noted that the sustainability of observer programmes for the gillnet fisheries is questionable as it involves high costs and large logistics and is dangerous. Consequently, electronic observation methods to supplement human observers are being envisaged, for which

the Maldives agreed to conduct trials. However, additional work with t-RFMOs is required in order for them to accept electronic observer data.

76. The PSC noted the positive reaction of fishermen in Pakistan, and the potential for changing to an alternative gear to reduce bycatch rates, but recognized that this could take some time as first data need to be collected, and new markets might need to be identified.
77. The PSC noted the interest of Birdlife and ISSF to collaborate with WWF on the development of specific bycatch mitigation measures for gillnetters.

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

### **Output 4.1.1 Key messages and progress**

78. FAO 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. In addition, the project is represented at different *fora*, in particular during t-RFMO meetings, *i.e.* Scientific Committee and Commission meetings, to present activities and progress as well as to highlight opportunities to Member countries.
79. The PSC noted that the preparation of content for the [Common Oceans website](#)<sup>7</sup> was time consuming for the PMU, and encouraged all partners to provide activity-related content, and that such submissions to the PMU will be most welcome.
80. The PSC noted that, through the Common Oceans/ABNJ Capacity Project (Strengthening Global Capacity to Effectively Manage ABNJ), messages and lessons learnt emerging from the Common Oceans/ABNJ Program and its four projects are being passed on to high-level policy makers.

### **Output 4.1.2. Synthesis of immediate project results**

81. FAO presented progress achieved under Output 4.1.2 which aims at documenting project progress and compiling catalytic results globally. Project Progress Reports and the first Project Implementation Review were prepared with inputs of the partners responsible for the different outputs.
82. The PSC acknowledged that with the large number of partners, reporting procedures could be challenging.

### **Output 4.1.3. IW:Learn**

83. The PSC noted that no International Waters conference had been held since the beginning of the project but that funding was available for 25 participants developing t-RFMO members to attend coming conferences during the duration of the Project. The PSC further noted that, it would be interesting to investigate how the available funds could be used in a more effective manner to ensure learning and sharing of experiences within the Project and beyond.

### **Output 4.2.1 Midterm and final evaluations**

84. The PSC noted that the mid-term project evaluation, which is the responsibility of the [FAO Evaluation Office](#), will be undertaken next year around June, and that partners will be consulted in the development of the ToRs, and will also be given the opportunity to provide comments on the draft evaluation report.

---

<sup>7</sup> [www.commonoceans.org](http://www.commonoceans.org)

## V. Review of the project results matrix and project indicators

---

85. Several issues with baselines and indicators in the Project result matrix were highlighted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer of the Project, noting that a revision should be discussed and proposed before or at the time of the mid-term evaluation. In particular, it was shown that some outputs are not clearly related to the outcomes, that the resolution of some indicators is not always appropriate to track their progress, and that some indicators are not always a good measure of the expected results of the outputs or are insufficiently robust.
86. The PSC recognized that some indicators should be reviewed in order to better measure the progress of the project and recommended that such a review be done at the time of the mid-term evaluation. Revised indicators could be used even beyond the life of the Project to be able to measure progress at the outcome level in the long term.
87. The PSC noted that the Common Oceans/ABNJ Oceans Partnership for Sustainable Fisheries and Biodiversity project (OPP) is experiencing similar challenges and that an exchange of experiences in the development of new indicators will benefit both Projects.
88. The GEF Secretariat reminded the PSC that the GEF Council is expecting transformational changes from the project, and that before next year at least two strong transformational impacts should be reached in order for GEF to positively consider initiating the development of a second phase of the Project.
89. The PSC noted that the t-RFMOs were positive on the progress of the Project, although it is still early to confirm transformation changes. The ICCAT Secretariat also expressed its expectations to increase its involvement in the Project, pending agreement from ICCAT members.

## VI. Proposals for new activities

---

90. A template for the presentation of new proposals was developed last year, however it did not fully capture all the GEF eligibility criteria, *i)* existing baseline and rationale, *ii)* incremental value, *iii)* global environment benefits, *iv)* innovation, sustainability, scaling-up and *v)* co-financing. The template was revised (Annex IV) and partners wishing to propose new activities are invited to present information following the structure of the revised template.

