



# mid term evaluation

## PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME  
PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY**

*Governments of:*

*Cook islands , Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall  
Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon  
Islands, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Vanuatu*

*To achieve global environmental benefits by enhanced conservation  
and management of trans-boundary oceanic fishery resources in  
the Pacific islands region and the protection of the biodiversity of the  
Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool LME.*



FFA



**IUCN**  
The World Conservation Union

**PUBLISHED BY**

Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Project  
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency

P.O. Box 629  
Honiara  
Solomon Islands

**T** (677) 21124  
**E** [barbara.hanchard@ffa.int](mailto:barbara.hanchard@ffa.int)  
**W** [www.ffa.int/gef](http://www.ffa.int/gef)

**DESIGN & LAYOUT**

Hatamara Graphics Company Limited

**T** (679) 338 5261  
**E** [hatamara@connect.com.fj](mailto:hatamara@connect.com.fj)

Reproduction and dissemination of material in this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorised without any prior written permission provided that the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited.



# mid term evaluation

## PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME  
PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY**

*Governments of:*

*Cook islands , Federated Sates of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribatl, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Vanuatu*

*To achieve global environmental benefits by enhanced conservation and management of trans-boundary oceanic fishery resources in the Pacific islands region and the protection of the biodiversity of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool LME.*

# Preface

---

This Mid Term Evaluation report sets out findings, lessons learnt and recommendations for the UNDP/GEF Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project). The report is developed in compliance with the terms of reference for the assignment. The conclusions and recommendations set out in the following pages are solely those of the evaluators and are not binding on the project management and sponsors.

The authors would like to thank all who assisted in the Mid Term Evaluation, particularly Alvin Chandra (UNDP), Barbara Hanchard (FFA OFM Coordinator) and Les Clark (Ray Research), and the country representatives who consented to be interviewed.

# Glossary

---

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

<b>APR</b>	Annual Project Review
<b>CROP</b>	Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific
<b>DEVFISH</b>	Development Of Tuna Fisheries In Pacific ACP Countries (EU Project)
<b>EEZ</b>	Exclusive Economic Zone
<b>ENGO</b>	Environmental Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FAO</b>	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation
<b>FFA</b>	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
<b>FSPI</b>	Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific, International
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>ICWM</b>	Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management
<b>IUCN</b>	The World Conservation Union
<b>IW</b>	International Waters (focal area of the GEF)
<b>LME</b>	Large Marine Ecosystem
<b>MDGs</b>	Millenium Development Goals
<b>NCC</b>	National Consultative Committee
<b>NFP</b>	National Focal Point
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>OF</b>	Oceanic fisheries
<b>OFM</b>	Oceanic Fisheries Management
<b>OFP</b>	Oceanic Fisheries Programme (of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community)
<b>Pacific SIDS</b>	Pacific Small Island Developing States
<b>PCU</b>	Project Coordinating Unit
<b>PITA</b>	Pacific Islands Tuna Association
<b>Prodoc</b>	OFM Project Document
<b>RSC</b>	Regional Steering Committee
<b>SAP</b>	Strategic Action Programme
<b>SIDS</b>	Small Island Developing States
<b>SOPAC</b>	South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission
<b>SPC</b>	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
<b>SPREP</b>	Pacific Regional Environment Programme
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNCED</b>	United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development
<b>UNCLOS</b>	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>US</b>	United States
<b>USP</b>	University of the South Pacific
<b>WCPF</b>	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
<b>WCPF</b>	Convention
<b>WCPF</b>	Commission
<b>WTP</b>	Western Tropical Pacific
<b>WTP</b>	WP LME Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool Large Marine Ecosystem
<b>WWF</b>	World Wildlife Fund for Nature



# Table of Contents

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>8</b>
1. Introduction	10
1.1. Background and context	10
1.2. Objective and Purpose of the Mid Term Evaluation	11
2. Project and development context	12
2.1. Logic and objectives	12
2.2. Components, outputs and activities	13
3. Approach and methodology of Mid Term Evaluation	16
3.1. Approach	16
3.2. Methodology	16
3.2.1. Desk study, literature review	16
3.2.2. Site visits	16
3.2.3. Consultation and questionnaires	17
3.3. Evaluation Team	17
4. Results	18
4.1 Project Impact	18
4.1.1. General achievements	18
4.1.2. Sustainable oceanic fisheries management	18
4.1.3. Capacities of Pacific SIDS	19
4.1.4. Governance	19
4.1.5. Intended beneficiaries	21
4.1.6. Lessons learnt and sustainability of results	22
4.1.7. Recommendations from results	22
4.2 Project Design	22
4.2.1. Relevance of overall design	22
4.2.2. Relevance to capacity development and sustainability	23
4.2.3. Impacts on root causes	24
4.2.4. Effectiveness	24
4.2.5. Potential for replication	24
4.3. Project Management and Administration	25
4.3.1. Implementing agency UNDP	25
4.3.2. Executing agency FFA	26
4.3.3. SPC	27
4.3.4. IUCN	28

# Table of Contents

---

4.4. Project Implementation	28
4.4.1. Efficiency and cost effectiveness	28
4.4.2. Applicability of logical framework tool	29
4.4.3. Project reporting	29
4.4.4. Information dissemination	30
4.4.5. Risk management	31
4.4.6. Adaptive management processes	31
4.4.7. Partnership arrangements	31
4.4.8. Cross-cutting issues	32
4.4.9. Coordinating mechanisms	32
4.5. Project Finances	33
4.5.1. Budget procedures	33
4.5.2. Disbursements and spending	34
4.5.3. Actual spending and budget expectations	35
4.5.4. Co-financing and leverage	35
4.5.5. Effectiveness	35
4.6. Lessons learned	36
4.6.1. Country ownership/drivenness	36
4.6.2. Regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation	36
4.6.3. Stakeholder participation	36
4.6.4. Adaptive management processes	36
4.6.5. Efforts to secure sustainability	36
4.6.6. Role of M&E in project implementation	37
4.7. Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations	37
5. Recommendations	40
5.1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project	40
5.2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project	42
5.3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives	42

## Annexes

---

1. TOR	44
2. Itinerary	52
3. List of persons interviewed	53
4. Summary of country visits	55
5. List of documents reviewed	58
6. Questionnaire used and summary of results	61
7. OFM Project Co-financing and Leveraged Resources	68
8. OFM Project FFA Annual workplan and activities	71
9. OFM Project Logical framework	82

# Executive Summary

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) has been developed to assist Pacific SIDs sustainably manage their oceanic resources, which include the world's largest stocks of highly migratory tunas, and conserve ocean biodiversity. The Project is large in scope and complex in design. It spans a vast area, around 40 million sq km of the Central Western Pacific, and the jurisdictions of 15 Pacific Island nations and territories. It is a multi-governmental, five year project (2005-2010), funded by US\$ 11,644,285 from Global Environment Facility (GEF) and US\$ 79,091,993 of co-financing from participating countries, regional organisations and other sources. At the mid-term of the OFM, the GEF Implementing Agency, UNDP, has commissioned this MTE to assess progress, provide feedback on lessons learnt and future directions.

The MTE found that the Project was well designed and implemented, and has already had a significant impact on the immediate regional objectives (i.e. improved OFM in Pacific SIDs, and sustainable development of resources), and contributed to its wider global objectives (i.e. management of oceanic fishery and oceanic biodiversity). The capacities of most Pacific SIDs to meet their obligations under the WCTF Convention have been substantially enhanced, and the performance and outcomes of the Project were highly rated by the WCPF Commission. However, it is evident that smaller, less developed Pacific SIDs require greater levels of support. This is occurring in some countries through bilateral funding. As capacity-building in the Project has largely focused on immediate objectives (needs under the WCPF Convention), long-term, more strategic capacity-building will be required in the future. The commencement of one component, the IUCN Seamounts study, has been delayed for matters beyond the organisation's control but has now been redesigned and will commence in the near future.

Project management and administration is rated as very efficient and effective. UNDP, the GEF Implementing Agency has been efficient and responsive. Its bureaucratic procedures were initially considered onerous by the Executing Agency (FFA) resulting in some delays in disbursements, but these issues since have been resolved. FFA, a regional body with 30 years experience in OFM, has been very effective in its key role. Project management and coordination, undertaken by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) within FFA has been effective. However, the PCU is under-resourced for such a large project, and does not have resources for regular country visits and information dissemination. SPC, the main scientific organisation, has also been effective in increasing knowledge of the status of oceanic fisheries. However, a number of countries indicated their desire for greater capacity in this area.

Financial management by FFA was ranked highly and financial procedures, disbursements and spending have been effective. However, the decline in the US\$ has created significant problems, requiring some reallocations of budgets in the second term. The weakening in the US\$ will contribute to the loss in the value of the Project budget and staff costs, particularly in SPC's scientific assessment and monitoring component. The loss in the value of the budget has been effectively managed by increasing co-financing. While it is not possible to comment on the co-financing and contributions in kind of the regional partners, the high level of the commitment does indicate their overall effectiveness. Leverage funding to date has been substantial and further external funds are foreshadowed. This will greatly assist in sustainability of the Project. The overall cost/effectiveness, risk assessment and adaptive management were rated highly, but quantitative indicators should be developed for monitoring and assessment of progress. Cross-cutting issues of institutional strengthening, national development and innovation (cornerstones of the Project) have been very well addressed, but gender, equity and human rights were not explicitly addressed in the Project design.



The positive negative lessons learnt from the Project include: its strong emphasis on planning and design and engagement of stakeholders; reducing risks in implementation through the utilisation of existing resources, organizations and arrangements; and maximising stakeholder participation and collaboration through partnership arrangements. The OFM Project is an appropriate model for other regional, multi-stakeholder and inter-governmental projects. However, long-term sustainability of the Project objectives will require longer-term, strategic approaches to capacity-building.

Recommendations relating to the second term of the OFM Project include: the need for greater coordinated and integrated approaches in the seamount research component; greater involvement of interested Pacific SIDS in oceanic fisheries science; identification of appropriate indicators for monitoring progress and final evaluation of the Project; a focused information dissemination and media programme; need for greater collaboration with other CROP agencies (e.g. USP, SPREP); need for closer linkages with the Pacific Plan and Pacific Forum Secretariat; and need for additional support to the FFA PCU to enable greater focus on information dissemination, monitoring and reporting, and future project development.

New initiatives recommended are that planning is commenced as soon as possible on a new project to focus on longer-term capacity building in OFM, especially on the smaller and less developed Pacific SIDS. As the small populations and technical capacities of the smallest Pacific SIDS are insufficient for a comprehensive technical OFM capacity, new approaches are also recommended to assist them in OFM (e.g. collaborative, sub-regional approaches; staff attachments for national OFM officers at FFA; specialist staff or consultants at FFA to look after their interests).

# I Introduction

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM) Project is a globally important project spanning around 40 million sq km of the Central Western Pacific region (over 10% of the entire world's surface), and the jurisdictions of 15 Pacific Island nations and territories. The region is encompassed by the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) Large Marine Ecosystem, a oceanographically complex and variable, and scientifically poorly known, waterbody of great global biodiversity and fisheries value. This supports the world's largest stocks of oceanic fisheries, including about one third of the world's tuna landings. These are migratory species which cross vast distances of ocean and many national jurisdictions, necessitating large scale, international, collaborative approaches to management.

## 1.1. Background and Context

Small Island Developing States (SIDS) have special conditions and needs that were identified for international attention in the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of SIDS, and in the World Summit for Sustainable Development's Johannesburg Plan of Implementation which specifically calls for support for the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention (the WCPF Convention). The third phase of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF-3) identified sustainable management of regional fish stocks as one of the major environmental issues SIDS have in common, and as a target for activities under the SIDS component of OP 9, the Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Programme. The GEF-3 also promoted the adoption of an ecosystem-based approach to addressing environmental problems under the Large Marine Ecosystem Component of OP 8, the Waterbody-Based Operational Program. In the current fourth phase of the GEF (GEF-4), the priorities from GEF-3 has been further sharpened and articulated into strategic programmes (SPs). The OFM project is consistent with SP1 on 'Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity'.

The OFM Project is the second phase of GEF/IW support for Pacific SIDs to enhance management of fishery resources and to protect ocean biodiversity. The initial, pilot phase, the GEF International Waters (IW) South Pacific Strategic Action Programme (SAP), provided support for OFM, assisted in the conclusion of the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Convention (WCPF Convention) and in the developed the present Project. The OFM Project now provides support for Pacific SIDS efforts as they commence participation in the establishment and initial period of operation of the new WCPF Commission. This necessitates they reform, realign, restructure and strengthen their national fisheries laws, policies, institutions and programmes to take up the new opportunities which the WCPF Convention creates, and to discharge the new responsibilities which the Convention requires.

The OFM Project is a multi-governmental, five year project (2005-2010), with a total cost of US\$ 90,736,217, comprising US\$ 11,644,285 from Global Environment Facility (GEF) and US\$ 79,091,993 of co-financing from participating governments, regional organisations, industry, fishing nations and other sources. The OFM Project is implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and executed by the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA).

The major objectives of the OFM Project address: (a) the threats to the sustainability of the use of the region's oceanic fish resources identified in the SAP (ie the lack of understanding and the weaknesses in governance relating to oceanic fisheries in the International Waters in the region); and (b) the need for improved understanding of transboundary oceanic fisheries resources and create new regional institutional arrangements as well as realigning, reforming and strengthening national arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources. The OFM Project Document (PRODOC) and its Annexes describe full details of the project.

## 1.2. Mid Term Evaluation (MTE)

In accord with the accountability and adaptive management policies of GEF and UNDP, MTEs are undertaken to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned and repeatability, and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. They identify strengths and weaknesses, and provide an evaluation of the implementation and management of the project by identifying factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievements of the project objectives and outputs. MTEs also provide recommendations and lessons learned to assist on defining future directions for the project. The key beneficiaries for the MTE include the GEF (and the global community), UNDP, Pacific SIDS, Pacific regional organizations, relevant donor organizations and industry and environment non-government organizations.

The objectives of this MTE are to examine initial results for possible amendments and improvements; promote financial accountability; and provide early feedback on progress, and lessons learned. (The background and TOR for the MTE are contained in Annex 1).

# The OFM Project and its development context

The background and context of the OFM Project are described in detail in the PRODOC, and summarised above (1.1). The following examines the logic of the Project, and its major components, outcomes and activities.

## 2.1. Logic and objectives

The logic of the OFMP flows from the structure of the IW Pacific Islands SAP. It has two main goals, targeting: (a) global environmental benefits by enhanced conservation and management of trans-boundary oceanic fishery resources in the Pacific Islands region and the protection of the biodiversity of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool Large Marine Ecosystem; and (b) enhanced contributions to Pacific SIDS sustainable development from improved management of trans-boundary oceanic fishery resources and from the conservation of oceanic marine biodiversity generally.

The OFM Project has two objectives, addressing the two major deficiencies in management that were identified by the IW Pacific Islands SAP as the ultimate root cause underlying the concerns about, and threats to, International Waters in the region. These are the: (a) Information and Knowledge objectives (to improve understanding of the trans-boundary oceanic fish resources and related features of the Western and Central Pacific Warm Pool Large Marine Ecosystem); and (b) Governance objectives (to create new regional institutional arrangements and reform, realign and strengthen national arrangements for conservation and management of trans-boundary oceanic fishery resources.

The Project has two major technical components associated with the above objectives, and a support component: (a) Scientific Assessment and Monitoring Enhancement Component to provide improved scientific information and knowledge on the oceanic trans-boundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the WTP LME and to strengthen the national capacities of Pacific SIDS in these areas. (b) Law, Policy and Institutional Reform, Realignment and Strengthening Component to support Pacific SIDS as they participate in the earliest stages of the work of the new WCPF Commission, and at the same time to reform, realign and strengthen their national laws, policies, institutions and programmes relating to management of trans-boundary oceanic fisheries and protection of marine biodiversity. (c) Coordination, Participation and Information Services Component for effective project management, complemented by mechanisms to increase participation and raise awareness of the conservation and management of oceanic resources and the oceanic environment.

## 2.2. Stakeholders and targeted beneficiaries

The stakeholders and targeted beneficiaries of the OFM Project include: the Global Community; Pacific Islanders dependent on oceanic fish resources; Pacific Island communities; other users of the oceanic fish resources of the region; government sectors; technical and policy personnel in government agencies; the private sector; national, regional and global NGOs concerned with conservation of oceanic fish resources and protection of the marine environment, including the WCPF Commission; other island communities and other SIDS geographical groups, regional organizations participating in the Project and those whom they serve.

## 2.3. Project components and outcomes

The Project comprises three main Components, 11 Subcomponents, 36 Outputs and 109 specific Activities. Details are provided in the PRODOC, and the modified FFA OFM Project Annual Work Plan (Annex 8). The following summarises the components and their expected outcomes.

OFM Project Components and Outcomes

### COMPONENT 1: SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING ENHANCEMENT

#### Sub-Component 1.1. Fishery Monitoring, Coordination and Enhancement

**Outcome:** *Integrated and economically sustainable national monitoring programmes in place including catch and effort, observer, port sampling and landing data; Pacific SIDS providing data to the Commission in the form required; national capacities to process and analyse data for national monitoring needs enhanced; improved information on fishing in national waters and by national fleets being used for national policy making and to inform national positions at the Commission. Enhanced quality and accessibility of fisheries information and data leading to more effective development and improvement of the Commission's policy and decision-making process*

#### Sub-Component 1.2. Stock Assessment

**Outcomes:** *Detailed information available on the status of national tuna fisheries, including the implications of regional stock assessments and the impacts of local fisheries and oceanographic variability on local stocks and fishing performance; strengthened national capacities to use and interpret regional stock assessments, fisheries data and oceanographic information at the national level, to participate in Commission scientific work, and to understand the implications of Commission stock assessments.*

#### Sub-Component 1.3. Ecosystem Analysis

**Outcomes:** *Enhanced understanding of the dynamics of the WTP warm pool pelagic ecosystem, with particular focus on trophic relationships; enhanced understanding of the ecology of seamounts, in particular their impacts on aggregation and movement of pelagic species and the fisheries impacts thereon; provision of ecosystem-based scientific advice to the Commission and to Pacific SIDS; enhanced information on the magnitude of by-catch in WCPO oceanic fisheries.*



**SUB-COMPONENT 2.1. LEGAL REFORM**

**Outcomes:** Major Commission legal arrangements and mechanisms in place, including provisions relating to non-Parties and sanctions for non-compliance; national laws, regulations, license conditions reformed to implement the WCPF Convention and other relevant international legal instruments; enhanced national legal capacity to apply the Convention and national management regimes, including domestic legal processes for dealing with infringements.

**SUB-COMPONENT 2.2. POLICY REFORM**

**Outcomes:** Commission Secretariat and technical programmes established and conservation and management measures beginning to be adopted; national oceanic fisheries management plans, policies and strategies prepared, implemented and reviewed; adoption of a more integrated and cross-sectoral approach and, improved coordination between government departments (Fisheries, Environment, Development, Economy, etc); enhanced understanding by policy makers and enhanced national capacities in regional and national policy analysis for sustainable and responsible fisheries; enhanced stakeholder understanding of Commission and national policy issues, especially the private sector.

**Sub-Component 2.3. Institutional Reform**

**Outcomes:** Public sector fisheries administrations reformed, realigned and strengthened; capacities of national non-governmental organisations to participate in oceanic fisheries management enhanced; consultative processes enhanced to promote a more integrated approach to fisheries management and administration that encourages coordination and participation between diverse government and non-government stakeholders.

**Sub-Component 2.4 Compliance Strengthening**

**Outcomes:** Realigned and strengthened national compliance programs; improved regional MCS coordination; strategies for Commission compliance programs; enhanced national compliance capacities (inspection, observation, patrol, VMS, investigation).

**Outcomes:** Effective project management at the national and regional level; major governmental and non-governmental stakeholders participating in Project activities and consultative mechanisms at national and regional levels; information on the Project and the WCPF process contributing to increased awareness of oceanic fishery resource reflecting successful and sustainable project objectives

#### **Sub-Component 3.1. Information Strategy**

**Outcomes:** Enhancement of awareness about the Project and understanding of its objectives and progress; establishment of a Clearing House for lessons and best practices within the Pacific SIDS, as well as through linkages to other global fisheries and their issues; capture of up-to-date information and advice on related ecosystem management and innovative fisheries management approaches; transfer of lessons and replication of best practices through an active mechanism linked to the Commission; active participation with IW:LEARN

#### **Sub-Component 3.2. Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Outcomes:** Effective monitoring and evaluation of progress and performance, including monitoring of process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators; monitoring and evaluation outputs used in project management and in assessing the effectiveness of Commission measures.

#### **Sub-Component 3.3. Stakeholder Participation and Awareness Raising**

**Outcomes:** Non-governmental stakeholder participation in national and regional oceanic fisheries management processes, including the Commission, enhanced; awareness of oceanic fisheries management issues and the WCPF Convention improved. Specific forums developed for NGO participation and discussion process; promotion of awareness of national and regional development and economic priorities and how these relate to sustainable fisheries management.

#### **Sub-Component 3.4. Project Management and Coordination.**

**Outcomes:** Project effectively managed and coordinated between implementing and executing agencies and other participants in the Project; effective participation in Project management and coordination by stakeholders; reports on Project progress and performance flowing between Project participants and being used to manage the Project.

# Approach and methodology of Mid Term Evaluation

## 3.1. Approach

The MTE assesses and reviews: the extent to which the overall project design remains valid; the project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability; the approach used in design and whether the selected intervention strategy addresses the root causes and principal threats in the project area; the effectiveness and the methodology of the overall project structure, how effectively the project addresses responsibilities especially towards capacity building and challenges; and plans and potential for replication.

The MTE also assess the extent to which project management has been effective, efficient and responsive; and the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various institutional arrangements for project implementation, and the level of coordination between relevant players (including the oversight role by UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency, project execution role of FFA agency, the PCU and the project focal points, project implementing role of FFA, SPC and IUCN, multipartite review processes via the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and the national consultative committees.

## 3.2. Methodologies

The MTE was undertaken through a combination desk research of project and related documents; selected site visits; and questionnaires and interviews. A total of 71 person days, comprising in-country travel, meeting participation, desk research, write-up and presentation), was undertaken by the consultants.

### 3.2.1. Desk study, literature review

OFM Project and related documentation (e.g. PRODOC, Quarterly and Annual Project Implementation Reports, background UNDP documents, FFA Project management documentation, reports from Project activities) and a range of background technical and scientific reports (e.g. on tuna fisheries, biology, oceanography, seamounts) were examined. Most material required was readily accessible from UNDP and FFA, in digital form. The OFM Project website located within FFA's website was particularly effective in providing detailed project management and financial information. The SPC website was an excellent source of technical and scientific material, demonstrating the potential of the Internet in information dissemination and coordination in the OFM Project. (Information sources are cited in Annex 5, Literature review).

### 3.2.2. Site visits

The TOR stipulated visits to six selected countries (Fiji, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Kiribati) in May 2008. However, as most OFM stakeholders were attending the 67<sup>th</sup> Forum Fisheries Committee and Related Meetings in Palau in May, the Consultants, with UNDP and FFA approval, visited Palau to consult with stakeholders from the above and other countries, in the margins of the meetings. The following summarises countries visited, and stakeholders consulted. (Details are given in Annex 2: Itinerary; Annex 3: Persons Consulted).

### **Fiji Islands** (Apr 27-May 2, 2008)

Briefing on PIOFM and MTE were held with UNDP Suva Office and the Regional Technical Advisor from UNDP's Regional Centre in Bangkok. Interviews were also conducted with stakeholders from WWF South Pacific Programme, Fiji Fisheries Department and University of the South Pacific Marine Programme (USP).

### **Palau** (May 3-18, 2008)

In Palau, consultations were undertaken with stakeholders from the stipulated countries of Fiji, Solomon Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Kiribati, as well as additional countries of Papua New Guinea, Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau, Tuvalu, and Marshall Islands. Representatives from a range of international and regional organisations and NGOs were also consulted (FAO, UNEP, Greenpeace, FFA, SPC, WCP Commission, AusAID). Industry representatives from PNG and the Solomon Islands, and other consultants were also interviewed.

### **Solomon Islands** (May 19-30)

Detailed discussions were held at FFA with the OFM PCU on the financial management of the Project, and progress of activities. A teleconference was also undertaken with an IUCN representative on the re-design of the seamounts sub-component.

## **3.2.3. Consultation and questionnaires**

Formal and informal consultation was undertaken with the stakeholders. This generally comprised of initial, informal discussions on the OFM Project and MTE objectives, general progress and issues, followed by a formal questionnaire where appropriate. Topics and levels of detail covered varied according to the informants' roles in the Project. For example, heads of national fisheries departments were interviewed more on the general level of support from the executing agencies and general outcomes within their departments, status of national tuna industries, and wider governance issues. Those in OFM sections were questioned more on technical details, training needs and effectiveness of Project activities (Questionnaires and summarises of results are given in Annex 6). The opinions of the private sector (tuna fishing companies, and professional bodies) on industry needs, Project objectives and outcomes were particularly sought. Social and other consequences of the tuna industry such as gender issues, equity and occupational health and safety, were discussed with industry, regional organizations, heads of national fisheries departments and ENGOS.

Detailed discussions were held with the main executing agencies (FFA, SPC) regarding Project details, deliverables, management, administration, communications and coordination, and financial effectiveness and accountability. A questionnaire to assess performance of a range of mainly GEF-funded activities was provided to OFM Coordinator in a 'bottom-up' evaluation. Informants from organisations responsible for specific components (WWF, IUCN, USP Marine Studies) were interviewed on progress and outcomes, and issues in their areas of responsibility. Biodiversity conservation issues were specifically discussed with ENGOS (Greenpeace, WWF).

## **3.3. Evaluation Team**

The team comprised of a Team Leader (Leon Zann BSc Hons PhD: Fisheries and Marine Environmental Consultant, and former Professor of Marine Studies at the University of the South Pacific, Fiji, with expertise in fisheries and marine environmental management in the Pacific region); and a Regional Resource Specialist (Veikila Vuki BSc MSc PhD: SPC Women-in-Fisheries Bulletin Editor, Adjunct Research Associate University of Guam, and former Fisheries Officer in Fiji Fisheries Dept, former Senior Lecturer at the University of the South Pacific, NOAA/University of Guam Marine Protected Areas Coordinator, with expertise in PIC marine resources, fisheries management, and gender issues).

The following summarises the major findings of the MTE. It assesses the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and results achieved by the project to-date by examining how the components, processes and outcomes contribute to the achievement of project goals and objectives.

### **4.1. Project impact**

Overall progress in the OFM Project in the first term is rated as good to very good, and there have been significant achievements in several key areas. It is evident that the Project is well managed and executed, and most component activities are on time and effective. There are already significant impacts, particularly in areas of Scientific Assessment and Monitoring, and in aspects of Law, Policy and Institutional Reform. Capacities have been increased in most Pacific SIDS in OFM, and in meeting their obligations under the WCPF Convention and attending the WCPF Commission meetings. However, it is evident that needs of the Pacific SIDS vary greatly, with the small countries, and those which have experienced breakdowns in national governance, requiring greater levels of support.

#### ***4.1.1. Regional and global objectives***

Progress towards the regional objective (Pacific SIDS sustainable development from improved OFM and conservation of oceanic marine biodiversity) has been significant. The OFM Project has assisted the Pacific SIDS in OFM and in meeting their responsibilities under the WCPF Convention to varying degrees, and there has been a marked increase in OFM capacities in several countries. However, as noted, some require special assistance.

Achievements gained in the regional objective have contributed to meeting the global objective (enhanced conservation and management of trans-boundary oceanic fishery resources and protection of the biodiversity of the WTM LME). The design of the OFM Project largely focused on trans-boundary oceanic fisheries, necessitating a greater focus on the biodiversity conservation goals in future initiatives.

#### ***4.1.2. Sustainable oceanic fisheries management***

Sustainable oceanic fisheries require appropriate, knowledge-based, and precautionary decision-making approaches to fisheries management at regional and country levels. The first term of the OFM Project has made significant contributions to the knowledge-base of the fisheries, and strengthened the capacities of national governments and regional fisheries management organisations in OFM. The initial phase, the GEF IW SAP, assisted in the conclusion of the WCP Fisheries Convention, and establishment of the Commission. The Director of the WCP Fisheries Commission rated the OFM Project very highly in effectiveness in supporting Pacific Island's activities in the Commission, scoring it an arbitrary 80%.



Scientific knowledge on the WCP LME still remains rudimentary as it is vast in scale, variable in time and space (annually and inter-annually) and remote from major centres of marine research. As applied scientific research and biodiversity conservation were not prioritised in the OFM Project because of GEF funding requirements, these will require greater focus in collaborative future initiatives. It must also be recognised that ecosystem-based management of fisheries is a relatively recent initiative and not yet well underpinned by scientific knowledge and management practice. The implementation of large-scale, long-term and integrated approaches to fisheries/environment/biodiversity conservation are clearly beyond the scope and duration of this PIOFM Project.

#### **4.1.3. Capacities of Pacific SIDS**

The Project has generally had a significant effect on increasing the capacities of most Pacific SIDS in OFM and the regional decision-making processes. Most of the heads of fisheries and related departments, and other country representatives interviewed by the consultants reported significant increases in OFM capacity because of this Project.

This has increased their effectiveness in the WCPF Commission. For example, representatives of all seven countries examined by Clark (2007) felt their delegations to the WCP Commission meeting (WCPFC4) in 2007 were much better prepared than for WCPFC2 in 2005. Four countries considered their national OFM arrangements were better than in 2005, and two others were optimistic about future improvements. Progress towards meeting WCPF Convention commitments was mixed; three felt progress was satisfactory, and four others admitted partial success.

While they have been greatly assisted by the OFM Project, it is evident that some countries still have limited capacity in OFM and are experiencing problems in meeting WCPF Convention Commitments. These include the smallest countries (e.g. Niue, Tokelau, Nauru) and countries which have experienced recent breakdowns in governance (e.g. Solomon Islands).

Although the OFM Project design attempted to balance support for regional assistance and specific national needs, and an initial needs assessment during Project development provided each country with the opportunity to prioritise their requirements in OFM, the Project design did not adequately consider the varying needs of the Pacific SIDS, and the specific problems of the smallest countries. It must be recognised that the Pacific SIDS vary greatly in sizes, development and governance, and in capacities in OFM. Microstates such as Tokelau, Niue, Nauru and Tuvalu, and some of the States of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), have very small populations (under 15,000), small landmasses (generally under 30 sq km), and limited terrestrial resources and economic development. Intermediate countries such as Cook Islands, Kiribati, Tonga, Samoa and Vanuatu have larger land areas and populations, and varying levels of economic development. Larger countries such as Solomon Islands, Fiji and Papua New Guinea have fast-growing populations (hundreds of thousands to millions), a range of terrestrial resources and, in some cases, greater economic development.

#### **4.1.4. Governance**

Effective governance in OFM is particularly important in smaller countries where oceanic fisheries are a major economic resource, and where revenues from oceanic fisheries landings and licences are major contributors to national incomes. A major focus (Component 2) of the Project is in strengthening national and regional governance in OFM, including legal, policy and institutional reform.

As noted above, the initial GEF IW SAP and this first term of the OFM Project has had some notable successes in strengthening of capacities in national OFM and has assisted countries to meet their obligations, to varying degrees. For example, in Fiji which has experienced inefficiency in OFM and corruption in licensing procedures in the past decade, OFM has been greatly enhanced through the restructure of the Fisheries Department by the interim Government, and the more recent assistance of the OFM Project.

As noted above, the varying needs of the Pacific SIDS relating to governance of oceanic fisheries were not well recognised in the original OFM Project design. Some countries are relatively well resourced, with well managed and effective Fisheries Departments or Authorities (e.g. PNG). Others are much less so, often because of their small sizes (e.g. Tokelau, Niue, Nauru, Tuvalu, Kiribati) or unstable national governments ((e.g. Solomon Islands). While the PIOFM Project has focused more on regional approaches, training and support, the situations and needs of particular countries will require a more targeted approach in future OFM initiatives.

It must also be recognised that oceanic fisheries governance in Pacific SIDS is reliant on their overall national governance. Several Pacific Island SIDS have experienced problems in national governance since independence, due in part to their premature independence, lack of capacities (human and financial), cultural diversities (especially in Melanesia), and geography (small sizes, isolation, lack of terrestrial natural resources etc). Some of the larger and more diverse countries (e.g. Fiji Islands, Solomon Islands) have suffered serious breakdowns in governance, and serious declines in the effectiveness and accountabilities of their Public Services, including Fisheries Departments. Other countries are so scattered, and communications so poor, that central governments are relatively ineffectual, and some of their powers have been delegated to provincial or outer island local councils and communities (e.g. Kiribati, Tuvalu).

Strengthening of Pacific SIDS governance is a broader, underlying issue, and a high priority in the Pacific Plan and the recent Vavau Declaration (Pacific Forum Secretariat 2005, 2007). The latter's 'Declaration on Pacific Fisheries Resources' recommended (inter alia) a 'greater effort to foster a long-term strategic approach to ensuring these resources are effectively managed will provide enduring benefits for all Forum Member countries'.

There are also advantages in more explicitly linking the OFM Project, with its strong emphasis on governance, to the governance-focused Pacific Plan, and the wider UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This would provide a broader political and development context to the OFM Project, provide greater opportunities for collaboration and continuing funding, and increase its long-term sustainability.

***It is therefore recommended that:***

- ***the OFM Project should be more explicitly linked to the Pacific Plan and a new project be developed to implement the long-term strategic approach to capacity-building in OFM recommended under the Vavau Declaration. Discussions should be held between FFA and the Pacific Forum Secretariat in developing this project.***

#### 4.1.5. Intended beneficiaries

The following briefly evaluates the extent to which OFM Project impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries identified in the PRODOC. The diversity of beneficiaries targeted necessitates a summary approach.

BENEFICIARY	NATURE OF BENEFITS	PROGRESS AT MID-TERM
Global community GEF	Enhanced stewardship of the oceanic fisheries resources and ecosystems	Long-term benefits, marked progress with WCPF Convention. An increased in OFM capacities in Pac SIDS. Limited progress in understanding LME and biodiversity conservation.
Pacific Islanders dependent on oceanic fish resources	Sustained abundance of resources through food security and health, direct employment in industry (fishing, processing, tourism etc)	WCPF Commission now operating. Progress in OFM assisted to varying extents in Pacific SIDS. (Some Island countries advanced, others require support.)
Pacific Island communities	Broader economic gains, improved food security, employment in service & other industries through economic multipliers, redirection of aid etc	Oceanic fisheries already a major revenue earner for many countries. Domestic fisheries development supported through collaborative development projects (e.g. DEVFISH).
Other users (foreign fishing nations)	Economic gain for foreign fishing nations, increased national and global food security	Access, economic sustainability enhanced through WCPF Commission.
Government sectors	Enhanced capacity and improved coordination in OFM	Increase in OFM capability in most Pacific SIDS already enhanced by OFM Project. Significant improvements in coordination, through WCPF Commission.
Technical and policy personnel	Increased capacity in technical areas, better national and regional outcomes	National staff trained in OFM. Significant improvements in most countries. Smaller countries require specific support.
Private sector (fishers, support industries)	Economic development, sustainable resources, participation in resources management	Longer-term economic benefits not yet assessable. Opportunities in participatory management have been enhanced.
National, regional and global conservation NGOs	Improved OFM, conservation of ocean fish stocks and ocean biodiversity, ecosystem-based management	Longer-term economic benefits not yet assessable. Opportunities in participatory management significantly enhanced.
Other SIDS, geographic groups	Benefit from lessons learnt, and transferable best practices	OFM Project successfully developed and demonstrated as an appropriate model for regional collaboration in resources management.
Regional organisations participating in project	Enhanced capacities in core areas	SPC scientific and monitoring programme and FFA governance and training activities well supported. IUCN activities not yet commenced. (Greater participation/ collaboration by SPREP, USP etc. required.)

#### **4.1.6. Lessons learnt and sustainability of results**

Although it is too early to assess the results of most activities of the OFM Project, there are important lessons to be learnt from the first term:

- The success of the OFM Project to date results from good project planning; a strong regional approach (through FFA, SPC); a high degree of participation/ownership of Pacific SIDS through consultation and co-funding contributions; and a focus on specific outcomes (support for Pacific SIDS for WCPF Convention and Commission obligations).
- The lack of success in the one area, IUCN Seamounts study, results from reliance on outside resources beyond direct control and an organisation, which had not been established in the region.
- Because Pacific SIDS greatly vary in sizes, natural resources, development and effectiveness of governance, they require more country-specific approaches in capacity-building. Smaller Island countries require a greater level of support.
- Despite specific support in the OFM Project, smaller island countries may never have full capacity in OFM, necessitating other approaches (e.g. sub-regional groupings, country-specific support from FFA).
- Long-term capacity-building is required for the sustainability of OFM.

#### **4.1.7. Recommendations from results**

It is recommended that:

- the second term of the OFM Project, and any future developments of the Project, specifically addresses the needs of smaller Pacific SIDS;
- alternative strategies should also be considered to support smaller Pacific SIDS in OFM (e.g. Sub-regional groupings, country-specific support from FFA);
- long-term, strategic approaches should be developed to build capacity in OFM and ensure sustainability, and should be the focus of a future OFM Project. (These recommendations are elaborated upon in 5.2 and 5.3)

### **4.2 Project Design**

The Prodoc design rates very highly. Both FFA and SPC regarded the Prodoc as ‘very good’. The Project Coordinator rated it very highly (‘9/10’), and reported following it ‘religiously’.

#### **4.2.1. Relevance of overall design**

The Prodoc design is highly relevant to the needs of the Pacific SIDS in OFM as it explicitly focuses on providing the broad range of capacities for Pacific SIDS required to fulfil their obligations under the WCPF Convention. The design and objectives flowed from the previous GEF IW SAP and wide consultation of the Pacific SIDS and regional organisations.

The Prodoc is multidisciplinary in approach and well integrates scientific knowledge and governance objectives required for sustainable fisheries. It is long (109 pp, with several hundred extra pages of supporting Annexes) and detailed, and describes in detail some 109 different activities and outputs. It is unusually prescriptive and takes a ‘construction plan’ approach, ensuring delivery of a broad range of products in sequential and timely manner. According to one of the Prodoc’s main designers, this was one of the lessons learnt from the GEF IW SAP, which was deficient in detail itself.

A major strength of the Project design was that it builds on the existing capacities of SPC and FFA, reducing the need for new personnel and inevitable delays in recruitment and familiarisation, and reducing risks in Project delivery. Notably, the seamounts sub-component 1.3 which involved an organisation not then established in the region (IUCN), and reliant on outside resources (a research vessel and submarines) has not been successful, and had to be re-designed.

While the Prodoc is rated highly, the consultants consider that the Prodoc is deficient in two areas: (a) long-term capacity building in Pacific SIDS, especially in smaller countries; and (b) understanding and conservation of oceanic biodiversity insufficient. These could have been addressed by including in the OFM Project the two CROP agencies responsible for these areas, USP and SPREP (below).

The Project Coordinator, who was involved in the initial development of the Prodoc, noted in her comments on a draft of the MTE Report that the above had been initially considered in project development, but GEF would not consider institutional development with education/training service providers, and wanted a focus on capacity-building in the immediate Project objectives. However, involvement of other appropriate donors might have resolved this problem.

#### ***4.2.2. Relevance to capacity development and sustainability***

As noted above, the OFM Project focused on shorter-term capacity building required to meet immediate responsibilities of Pacific SIDS under WCPF Convention. Longer-term capacity development in OFM was not adequately addressed, affecting the long-term sustainability of the Project objectives.

Capacity-building in Fisheries governance and institutions in Pacific SIDS is a widely recognised issue, and countries vary greatly in capacity needs (e.g. AusAID 2007; Hanich et al. 2008). Despite the importance of inshore and oceanic resources in the region, and the need for specialised staff in OFM, regional fisheries departments are often small in size and inadequately resourced. In some cases public service procedures have declined, resulting in inefficiencies and poor work practices, and cases of corruption (e.g. in selling foreign fishing licences). Turn-over of senior and more capable staff is often high (e.g. a quarter of the island fisheries departments had a change in senior leadership in the previous two years). Fisheries departments have traditionally had a fisheries development focus, and capability in sustainable fisheries and ecosystem-based approaches are generally limited. This is exacerbated by generally poor relationships between national fisheries and environment departments, limiting opportunities for collaboration in ecosystem-based management.