### EMS project in Seychelles

91. A proposal was presented for a new activity to be conducted and led by the Government of Seychelles, with the Organización de Productores Asociados de Grandes Atuneros Congeladores (OPAGAC), on the deployment of Electronic Monitoring System on two Seychelles' flagged purse seine vessels to strengthen compliance for future monitoring of foreign vessels licensed in Seychelles. The objective of the activity is to build capacity in Seychelles, in particular for the development of a cost-effective way to monitor domestic and foreign fleets, and to assess the feasibility of using a combination of dry and wet observers, as well as port sampling data to estimate catch in weight and length frequency distribution by species.
92. The PSC noted that selected vessels are already equipped with some EMS equipment provided by the same company that was selected by FAO for the Project activities in Fiji and Ghana, and the EMS systems should only be completed, using the same supplier, to reach the same standards as defined for the Ghana pilot.
93. The PSC acknowledged that this new activity would provide an opportunity for EMS trials to be undertaken in the Indian Ocean, in addition to the already ongoing EMS project activities in Ghana and Fiji.



94. The PSC agreed in principle to support this new activity but requested that the proposal is resubmitted to show it meets all the GEF criteria.

### Marine Stewardship Council

95. MSC presented a proposal for a new activity to improve transparency and credibility throughout the tuna supply chains. The objectives of the proposal are to test monitoring of tuna supply chains through a new online solution and to strengthen supply chain oversight and monitoring through newly developed tools for genetic testing.

96. The PSC acknowledged that genetic analysis is an interesting approach also supported by the industry as well as by the public, and noted that such analysis could also bring valuable information on tuna stocks and their movements.

97. The PSC further noted that IOTC has recently engaged in a large genetic project in the Indian Ocean, and that the results of this project would benefit the development of the proposed genetic tests.

98. The PSC requested that MSC revised its proposal to remove the training component as well as the development of tools for genetic testing pending further results of the IOTC project, and to make sure it addresses all the GEF criteria.

### IOTC eCompliance

99. IOTC presented a proposal for a new activity to develop an electronic compliance module for countries to report and better measure their compliance towards IOTC Conservation and Management Measures. The development of this module is following the development of an electronic module on Port State Measures finalized in 2015.

100. The PSC agreed in principle to support this new activity but requested that the proposal is submitted according to the template for new activity addressing all the GEF criteria.

## VII. Annual Work Plan and Budget for the first year

---

### Status of expenditures for Year 1

101. The PSC noted the status of expenditures for the first year of implementation of the project and that currently 11.8 million USD were committed or spent, *i.e.* 43% of the budget. The high delivery rate is partly caused by the signing of a number of contracts, which are reflected as commitments in FAO's financial management system.

102. The PSC further noted that the allocated GEF fee, (9% of the total GEF project grant or about 2.4 million USD), of which 40% is dedicated to technical backstopping of the project, had not yet been utilized. Some fee resources will be used to support external reviews of some of the major reports (*e.g.* PSM legal template, Best Practices in CDS).

### Budget revision

103. The PMU presented a proposal for the first project budget revision which includes reallocation of funds from budget lines where funds could either be saved since the costs had been overbudgeted for, or since the activities were no longer required. In total, 1.9 million USD could be reallocated to activities that need additional funds. It is possible that further savings might arise when all the equipment procurements will be finalized.

104. The PSC noted that this budget revision does not take into account new activities proposed during this meeting.

105. The PSC further noted that, while the structure of the PMU had been modified to increase its efficiency, the workload on the PMU has, at the same time, increased substantially compared to what was originally foreseen in the project document. The main reason for this is the large and very complex procurement process of equipment which could not be outsourced to the project partners as planned, but instead has to be undertaken, and monitored, by the PMU throughout the duration of the project. Thus, it is essential that sufficient resources are placed at the disposal of the PMU for it to disburse its responsibilities in the execution of the project activities.

### **Workplan and budget for the second year**

106. The PMU presented the annual work Plan and budget that covers the period July 2015-June 2016.

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

## **VIII. Any other business**

---

### **Progress of the Common Oceans Program**

108. 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-sea 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, and that the 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.

### **FAO data services**

109. The PSC noted a presentation of FAO on data services, currently being developed, in order to integrate heterogeneous sources of data, increase transparency, and provide tools for sharing and dissemination. In particular for t-RFMOs, such services could enhance the harmonization and dissemination of their data.

### **Time and place of the third PSC meeting**

110. The PSC noted that its next and third meeting will take place at FAO, in Rome, from July 06-08, 2016 just prior to the next meeting of COFI.