At the regional level, there has been limited collaboration, and often duplication of effort and competition, amongst the CROP agencies. The close collaboration between FFA and SPC in the OFM Project is a notable exception. However, the lack of involvement of USP and SPEC in this Project has been noted.

There have been some notable successes in restructuring fisheries institutions in the region (e.g. PNG has restructured its fisheries department, reduced staffing levels and increased efficiencies, and created an entrepreneurial national fisheries authority which integrates the public and private sectors).

International assistance has been given to some smaller Pacific SIDS for restructure of Fisheries institutions through bilateral aid and the OFM Project has assisted in training in aspects of OFM. For example, AusAID is currently assisting Nauru in its fisheries department restructure, and plans to similarly provide assistance to Kiribati and Tuvalu in the near future.



*It is therefore recommended that:*

- *the above proposed long-term capacity building project in OFM be based on systematic assessments of training needs in OFM in each country, and appropriate fisheries institutional models and arrangements. (See 5.3 for details)*

#### **4.2.3. Impacts on root causes**

The root causes of threats to sustainability of regional fisheries resources, a lack of understanding and weaknesses in governance, are the focus of the OFM and have been generally well addressed in the first half of the Project.

**Lack of understanding:** Component 1 ‘Scientific assessment and monitoring enhancement’ addresses this, and focuses on the status of oceanic trans-boundary fish stocks, especially of the four main tuna species. Progress in the first term has been very good, largely because it has built on existing tuna stock assessment programmes in SPC and on monitoring programmes on catch and effort, observer, port sampling programmes supported by SPC and FFA, and by Pacific Island SIDS in varying degrees. The quality and timely delivery of information reaching fisheries managers (national, regional and WCPF Commission) on the main stocks (by species, area and time) is very good.

Progress on increasing understanding on the WTP LME and seamounts is limited. While the capacity of SPC in this area has been enhanced, and existing information is being analysed, there was no progress in the IUCN seamount study, although this is considered a minor part of the OFM Project (discussed above).

**Weaknesses in governance:** the initial SAP Project GEF input was effective in assisting Pacific SIDS in negotiations in the WCPF Convention, and the establishment of the WCPF Commission. A major focus of the current OFM Project is now the reform, restructure and strengthening of national fisheries laws, policies, institutions and programmes. All countries report progress in these areas, and there is already a marked improvement in OFM governance within some Pacific Islands (e.g. Fiji, Nauru). However, as noted in 4.2.2, certain countries require specific support.

#### **4.2.4. Overall effectiveness**

The OFM Project is rated as generally very effective in its design, methodologies, activities and outcomes. As it has focused primarily on capacity-building to meet immediate obligations under WCP Fisheries Convention/Commission, it has been less effective in long-term capacity-building and sustainability.

#### **4.2.5. Potential for replication**

The OFM Project is an excellent model for replication for similar multi-national and trans-boundary resource management initiatives. Its particular strengths are:

- use of a preliminary project (GEF IW SAP) to identify needs and issues, develop objectives, required outcomes and appropriate activities to achieve these;
- adoption of ‘lessons learnt’ from that project (e.g. need for high level of detail in Prodoc);
- a generally tight focus and prescriptive approach (to build capacity in specific areas required under WCPF Convention within a specified time-frame);
- interdisciplinary nature (integrating science and governance);
- regional, trans-boundary approach and multi-government involvement (involving all Pacific Island countries in this region);

- high degree of collaboration and ownership (involving stakeholders in funding, Project ownership and execution);
- co-funding model (core GEF component for key new initiatives, with stakeholder co-funding in kind and cash ensuring support and collaboration);
- use of existing organisations and structures (FFA, SPC, regional fisheries arrangements, bodies) in key tasks to minimise risk;
- high degree of ownership amongst stakeholders (through extensive collaboration and co-ownership);
- effective coordination (through OFM Project Management Unit in FFA, Regional Steering Committee, national focal points and consultative committees);
- effective administration (through UNDP, and FFA and SPC administrations); and a
- performance monitoring (Project quarterly reports, annual reports and annual reviews); and
- adaptive management approaches (through monitoring and MTE) to assess progress, identify issues and develop appropriate responses).

### 4.3. Project Management and Administration

A large and complex endeavour such as the OFM Project requires effective project management and administration. Overall, project management and administration has been very effective, efficient and responsive. The implementing agency (UNDP) and executing agency (FFA) have delivered very high quality of support, both at the institutional and personal levels. The roles and responsibilities of all the organisations involved, and the institutional arrangements have been well defined.

#### 4.3.1. Implementing agency UNDP

UNDP has been effective as the GEF Implementing Agency. Its long international, regional and national experience and administrative procedures ensured delivery and accountability. The OFM Project is administered by the UNDP Fiji Office, which has a regional focus and capability. The Project managers are nationals with professional experience in the region, and displayed a high degree of personal interest and commitment to the Project.

Feedback from the Executing Agency rated UNDP's administration generally favourably ('7/10'). However, there were some criticisms about UNDP bureaucracy and the complexity of administrative procedures, which caused some initial delays in appropriations. The Project Coordinator considered: 'lack of capacity, project knowledge and design in the UNDP Country office contributed significantly to the long period for the coordination aspects of the project to 'settle down'. The inexperience of dealing with a project of this size and nature contributed to the inability of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) to obtain adequate guidance on UNDP procedures and requirements during project establishment. This situation has abated over time and for the large part UNDP requirements are at present routine.'

UNDP Fiji attributed the above problems to the transfer of Project management from the Samoa Office, and problems in the Suva Office at that time because of a new project management and financial system. Technical problems have been rectified, and relationships are now good.

### 4.3.2. Executing agency FFA

FFA has also been very effective in the execution of the OFM Project. FFA's mandate and 30 years of experience in OFM, and its involvement in the development of the project development has ensured an effective delivery. FFA established an OFM Project Coordination Unit (comprising a Coordinator and Administration Officer) to coordinate and manage the Project.

Personal visits were made by the Coordinator to most countries (2-3 remain to be undertaken) to confer with country fisheries departments, focal points and other stakeholders. An OFM website was established early in the Project in the FFA site, and is an important mechanism for coordination and information dissemination.

The countries and organisations involved in the OFM were generally highly satisfied with the level of support by FFA and coordination by the PCU. However, because of a high turn-over of fisheries department personnel, several of the heads of fisheries interviewed were not well informed on the OFM Project. Others considered that coordination could be improved through more regular country visits by the Coordinator.

The Consultants consider that the OFM PCU is insufficiently resourced to undertake additional tasks such as regular country visits, and appropriate media and education outreach activities. The extent of the terminal reporting in the next term of the project, and additional tasks recommended in the MTE (e.g. development of a new Project on capacity-building, below) will greatly increase the pressure on the Coordinator.

As noted in the OFM Annual Review (2007), the PCU is very small, given the complexity of the OFM Project, and the Coordinator's effectiveness is limited by available resources. The Consultants consider that the Prodoc was deficient in its Project coordination/management arrangements and budget. Two positions (one professional, one junior, comprising around 6-8% of project funds) are clearly inadequate in such a project. (Normally, 15-20% of budgets in projects of this complexity are allocated for administration support.)

The low administration allocation in the Prodoc is attributed by UNDP to GEF's cap of 7% on project management but it must be recognised that there was no contribution in cash from the other partners towards FFA's project management, greatly increasing pressure on the Coordinator (and reducing the total allocated to project management to around 1% of the total cash and kind contributions). Because of a lack of resources for technical assistance in areas such as information dissemination, the Coordinator also has had to devote much of her time (as much as 50%) to technical matters such as web design and maintenance.

It is therefore recommended that:

- ***The OFM PCU is better supported in the second term of the Project.*** Urgent discussions should be held between the Project Coordinator and UNDP on Project management needs in the second term, and ways ahead. For example, an additional professional staff member should be recruited as soon as possible to assist in coordination, reporting and in the development of the recommended new Project. One or two additional technical assistants might be established where funds could be reallocated from other technical activities. The additional staff might be seconded from regional fisheries departments to aid in coordination and national capacity building.
- ***Greater focus is given by the PCU to information dissemination on the OFM Project amongst stakeholders, and wider community in the Pacific SIDS.*** (See 4.4.4. for details).
- ***GEF should be informed on the need for greater flexibility in allocations for Project management.*** Success of any project depends on the quality of Project management.

### 4.3.3. SPC

Management by SPC of the scientific components has also been efficient and their outputs of high quality. SPC has the mandate in oceanic fisheries research and stock assessment in the region, and a proven capacity and performance in this area. Information users (FFA, WCPF Commission, and Pacific SIDS) reported favourably on SPC's performance, and usefulness of the information supplied. Coordination and collaboration between FFA and SPC was excellent, despite past problems in overlapping mandates and duplication of effort, and the uncertainties of a review in 2007 on possible amalgamation of these organisations.

Information dissemination by SPC through regular presentations at regional and country meetings was rated highly by most countries. The SPC Oceanic Fisheries website is user-friendly and visually attractive, and background scientific reports and all internal reports and technical publications required for the MTE were readily accessible on line.

A significant number of interviewees thought that their countries fisheries institutions should be given some technical capacity in oceanic fisheries science and modelling. Several commented that the SPC scientific program was 'dominated by Western scientists, and Pacific Islanders should be engaged in the programme as they are in other aspects of OFM.'

While it is evident that stocks of highly migratory species such as tunas must be studied and managed holistically, and that oceanic fisheries modelling require specialised skills and is best undertaken by a central agency such as SPC, it is suggested here that capacity in oceanic fisheries science is increased within the Pacific SIDS. All national fisheries institutions require at least a basic competency in fisheries science in order to understand the information and advice given by SPC, the uses (and limitations) of predictive models, and need for country-based fisheries monitoring and reporting. Smaller SIDS may require only limited in-country expertise, but larger countries with major oceanic fisheries may require higher levels of capacity.

***It is therefore recommended that:***

- ***Where possible, SPC should assist in the development of oceanic fisheries science within Pacific SIDS in this term of the Project*** (e.g. by encouraging regional researchers and postgraduate students in oceanic fisheries science, providing short-term attachments for relevant regional Fisheries staff at SPC, and developing formal linkages with a current USP/UNU/FAO fisheries science and modelling training programme).
- ***Development in oceanic fisheries science within Pacific SIDS is a priority in the proposed new capacity-building Project.***

#### 4.3.4. IUCN

IUCN, a global NGO with long experience in global biodiversity conservation, was responsible for seamount surveys. This sub-component was originally added to the core OFM Project to take advantage of a no-cost voyage by a private research vessel and submarines through the region. Unfortunately, the vessel was damaged in Hurricane Kathrina in 2005, and is no longer available within the timeframe of this Project. This indicates the risks when relying on outside, non-funded contributions.

The seamounts programme had to be substantially redesigned in 2007/8. Some funds were diverted to SPC's seamount research group to recruit a spatial analyst/physical oceanographer to identify and classify seamounts and analyse historical catch and effort data. After consultations with UNDP, FFA and SPC it was agreed in February 2008 that: IUCN/Hawaii will undertake a survey of purse seine and longline fishers and hold a technical workshop to document status of knowledge in the subject; and the new IUCN Oceania office in Fiji will recruit a scientist to work with stakeholders in the Pacific SIDS on sustainable seamount fisheries. This post has been advertised and will be filled by July 2008. While progress in the seamount research has been delayed by 2.5 years, the redesigned programme will provide at least preliminary information on the subject. The consultants were satisfied with the re-design, but were concerned about IUCN's lack of knowledge of the general OFM Project, and current limited coordination both within IUCN and with other OFM Project partners.

*It is recommended that:*

- *the Seamounts program is coordinated by the new scientist at the IUCN Oceania Office to ensure collaboration within the SPC/IUCN Seamounts programme, with other OFM Project activities, and with other agencies involved in seamount research in the region* (e.g. France's research vessel Alis which is based in New Caledonia, and Japan Fisheries University's Koyo Maru which undertakes research with USP in Fiji).

### 4.4. Project Implementation

Overall management and implementation of the OFM Project has been effective and efficient.

#### 4.4.1. Efficiency and cost effectiveness

A high level of efficiency and cost effectiveness in most areas has been achieved through use of existing structures, arrangements and organisations. No new infrastructure was required, and apart from the PCU, administrative support has been undertaken as an additional task by the collaborating organisations. As capacity in most technical areas already existed within FFA and SPC, Project funding has been used most effectively to develop existing activities. Where new staff was required, these were often recruited internally from the organisations and island countries, saving greatly on staff recruitment and orientation.

The IUCN seamounts study which required new structures and staff, and outside technical support has therefore been less effective.

It is not possible to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the contributions in kind by the 15 Pacific SIDS and other organisations, but the marked successes in the OFM project to date, increases in capacities of many Pacific SIDS, and the high level of commitment to the WCPF Convention and Commission all indicate increased effectiveness in their support for OFM.



#### 4.4.2. Applicability of logical framework tool

Logical framework was used as a management tool during OFM Project development and implementation (Annex 9) but its effectiveness has been limited due to a lack of quantitative indicators and timelines. There is some uncertainty on the reasons for this. The US representative in the GEF Council's review of the OFM Project in Feb 2005 noted that it has few quantitative indicators or milestones by which to judge progress, and gave instructions for the development of indicators relating to the environmental status of international waters by the first year of the Project. However, the OFM Project developers argued that their log frame emphasised 'process' indicators (building new institutions (WCPF Commission) and reforming and realigning existing institutions etc), and that the monitoring plan did identify a range of environmental status indicators. This justification appeared to have been accepted by the GEF Council and the Log frame lacks the quantifiable indicators which would have aided this MTE, and we have evaluated progress in a more qualitative manner. An evaluation of progress is shown in the logical framework in the 2007 Annual Report (Clark, 2007) and in Annex 9.

*It is therefore recommended that:*

- *A suite of appropriate indicators should be developed within the Logical Framework to better monitor progress in Project Outputs and Activities.* The Project Coordinator should develop these in consultation with UNDP and GEF. (Some possible indicators are suggested in 5.1)

#### 4.4.3. Project reporting

Project reporting has been regular, of a high quality and detail, and provides an effective project monitoring and evaluation framework. Reporting comprises: quarterly narrative and financial reports; annual reports; annual Regional Steering Committee meetings; annual GEF Performance Results framework; annual reviews; mid term evaluation (this report); terminal report; terminal evaluation; and post project evaluation. Over 140 technical reports have also produced on specific activities to date.

The 2007 Annual Review (Clark, 2007), written by one developers of the OFM Prodoc, was particularly useful to the MTE. It was very comprehensive, assessed progress in the various components, identified achievements and issues, and made appropriate recommendations. The author was interviewed in the MTE to elaborate on background and progress of the OFM Project. While guided by the 2007 Annual Review's findings and recommendations, this MTE also takes a wider perspective, as dictated in the TOR.

The above reporting framework is very comprehensive, but takes a major effort from the PCU. The Coordinator noted that reporting took a very large amount of her effort, and resulted in little feedback (very few comments have ever been received). The reporting schedule does appear to be overly detailed and onerous.

*It is therefore recommended that:*

- *The OFM Project Coordinator and UNDP Project Management should undertake an informal review of the reporting processes and their effectiveness with the view of reducing the number and/or detail, while maintaining their effectiveness.*

#### 4.4.4. Information dissemination

Effective communications and information dissemination is essential in such a large and complex Project to keep the key stakeholders informed and committed, and to inform other interest groups and the wider community. Information on the progress and findings of the Project has been disseminated amongst stakeholders mainly through the above, comprehensive reporting framework. A brochure outlining the objectives and outputs of the Project has also been produced, and an OFM Project website is maintained within FFA's site. The website was an excellent source of information (Project documents, internal reports, minutes and proceedings of meetings etc) in the MTE. It is user-friendly, although is not visually 'interesting', and does not contain a 'popular' description of the OFM for non-technical browsers.

Despite the ready availability of information on the OFM Project, many stakeholders interviewed did not know much about the Project's progress and achievements outside their own area of interest. Most of those not personally engaged in the Project knew little or nothing of it. Few interviewees had seen the brochure, or visited the OFM website. This may reflect the high turnover in regional fisheries senior staff, but does indicate the need for a more active communications effort. Surprisingly, some informants said they did not frequently use the Internet for their information requirements (sometimes because of poor connections), indicating a wider need to promote its use.

WWF-Pacific and PITA have been engaged in the OFM Project to promote industry awareness of OFM and the WCPF Commission. FFA indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the performance of WWF-Pacific in the OFM Project but it was not possible to evaluate the performance of PITA, or of the success of these initiatives. Interviews with fishing industry representatives from PNG and the Solomon Islands at the Palau FFC meetings did show a high degree of knowledge of OFM and the Commission's activities, but not of the OFM Project. Note also that this was a biased sample as they were attending the meetings because of their special interests in OFM.

The lack of an active media program is a serious deficiency in the OFM Project. The OFM Project is a regionally (and globally) important one, and should be widely reported and promoted, particularly given its notable achievements in its first term. While a comprehensive media strategy was developed by outside consultants in 2006, no position or specific funding was identified in the Prodoc to implement this. As FFA's media position has been unfilled for two years, the Coordinator has had to undertake this task in addition to her other duties.

The situation is however, being improved. FFA has recently recruited a media expert who will assist in information dissemination in the OFM and other FFA activities. A newsletter on OFM Project is currently being prepared.

***It is recommended that:***

- ***the OFM media strategy should be implemented and there should be a greater focus on dissemination of information from the OFM Project by the PCU.*** This should include: wider distribution of the OFM brochure; special briefings for newly appointed heads of fisheries and other key stakeholders; formal briefings at relevant regional meetings; promotion of OFM Project and wider FFA and SPC websites amongst stakeholders; popular descriptions on the Project website for educators and the wider community; regular newsletters (email, Web and hard copy); and radio and press news releases distributed amongst regional media; and presentations on the OFM Project at international fisheries and ocean conservation meetings to promote the Project and approaches, and aid in continuing funding.
- ***the capacity of the OFM/PCU should be increased to undertake these additional functions.*** The previously recommended additional staff member may be charged with these responsibilities.

#### **4.4.5. Risk management**

The level of risk is potentially great in the OFM Project because of the inherent nature and complexity of the subject, its huge geographic scale and the large number of national, regional and international stakeholders. The general success of the OFM Project to date is attributable to the effective use of risk assessment in its Project design and implementation. As noted above, these were reduced by using established organisations and institutional arrangements, wide consultation and ownership amongst stakeholders.

#### **4.4.6. Adaptive management processes**

Adaptive management processes are established through monitoring of activities, annual reviews and this MTE. The 2007 Annual Review and this MTE evaluated progress identified issues and make recommendations for the remainder of the OFM Project, and possible future initiatives. It remains to be seen how these are implemented by the Implementing and Executing agencies. While the MTE is undertaken at mid-point of the Project, the time for review and final endorsement (October 2008) and responses (earliest at end of 2008) are further limits to its effectiveness.

#### **4.4.7. Partnership arrangements**

The OFM Project is based on partnerships (GEF, UNDP, FFA, SPC, WWF-Pacific, the 15 Pacific SIDS governments and industry). Arrangements amongst the participating national and regional organisations have been very effective. Co-funding arrangements with the Pacific SIDS has ensured their engagement in the Project. The working relationships between FFA, WWF-Pacific and SPC are effective. The effectiveness of partnerships with industry were more difficult to assess. Partnerships with international assistance agencies and donors (e.g. Japan, Australia) are being developed.

As discussed in 4.1.4. Governance, there should be close collaboration between FF/OFM and the Pacific Forum Secretariat to develop closer linkages with the Pacific Plan, wide capacity-building in governance, and collaboration in development of a new, strategic, long-term capacity-building project in OFM.

As also noted earlier, a serious omission in the OFM Project design was the lack of partnership agreements with relevant CROP agencies including: USP which is responsible for tertiary capacity building in the region; SPREP which executed the first GEF IW Watersheds Project, and is responsible for biodiversity conservation in the region; and SOPAC, which has a developing interest in the physical ocean environment and is about to start implementing the component of the Pacific SAP on Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (ICWM). FSPI, the region's leading community NGO was also not involved in the Project, despite a capacity in social aspects of OFM.