111. In order to be able to circulate the documents in advance, the PSC recommended that all partners prepare and submit the necessary information 30 days in advance of the meeting.

### **IX. Closing of the meeting**

---

112. The meeting was closed on July 30, 2015, by the Chair who thanked all the participants for their support and collaboration.

## Annex I. List of participants

---

### **Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels**

Warren Papworth  
Executive Secretary  
[warren.papworth@acap.aq](mailto:warren.papworth@acap.aq)

### **Birdlife International**

Ross Wanless  
Seabird Division Manager, Africa Coordinator  
[ross.wanless@birdlife.org.za](mailto:ross.wanless@birdlife.org.za)

### **FAO Project Management Unit**

Alejandro Anganuzzi  
Global Tuna Project Coordinator  
[alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org](mailto:alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org)

Anja Bruyneel  
Administrative Assistant  
[Anja.Bruyneel@fao.org](mailto:Anja.Bruyneel@fao.org)

Janne Fogelgren  
Operations Officer  
[janne.fogelgren@fao.org](mailto:janne.fogelgren@fao.org)

Kathrin Hett  
Monitoring and Evaluation Officer  
[kathrin.hett@fao.org](mailto:kathrin.hett@fao.org)

Gilles Hosch  
Fisheries planning and management expert –  
FAO consultant for output 2.2.4  
[Gilles.Hosch@fao.org](mailto:Gilles.Hosch@fao.org)

Julien Million  
Tuna Fisheries Expert  
[Julien.million@fao.org](mailto:Julien.million@fao.org)

Debora Piscitelli  
Administrative Assistant  
[Debora.piscitelli@fao.org](mailto:Debora.piscitelli@fao.org)

Judith Swan  
Legal Expert – FAO Consultant Output 2.1.4  
[judithswan@gmail.com](mailto:judithswan@gmail.com)

### **FAO**

Jacqueline Alder  
Common Oceans Program Coordinator  
[Jacqueline.alder@fao.org](mailto:Jacqueline.alder@fao.org)

Marco Boccia  
Fishery Liaison Officer  
[Marco.Boccia@fao.org](mailto:Marco.Boccia@fao.org)

Matthew Camilleri  
Fishery Liaison Officer  
[matthew.camilleri@fao.org](mailto:matthew.camilleri@fao.org)

Nicolas Gutierrez  
Lead Technical Officer  
[Nicolas.gutierrez@fao.org](mailto:Nicolas.gutierrez@fao.org)

Chris O'Brien  
Common Oceans/ABNJ Deepsea Coordinator  
[Chris.obrien@fao.org](mailto:Chris.obrien@fao.org)

Jessica Sanders  
Fisheries Officer  
[Jessica.sanders@fao.org](mailto:Jessica.sanders@fao.org)

**Fiji, Government of**  
Anare K Raiwalui  
Principal Fisheries Officer  
[raiwalui.anare@gmail.com](mailto:raiwalui.anare@gmail.com)

Jone Amoe  
Senior Fisheries Officer  
[amoe.jone@gmail.com](mailto:amoe.jone@gmail.com)

**Fiji Tuna Boat Owner Association**  
David Charles  
[dave@solander.com](mailto:dave@solander.com)

**Ghana, Government of**  
Raymond Babanawo  
Project Coordinator  
[babsraymond@yahoo.ca](mailto:babsraymond@yahoo.ca)

**GEF**  
Nicole Glineur  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[nglineur@thegef.org](mailto:nglineur@thegef.org)

Leah Bunce Karrer  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[lkarrer@thegef.org](mailto:lkarrer@thegef.org)

**Global Oceans Forum**

Biliana Cicin-Sain  
Director, Center for the Study of Marine  
Policy, University of Delaware  
[bc@UDel.Edu](mailto:bc@UDel.Edu)

**Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission**

Guillermo Compeán  
Director  
[gcompean@iattc.org](mailto:gcompean@iattc.org)

**International Commission for the  
Conservation of Atlantic Tunas**

Jenny Cheatle  
Compliance Department Head  
[Jenny.cheatle@iccat.int](mailto:Jenny.cheatle@iccat.int)

**Indian Ocean Tuna Commission**

Rondolph Payet  
Executive Secretary  
[rondolph.payet@iotc.org](mailto:rondolph.payet@iotc.org)

David Wilson  
Deputy Secretary/Science Manager  
[David.wilson@iotc.org](mailto:David.wilson@iotc.org)

**International MCS Network**

Harry Koster  
Executive Director  
[hkoster@imcsnet.org](mailto:hkoster@imcsnet.org)

**International Seafood Sustainability  
Foundation**

Gerald Scott  
ISSF Scientific Advisory Committee member  
[gpscott\\_fish@hotmail.com](mailto:gpscott_fish@hotmail.com)

Papa Kebe  
Ghana ABNJ Tuna project Coordinator  
[papa.amary@gmail.com](mailto:papa.amary@gmail.com)

**Marine Stewardship Council**

David Agnew  
Standards Director  
[David.Agnew@msc.org](mailto:David.Agnew@msc.org)

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric  
Administration**

Melanie King  
Foreign Affairs Specialist  
[Melanie.king@noaa.gov](mailto:Melanie.king@noaa.gov)

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

Miguel Herrera  
[miguel.herrera@opagac.org](mailto:miguel.herrera@opagac.org)

**Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency**

Hugh Walton  
Policy Specialist  
[Hugh.walton@ffa.int](mailto:Hugh.walton@ffa.int)

**Secretariat of the Pacific Community**

Simon Nicol  
[simonn@spc.int](mailto:simonn@spc.int)

**Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission**

Aaron Nighswander  
Finance and Administrative Manager  
[aaron.nighswander@wcpfc.int](mailto:aaron.nighswander@wcpfc.int)

Shelley Clarke  
Technical Coordinator Sharks and Bycatch  
[Shelley.Clarke@wcpfc.int](mailto:Shelley.Clarke@wcpfc.int)

**World Bank**

Milen Dyoulgerov  
Senior Fisheries Expert  
[mdyoulgerov@worldbank.org](mailto:mdyoulgerov@worldbank.org)

**WWF**

Lauren Spurrier  
Managing Director, Latin America Marine and  
Fisheries  
[lauren.spurrier@wwfus.org](mailto:lauren.spurrier@wwfus.org)

Daniel Suddaby  
Deputy Leader WWF Smart Fishing Initiative  
[daniel.suddaby@wwf.panda.org](mailto:daniel.suddaby@wwf.panda.org)

Rab Nawaz  
Director WWF Pakistan  
[rnawaz@wwf.panda.org](mailto:rnawaz@wwf.panda.org)

# Annex II. Agenda of the Meeting

## Second Project Steering Committee Provisional Annotated Agenda

*FAO, Rome – Room Lebanon*

*28-30 July 2015*

*Opening 28<sup>th</sup> July at 9:00am*

1. **OPENING OF THE MEETING**
2. **ELECTION OF THE CHAIR**
3. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (ABNJ\_Tuna\_2015\_PSC\_01rev1)**
4. **PROGRESS OF THE COMMON OCEANS TUNA PROJECT (ABNJ\_Tuna\_2015\_PSC\_02)**
  - A. **Component 1: Strengthening governance (ABNJ\_Tuna2015\_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\_Tuna2015\_PSC\_04)**
    - i. Support to MCS and compliance (Outputs 1.1.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.3 and 2.2.3)
    - ii. PSM Legislative template (Output 2.1.4) (ABNJ\_Tuna2015\_PSC\_inf\_01)
    - iii. CLAV (Output 2.1.5)
    - iv. Electronic Monitoring Systems in Fiji (Output 2.2.1) and Ghana (Output 2.2.2)
    - v. Catch Documentation Scheme Best Practices (Output 2.2.4)
    - vi. Extension of eBCD
  - C. **Component 3: Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing (ABNJ\_Tuna2015\_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\_2015\_PSC\_06)**
    - i. Project communication and knowledge management (Output 4.1.1 and 4.1.3)
    - ii. Midterm evaluation (Output 4.2.1)
5. **REVIEW OF THE PROJECT RESULTS MATRIX AND PROJECT INDICATORS (ABNJ\_Tuna2015\_PSC\_inf\_02)**
  - i. Review of Project indicators
6. **PROPOSAL FOR NEW ACTIVITIES**
  - i. MSC traceability proposal (ABNJ\_Tuna\_2015\_PSC\_07)
  - ii. E-Compliance proposal
  - iii. Seychelles EMS proposal
  - iv. Presentation of revised Output 3.2.1
7. **ANNUAL WORK PLAN AND BUDGET**
  - i. Status of expenditures for Project Year 1
  - i. Budget Revision (ABNJ\_TUNA\_2015\_PSC\_08)
  - ii. Work plan and budget for Project Year 2 (July 2015 – June 2016) (for endorsement, ABNJ\_TUNA\_2015\_PSC\_09)
8. **OTHER BUSINESS**
  - i. Cooperation with other Projects under the Common Oceans Program
  - ii. Cooperation with other FAO activities (ABNJ\_Tuna\_2015\_PSC\_10)
  - iii. Time and place for the 3rd PSC meeting