*It is therefore recommended that:*

- *the proposed future Project in capacity-building in OFM involves partnerships with appropriate CROP agencies (including Pacific Forum Secretariat, USP and SPREP), regional NGOs, and international assistance agencies.*

#### **4.4.8. Cross-cutting issues: Institutional strengthening, innovation, national development, gender, human rights, and equity**

Although the above cross-cutting issues were not explicitly addressed in the Prodoc, the Project explicitly focuses on national (and regional) sustainable development through institutional strengthening. These are rated very highly in the first term as global institutions (GEF, UNDP) and regional institutions (FFA, SPC, WCPF Commission) and Pacific SIDS fisheries institutions have significantly benefited. Institution strengthening in the first term has assisted most of the Pacific SIDS in OFM, and in meeting their obligations under the WCPF Convention. Institutional strengthening in some countries (e.g. Fiji, Nauru) has been particularly effective.

The Project also rates very highly in innovation because of its effective integration of science and management (OFM governance) at an ocean scale, its multi-governmental approach to management of a trans-boundary fisheries resource, and in its focus on collaboration, partnerships and co-funding arrangements to ensure ownership and sustainability.

Social issues rate relatively poorly, and may have been more explicitly addressed in the Project design though linkages with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). While gender issues are considered in a study of sexually-transmitted diseases (STDs) around fishing ports, the OFM Project does not address wider gender equity issues such as promotion of equal employment opportunities for women in OFM at all levels. It is noted that the lack of capacity and efficiency in regional fisheries departments (traditionally male domains) could be greatly assisted by equal employment policies.

Human rights issues are also not well addressed. Fishing is one of the most hazardous occupations on earth. Crew on OF vessels are low-paid, sometimes indentured for long periods, have poor living conditions, and have poor medical support

*It is therefore recommended that:*

- *gender, human rights and equity issues should be better promoted in the second term of the OFM Project, and be a focus in the proposed future capacity-building project.*

#### **4.4.9. Coordinating mechanisms**

Coordination mechanisms in the Prodoc design are comprehensive and comprise: the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) with the Project Coordinator to manage the operations; a Project Steering Committee to oversee this; a National Consultative Committee (NCCs) in each country to secure broader stakeholder participation in the Project's activities; and a National Focal Point in each country as a point of contact.

The Project's 109 Activities and outputs have been effectively coordinated by the PCU, although as noted above, the PCU is not adequately resourced to manage a complex project of this scale. Coordination between the implementing agency UNDP and executing agency FFA has been also effective, although there were initial procedural problems. The working relationships between FFA and SPC, and FFA and WWF-Pacific have been very close.

Coordination between the PCU and IUCN has been less effective, possibly because the latter agency was not directly involved in the Prodoc development, was not represented in the region and did not have technical expertise in for the seamount sub-component. Presumably this will improve when the IUCN Oceania Office's Project marine programme staff is recruited. Recommendations are made above (4.3.4.) on mechanisms for coordination of the Seamounts activities.

The performances of the NCCs have been variable, and some NCCs have not even been successfully established. The 2007 Annual Review (Clark, 2007) flagged this as a problem, and attributed this in part to the different capabilities of the Pacific SIDS. For example, national coordination is less of a problem in PNG which has a National Fisheries Authority governed by a Board representing the range of stakeholders. Smaller undeveloped countries with limited Public Service capabilities and many overseas assistance programs to administer have difficulties in arranging meetings in which all relevant representatives can attend.

Clark (2007) questioned the need for NCCs (a requirement in GEF Projects to ensure national commitment and collaboration). He noted that most OFM Project activities and training programmes are regionally (not nationally) executed; that coordination of external assistance by donors is less a problem now than in the past; that donor coordination arrangements imposed by donors are a 'fatiguing burden' for smaller countries; and that the heavy schedule of national and regional meetings in fisheries and related areas imposes an impossible load on senior government personnel in the Pacific SIDS. The last issue is particularly serious in the Pacific SIDS as the extended absences of heads of fisheries in meetings adversely affects their performance in their core task of running their national fisheries institutions.

*As a detailed evaluation of the performances of each NCC was not possible within the MTE, it is therefore*

*recommended that:*

- *the performance of each NCC should be evaluated by the PCU and be reported to the Project Steering Committee, and assistance in kind be given where appropriate to assist in their operations. Where this is not possible, alternative strategies should be considered for national coordination* (e.g. national circulation of newsletters, email news).

## 4.5. Project Finances

### 4.5.1. Budget procedures

Budget procedures and financial accountability have been of a high standard. Monthly, quarterly and annual financial reports are undertaken. An annual Audit is undertaken for FFA by certified external auditors based in Honiara, Solomon Islands. There have been subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations and changes have also been made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions because of the weak US dollar. These have been approved by the Regional Steering Committee.

There has been a significant impact of the weak US\$ on the budget, especially on the scientific assessment and monitoring component. As contingency funds were not permitted by the donors, the rise in staff costs in SPC and FFA are considerable. As noted by Clarke 2007, staff costs have been at 30-40% over the original budgeted values. The consequent budget revisions have been approved by the Regional Steering Committee to compensate for this, and to prevent any future risk to the project outcomes.

The project implementing agencies have been using disaggregated working budget, while for reporting purposes to UNDP and Pacific SIDS aggregated budget have been utilised as required by UNDP.

## OFM Project Working Budget

1. SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING COMPONENT		(US\$)
1.1 Fishery Monitoring		1,260,000
1.2 Stock assessment		880,000
1.3 Ecosystem Analysis		2,551,000
Data processing/management		150,000
SPC Project Support		306,250
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>5,147,250</b>
2 LAW, POLICY AND COMPLIANCE COMPONENT		
2.1 Legal Reform		679,000
2.2 Policy Reform		1,849,000
2.3 Institutional Reform		392,000
2.4 Compliance Strengthening		729,000
FFA Project Support		234,850
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>3,883,850</b>
3. COORDINATION, PARTICIPATION & INFORMATION SERVICES COMPONENT		
3.1 Information Strategy		35,000
3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation		222,000
3.3 Stakeholder Participation & Awareness Raising		400,000
3.4 Project Management & Coordination		1,159,000
FFA Project Support		99,120
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>1,915,120</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>10,946,220</b>

### 4.5.2. Disbursements and spending

The disbursement process has run smoothly despite the slow start-up of the project. There was some concern by UNDP regarding the large amount of advances (a quarterly advance of approx \$0.8 million in an annual budget of over \$2 million) which caused some problems in cash flow for SPC and FFA, the two main implementing agencies. But these initial difficulties were resolved. By the MTE, May 30 2008, 57% of the project budget had been disbursed by UNDP and the project budget spent was 52%.

### Disbursements in OFM Project to MTE (May 2008)

	Initial Approved Budget (Us\$)	Received from UNDP (Us\$)	Cumulative % of Total Budget	Spent (Us\$)	Cumulative % of Total Budget	Cumulative % of Project Life
2005	668,675	628,676	5.7	208,139	1.9	5.0
2006	2,751,365	1,834,068	22.5	2,092,871	19.1	25.0
2007	2,737,105	2,775,661	47.9	2,745,510	46.1	45.0
2008	2,058,330	996,216	57	632,011	51.9	65.0
2009	1,622,445					
2010	1,108,300					
	<b>10,946,220</b>					



#### **4.5.3. Actual spending and budget expectations**

A detailed assessment of the actual spending versus budget expectations was undertaken by the evaluators at FFA and was considered satisfactory. A comparative analysis of the patterns of disbursements and expenditures with the initial project budget is presented in the table above. As stated by Clarke 2007, the project was below delivery rate because 56% of the budget was to be spent by December, 2007. By the MTE only 52% had been spent with the majority of the shortfall due to the lack of progress by IUCN in implementing its portion of the project. The IUCN activities have now been redesigned and an assurance has been given by IUCN that the re-designed programme will be implemented and completed within 2.5 years, the project life.

#### **4.5.4. Co-financing and leverage**

The co-financing of the project is outlined in Annex 7. It is not possible to assess the in-kind contribution of Pacific SIDS and the complex aspect of co-financing in this project at this stage because there are no specific requirements from UNDP/GEF for accounting of contributions from co-financing at this stage. However, it the PCU may need to establish a system for keeping track of co-financing, as actual co-financing received needs to be reported to the GEF at project closure.

The level of support by donors to fund OFM project related in-country and regional activities have been very strong. The co-financing aspect of the project has exceeded the level of financing required to meet the commitments of the co-financing requirements in the Project document.

#### **4.5.5 Effectiveness**

The financial effectiveness of the PCU as a regional approach in support of the Project's financial management is rated highly. The PCU has shown leadership and a high level of competency in its approach in supporting the in-country conservation and sustainable oceanic fisheries management initiatives in the Pacific. The strong and sound financial management capabilities of FFA and SPC have prevented any difficulties in this area.

The Auditor's Reports are adequate for financial accountability for the project. The procedures and accountability for financial reporting between FFA, SPC/OFM, UNDP and the Regional Steering Committee members are of high quality. The Project Finance and Administration Officer has good rapport with the Coordinator and is highly competent. The strong financial capabilities of FFA and SPC institutions have supported the OFM Project. The overall financial management of the Project is considered to be very impressive.

## 4.6. Lessons learned

The following highlights lessons learned, and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success of the OFM Project. Some lesson learned are applicable only to this Project, while others are of value more broadly, to similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio, and elsewhere.

### 4.6.1. Country ownership/drivenness

**Best practice:** A high degree of ownership, and consequently 'drivenness' was achieved through involvement of the Island countries in all phases of the Project, in the preliminary IW SAP and in the development and execution of the OFM Project. Real 'ownership' has been achieved through co-funding arrangements and contributions in cash and kind from all the Pacific SIDS involved.

**Poor practice:** The varying need of the Pacific SIDS, and special needs of the smaller countries were not adequately considered in the project design. The continuing need to maintain 'ownership' has not been adequate. A focus is therefore required in the second term of the Project on implementation of the media strategy and information dissemination.

### 4.6.2. Regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation

**Best practice:** There is a high degree of regional and intergovernmental cooperation through the execution by the established regional organisations, FFA and SPC. The establishment of the PCU within FFA has facilitated coordination in the execution of the Project.

**Poor practice:** The PCU was not sufficiently resourced in the Prodoc budget to manage such a large and complex project. Because of the high degree of success in regional cooperation, some countries feel that their own national interests are inadequately considered.

### 4.6.3. Stakeholder participation

**Best practice:** The development of strong degree of ownership established by making the Pacific SIDS partners in the Project (above) has maximised participation of stakeholders.

**Poor practice:** Some key stakeholders were not engaged as partners in the Project (e.g. USP in capacity-building and SPREP in biodiversity conservation). The NCCs have had limited success for various reasons. Wider public information and media programmes have not been undertaken to inform and engage other stakeholders such as other government departments, industry, community NGOs, schools and interested members of the public.

### 4.6.4. Adaptive management processes

**Best practice:** Regular reports, annual reviews, and the MTE assess progress, identify weaknesses and recommend remedial measures.

**Poor practice:** There is a significant time lag between the performance of the MTE and its acceptance, and (hopefully) remedial actions. Remedial actions may not be possible because of funding constraints. There may not be budget savings to implement recommended activities.

### 4.6.5. Efforts to secure sustainability

**Best practice:** The emphasis on regional and national engagement and multiple partnership arrangements enhance ownership and sustainability. The focus on providing capacity for Pacific SIDS to meet their longer-term obligations aids the sustainability of the WCPF Convention and Commission, and hence sustainability of fisheries stocks.

**Poor practice:** The longer-term financial support to the Commission is not certain, affecting its future sustainability. The OFM Project generally does not take a long-term, strategic approach to increasing capacity in OFM in the Pacific SIDS, particularly smaller countries.

#### **4.6.6. Role of monitoring and evaluation in project implementation**

**Best practice:** Regular reporting, reviews and the MTE monitor progress and evaluate implementation.

**Poor practice:** The Project logical framework lacks quantitative indicators and timeframes, hindering evaluation of progress.

### **4.7. Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations**

The OFM Project is unusually large and ambitious in its objectives and geographic scale, and complex in its design and implementation. Despite these challenges, the MTE concludes that OFM Project has been very effectively implemented in its first term. There has been a significant impact on the immediate regional objectives (improved OFM in Pacific SIDS, and sustainable development of resources), contributing to wider global objectives (management of oceanic fishery and oceanic biodiversity). There has also been significant progress on addressing the root cause problems (lack of understanding, and weaknesses in governance), though these will require continued effort.

The most notable achievement has been to provide capacities to the Pacific SIDS in a coordinated manner for them to meet their obligations under the WCPF Convention. The WCPF Commission rated the OFM Project very highly in performance and outcomes in this regard. However, it is evident that smaller and less developed islands are struggling, and will require continued and focused support. While capacity-building has commenced in some of these countries (e.g. Nauru) and will be undertaken in others (e.g. Tuvalu, Kiribati) through leverage funding, it is the smaller countries, and those which have suffered problems in national governance, which will require continuing support.

OFM Project management and administration is rated very highly in effectiveness. The GEF Implementing Agency, UNDP is efficient and responsive, though its procedures were considered rather onerous by the Executing Agency (FFA). FFA, a well-established regional institution with 30 years of experience in OFM, has been very effective in this key role. Project coordination (through the PCU) has been good, though the PCU is severely under-resourced for a project of this scale and complexity. The major scientific organisation, SPC, has also been effective in increasing knowledge of the status of oceanic fisheries. However, some of the larger Pacific SIDS consider that they have not been significantly involved in oceanic fisheries science and would like closer involvement.

One sub-component, the IUCN Seamounts study, did not begin in the first term for matters beyond that organisation's control. This sub-component, developed to take advantage of a no-cost deep sea expedition, was not considered a core part of the programme and has not hindered the primary objectives of the Project. This study has now been redesigned and will commence in the near future. IUCN has assured that the study will be completed within the life of the OFM Project. However, it is evident that the IUCN activities will have to be better related to the other Project activities, and closely coordinated in future.

The overall cost/effectiveness of the Project is rated very highly. Risk assessment and management (in a complex Project with high inherent risk) has been well employed in the Project design. However, monitoring and assessment of progress has been limited by a lack of quantifiable indicators in the Project's logical framework. Adaptive management processes within the Project are good in theory, but time lags may reduce their effectiveness. A lack of funds would also prevent any new initiatives stemming from recommendations of this MTE.

Partnership agreements, the bases for the Project, and other internal arrangements have been very effective. A major strength in the Prodoc is its inclusion of all Pacific SIDS and a number of international and regional institutions as partners. However, regional organisations with mandates in capacity-building and oceanic biodiversity conservation were not included, to the detriment of the long-term sustainability of the Project objectives. The cross cutting issues of institutional strengthening, national development and innovation are cornerstones of the Project and are well addressed. However, social issues of gender, equity and human rights were not addressed in the Project design. The latter should be explicitly addressed in any future capacity-building projects in OFM.

Project coordination has been effective, but requires a continuing effort because of high staff turnover in the region. However, the effectiveness of the National Coordination Committees has been variable and some have not yet met. This reflects the range in capabilities within the Pacific SIDS. Smaller countries with limited Public Services are especially hard pressed to provide a full range of national services as well meeting the often demanding obligations of external donors.

This has not affected delivery of training and other Project activities which are undertaken on a more regional basis. The issue of national coordination requires further evaluation, and alternative initiatives (e.g. smaller committees, wider circulation of newsletters, Web material).

The procedures and accountability for financial reporting within and between FFA, SPC/OFM, UNDP and the Regional Steering Committee members are of high quality. Monthly, quarterly and annual financial reports are undertaken, and there is an external annual audit. The decline in the US dollar has had a serious impact on the Project budget and staff costs have risen 30-40% over the original budgeted values. This has particularly affected SPC which has several Project funded positions. Reallocations of funds have been made to support staffing and have been approved by the Regional Steering Committee. A major weakness in budget procedures is the use of an aggregated budget, which does not specifically identify budgets for regional and national activities. The details are, however, provided by the disaggregated working budgets used by FFA and SPC. By the MTE, May 30 2008, 57% of the project budget had been disbursed by UNDP and the project budget spent was 52%. The levels of co-financing and leverage by donors to fund OFM project related in-country and regional activities have been very strong. The co-financing aspect of the project has exceeded the level of financing required to meet the commitments of the co-financing requirements in the Prodoc.

The lessons learnt (positive and negative) from the first term are important. Positive lessons learnt include: importance of large-scale, coordinated and integrated approaches in ocean-scale conservation and sustainable resources management; importance of engagement of stakeholders in all stages of Project planning and implementation; importance of a detailed design to ensure product delivery; reduction of risks in implementation through the utilisation of existing resources, organizations and arrangements; and maximisation of stakeholder participation, collaboration and sustainability through formal co-financing and partnership arrangements. The OFM Project is considered a good model for other large-area, multi-stakeholder or inter-governmental projects.

Negative lessons learnt include: need to include all relevant stakeholders (in this case, the regional tertiary training and biodiversity conservation institutions); need for long-term capacity-building approaches to ensure long-term sustainability; a false assumption that all Pacific SIDS have similar needs; insufficient consideration of the special needs of small, isolated countries; need for more flexible budgeting in longer-term projects to allow for new initiatives and unexpected actors such as varying exchange rates; need for continuing coordination and for a focused media programme; and the need for donors to minimise and streamline bureaucratic procedures because of the excessive burden they place on executing institutions and governments of small Pacific SIDS.

In conclusion, it should be recognised that while there has been significant progress on the root cause problems (lack of understanding, and weaknesses in governance) the scale of these necessitates long-term efforts, beyond the duration of this Project. A potentially serious problem lies in longer-term sustainability of the Project objectives. While capacity-building in the OFM Project has largely focused on meeting the more immediate needs (obligations under the WCPF Convention), more strategic, longer-term capacity-building in OFM will be required in the future, particularly to assist small, isolated Pacific SIDS.

# Recommendations

Recommendations are made throughout Part 4, above. The following places these into recommendations for corrective actions in the design, implementation, management and evaluation of the OFM Project; actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project; and proposals for future directions underlining main objectives. Those relating to the OFM Project are designed, where possible, to be financial resource-neutral to minimise impacts on ongoing activities.

## 5.1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

### 5.1.1. Design

- ***The revised design for the IUCN Seamount sub-component Output 1.3.2. should be closely coordinated, integrated with the wider OFM Project objectives, and be collaborative with other regional research.*** The various IUCN seamount activities should be coordinated by the Principal Investigator who is to be recruited by IUCN Oceania Office in Fiji. The activities and outputs of the IUCN Seamount research should be related to other aspects of the OFM Project such as management options, law reform, compliance, information strategy etc. Where possible, there should be collaboration with other seamount research and management initiatives in the region (e.g. by French research vessel *Alise*; Japan Fisheries University /USP seamounts research on *Koyo Maru*).

### 5.1.2. Implementation

- ***The OFM PCU should be better supported in the second term of the Project.*** Urgent discussions should be held between the Project Coordinator and UNDP on Project management needs in the second term, and ways ahead. For example, an additional professional staff member might be recruited to assist in coordination, reporting and in the development of the recommended new Project. One or two additional Technical assistants might be established where funds could be reallocated from other technical activities. The additional staff might be seconded from regional fisheries departments to aid in coordination and national capacity building.
- ***GEF should be informed on the need for greater flexibility in allocations for Project management.*** Success of any Project depends on the quality of Project management.
- ***Pacific SIDS should be assisted where possible in developing their capacities in oceanic fisheries science.*** (e.g. through work attachments for fisheries institution research staff at SPC; linkages between SPC with USP's School of Marine Studies; encouragement for students from Pacific SIDS to undertake postgraduate research in oceanic fisheries). More strategic, long-term assistance in building national capacities in ocean science should be included in the proposed capacity-building project (below).



### 5.1.3. Partnership agreements

- *the OFM Project should be more explicitly linked to the Pacific Plan and a new project be developed to implement the long-term strategic approach to capacity-building in OFM, as recommended under the Vavau Declaration. Discussions should be held between FFA and the Pacific Forum Secretariat in developing this project.*
- *Discussions should be held with USP and SPREP to more actively involve them in capacity-building and oceanic biodiversity and conservation.* As funding is fully committed for the second term of the OFM, they may be able to contribute in kind and through leverage funding arrangements.
- *Special efforts should be made to more closely engage with the private sector, tuna industry and related business communities in the promotion of the OFM Project objectives.*

### 5.1.4. Monitoring and reporting

- *A suite of appropriate indicators should be developed within the Logical Framework to better monitor progress in Project Outputs and Activities.* The Project Coordinator should develop these in consultation with UNDP and GEF. Quantitative indicators should be aggregated from (a) a 'bottom-up' approach (e.g. performance of each activity (e.g. planned versus actual performance with respect to timeliness, budget, outcomes, technical reports, numbers of meetings); and (b) 'top down' indicators reflecting the broad objectives of the OFM Project (e.g. numbers of Pacific SIDS with appropriate legislation; observer programmes; participation in CPWCPF Commission meetings).
- *A baseline study of OFM in Pacific SIDS, including a summary of the achievements and shortfalls of WCPF Convention commitments, should be prepared.* This was recommended in the 2007 Annual Review of the OFM Project. It will be useful background for future initiatives (see 5.3).
- *The monitoring and reporting requirements of the major donor, GEF, and implementing agency UNDP, should be assessed to reduce unnecessary bureaucratic procedures.* The PCU Coordinator should enter a dialogue with UNDP Project Management staff to streamline processes in the second term.

### 5.1.5. Coordination

Increased support for the PCU to undertake additional tasks is recommended above. It is also recommended that:

- *A review of the functions and effectiveness of the Regional Coordination Committees should be undertaken by the PCU and alternative strategies for in-country coordination is developed where necessary.* Strategies may include smaller committees, less frequent meetings, delegated responsibilities to existing national coordination committees and/or wider use of newsletters, Internet and media releases to keep stakeholders informed.

### 5.1.6. Information dissemination

- *the OFM Knowledge Management Strategy should be fully implemented and there should be a greater focus on dissemination of information from the OFM Project by the PCU.* Information dissemination should include: wider distribution of the OFM brochure; special briefings for newly appointed heads of fisheries and other key stakeholders; formal briefings and presentations at relevant regional fisheries meetings; promotion of OFM Project and wider FFA and SPC websites amongst stakeholders; popular descriptions on the Project website for educators and the wider community; regular newsletters (email, Web and hard copy); and radio and press news releases for distribution to regional media.

## 5.2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

- *The specific needs of small Pacific SIDS should be identified, and a strategic plan developed to provide appropriate support.* This may include an assessment of needs and assistance in negotiations with bilateral donors for specific in-country support in OFM.
- *The Knowledge Management/Media programme should highlight significant achievements in the first term.* This will assist in the development of leverage funding and funding for the proposed future project in long-term capacity-development (see 5.3).
- *Discussions should be held as soon as possible with potential donors for a future project* (see 5.3). Continued GEF funding is uncertain. GEF may not commit to a fourth regional project, but may commit to specific country support through bilateral funding arrangements. The EU, Japan and Australia have shown a strong commitment to supporting sustainable oceanic fisheries and biodiversity conservation.

## 5.3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

### 5.3.1. New initiatives

- *A new project should be developed for strategic, long-term capacity-building in OFM in Pacific SIDS, and to specifically assist smaller Pacific SIDS and those with governance problems.* The need for continuation and long-term sustainability of the OFM initiatives, and need for more focused assistance to small Pacific SIDS has been raised throughout the MTE. The 2007 Pacific Forum Leaders' Vavau Declaration calls for long-term, strategic capacity-building in OFM in the Pacific SIDS.

Planning should commence as soon as possible on a new project. Although the details of this are outside the scope of this MTE, some general suggestions on process are given here.

The TOR of the new Project might be scoped by consultants reporting to the OFM Steering Committee. Details might be developed by consultants in a workshop of stakeholders, including OFM experts, Pacific SIDS, regional organisations (e.g. FFA, SPC, Pacific Forum Secretariat, USP, SPREP), potential donors (e.g. GEF, EU, Japan, AusAID) and NGOs (e.g. WWF, Greenpeace).

The long-term capacity-building Project should be strategic and inclusive in approach. It should consider the specific needs of each country in OFM (mid- to long-term); capacity and training requirements; appropriate training programmes (e.g. at USP, other regional and International institutions); and funding opportunities (multilateral and bilateral aid). It will require commitment from the targeted Pacific SIDS through partnership arrangements, and contributions in kind (e.g. commitment to additional staff in OFM in fisheries departments).

The new project should also focus on closer engagement of the private fisheries sector in OFM, and build on the OFM Project's partnership arrangements.

The project (or some related, coordinated project) should also focus on better understanding of the ecology of the WTP Large Marine Ecosystem, and the status and conservation of its marine biodiversity. This component might be implemented in collaboration with SPREP and SOPAC.

- ***Special arrangements should be considered for OFM in small, isolated SIDS. Given the lack of progress in capacity-building in the smallest Pacific SIDS in the past 30 years, and the reality that those with very small populations*** (e.g. under 25,000) will probably always lack the human capacity for specialised OFM, alternative approaches should be considered to better assist them. These might be scoped in an open forum or workshop involving country representatives; experts in OFM and international assistance; donor organisations and 'problem solvers'. Preliminary suggestions by the Consultants include:

***Sub-regional groupings to provide better support for smallest countries:***

Because individual small countries are unable to have the full range of expertise in OFM, they might collaborate to share OFM expertise sub-regionally. Groupings might be based on current FFA sub-groupings of countries with similar challenges and experiences, with shared EEZ borders and shared tuna stocks. The FFA groupings are:

- (a) East Sub-Regional Group: Cook Islands, Tokelau, Niue, Tonga, Samoa and New Zealand (shared Polynesian culture, political affiliations with New Zealand etc.)
- (b) West Sub-Regional Group: Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu (and Australia)
- (c) North Sub-Regional Group: FSM (Ponape, Yap, Chuuk), Palau and Marshall Islands (Micronesian, small countries, former US affiliations), and Nauru, Kiribati and Tuvalu (Micronesian/Polynesian, atoll countries, former British affiliations).

Subgroups (a) and (c) largely comprise small, isolated island countries. There may be benefits in separating the two groups within (c) on geographic and cultural grounds.

***Country attachments or representatives within FFA***

As the smallest Pacific SIDS are unable to fully support OFM, mechanisms to assist them might include: a national fisheries staff member situated at FFA to look after their country's interests; a dedicated FFA staff member or consultant to undertake this task; and/or a pool of technical experts within FFA to look after the specific interests of the small countries.

# Annex 1. Terms of Reference

## Mid Term Evaluation of UNDP-GEF's Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project – PIMS 2992

### 1. Background and Context

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) is a multi-governmental five year initiative by 14 independent islands nations and one territory<sup>1</sup> to address the sustainable management of regional fish stocks in the Pacific region. The project is implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through its Fiji country office and executed by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). The project document was signed by UNDP on 30 September 2005 and by the FFA on 13 July 2005. The execution start date was not until November of the last quarter of 2005 which resulted in the first Regional Steering Committee agreeing to adjust the 5 year period of project implementation across 2005 to completion in 2010 and a post evaluation phase in 2012. A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) based at the FFA administers the project.

The OFM Project fits within the overarching Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters of the Pacific Island Developing States (RAS/98/G32) which contained at the time, two complementary linked consultative sub programmes: Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (SPREP Funded IWP Programme) and Oceanic Fisheries Management. The delivery of actions of the full OFM Project is now undertaken directly by the FFA. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) is confined to the OFM Project executed by the FFA.

The OFM Project has two objectives that address (a) the threats to the sustainability of the use of the region's oceanic fish resources identified in the SAP, principally the lack of understanding and the weaknesses in governance relating to oceanic fisheries in the International Waters in the region, and (b) the need for improved the understanding of transboundary oceanic fisheries resources and create new regional institutional arrangements as well as realigning, reforming and strengthening national arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources.

The origins of the project, its preparation, its objectives and structure address the concerns that Pacific Islands small developing States (Pacific SIDS) have for the unsustainable use of transboundary oceanic fish stocks of the Pacific region and unsustainable levels and patterns of exploitation in the fisheries that target those stocks.

At the centre of these concerns is the transboundary nature of the stocks. The stocks are dominantly highly migratory, with their range extending through waters under the jurisdiction of around 20 countries and into large areas of high seas. Each of the countries within whose waters the stocks occur has responsibilities under international law to adopt measures for the conservation and management of these stocks. But without a coherent and legally binding framework to establish and apply measures throughout the range of the stocks, including the high seas, the efforts made by individual countries in their own waters can be undermined by unregulated fishing on the high seas and by inconsistencies in measures in different national zones.

<sup>1</sup> The 14 Pacific Island States and territory that qualify for GEF support under the OFM Project are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

These are global concerns. They were important issues in the preparation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) during the 1970s, particularly in the provisions relating to management of fishing on the high seas and management of fishing for highly migratory species. In 1992 they found expression in the call from the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) within Agenda 21 for a UN intergovernmental conference on high seas fishing and they are also the key concerns addressed in the UN Fish Stocks Agreement.

The PIOFM project implementation has progressed satisfactorily. A significant activity that has not been implemented in accordance with the approved work plan is the work under sub-component of Ecosystem Analysis. This sub-component is to be undertaken by IUCN and issues beyond their control have hampered implementation. Discussions continue on the approach to sea mount analysis, and will be subject to review under the MTE.

## 2. Objective and Purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments<sup>2</sup>.

The objective of the PIOFM MTE is to provide an assessment of the progress made towards the OFM project's objectives and outputs. It should also identify strengths and weaknesses and provide an evaluation of the implementation and management of the project by identifying factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievements of the project objectives and outputs. In addition, the MTE should also provide recommendations and lessons learned to assist on defining future directions for the project.

---

<sup>2</sup> "UNDP Guidance on Terms of References for Mid-Term Evaluation Missions" Annex 1 – Standard Introduction for Mid-Term Evaluations.

### 3. Targeted beneficiaries

The key beneficiaries for the MTE include the Global Environment Facility (and the global community), UNDP, Pacific SIDS, Pacific regional organizations, relevant donor organizations and industry and environment non-government organizations. The Report of the MTE will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions and will be targeted at meeting the evaluation needs of all key stakeholders.

### 4. Scope of the Evaluation

This section should be read in conjunction with the objectives of the MTE. The scope of the MTE will critically assess issues pertaining to the relevance, performance (based on indicators identified in the logframe matrix) and success of the project including the sustainability of results. The evaluation will also result in the formulation of recommendations and identification of lessons learned to assist determining future directions of the project.

#### **4.1 Project Impact (Results)**

The Evaluation will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and results achieved by the project to-date, by showing how the component(s) processes and outcomes have contributed (or have the potential to contribute) to the achievement of project goals and objectives. Specifically the MTE will:

- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, the achievements and impact in terms of outputs and their contribution to outcomes as defined in the project document;
- Assess progress towards attaining the Programme's regional and global environmental objectives as described in GEF operational focal areas 9;
- assess to what extent the project has or will contribute to the establishment of regional arrangements for sustainable oceanic fisheries management;
- assess to what extent the project has made impacts on the promotion of Pacific SIDS participation in decision-making and realignment and strength of local governance;
- how the project contributed to improved governance at national levels, and examine how governance issues have impacted on the achievement of project goals and outputs;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which OFM Project impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries, both within and outside project sites;
- determine lessons learned and assess the sustainability of project results;
- provide recommendations for how the project implementation can be strengthened and can most effectively support regional and national priorities, management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and strengthen and achieve project objectives.

#### **4.2 Project Design**

The MTE will assess:

- the extent to which the overall project design remains valid;
- review the project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability;
- assess the approach used in design and whether the selected intervention strategy addresses the root causes and principal threats in the project area;
- the effectiveness and the methodology of the overall project structure, how effectively the project addresses responsibilities especially towards capacity building and challenges; and
- assess plans and potential for replication.



### **4.3 Project Management and Administration**

- The MTE will assess the extent to which project management has been effective, efficient and responsive. This includes the oversight role by UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency, project execution role of FFA agency, the PCU and the project focal points, project implementing role of SPC and IUCN, multipartite review processes via the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and the national consultative committees.
- This will also review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various institutional arrangements for project implementation and the level of coordination between relevant players;

### **4.4. Project Implementation**

The Evaluation will assess the extent to which project management and implementation has been effective, efficient and responsive, and in particular will review the following:

- the OFM Project management structure and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost effectiveness;
- assess the use of logical framework as a management tool during implementation;
- assess the quality and relevance of project reporting;
- the mechanisms for information dissemination of project implementation;
- risk management by identifying any problems or constraints which may impact, or are impacting on the successful delivery of the OFM Project, whether they have been, or are being appropriately dealt with and if they are likely to be repeated in future phases;
- Describe the project's adaptive management processes – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, and have the changes been appropriate;
- Review any partnership arrangements with other donors and comment on their strengths and weaknesses, as well as collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and NGOs, national level involvement and perceptions and the involvement of other stakeholders;
- assess the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Gender, Human rights, Equity, Institutional strengthening and Innovation or added value to national development; and
- the effectiveness of coordinating mechanisms by evaluating the appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between UNDP, the FFA (including internal coordination), with SPC & IUCN and GEF

### **4.5. Project Finances**

The evaluation will critically analyze the project finance elements including:

- budget procedures including the review of audits; and the subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations; and any changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions providing an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions;
- the appropriateness of and efficiency of disbursements and actual spending;
- by providing an overview of actual spending versus budget expectations;
- assessing how the project has materialized/leveraged co-financing for various components; and
- assessing the financial effectiveness of the PCU as a regional approach in support of in-country conservation and sustainable oceanic fisheries resource management initiatives in the Pacific, and if so how can this approach be improved;

## **4.6. Lessons learned**

The Evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio.

This section will also describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:

- country ownership/drivenness;
- regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation;
- stakeholder participation;
- adaptive management processes;
- efforts to secure sustainability; and
- the role of M&E in project implementation.

## **5. Expected Outputs**

The main product of the MTE will be a Mid-term Evaluation Report based on an agreed format (**Annex A**) and will include

- Findings and conclusions in relation to issues to be addressed under sections B and C of these TORs; and
- Assessments of gaps and/or additional measures needed to justify future GEF investment in the Pacific Islands region in relation to International Waters issues and sustainable oceanic fisheries resource management.

The draft and final Mid-Term Evaluation Report will be:

- written in the format outlined in Annex A and be no more than 40 A4 pages (excluding an Executive Summary and annexes);
- (**draft** report) submitted to UNDP by **16 June 2008** and will be circulated to stakeholders for comment. The draft report will be further reviewed by the evaluators taking into account comments from the stakeholders<sup>3</sup>. The evaluators shall annex to the final report a record of all comments made on the draft report, responses to these comments and detail how they were dealt with in the report.
- A final mid-term evaluation report will be submitted to UNDP for circulation to stakeholders allowing for a period of review before the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review meeting scheduled for **early October 2008** in Honiara, Solomon Islands. Submission of final report is due **16 July 2008**.

## **6. Evaluation Approach**

The MTE will be undertaken through a combination of processes including desk research, selected site visits, questionnaires and interviews - involving all stakeholders, including, but not restricted to: UNDP (Suva, Bangkok, New York), GEF, FFA, SPC, IUCN, SPREP, participating Governments, regional ENGOs and industry, communities, resource users and local governments.

---

<sup>3</sup> The evaluators shall accept changes related to factual errors, but should retain the independence to draw their own conclusions from the findings.

The methodology for the study is envisaged to cover the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant OFM Project documentation, including but not confined to those listed at **Annex B**;
- Fiji-based consultations with UNDP, SPC, IUCN, WWF South Pacific Programme, University of the South Pacific Marine Programme (USP), Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA, including Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO) based at the Forum Secretariat and PITIA Fiji based officials) national project related stakeholders, other Fiji-based agencies;
- Solomon Islands-based consultations with UNDP, FFA, national project-related stakeholders, other Fiji-based agencies;
- Selected visits to Fiji, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Samoa;
- Participation in the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review Meeting scheduled for early October 2008 at Honiara, Solomon Islands.

A total of approximately 45 days (including in-country travel, meeting participation, research, write-up and presentation) has been budgeted to support the Evaluation. The number of days for consultancy will vary and dependent on (i.) engagement of team leader in the Regional Steering Committee meeting for MTE presentation (ii.) flight schedules in and out of countries.

## 7. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will comprise two consultants with the appropriate expertise, a Team Leader and a Regional Resource Specialist. The team leader will be responsible for the overall evaluation exercise and take lead in preparation of the expected outputs. The Regional resource specialist will assist the Team leader in the above, with specific focus on country consultations, facilitation of stakeholder meetings and creation of required documents.

The consultants will conduct a participatory evaluation for improved understanding of the results of the PIOFM and provide recommendations for future project focus. On completion of the evaluation, the team leader will circulate draft outputs to key stakeholders for comments before completing a final evaluation report. Principles of gender equity will and selection will be subject to the UNDP Ethical Code of Conduct appended at **Annex C**. The following attributes are requirements for the selection of the review team:

### **7.1 Team Leader**

- Academic and/or professional background in the institutional aspects of resource management with a minimum of 15 years experience;
- In depth knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, particularly with emphasis on the regional priorities of Pacific region and SIDS, regional groupings, structures and operations;
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors;
- Experience in the evaluation of GEF funded projects, preferably those under the International Waters portfolio;
- Proven capacity in working across the levels of institutions from policy, to legislation and organisations;
- Excellent leading multi-disciplinary teams to deliver quality products in high stress or short deadline situations;
- An ability to assess institutional capacity and incentives;

Excellent written and English communication skills with a demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions; and

- Professional skill, information analysis and communication, science communication (oral, written, multimedia)
- Excellent facilitation skills.

### **7.2 Regional Resource Specialist**

- Academic / professional background in oceanic fisheries management/fisheries science with extensive experience in sustainable development and conservation – preferably in Pacific Islands environments with a minimum of 15 years of working experience;
- An understanding of GEF principles and the expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- Experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects;
- An understanding of UNDP, the FFA, SPREP and IUCN activities and extensive knowledge of operational programmes in the Pacific region;
- Skills and experience in oceanic fisheries management regimes, preferably the development and establishment of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention;
- Excellent written and English communication skills; and
- Excellent facilitation skills.

## **8. Application requirements**

Expressions of interest should include:

- A short (maximum three page) covering letter addressing the evaluation criteria;
- Curriculum vitae, including references;
- Cost estimates for services rendered including:
  - a) daily consultancy fees, travel costs, communication costs, publishing and stationary costs and other logistical costs as relevant; and
  - b) airfares, anticipated accommodation and living costs are to be included in overall fee charged

Applications for team leader and Regional resource specialist can be applied separately or as a team. To ensure adequate representation of women in OFM project and fisheries issues, applications from women are highly encouraged for the consultancy. All costs, including international and domestic airfares and expected accommodation and living costs incurred at the duty stations will need to be included in the overall fee charged by the consultants or consultancy firm. Assistance can be provided by the UNDP-Fiji for the purposes of calculating the subscribers travel costs on the basis of the authorized itinerary and the routing and travel time.

## 9. Implementation Arrangements

The overall supervision of the MTR will rest with the UNDP-Fiji Deputy Resident Representative and UNDP Regional Technical Adviser (IWP) in the Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific (RBAP).

A contract will be signed by the evaluators upon commencement of the evaluation which will detail aspects on inputs and deliverables. The consultants will be bound by the terms and conditions of UNDP Procurement rules and guidelines.