## Annex III. List of documents

---

<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_01</b>	Provisional Agenda
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_02</b>	List of Documents
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_03</b>	Component 1: Strengthening of sustainable fisheries management, including precautionary approach and ecosystem approach to fisheries - Summary of progress -
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_04</b>	Component 2: Strengthening and Harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to Address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU) - Summary of progress
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_05</b>	Component 3: Reducing Ecosystem Impacts of Tuna Fishing Activities - Summary of Progress
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_06</b>	Component 4: Component 4: Information and Best Practices Dissemination and M&E - Summary of progress -
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_07</b>	Proposed new activity by the Marine Steward Council
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_08</b>	Notes on the proposed Budget Revision
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_09</b>	Work Plan and Budget for Project Year 2
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_10</b>	Global Data Services by FAO

### Information documents

<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_Inf01</b>	Legal template for Port State Measures
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_Inf02</b>	Ongoing review of Project indicators
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_Inf03</b>	Report of the Inception Workshop
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_Inf04</b>	Report of the First Steering Committee
<b>ABNJ_Tuna_2015_PSC_Inf05</b>	PPR July-December 2014

---

# 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: The extent that the partner, or other stakeholders, can provide co-financing in support of the activity.

*Propose indicators, baseline and target values for the activity keeping in mind the SMART<sup>8</sup> criteria.*

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

*Present a list of the activities as detailed as possible together*

---

<sup>8</sup> Specific - Measureable - Achievable and Attributable - Relevant and Realistic - Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted



**Workplan:**

*Present a list of the activities as detailed as possible together*

**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 <sup>9</sup>	TOTAL
Staff/Consultants					
<b>Subtotal Staff/Consultants</b>					
Workshops/Training <sup>10</sup>					
<b>Subtotal Workshops/Training</b>					
Travel					
<b>Subtotal Travel</b>					
Procurement					
<b>Subtotal Procurement</b>					
General operating expenses (printing, workshop material, etc.)					
<b>Subtotal GOE</b>					
<b>TOTAL</b>					

**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.*




<sup>9</sup> End date of the Project: 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019




<sup>10</sup> Including travel costs for participants

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

	Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Component 1 Promotion of Sustainable Management (including Rights-Based Management) of Tuna Fisheries, in Accordance with an Ecosystem Approach</b>												
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> MSE – Capacity building	<b>Lead: WWF</b>						<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 260,000 (1,200,000)					
<b>Planned work:</b> The third and fourth workshops are planned for Project year 2.												
<b>Training curriculum revision</b>												
<b>Directed training of fisheries admin personnel on t-RFMO processes and development of harvest strategy framework plans: Third and fourth workshop</b>												
<b>Output 1.1.4</b> MSE - Development	<b>Lead: FAO</b>						<b>Budget allocation for Year 2::</b> 900,000 (3,400,000)					
<b>Planned work:</b> 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.												
<b>Support to Science Management dialogues in t-RFMOs (dates tentative as in 2015)</b>							WC PFC				IOTC	ICCA T
<b>Preparation of material in support of the dialogues</b>												
<b>Meeting of the Global Joint WG on MSE (chaired by ICCAT)</b>												
<b>Workshop on MSE in data poor situations organized by IATTC</b>												
<b>Output 1.1.5</b> Integrated Ecosystem Evaluations and Plans prepared for each t-RFMO to support an EAF.	<b>Lead: FAO with ICCAT</b>						<b>Budget allocation for Year 2::</b> 150,000 (630,000)					
<b>Planned work:</b> ICCAT SCRS has suggested the possibility of organizing a joint WG on the implementation of the ecosystem approach for all t-RFMOs, to present the current work of ICCAT and explore cooperation across RFMOs to advance the issue. The Project is lending support to the organization of the joint WG and is facilitating contacts between scientific personnel of all t-RFMOs.												