## 10. Timeline

An indicative schedule for the completion of the MTE is as follows:

DATES	SCHEDULE
February 10	Call for expressions of Interests
March 10	Application submission deadline
March 7 – April 17	Selection process, contract
April 28	Evaluators commence evaluation
April 28 - 30	Evaluators assemble in Suva, Fiji for briefing by UNDP and undertake Fiji based consultations
May 1 - 7	Evaluators assemble in Honiara, Solomon Islands for consultations
May 12 – June 6	Travel to New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Kiribati
16 June*	Draft Report completed
16 July*	Final report completed
October (early)	Report presentation at RSC4, Solomon Islands by Evaluation Team Leader

*\*Between 16 June and 16 July, 2008, the evaluators will be engaged for a period of 5 working days for revision of the evaluation report. As such this activity, will not anticipate any travel to duty station.*

## 11. Applications

Expressions of interest should be addressed to:

**The Resident Representative**

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)  
Private Mail Bag  
Suva  
FIJI

**Re:** Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project

**Email:** registry.fj@undp.org

Applications submission deadline: **10 March 2008**

## Annex 2. Itinerary of OFM Project Consultants

### Date /Activity<sup>4</sup>

26 <sup>th</sup> April 2008	VV travel to Fiji
28 <sup>th</sup> April	- Briefing Meeting with Alvin Chandra at UNDP - Teleconferencing with Alvin Chandra, Leon Zann and Veikila Vuki
29 <sup>th</sup> April	- Teleconferencing meeting with Alvin Chandra, Anna Ternberg, Leon Zann, Veikila Vuki and Barbara Hanchard -Consultations with Fiji Stakeholders
30 <sup>th</sup> April	- Consultations with the University of the South Pacific staff and WWF Staff; Fiji Fisheries Department
1 <sup>st</sup> May-3 <sup>rd</sup> May	Travel to Palau
4 <sup>th</sup> May	Consultants meeting - sessions on 67 <sup>th</sup> Forum Fisheries Committee and Related Meetings
5 <sup>th</sup> May	Preliminary consultations, Fiji, PNG, Solomon Islands etc reps
6 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Cook Islands and Marshall Islands
7 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Solomon Islands and Solomon Islands Industry
8 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Tuvalu and PNG Industry
9 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with PNG and SPC
10 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Palau and Kiribati
11 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Niue
12 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Samoa
13 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Nauru
14 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Tokelau and Tonga
15 <sup>th</sup> May	Country Consultations with Federated States of Micronesia and Consultations with WCPFC
16 <sup>th</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup> May	Travel to FFA, Solomon Islands
21 <sup>st</sup> May	FFA Consultations with PCU coordinator Barbara Hanchard - IUCN Teleconference
22 <sup>nd</sup> May	FFA Consultations with PCU coordinator Barbara Hanchard, Darren Cameron
23 <sup>rd</sup> May	Consultants Discussions on Draft Report – LZ Travel to Australia- Malaysia
24 <sup>th</sup> May-30 <sup>th</sup> May	VV consultations with PCU and FFA on finances, budget
30 <sup>th</sup> May-3 <sup>rd</sup> June	VV travel to Fiji
12 <sup>th</sup> June	VV briefing Meeting at UNDP in Fiji



# Annex 3. List of Persons Interviewed or Consulted by Organizations

A3

## Organizations

### UNDP

**Alvin Chandra**  
**Asenaca Ravuvu**

### UNEP GEF

**Dr Keneti Faulalo**

### FAO

**Dr David J. Doulman**

Senior Fisheries Liaison Officer  
International Institutions and Liaison Service  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department  
Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations  
Rome

### IUCN

**Dr. Eric Gilman**  
Hawaii

### WCPF Commission

**Mr Andrew Wright**

Executive Director  
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission  
Kolonias  
Pohnpei

### WWF South Pacific

**Seremaia Tuqiri**

Fisheries Policy Officer  
WWF South Pacific Programme  
4 Ma'afu Street  
Private Mail Bag  
Suva  
Fiji Islands  
**T** 679 331 5533  
**F** 679 331 5410  
**E** [stuqiri@wwfpacific.org.fj](mailto:stuqiri@wwfpacific.org.fj)  
**W** [www.wwfpacific.org.fj](http://www.wwfpacific.org.fj)

### Louise Heaps

Conservation Director (East)  
WWF South Pacific Programme  
4 Ma'afu Street  
Private Mail Bag  
Suva  
Fiji Islands  
**T** 679 331 5533  
**F** 679 331 5410  
**E** [lheaps@wwfpacific.org.fj](mailto:lheaps@wwfpacific.org.fj)  
**W** [www.wwfpacific.org.fj](http://www.wwfpacific.org.fj)

### National Fisheries Development Ltd., Solomon Islands.

**Albert Wata**

Fisheries Affairs Manager,  
PO Box 717, Honiara,  
Solomon Islands.  
**T** **Noro** 677 61131  
**T** **Honiara** 677 30991  
**F** 677 61109  
**E** [awata@trimarinegroup.com](mailto:awata@trimarinegroup.com)

### Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat

**George Beck**

Senior Technical Adviser (EC)  
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands  
**T** 679 331 2600 / 322 0323  
**F** 679 331 2696  
**E** [georgeb@forumsec.org.fj](mailto:georgeb@forumsec.org.fj)  
**W** [www.forumsec.org](http://www.forumsec.org)

### Fairwell Fishery (PNG) Ltd.

**Francis Houji**

PO Box 262  
Gordons-NCD 0135  
PNG  
**T** 675 3200685/ 3200655  
**F** 675 3212631  
**E** [hope@daltron.com.pg](mailto:hope@daltron.com.pg)

## **SPC**

### **Jonathan Manieva**

Fisheries Development Officer (DEVFISH)  
Coastal Fisheries Program  
SPC, B.P. D5-98848 Noumea Cedex  
New Caledonia

**T** 687 262000

**F** 687 26 38 18

**E** [janathanm@spc.int](mailto:janathanm@spc.int)

**W** [www.spc.int/coastfish](http://www.spc.int/coastfish)

### **John Hampton**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

### **Su'a N. F. Tanielu**

Director- General  
Honiara  
Solomon Islands  
[dan.sua@ffa.int](mailto:dan.sua@ffa.int)

### **Transform Aqorau**

Deputy Director-General  
[Transform.aqorau@ffa.int](mailto:Transform.aqorau@ffa.int)

### **Moses Amos**

Director Fisheries Management  
[Moses.amos@ffa.int](mailto:Moses.amos@ffa.int)

### **Manu Tupou-Roosen**

Legal Counsel  
[Manu.tupou-roosen@ffa.int](mailto:Manu.tupou-roosen@ffa.int)

### **Kaburoro.Ruaia**

Manager Treaties Administration  
[Kaburoro.ruaia@ffa.int](mailto:Kaburoro.ruaia@ffa.int)

### **Les Clark**

[les@rayfishresearch.com](mailto:les@rayfishresearch.com)

## **Greenpeace**

### **Duncan Currie**

Greenpeace International Legal Adviser

### **Joshua Turaganivalu**

Greenpeace Australia Pacific Oceans Campaigner,  
E-mail: [josua.turaganivalu@fpj.greenpeace.org](mailto:josua.turaganivalu@fpj.greenpeace.org)

### **Seini Nabou**

Greenpeace Australia Pacific Oceans Campaigner

# Annex 4. List of Persons Interviewed or Consulted by Countries

**A4**

## Countries

### **Fiji**

#### **Jone Amoe**

Tuna Project Officer  
Department of Fisheries  
Suva, Fiji  
**E** fishfinderfj@gmail.com  
**T** 679 3301611

#### **Sanaila Naqali**

Director of Fisheries  
Department of Fisheries  
Suva, Fiji  
**E** snaqali@mff.net.fj  
**T** 679 3301611

#### **Anare Raiwalui**

Tuna Fisheries Licensing  
Department of Fisheries  
Suva, Fiji  
**E** anare\_raiwalui@yahoo.com  
**T** 679 3301611

#### **Murray Isimeli**

Acting Director Political & Treaties (Foreign Affairs)  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
International Cooperation and Civil Aviation  
Suva, Fiji  
**E** misimeli@govnet.gov.fj

#### **Ajendra Pratap**

Solicitor General's Office  
Suva, Fiji

#### **Pio Manoa**

University of the South Pacific  
Suva, Fiji  
**E** manoa\_p@usp.ac.fj

### **Cook Islands**

#### **Mr Ian Bertram**

Director  
Ministry of Marine Resources  
PO Box 85  
Rarotonga  
Cook islands  
**T** 682 28721  
**F** 682 29721  
**E** i.bertram@mmr.gov.ck

### **Marshall Islands**

#### **Samuel K. Lanwi, Jr**

Deputy Director  
MIMRA  
PO Box 860, Majuro, MH 96960  
**T** 692 6258262/ 5632  
**F** 692 625 5447  
**E** skljr@mimra.com or blanwi@gmail.com

#### **Glen Joseph**

Director  
MIMRA  
PO Box 860, Majuro, MH 96960  
**T** 692 6258262/ 5632  
**F** 692 625 5447  
**E** gjoseph@mimra.com or mimra@ntamar.net

### **Samoa**

#### **Savale Time**

Fisheries Department  
PO Box 1874  
Apia, Samoa  
**T** 685 20369  
**F** 685 24292  
**E** sgtime@lesamoa.net

## **Federated States of Micronesia**

### **Bernard Thoulag**

Executive Director  
National Oceanic Resource Management  
Authority(NORMA)  
P O Box PS122 PALIKIR  
POHNPEI  
Federated States of Micronesia 96941  
**T** (691) 320 2700/5181  
**F** (691) 320 2383  
**E** norma@mail.fm

## **Kiribati**

### **Awira Ribaantake**

Fisheries Department,  
P O Box 276 BIKENIBEU  
TARAWA  
Republic of Kiribati  
**T** (686) 21296 / 21099  
**F** (686) 22289 / 21120

## **Nauru**

### **Terry Amram**

Oceanic Fisheries Manager  
Oceanic Department  
Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority  
Aiwo District Republic of Nauru  
**T** (674) 444 3739/ 3733  
**F** (674) 444 3812  
**E** tamramnr@yahoo.com

## **Palau**

### **Nanette, MALSOL**

Fisheries Law Compliance Officer  
Ministry of Resources and Development  
P O Box 117 KOROR Republic of Palau 96940  
**T** (680) 488 3125  
**F** (680) 488 3555  
**E** dillymalsol@yahoo.com or tunapal@palaunet.com

### **Theo Isamu**

Director  
Bureau of Marine Resources  
Ministry of Resources and Development  
P O Box 117 KOROR Republic of Palau 96940  
**T** (680) 488 3125  
**F** (680) 488 3555  
**E** tekoilchei@palaunet.com

## **Papua New Guinea**

### **Kumoru Ludwig**

Manager  
Tuna Fishery National Fisheries Authority  
Investment Haus  
P O Box 2016 PORT MORESBY, NCD  
Papua New Guinea  
**T** (675) 309 0442  
**F** (675) 3202061  
**E** lkumoru@fisheries.gov.pg

## **Solomon Islands**

### **Sylvester Diake**

Under-Secretary of Fisheries,  
Department of Fisheries and Marine Resources,  
P O Box G13  
HONIARA  
Solomon Islands  
**T** (677) 28604/39143  
**F** (677) 38774 /38730

## **Tokelau**

### **Mose Pelasio**

Director  
Department of Economic Development,  
Natural Resources & Environment;  
Tauata o Faleagafulu Building Fakaofo  
TOKELAU  
**T** (690) 3127 or 3134  
**F** (690) 3108 or 3133  
**E** Mose.pelasio@clear.net.nz

## **Niue**

### **James Tafatu**

Principal Fisheries Officer  
Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries  
P.O. Box 74, ALOFI Niue.  
**T** (683) 4032  
**F** (683) 4079 / 4010  
**E** fisheries@mail.gov.nu

## **Tonga**

### **Penisimani Vea**

Director Agriculture Forest and Fisheries  
Department of Fisheries  
P. O. Box 871, NUKU'ALOFA  
Kingdom of Tonga  
**T** (676) 21399, 27799  
**F** (676) 23891

## **Tuvalu**

### **Samasoni Finikaso**

Director of Fisheries

Tuvalu Fisheries

Department Ministry of Natural Resources and  
Lands

VAIAKU, FUNAFUTI Tuvalu

**T** (688) 20836 ext 2206

**F** (688) 20151

**C** (688) 90720

**E** safin70@yahoo.com

## **Australia**

### **Gordon Anderson**

AUSAID

**E** Gordon.Anderson@ausaid.gov.au

### **Dr Quentin Hanich**

Australian National Centre for Ocean Capacity  
and Security

University of Wollongong

Australia

E-mail (capacity needs etc)

# Annex 5. List of Documents Reviewed

## (a) Project and Related Documents

United Nations Development Programme, Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (2005) Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. PIMS. UNDP Project Document.

**Annexes:** A. Incremental Cost Analysis. B. Logical Framework Analysis. C. Response To Reviews. D. Endorsements from GRF Operational Focal Points and other contributors. E. Summary of the Terminal Evaluation Report of the OFM Component of the IW SAP Project.

**Optional Annexes:** F. Implementation Arrangements and Project Management. G. Stakeholder and Public Participation Plan. H. Maps of the Project Area. I. Summary of the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands. J. WCPF Convention. K. National Reports: Cook Islands; Federated States Of Micronesia; Fiji; Kiribati; Republic Of The Marshall Islands; Nauru; Niue; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Tokelau; Tonga; Vanuatu. L. GEF Indicators. M. Reference Documentation.

UNDP MTE Procedures (nd). Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. Purpose/Description of the Evaluation Report. Part II. How to conduct Monitoring and Evaluation. Commissioning an evaluation

UNDP GEF Annual Project Report (2006). Project Implementation Report Apr -Nov 2006.

Williams-Lahari, L. (2007) Knowledge Management Strategy. Prepared for the Forum Fisheries Agency. Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM) project  
Pacific Media Consultant.

## (b) Background Documents

AusAID (2007) Valuing Pacific Fish. A Framework for Fisheries-Related Development Assistance in the Pacific. CoA.

Bowden, D (2006). IUCN Contributions to the Ecosystem Analysis Component of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. Report to: Andrew Hurd, IUCN Global Marine Programme, Gland, Switzerland

Cartright, I. (2007) NGO and Civil Society Workshop on Oceanic Fisheries Management in the Western and central Pacific Fisheries Convention Area. Tanoa Plaza, Suva, Fiji. 24-25 April 2007. Summary Record and Outcomes.

Clark, L. (2007) Final report. Annual review Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. Report prepared for FFA. Ray Research.

FFA (Oct 2005- Mar 2008). Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project . Consolidated Quarterly Narratives. Reports to UNDP.



FFA (2005) Overview of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries

Management Project (PIMS 2992). RSC1/WP.1

FFA (2008). Meetings of OFM Project Regional Steering Committee. 2005-2007. FFA/ PIOFM. Steering Committee. FFA Website.

Fletcher, W.J. (2007). A Guide to Implementing an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) within the Western and Central Pacific Region. Forum Fisheries Agency, Honiara, Solomon Islands.

Fox, A and Ong Jin-Eong (2007). Mid Term Evaluation UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Large Marine Ecosystem. Report to UNDP. YSLME MTE. (recommended model report)

GEF International Waters (2006) Annual Project Performance Results. Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. Att. OFM Risk and Issues Matrix.

GEF International Waters (2007) Annual Project Performance Results. Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project.

GEF Evaluation Office (2006). The GEF Monitoring and evaluation Policy. Evaluation Document No 1.

Hanich, Q., Teo, E. and Tsamenyi, M. (2008) Closing the Gaps: Building Capacity in Pacific Fisheries Governance and Institutions. Report to AusAID. Australian National centre for Ocean Resources and security, University of Wollongong, Australia.

Lam, M (2006). Strategy to Promote and Strengthen Environmental NGOs Stakeholder Participation and Public Awareness of Pacific Oceanic Fisheries Management Issues.

Sauni, S. and Amos, M. (2007) Application of the Ecosystem-Based Approach to Fisheries Management in Tuna Fisheries at the Western-Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO). Abstract 21<sup>st</sup> Pacific Science Congress.

SPC (2008). Oceanic Fisheries Programme. Selected Website and Technical Reports:

- The UNDP/GEF project: Food web study of the western and central Pacific Ocean tuna ecosystem.
- Annual Report 2007 and Work Plan 2008
- Food Web Study Of The Western And Central Pacific Ocean Tuna Ecosystem.
- Conventional Tuna Tagging Experiments
- Stock Assessment and Modelling
- Regional stock assessment (South Pacific albacore tuna, Bigeye tuna, Skipjack tuna, Yellowfin tuna)
- Climate and tuna fisheries: Spatial variability. Vertical distribution. Recruitment and population abundance. Long-term climate change.
- EPoDyM a Spatial Environmental POPulation DYnamic Mode
- Modelling the Nutrient – Phytoplankton – Zooplankton Food Web
- Food Web Study Of The Western And Central Pacific Ocean Tuna Ecosystem
- Physical ocean model
- Preliminary estimates of annual catches for billfish species taken in commercial and recreational fisheries of the western and central Pacific Ocean. (Williaqms, P. and Whitelow, A.) 2000. BBRG-3
- An update of by-catch issues in the western and central Pacific Ocean tuna fisheries (P. Williams 1996)

- Shark and related species catch in tuna fisheries of the tropical Western and Central Pacific Ocean (P. Williams 1998)
- Stock assessment of albacore tuna in the south Pacific Ocean. Stock assessment of bigeye tuna in the western and central Pacific Ocean. Stock assessment of yellowfin tuna in the western and central Pacific. Stock assessment of skipjack tuna in the western and central Pacific Ocean (J. Hampton, 2002)
- The Western and Central Pacific tuna fishery: 2006 overview and status of stocks (Langley, A., Williams, P. and Hampton, J. 2006)

# Annex 6. Interview Questionnaire and Summary of responses

**A6**

## OFM Interview Questionnaire

### Introductionary Questions

Personal introductions; reasons for meeting; brief background/description of PIOFM; brief description of review process etc.

### QUESTIONS

- 1. Informant's name/affiliations:**
- 2. How are you involved in PIOFM project?**
  - a. Directly
  - b. Indirectly
- 3. Rate your knowledge of PIOFM project:**
  - a. Extensive
  - b. Some
  - c. Little
  - d. None
- 4. How important do you rate this project (and why):**
  - a. Very (eg essential to country, region, sector)
  - b. Moderately
  - c. Less important
- 5. Were you consulted/involved in project development? (How?)**
  - a. Extensively
  - b. Somewhat
  - c. Not involved (Do you think you should have been?)
- 6. Have you been adequately involved/advised on progress of project?**
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
- 7. In your area, how do you rate progress of project to date?**
  - a. Excellent
  - b. Good
  - c. Poor
  - d. Do not know
- 8. Do you think there are any gaps in the project design?**  
**How might these be improved/filled in future?** Elaborate.

**9. Which agency have you been working for/dealing with, in this project?**

- a. UNDP
- b. FFA
- c. SPC
- d. Other (name)

**10. How do you rate that agency's:**

Project management, communications, efficiency & general administration:  
(rate: Excellent. Adequate. Poor)

**11. Please list 1-2 major strengths of project:**

**12. Please list 1-2 major weaknesses:**

**13. What are the 'lessons learnt' to date?**

**14. What message would you like conveyed within the mid-term review?**

## ANALYSES OF COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES' RESPONSES

	FIJI	COOK ISLANDS	KIRIBATI
2. Project Involvement	Directly - Data Analyses and Scientific Interpretation	Directly- oversee project and management	-Indirectly Involved being newly appointed
3. Knowledge of Project	Extensive	Extensive	- New and little knowledge
4. Rate Importance of Project	Very Important	Very Important	- Very important because of new conservation measures
5. Project Development Consultation	Somewhat Consulted	Somewhat Consulted because of huge project documentation	- Consulted
6. Progress of project Reporting	Inadequate Project Reporting	Adequate Project Reporting	- Not adequately involved
7. Rate of Project Progress	Good Rate of Progress	Good Progress	Good progress
8. Gaps in Project Design	Lack of Knowledge	Long term Capacity Building	-Not sure
9. Agencies dealing with	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC	SPC & FFA
10. Agency rating in management, communication, efficiency and administration	Very helpful and Efficient.	Excellent project management and very efficient for both agencies	Good
11. Major strengths of Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Streamlining &amp; efficient operations</li> <li>- Improvement of monitoring</li> <li>- Reformed Tuna Industry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good scientific component</li> <li>- Improved legislation</li> <li>- Institutional reform from leverage funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional reform very useful</li> <li>- Scoping study successful</li> <li>- Monitoring and surveillance improved</li> </ul>
12. Major Weaknesses of Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of human resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of Fisheries Intelligence &amp; Surveillance</li> <li>- Implementation of legal and policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long term capacity building in conservation and management</li> </ul>
13. Lessons' Learnt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Tuna Commission roles</li> <li>- Well coordinated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity Building</li> <li>- Lack of ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to strengthen and put in place conservation and management of tuna and regional arrangements</li> </ul>
14. Message Conveyed - MTR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to develop domestic industry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In country attachment of legal and science experts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for capacity building in scientific assessments and monitoring</li> </ul>

	MARSHALL ISLANDS	SOLOMON ISLANDS	PNG
2. Project Involvement	Directly - Data Analyses and Scientific Interpretation	- Directly - oversee project and management - National Focal Point	Directly - National Focal Point
3. Knowledge of Project	Extensive	Extensive	Extensive
4. Rate Importance of Project	Very Important	Very Important to countries and region	Very Important to countries and region
5. Project Development Consultation	Somewhat Consulted	Somewhat Consulted	Extensively Consulted
6. Progress of project Reporting	Inadequate Project Reporting	Adequate Project Reporting through Steering committee and reports	Excellent project Reporting through steering committee
7. Rate of Project Progress	Good Rate of Progress	Good Progress	Good progress
8. Gaps in Project Design	Lack of Knowledge	Long term Capacity Building	- Lack of country visits - More support for sub-regional approach
9. Agencies dealing with	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC
10. Agency rating in management, communication, efficiency and administration	Very helpful and Efficient.	Good project management and very efficient for both agencies	Good but sometimes no tangible feedback in co-financing
11. Major strengths of Project	- Streamlining & efficient operations - Improvement of monitoring - Reformed Tuna Industry	- Better information & understanding of status of stocks because of scientific component - Legal & Policy strengthened	- Strong scientific component - Strong law and policy component
12. Major Weaknesses of Project	-Lack of capacity building	More support needed for the coordinator	- Lack of capacity building in the sciences - Lack of capacity building in fisheries economics
13. Lessons' Learnt	- New Tuna Commission roles - Well coordinated	- More knowledge on status of stocks and management - Establishment of Tuna Commission and legal obligation to the tuna convention	- Countries are culturally diverse and complex
14. Message Conveyed - MTR	- Need to develop domestic industry	- Excellent work and need more capacity building	- Set up scholarships to train Pacific islanders in economics and in the sciences



	FSM	PALAU	NAURU
2. Project Involvement	Directly Involved and GEF focal point	Directly - National Focal Point	Directly - National Focal Point
3. Knowledge of Project	Extensive	Extensive	Somewhat
4. Rate Importance of Project	Very Important to countries and to the region	Very Important in funding country delegations to various workshops	Very Important as the project help members to meet obligations
5. Project Development Consultation	Moderately Involved	Consulted and Involved	Consulted but not involved
6. Progress of project Reporting	Good progress in reporting through annual reports and country reports - Co-financing not clear	Good reporting via Steering Committee and quarterly reports	Good reporting because of steering committee membership
7. Rate of Project Progress	Good Rate of Progress	Good Progress	Good Progress
8. Gaps in Project Design	- Fulfilling objectives of projects in countries because of different needs - Implementation of projects at national level only & not at state level	- Lack of country visits	- Satisfied
9. Agencies dealing with	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC
10. Agency rating in management, communication, efficiency and administration	Good management and communication.	Good project management and need for country visits	- Need improvement in country consultations - FFA needs to follow up - SPC scientific sub-regional useful
11. Major strengths of Project	- Good capacity building in preparations and negotiations - Active participation through financial support to attend regional workshops - Good partnerships and the establishment of the Tuna Commission	- Good scientific component & better understanding & knowledge	- Good capacity building in understanding scientific component - Good support for National Consultative Committee
12. Major Weaknesses of Project	- Lack of clarity of activities funded by the project	- Need to improve legislations and policies	- Communication and Dissemination of information
13. Lessons' Learnt	- Regional Partnerships in management - Strengthen countries capacity to participate in meetings	- Additional task of work	- Rapid turn over in staff and need to bring them up to speed with project - Regional Steering Committee is useful
14. Message Conveyed - MTE	- Project has made a big difference in countries and region - Capacity building	- Lack of support in the legal process and capacity building	- Give high profile - Focus and strengthen project

	<b>SAMOA</b>	<b>TUVALU</b>	<b>TOKELAU</b>	<b>NIUE</b>
2. Project Involvement	Indirectly	Directly - National Focal Point	Directly - oversee work program	Directly – Data Analyses etc.
3. Knowledge of Project	Somewhat	Moderate	Extensive knowledge	Extensive
4. Rate Importance of Project	Very Important	Very Important	Very Important to countries and region	Very important in countries and region
5. Project Development Consultation	Consulted and Involved	Somewhat Consulted	Extensive Consultation	Somewhat consulted
6. Progress of project Reporting	Good Project Reporting	Adequate Project Reporting through steering committee	Good progress reporting	Good reporting through the GEF Focal Point
7. Rate of Project Progress	Good Rate of Progress	Good Progress but activities not properly addressed	Good Progress but need to capture the needs of smaller countries with smaller capacity	Good Progress
8. Gaps in Project Design	Lack of Knowledge	- More country consultations & smaller country needs to be considered	- Smaller country needs to be met and projects need to be designed to strengthen manpower needs. Eg. Tokelau has only 3 Fisheries staff and there is no legal person	- Lack of Law and Policy review because of limited resources - Slow adoption of Tuna Commission managements measures
9. Agencies dealing with	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC	FFA & SPC
10. Agency rating in management, communication, efficiency and administration	Helpful	Excellent project management and efficient for both agencies	- Good project management by staff of SPC and FFA - Several attempts have been made for country visits but without success because of isolation and unreliable boat services	Efficient
11. Major strengths of Project	- Improvement in monitoring - Good scientific component -reformed tuna industry	- Good scientific component & awareness - Law & policy strengthened with regard to Tuna Commission	- Scientific component & capacity building is good - Law and Policy component is also good with capacity building	- Good Scientific Component - More knowledge in interpreting data & understanding reports & policies
12. Major Weaknesses of Project	- Lack of human resources	- Institutional strengthening weak with current structure	- Lack of country visit to help people to have ownership of the project	Lack of capacity building in smaller countries

	<b>SAMOA</b>	<b>TUVALU</b>	<b>TOKELAU</b>	<b>NIUE</b>
13. Lessons' Learnt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional approach to tuna management</li> <li>- Restructure of domestic tuna industry and helping the domestic industry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restructure to have legal, scientific &amp; information services</li> <li>- Need to improve on information delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to review legislation &amp; conservation measures</li> <li>- Need for government to prioritize fisheries in some countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional approach to management</li> <li>- Lack of manpower in smaller countries to fulfill obligations</li> </ul>
14. Message Conveyed - MTE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to further develop and invest in the domestic tuna industry</li> </ul>	Smaller countries need assistance and manpower to fulfill obligations	Very little capacity for smaller countries to meet regional obligations and should try & partner at sub-regional level to build capacity	Smaller countries need assistance

Annex 7. OFM Project Co-Financing Activities<sup>5</sup>

YEAR & SOURCE	ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
<b>2005</b>	nil	nil
<b>2006</b>		
WCPFC	Japan Trust Fund now administered by the WCPFC Secretariat (over 5 yrs)	USD\$2 million
November - WWF Oceania	Co-financing Agreement (over 5 years)	USD\$94,750
		USD\$521,500
<b>2007</b>		
August 2007	PITIA Co-financing Agreement	USD\$521,500
October - NZAID	Funding support for Pacific Tuna Tagging Programme	NZD\$5 million
October – Taiwan/ROC	Participation in International Fisheries Agency	USD\$30,000
October - AusAID	Regional MCS Strategy	AUD\$50,000
<b>2008 (to May)</b>		
US Government	Assessment of the Hawaiian Longline Fishery (IUCN)	Unknown

(POST Q4 2005)

## 2006 APR - SECTION IV FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Name of Partner or Contributor (Including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B)	Amount committed in Project Document	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2006	Expected Total Disbursement by end of Project
GEF CONTRIBUTION	GEF	\$0.6m	\$10.9m	Nil	\$1.6	
CASH COFINANCING - UNDP MANAGED						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency					
CASH CO-FINANCING - PARTNER MANAGED						
Project only: excludes PDF co-financing						
NZAID			\$0.4m	\$0.4m		\$0.8m
PNG NFA				\$0.1m		\$0.1m
Fr Pacific Fund				\$0.06m		\$0.06m
ACIAR				\$0.3m		\$0.3m
Uni of Hawaii				\$0.1m		\$0.1m
UNDER CONSIDERATION						
EC				\$1.9m		\$1.91m
US Dept of State (OESI)				\$0.2m		\$0.2m
IN-KIND CO-FINANCING						
Participating Govts (in cash and kind):			\$17.28m			\$17.28m
Reg Org (in cash and kind):			\$14.45m			\$14.45m
NGOs (in cash and kind):			\$0.6m			\$0.6m
NGOs (in cash and kind):			\$0.4m			\$0.4m
Other WCPFC Members (Commission contributions):			\$6.48m			\$6.48m
OTHER ESTIMATED CO-FINANCING						
Fishing States (in kind regulation costs):			\$32.25m			\$32.25m
Surveillance Partners (in kind):			\$7.20m			\$7.20m
TOTAL CO-FINANCING			\$79.09M	\$3.07M		
TOTAL FOR PROJECT		\$0.6M	\$90.03M	\$3.07M		

## 2007 APR - SECTION IV FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Name of Partner or Contributor (Including The Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B)	Amount committed in Project Document	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2006	Expected Total Disbursement by end of Project
<b>GEF CONTRIBUTION</b>	GEF	\$0.69 m	\$10.94 m	\$Nil	\$4.00 m	
<b>CASH CO-FINANCING – UNDP MANAGED</b>						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency					
<b>CASH CO-FINANCING - PARTNER MANAGED</b>						
NZAID			\$0.40 m	\$0.40 m		
PNG PFA				\$0.10 m		
Fr Pacific Fund				\$0.06 m		
ACIAR				\$0.30 m		
Uni of Hawaii				\$0.10 m		
WWF Pacific				\$0.10 m		
<b>UNDER CONSIDERATION</b>						
EC				\$1.90 m		
US dept of State (OESI)				\$0.20 m		
Japan (JFT)				\$2.00 m		
PITIA				\$0.55 m		
<b>IN-KIND CO-FINANCING</b>						
Participating Governments (In cash and kind):			\$17.28 m			
Regional Organisation (In cash and Kind):			\$14.46 m			
NGOs (In cash and Kind):			\$0.61 m			
NGOs (In cash and Kind):			\$0.40 m			
Other WCPFC members (Commission Contributions):			\$6.49 m			
<b>OTHER ESTIMATES CO-FINANCING</b>						
Fishing States (In King regulation costs):			\$32.25 m			
Surveillance Partners (In Kind):			\$7.20 m			
<b>TOTAL CO-FINANCING</b>			<b>\$79.09</b>			
<b>TOTAL FOR PROJECT</b>		<b>\$0.69</b>	<b>\$90.03</b>	<b>\$5.71</b>		



# ANNEX 8. OFM PROJECT Indicative workplan and timetable (FFA PCU MAY 2008)

A8

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010							
Quarterly		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4				
<b>Component 1.</b> Scientific Assessment and Monitoring Enhancement																													
<b>Sub-Component 1.1.</b> Fishery Monitoring Coordination and Enhancement																													
Output 1.1.1.		A template for national integrated monitoring programmes including logsheet, observer, port sampling and landing data collection and management and provision of national data to the Commission																											
Activity 1.1.1.1.						X				X				X				X											
Activity 1.1.1.2.						X				X				X				X											
Output 1.1.2.		National monitoring systems based on the regional template for integrated monitoring and customised to meet national needs																											
Activity 1.1.2.1.						X				X				X				X				X							
Activity 1.1.2.2.						X				X				X				X											
Activity 1.1.2.3.						X				X				X				X				X				X			
Output 1.1.3. A regional monitoring coordination capacity, to develop regional standards such as data formats and to provide a clearing house for information on fishery monitoring																													
Activity 1.1.3.1.						X				X				X															
Activity 1.1.3.2														X												X			
Activity 1.1.3.3.										X				X				X				X				X			
Output 1.1.4. Training of national monitoring staff, particularly monitoring coordinators, observers and port samplers																													
Activity 1.1.4.1.						X				X				X				X				X				X			
Activity 1.1.4.2.														X												X			
Activity 1.1.4.3.						X				X				X				X				X				X			

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Quarterly</b>																									
<b>Sub-Component 1.2. Stock Assessment</b>																									
Output 1.2.1. National oceanic fisheries status reports prepared collaboratively with national scientific staff																									
Activity 1.2.1.1.	Prepare 6 National Oceanic Fisheries Status Reports annually				X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
Activity 1.2.1.2.	Hold In-country Stakeholder Workshops for delivery of National Status Reports				X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
Output 1.2.2. Advice to Pacific SIDS on scientific issues in the work of the Commission																									
Activity 1.2.2.1.	Provide reports on scientific issues for Pacific SIDS for meetings of the Commission, the Scientific Committee and Science Working Groups						X	X				X	X			X	X			X			X	X	
Activity 1.2.2.2.	Present scientific briefs to preparatory meetings of Pacific SIDS for the Commission						X	X				X	X			X	X			X			X	X	
Output 1.2.3. Training of national technical and scientific staff to understand regional stock assessment methods, interpret and apply the results and to use oceanographic data																									
Activity 1.2.3.1.	Hold Regional Workshops on stock assessment methods and analysis of oceanographic impacts on fisheries									X									X						
Activity 1.2.3.2.	Attach national technical staff to SPC/OFP and other institutions to participate in Commission stock assessment work and preparation of national status reports						X	X			X	X			X	X			X	X			X	X	
Activity 1.2.3.3.	Train scientific counterparts in-country				X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
Quarterly		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

### Sub-Component 1.3. Ecosystem Analysis

Output 1.3.1.	Observer sampling and analysis of commercial fishery catches to determine trophic relationships of pelagic species in the WTP LME																								
Activity 1.3.1.1.	Collect observer-based sampling data, especially stomach contents and tissue samples				X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X					
Activity 1.3.1.2.	Lab-based analysis of samples				X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X					
Output 1.3.2.	Collection and analysis of information on seamounts in the WTP LME																								
Activity 1.3.2.1.	Hold Seamount Activity Planning and Review Workshops						X											X							
Activity 1.3.2.2.	Describe seamounts and analyse historical fishing patterns around seamounts				X		X	X	X																
Activity 1.3.2.3.	Collect data at sea at selected seamounts, including tagging, trophic sampling and analysis,								X			X			X										
Activity 1.3.2.4.	Support national scientist participation in a benthic biodiversity survey								X																
Output 1.3.3.	Model-based analysis of ecosystem-based management options																								
Activity 1.3.3.1.	Incorporate ecosystem data and information into existing ecosystem models and refinement of those models as necessary								X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 1.3.3.2.	Use enhanced models and data to assess ecosystem-based management options												X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
Quarterly		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Activity 1.3.3.3.	Use enhanced models and data to assess management options targeted specifically at seamounts																								
Output 1.3.4.	Estimates of levels of by-catch in WCPO oceanic fisheries																								
Activity 1.3.4.1.	Review historical observer data and methodological development																								
Activity 1.3.4.2.	Estimate levels of by-catch																								
Output 1.3.5.	Results of ecosystem analysis and proposals for long-term ecosystem monitoring and operationalisation of the ecosystem-based approach for use by the Commission's Scientific Committee, especially its Ecosystems and Bycatch Working Group and by Pacific SIDS																								
Activity 1.3.5.1.	Present results of ecosystem analysis to the Commission through the Ecosystem and Bycatch Working Group																								
Activity 1.3.5.2.	Present information on national and regional implications of results of ecosystem analysis to Pacific SIDS																								
Activity 1.3.5.3.	Attach national technical staff to SPC/OFP and other institutions to participate in ecosystem analysis																								

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Quarterly</b>																									
<b>Component 2. Law, Policy and Institutional Reform, Realignment and Strengthening</b>																									
<b>Sub-Component 2.1. Legal Reform</b>																									
Output 2.1.1. A strategy and workplan for activities on regional and national legal issues																									
Activity 2.1.1.1.	Carry out legal and technical reviews of legal issues and national legal structures				X																				
Activity 2.1.1.2.	Hold a Regional Legal Consultation on Legal Issues, National Legal Structures and the Project strategy for legal work						X																		
Output 2.1.2. New draft laws, regulations, agreements and license conditions in line with WCPF Convention prepared and shared with Pacific SIDS																									
Activity 2.1.2.1.	Prepare templates of legal provisions to implement the Convention						X																		
Activity 2.1.2.2.	Undertake national legal reviews			X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X						
Activity 2.1.2.3.	Provide draft Bills; regulations, license conditions and access agreements to Pacific SIDS			X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X		
Output 2.1.3. Proposals for the Commission from Pacific SIDS for legal arrangements to implement the Convention																									
Activity 2.1.3.1.	Undertake legal studies on Commission and Convention issues including non-Contracting Parties and new members						X				X	X			X	X			X				X	X	
Activity 2.1.3.2.	Prepare legal briefs for Pacific SIDS for Commission and subsidiary body meetings											X	X			X	X		X	X			X	X	
Activity 2.1.3.3.	Hold Regional Legal Consultations						X								X								X		
Output 2.1.4. Training of policy makers and legal personnel in oceanic fisheries management legal issues																									
Activity 2.1.4.1.	Hold Regional Legal Workshops						X								X								X		
Activity 2.1.4.2.	Hold National Legal Workshops						X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X		
Activity 2.1.4.3.	Attach legal staff to FFA and other institutions to participate in legal analyses						X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
Quarterly		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Sub-Component 2.2. Policy Reform																									
Output 2.2.1. National oceanic fisheries management Plans, policies and strategies																									
Activity 2.2.1.1.	Prepare Plans, policy and strategy documents																								
Activity 2.2.1.2.	Support the implementation of Plans, policies and strategies																								
Activity 2.2.1.3.	Undertake Plan, policy and strategy reviews																								
Output 2.2.2. Strategies and specific proposals for the overall development of the Commission, including its Secretariat and technical programmes and for Commission conservation and management measures																									
Activity 2.2.2.1.	Undertake studies on Commission and Convention conservation and management issues																								
Activity 2.2.2.2.	Prepare and present reports on regional oceanic fisheries management issues to Pacific SIDS, including analysis of proposals for the Commission and its subsidiary bodies																								
Activity 2.2.2.3.	Hold Regional Fisheries Management Workshops and Consultations																								
Output 2.2.3. Identification of possible management options for seamounts, including compliance options																									
Activity 2.2.3.1.	Undertake technical studies on management of oceanic fisheries around seamounts																								
Activity 2.2.3.2.	Hold Workshops on seamount-related management options																								
Activity 2.2.3.3.	Prepare proposals on seamount-related conservation and management measures																								
Output 2.2.4. Training of policy makers, technical personnel and other stakeholders to increase understanding of sustainable and responsible fisheries																									
Activity 2.2.4.1.	Hold Regional Policy Consultations /Workshops																								
Activity 2.2.4.2.	Offer a TSC/USP Policy Training Course																								
Activity 2.2.4.3	Present National Fisheries Management Seminars and Workshops																								
Activity 2.2.4.4.	Attach Fisheries Management personnel to FFA and arrange study tours for Pacific SIDS personnel to other Fisheries Commissions																								
Activity 2.2.4.5.	Support relevant Ministerial meetings																								

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Quarterly</b>																									
<b>Sub-Component 2.3. Institutional Reform</b>																									
Output 2.3.1. Strategies, plans and proposals for the reform, realignment and strengthening of national oceanic fisheries management administrations																									
Activity 2.3.1.1. Prepare a review of experience and best practices in institutional reform																									
Activity 2.3.1.2. Undertake and support implementation of reviews of national oceanic fisheries management institutions																									
Activity 2.3.1.3. Present National Institutional Reform Workshops																									
Output 2.3.2. Processes for national consultation between stakeholders in oceanic fisheries management																									
Activity 2.3.2.1. Advise on and support national consultative processes																									
Activity 2.3.2.2. Support strengthening of national ENGOs and INGOs to empower them to participate in oceanic fisheries management																									
Activity 2.3.2.3. Support national workshops for non-state stakeholders																									
Activity 2.3.2.4. Arrange attachments and study tours for non-state stakeholders to learn from experience elsewhere																									



OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Quarterly</b>																									
<b>Sub-Component 2.4. Compliance Strengthening</b>																									
Output 2.4.1. Strategies, plans and proposals for realigning and strengthening national oceanic fisheries compliance programs																									
Activity 2.4.1.1. Prepare a review of Convention implications for national compliance									X																
Activity 2.4.1.2. Undertake and support implementation of reviews of needs to strengthen and realign national compliance programmes									X						X				X					X	
<b>Output 2.4.2. Arrangements for regional coordination of monitoring, control and surveillance activities</b>																									
Activity 2.4.2.1. Support regional consultations on coordination of air and sea patrols													X												
Activity 2.4.2.2. Provide advice on MCS coordination between Pacific SIDS and other states involved									X						X				X					X	
Activity 2.4.2.3. Prepare Niue Treaty subsidiary agreements									X						X				X					X	
<b>Output 2.4.3. Strategies and proposals for regional compliance measures and programs</b>																									
Activity 2.4.3.1. Undertake technical studies on compliance issues under the Convention																									
Activity 2.4.3.2. Hold meetings of a Working Group of Pacific SIDS on MCS issues related to oceanic fisheries													X												
Activity 2.4.3.3. Prepare and present reports on regional compliance issues to Pacific SIDS, including analysis of proposals for the Commission and its Technical and Compliance Committee																			X					X	
<b>Output 2.4.4. Training of national compliance staff, especially in inspection and VMS</b>																									
Activity 2.4.4.1. Present courses on National Inspection, VMS and other national MCS training programs									X										X					X	
Activity 2.4.4.2. Attach national compliance staff to FFA and other Pacific SIDS									X										X					X	

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010					
Quarterly		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
<b>Component 3.</b> Coordination, Participation and Information Services																											
<b>Sub-Component 3.1.</b> Information Strategy																											
Output 3.1.1.		Project Information System for capture, storage and dissemination of project data, lessons and best practices and provision of information products																									
Activity 3.1.1.1.						X																					
Activity 3.1.1.2.																											
Activity 3.1.1.3.																											
Output 3.1.2.		Knowledge management process identifying innovative, best practice and replicable ideas within the Project and relevant to the Project																									
Activity 3.1.2.1.						X																					
Activity 3.1.2.2.																											
<b>Sub-Component 3.2.</b> Monitoring and Evaluation																											
Output 3.2.1.		Measures of, and reports on, overall project performance and delivery, including independent valuations of the Project																									
Activity 3.2.1.1.																											
Activity 3.2.1.2.																											
Activity 3.2.1.3.																											
Activity 3.2.1.4.																											
Activity 3.2.1.5.																											
Output 3.2.2.		Analysis of process, stress-reduction and environmental status indicators as per the GEF International Waters Operational Strategy																									
Activity 3.2.2.1.																											
Activity 3.2.2.2.																											