Joint t-RFMO workshop led by ICCAT (tentative)												
	Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Pilot enhanced Rights Based Management system in the Western Pacific Ocean (PNA VDS) implemented	<b>Lead: FAO with PNA</b>			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2::</b> 0 (200,000)								
<b>Planned work:</b> 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.												
<b>Output 1.2.2</b> RBM discussions at the RFMO-level, and disseminating lessons learned from the RBM pilot implementation shared globally	<b>Lead WWF</b>			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 0 (170,000)								
<b>Planned work:</b> No work planned for year 2.												
<b>Component 2 Strengthening and Harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to Address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU)</b>												
<b>Output 2.1.1</b> Global Best practices for MCS in tuna fisheries prepared and agreed by the five t-RFMOs	<b>Lead FAO</b>			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 100,000 (260,000)								
<b>Planned work:</b> 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.												
<b>Develop first draft of Best Practices</b>												
<b>Review by the compliance/MCS sections from the t-RFMOs</b>												
<b>Expert consultation</b>												➔

		Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Output 2.1.2</b> MCS network	<b>Lead FAO</b>	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 150,000 (400,000)											
<b>Planned work</b> 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.													
<b>Discuss opportunities for establishing a subnetwork with iMCS Network</b>		■	■	■									
<b>Set-up network (tentative)</b>					■	■	■	■					
<b>Start facilitated discussions (tentative)</b>								■	■	■	■	■ 	
<b>Output 2.1.3</b> Competency based certification program for MCS	<b>Lead FAO</b>	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 300,000 (1,220,000)											
<b>Planned work</b> 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. .													
<b>Development of training curriculum including regional considerations</b>		■	■	■	■	■	■	■					
<b>Organize and implement first course</b>								■	■	■	■	■ 	
<b>Development and organization of MCS Officer Foundation Training Course for 14 participants during four weeks (FFA led activity)</b>		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> PSM legislative template	<b>Lead: FAO</b>	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 150,000 (530,000)											
<b>Planned work</b> The review of the template is expected to be completed in the September 2015.													
<b>Review of legislative template</b>		■	■	■									
<b>Dissemination of the template to potential customers</b>					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■ 	

	Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Output 2.1.5</b> CLAV and GR harmonized to provide a complete record and search tool for tuna vessels authorized to fish in all t-RFMO regions	<b>Lead: IOTC</b>			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 50,000 (420,000)								
<b>Planned work</b> After the successful completion of the revision of the CLAV, work to identify and address issues and inconsistencies is ongoing and will continue in collaboration with t-RFMOs												
<b>Improving data quality in collaboration with RFMOs</b>												
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> 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.	<b>Lead: FAO with Fiji</b>			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 350,000 (2,400,000)								
<b>Planned work:</b> The trials can start once the equipment have been delivered, which should be by mid-August.												
<b>Installation of equipment</b>												
<b>Conduct trials</b>												
<b>Training for land-based observers on software, and collection of compliance and biological data</b>												
<b>Preparation of specialized training material for the collection of data</b>												
<b>Review reports on compliance and biological catch data</b>												

	Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Output 2.2.2</b> 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 2: 300,000 (2,100,000) with WWF								
<b>Planned work.</b> The trials can start once the equipment have been delivered, which should be by mid-August.												
Installation of equipment		■					■					→
Conduct trials			■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	→
Data Analysis				■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	→
Review								■	■	■	■	→
<b>Output 2.2.3</b> Integrated MCS system in FFA	Lead: FFA			Budget allocation for Year 2: 75,000 (200,000)								
<b>Planned work:</b> 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		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	→
<b>Output 2.2.4</b> Best practices on Traceability / CDS systems	Lead: FAO			Budget allocation for Year 2: 100,000 (600,000)								
<b>Planned work.</b> As the field work has been completed, the draft report on best practices will be finalized and reviewed before the end of the year, with publication of the Technical Report at the beginning of 2016.												
Completion of draft Best Practices		■	■	■								
Peer Review of draft Best Practices				■	■							
Publication of the guidelines through FAO's Fisheries Technical Paper series						■	■					

		Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Output 1.1.2</b> Increased compliance	Lead FAO	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 500,000 (1,600,000)											
<b>Planned work</b> 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. ICCAT has shown interest to develop PSM training, taking advantage of the experience of IOTC on the matter.													
<b>Compliance support missions in the IOTC region (tentative)</b>													
<b>PMS training (tentative, under discussion with ICCAT)</b>													
<b>Component 3 Reducing ecosystem impacts of tuna fishing</b>													
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> Shark data Improvement and Harmonization:	Lead WCPFC with IATTC	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 356,000 (1,600,000)											
<b>Planned work:</b> Work in Year 2 will comprise taking forward initiatives begun in Year 1 as well as launching new projects. The Global Shark Browser product will be released as an heuristic tool for comparing data holdings and shark status between regions. Efforts toward agreeing a harmonization of longline observer fields and data exchange (compilation) of bycatch data across all five t-RFMOs will continue. Shark post release mortality studies will continue with NOAA for whale sharks and be expanded to other species. Shark biological data studies may become possible with external funding. IATTC will complete the identification of existing data sources, logistical constraints and improvements needed on sharks in the Eastern Pacific and incorporate new and existing data holdings on shark fisheries into a database suitable for stock assessment. IATTC will also carry out and carry out a Workshop on Data Limited Assessment Methods for Shark Species.													
<b>Collaborative arrangements and work planning</b>													
<b>Meetings of pan-Pacific shark Steering Committee (blue) and ABNJ Tuna Project-Sharks and Bycatch Consultative Committee (green)</b>													
<b>Baseline shark inventory</b>													
<b>Identify and initiate data improvement activities for WCPFC and IATTC</b>													





		Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016		
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> Seabird mitigation long liners	<b>Lead BirdLife</b>	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 470,000 (1,500,000)											
<p><b>Planned work:</b>  <b>A</b> <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>                      Work in year 2 will include contracting key project personnel and initiating awareness workshops and training sessions. A tender for the provision of specialist services relating to Electronic Monitoring will be let, and the two pilot studies will be initiated. Plans for the port-based seabird bycatch mitigation outreach pilot in Cape Town will be developed and initiated</p> <p><b>B</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>                      Activities in year 2 will include the recruitment of the Project Coordinator. 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>													
<b>A Seabird bycatch mitigation outreach, liaison and training</b>													➔
<b>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</b>													➔
<b>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>													➔
<b>B Regional seabird bycatch data analysis workshops, including training and data preparation</b>													➔
<b>Output 3.2.2</b> Purse-seine trials of bycatch mitigation	<b>Lead WWF with ISSF</b>	<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 580,000(1,900,000)											
<p><b>Planned work:</b> Sea trials will take place in the second half of 2015, with results disseminated in 2016</p>													
<b>Purse Seine sea trials AO and PO</b>													➔
<b>Results analysis</b>													➔
<b>Incorporation of results into best practices</b>													➔
<b>Workshops to disseminate best practices</b>													➔

		Q3-2015			Q4-2015			Q1-2016			Q2-2016			
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	
<b>Component 4 Component 4: Information and Best Practices Dissemination and M&amp;E</b>														
<b>Output 4.1.1</b> Communications	Lead FAO			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 100,000 (400,000)										
<b>Planned work:</b> The PMU will continue to communicate project key messages, progress, results and best practices. Communication with Project and Program Partners will continue. The development of a graphic identity of the Project and poster templates will be completed by 2015. Project information on the Common Oceans website will be updated and amended.														
<b>Communication of project key messages, progress, results and best practices</b>														➔
<b>Communications with Project and Program Partners</b>														➔
<b>Output 4.1.2</b> Synthesis of immediate project results, compilation of catalytic results globally	Lead FAO			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 80,000 (270, 000)										
<b>Planned work:</b> The PMU will continue to compile information on progress for the different Project outputs and prepare Project progress reports and the PIR as required.														
<b>Monitoring and documentation of project progress</b>														➔
<b>Preparation of PPRs and PIRs</b>														➔
<b>Output 4.1.3</b> IW:Learn	Lead FAO			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 45,000 (212, 000)										
<b>Planned work:</b> The GEF International Waters conference is expected to take place in the Q1 2016.														
<b>Participation in GEF International Waters conference</b>														➔
<b>Output 4.2.1</b> Midterm and final evaluations	Lead: FAO Office of Evaluation			<b>Budget allocation for Year 2:</b> 0 (347,226)										
<b>Planned work:</b> The PMU will start liaising with the FAO Office of Evaluation in preparation of the midterm evaluation planned for Q3/4 2016.														
<b>Start liaising with the FAO Office of Evaluation in preparation of the midterm evaluation</b>														