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
Quarterly		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4				
Sub-Component 3.3. Stakeholder Participation and Awareness Raising																									
Output 3.3.1.		ENGO participation and awareness raising in Convention-related processes																							
Activity 3.3.1.1.	Conclude co-financing arrangement with Pacific ENGO																								
Activity 3.3.1.2.	Support Pacific ENGO participation in the Commission																								
Activity 3.3.1.3.	Provide information on the Convention and oceanic fisheries management issues to Pacific ENGOs																								
Activity 3.3.1.4.	Hold national and regional Workshops for ENGOs																								
Activity 3.3.1.5.	Produce information materials to raise public awareness on oceanic fisheries management issues																								
Activity 3.3.1.6.	Organise regional and national fora on the Convention and oceanic fisheries management issues for civil society participation																								
Output 3.3.2.		Support industry participation and awareness raising in Convention-related processes																							
Activity 3.3.2.1.	Conclude co-financing arrangement with Pacific INGO																								
Activity 3.3.2.2.	Support Pacific INGO participation in the Commission																								
Activity 3.3.2.3.	Provide information flow on the Convention and oceanic fisheries management issues to Pacific INGOs and businesses																								
Activity 3.3.2.4.	Support Pacific INGO consultations on the Convention and oceanic fisheries management issues																								

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES		2005				2006				2007				2008				2009				2010			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Quarterly</b>																									
<b>Sub-Component 3.4. Project Management and Coordination</b>																									
Output 3.4.1.	Project Coordination Unit staffing and office																								
Activity 3.4.1.1.	Appoint the Project Coordinator								X																
Activity 3.4.1.2.	Appoint other PCU staff								X	X															
Activity 3.4.1.3.	Procure equipment and other requirements to establish the PCU								X	X	X														
Output 3.4.2.	Arrangements for coordination between Implementing and Executing Agencies																								
Activity 3.4.2.1.	Preliminary UNDP/FFA/SPC/IUCN Consultations				X																				
Activity 3.4.2.2.	Conclude FFA/SPC and FFA/IUCN LOAs				X																				
Activity 3.4.2.3.	UNDP/FFA Consultations									X	X			X	X			X	X			X	X		X
Output 3.4.3.	Regional Steering Committee Meetings and Reports																								
Activity 3.4.3.1.	Hold Inception Workshop				X																				
Activity 3.4.3.2.	Hold Regional Steering Committee Meetings								X					X				X						X	
Output 3.4.4.	National Consultative Committee meetings and reports																								
Activity 3.4.4.1.	Secure National Focal Point nominations				X																				
Activity 3.4.4.2.	Support National Consultative Committee meetings								X	X				X	X			X	X			X	X		X
Output 3.4.5.	Reports on Project implementation, workplan and finances																								
Activity 3.4.5.1.	Prepare periodic financial and narrative reports								X					X	X			X	X			X			
Activity 3.4.5.2.	Prepare annual workplans				X																				
Activity 3.4.5.3.	Prepare annual project reports																								

Annex 9. Logical Framework<sup>6</sup>

## Analysis of Risks in the Project Logframe

## OVERALL PROJECT OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	Assessment by Annual Review December 2007	Assessment by MTE consultants
<p>WCPF Commission has adopted measures to regulate fishing in the high seas, and has formulated and assessed proposals for the conservation and management of fishing for globally important transboundary oceanic stocks throughout their range. These proposals include measures to address the impacts on other species in the globally important WTP LME. PacSIDS have undertaken reforms to implement the WCPF Convention and related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and have strengthened the management of fishing for transboundary oceanic fish in their waters.</p>	<p>Commission Members make good faith efforts to implement the WCPF Convention and other relevant MEAs. PacSIDS have the capacity to effectively participate in the Commission, and to support the development and operation of the Commission in a way that fulfils the WCPF Convention. PacSIDS governments and civil societies have the necessary awareness and commitment to take the hard decisions involved in limiting fishing in their waters.</p>	<p>Too early to judge effectiveness of overall implementation.</p> <p>PacSIDS participation is variable but generally effective, but some countries are having trouble participating effectively</p> <p>Too early to be definitive, but most PacSIDS are moving to implement limits to fishing in their waters</p>	<p>Agreed. Steady progress evident</p> <p>Agreed. Small Pacific SIDS having particular problems because of small staffs, lack of specialized capacities</p> <p>Agreed. Significant achievements in many countries. Major problems in some countries.</p>
<p>Improved information on the biology and ecology of target fish stocks, including their exploitation characteristics and fishery impacts, the fishery impacts on non-target, dependent and associated species and on the pelagic ecosystem as a whole. Substantially improved understanding of Seamount ecosystems, especially their relation to migratory pelagic fisheries.</p>	<p>Commission Members can establish, resource and manage effective data and research programmes. Project mechanisms contribute effectively to raising awareness and improving understanding within PacSIDS about oceanic fisheries management.</p>	<p>No obvious problems with resourcing of data and research programmes, except for Indonesia &amp; Philippines</p> <p>Too early to assess effectiveness of raising of awareness and improving understanding, but remains a risk</p>	<p>Significant progress in understanding of target stocks. Impacts on non-target stocks, other biodiversity and general pelagic ecosystems not adequately addressed. Will require future focus.</p> <p>Limited knowledge of seamount ecosystems because of late start of IUCN studies.</p>
<p>The WCPF Commission established and functioning. PacSIDS amend their domestic laws and policies and strengthen their national fisheries institutions and programmes, especially in the areas of monitoring and compliance, to implement the WCPF Convention and apply the principles of responsible and sustainable fisheries management more generally.</p>	<p>The WCPF Convention is ratified by sufficient states to make the Commission effective. PacSIDS are able to secure financing and sufficient political commitment to make necessary legal, institutional and policy changes.</p>	<p>No risk, Ratification comprehensive (excl. Indonesia)</p> <p>Slight risk, most PacSIDS seem to be securing necessary financing and commitment, but a few are not</p>	<p>Agreed. Important milestone in OFM and WCPF Commission achieved.</p> <p>Agreed. Leverage funding moderately successful in first term. Opportunities for future funding promising.</p>

<sup>6</sup> Note MTE consultants' concerns about lack of quantifiable indicators in OFM Project's logframe which has hindered performance of MTE.

## COMPONENT ONE

### SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT & MONITORING ENHANCEMENT

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	RISK ASSESSMENT (2007 Annual Review)	Assessment by MTE
Substantial, relevant and reliable information collected and shared between stakeholders with respect to transboundary oceanic fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects, (particularly for seamounts). The Commission using this information as the basis for its discussions and policy decisions on WCPF management. National technical capacity and knowledge greatly improved	Commission membership prepared to accept scientific findings and statistical evidence in formulating what may be difficult policy decisions on management of the fisheries, and difficult management proposals for the ecosystems. Sufficient sustainability available or identified through project to support national capacity improvements in technical and scientific functions as well as to support continued regional data coordination and analyses.	Too early to assess.	<p>Significant progress in information on fisheries stocks. Low risks.</p> <p>Limited progress on ecosystem aspects. Future risks.</p> <p>Some progress in Commission use of fisheries stocks in decision-making.</p> <p>Limited national capacities in scientific functions. High risks.</p>
Database and associated software developed. Reporting modules available for Commission data.		In place, no risk	Agreed. Important milestone reached. No risks.
National monitoring systems, including port sampling and observer programmes in place. All PacSIDS reporting regularly to Commission.	National commitment sufficiently strong to ensure allocation of staff	Good performance overall, one or two countries struggling to make appointments, no significant risk	Agreed. Some smaller countries require greater support. Some risks.
Common data formats made available to PacSIDS, and adopted by each country to provide comparable data. Information on fishery monitoring including best practice examples, being shared between stakeholders through newsletters, website and regional workshops.	All countries can agree on data reporting formats (some may have to change existing formats). Staff available to maintain website. Countries willing to network with Commission on a regular basis, and each country agrees on a focal point for this networking.	No significant risk, generally good progress on data formats and reporting	Agreed. Important milestone reached.
In-country Courses and training activities conducted. Two regional workshops undertaken. National monitoring personnel attached to SPC/OFP	Countries can afford to release staff for training and attachments.	Some PacSIDS finding it difficult to send appropriate participants to workshops	Agreed. High risk for small countries. Greater support and/or new strategies to assist small countries required.
Collaborative work undertaken on National Tuna Fishery Status in 6 countries annually, including presentations at in-country national workshops.	Countries have scientific and technical staff available and willing to undertake national fishery status reports and workshops (with GEF funding assistance)		SPC presentations effective. Limited progress in development of national capabilities.

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	RISK ASSESSMENT (2007 Annual Review)	Assessment by MTE
Advice on scientific issues provided in briefing papers to PacSIDS before each meeting of the Scientific Committee and the Commission, and presented to PacSIDS preparatory meetings.	PacSIDS able to find the financial human resources to participate effectively in the scientific processes of the Commission	Assisted by WCPFC financial rules requiring funding for PacSIDS participation, PacSIDS are participating effectively overall, but some are struggling and the PacSIDS effort is dependent on a few experienced individuals	Agreed. Limited human resources available, especially in small Pacific SIDS.
Regional Workshops carried out. National technical and scientific staff trained through attachments and in-country counterpart training.	PacSIDS can afford to release staff for training and attachments (national human resource limitations)	-	High risk. Limited national staff capability.
Technical and scientific counterparts producing independent technical and scientific analyses by the end of the Project.			
Observer-based data collections and lab analyses undertaken in accordance with a workplan for the ecosystem analysis component established in year 1.	National and regional observer programmes, including a Commission programme, are running and providing data for ecosystem analysis. Sufficient observers available.	-	Progress in observer programmes. Numbers of observers problem in some countries. Ecosystem analysis component of uncertain status (probably limited)
Seamount planning and review workshops carried out. Seamounts described, historical fishing patterns around seamounts analysed, and seamounts selected as sites for field work. Field data collected at selected seamounts, including tagging, trophic sampling and analysis - 2 cruises per year in years 2, 3, plus 1 cruise to research benthic biodiversity. Participation by national scientists in field work supported (2 participants per cruise). Reports on seamount-associated field data prepared.	Sufficient sea-time available to be able to undertake surveys and complete reports effectively and on-time. National scientists available to take part (human resource limitation issues)	Seamount-related work at risk due to lack of progress by IUCN	Limited progress. High risk. Workshops not carried out. Progress in SPC seamounts remote sensing activities. No cruises undertaken. No studies of benthos will be undertaken because research vessel no longer available.  IUCN Seamounts sub-component has been redesigned. Preliminary information should be available by end of project.
Data incorporated into ecosystem models. Models enhanced and used to assess management options, including options related to fishing around seamounts.	Agreement can be reached on realistic options for management to be assessed. Effective models available and sufficient data collected to drive models and reach a scientifically justifiable conclusion	Too early to assess the risk	Some progress evident. Longer-term objective.



## COMPONENT TWO: LAW, POLICY & INSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REALIGNMENT & STRENGTHENING

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	ASSESSMENT ANNUAL REVIEW 2007	Assessment by MTE
<p>WCPF Commission operating with a formally adopted framework of rules and regulations. Commission Secretariat has been established and the core science and compliance programmes and Committee structures are operational. PacSIDS are participating effectively in provision of information and in decision-making and policy adoption process for WCPF fisheries management. National institutions and supportive laws and policies have been reformed effectively to support national roles in Commission and to meet national commitments both to WCPF Convention, and to other relevant MEAs, and global treaties and conventions.</p>	<p>Commission remains effective throughout project lifetime and beyond. Countries continue to meet financial commitments to Commission to ensure its sustainability. Enormous Convention area and project system boundary can be effectively monitored to ensure compliance. Programmes of information collection and data analyses can be sustained throughout and beyond project lifetime. PacSIDS able to participate in the Commission effectively.</p>	<p>Too early to assess the risk. Early indications are mixed. Commission is regarded as being effectively established, but there are doubts about its likely effectiveness</p>	<p>Agreed. Important progress in establishment of WCP Commission but some risks in operation evident. Effectiveness of monitoring and compliance uncertain. Smaller countries struggling to effectively participate.</p>
<p>Legal and technical reviews (regional and national) undertaken and results available to regional Legal Consultation. Consultation carried out.</p>	<p>Appropriate legal consultants available within timescale.</p>	<p>No risk, high quality legal consultants are available and being used</p>	<p>Agreed. Low risk. Important achievements in most countries.</p>
<p>Templates for legal provisions necessary to implement Convention provided to PacSIDS. Legal reviews undertaken in PacSIDS which have not already updated their legislation.</p>	<p>Country commitment to legal reviews (consultants cannot be effective without national support and transparency)</p>	<p>No significant risk, strong national interest and support for legal reviews</p>	<p>Agreed. Low risk.</p>
<p>Legal reviews and studies on Commission and Convention issues undertaken and legal briefs for discussion in Commission and related bodies prepared and lodged with countries. Briefs discussed in PacSIDS consultations (see 2.1.1)</p>	<p>Countries willing to share national legal position and information with Commission. PacSIDS prepared to make submissions to Commission on legal policy issues following this consultative process</p>	<p>No significant risk, good flow of info the Commission on legal issues. PacSIDS active in making submissions on legal issues</p>	<p>Agreed. Low risks.</p>
<p>National and Regional legal training workshops carried out and assessed. Legal staff attached to relevant institutions and participating in analyses.</p>	<p>Countries willing to host and participate in workshops. Appropriate national personnel permitted to attend. National specialists available to take part (human resource limitation issues)</p>	<p>No significant risk,</p>	<p>Agreed. Low risks.</p>

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	ASSESSMENT ANNUAL REVIEW 2007	Assessment by MTE
Plan/policy/strategy documents prepared, implemented and reviewed based on feedback and lessons	Fisheries Management Adviser appointed to oversee the Policy Reform sub-Component. National policy-makers accept and adopt strategies and prepared to make necessary reforms to implement.	No risk, appointment made	Agreed. Important progress. Low risks.
Briefing papers provided to PacSIDS on establishment of the commission and on regional conservation and management measures. Regional consultations and workshops on Fisheries Management undertaken annually.	Appropriate national personnel permitted to attend. National specialists available to take part (human resource limitation issues)	No significant risk overall, but some PacSIDS are having difficulty	Agreed. Smaller countries require special support.
Technical studies on management of oceanic fisheries related to seamounts undertaken completed and circulated to stakeholders. Workshops undertaken for stakeholders on seamount management issues. Proposals based on outcomes of seamount policy and technical analyses considered by PacSIDS, and if appropriate, the Commission.	Technical capacity available to undertake studies within timeframe. Commission continues to operate effectively. Pac SIDS Stakeholders can agree on management measures in order to make proposals.	Seamount-related work at risk due to lack of progress by IUCN	Agreed. Lack of progress in Seamounts knowledge/issues at mid-term. Commencement of implementation in new design anticipated in early second term. Moderate risk.
Regional Policy Consultation workshops carried out. TSC/ USP training course developed and on offer. National Fisheries Management Seminars available and workshops carried out. Fisheries Management personnel on attachment to FFA. Study tours arranged to other Fisheries Commissions. Support given to relevant Ministerial meetings.	Countries willing to host and participate in workshops. Appropriate national personnel permitted to attend. National specialists available to take part (human resource limitation issues)	No significant risk overall. PacSIDS express strong support and appreciation for regional workshops. A few PacSIDS having difficulty with appropriate levels of participation in workshops, courses & Ministerial meetings	Agreed. Smaller countries require specific support.
Review the lessons and best practices in institutional reform carried out. Reviews of national fisheries management institutions carried out. National institutional reform workshops prepared and undertaken.	Conditions in PacSIDS are sufficiently common for national best practices to be replicable.	No significant risk, strong interest and support for Institutional strengthening programmes (ISPs)	Disagree with concept of generalized national approaches. Country-specific approaches necessary in ISPs.

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	ASSESSMENT ANNUAL REVIEW 2007	Assessment by MTE
National consultative process carried out between stakeholders. National ENGOs and INGOs given support to empower their participation in oceanic fisheries management	PacSIDS govts prepared to continue to improve transparency. National ENGOs & INGOs exist & have the capacity to participate. Consultation fatigue does not unduly constrain their participation	Too early to assess risk	Variable progress evident in establishment/support of national E/INGOs. Single model for all Pacific IDS not appropriate. Evidence of 'consultation fatigue.'
Review the national compliance implications inherent in the Convention, and identify strengthening requirements for national compliance to meet these implications	PacSIDS willing to provide transparent information on compliance procedures and data.	No significant risk, growing willingness to share info on compliance procedures and compliance data	Agreed.
Regional consultations to coordinate patrols (air and sea). Advice given on MCS coordination between PacSIDS and other stakeholder countries. Niue Treaty subsidiary arrangements prepared	Sufficient regional capacity and willingness to undertake an effective level of air and sea patrols	Good progress in enhancing surveillance capacity, esp with Australian, also support and coordination with US, France, NZ - but long term effectiveness of surveillance remains a risk	Ageed.
Technical studies undertaken on compliance issues relevant to Convention. Meetings of PacSIDS MCS Working Group held. Reports on regional compliance issues prepared and presented to PacSIDS. PacSIDS follow up those reports with proposals in the Commission & its Technical & Compliance Committee.	Commission Members can find basis for agreement on compliance measures to regulate fishing in the high seas	Extent of risk not clear. Some good early progress on agreement on high seas B&I, observers, VMS despite obstruction from fishing states.	Agreed.
National courses and training on inspection, VMS and other MCS issues undertaken. National compliance staff attached to FFA and/or other established PacSIDS compliance and monitoring agencies.	Appropriate national personnel available for attachments and permitted to attend. National specialists available to take part (human resource limitation issues)	No significant risk, strong support for, and participation in, MCS training activities	Agreed.

## COMPONENT THREE: COORDINATION, PARTICIPATION & INFORMATION SERVICES

OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	Assessment Annual Review 2007	MTE assessment
Project achieving its objectives. Project implementation and management is fully participatory with appropriate involvement of stakeholders at all levels. Information access is transparent and simple. Information available is relevant and significant. Public awareness raising at national and regional policy level is effective. High project evaluation ratings.	National commitment needs to be high to ensure fully participatory involvement in project over lifetime. Stakeholder commitment also needs to be high to ensure continued contributions, sometimes at own cost. Policy-makers are receptive to awareness-raising information and presentations.	Too early to assess	Agreed. Significant progress towards Project objectives. Relevant information is available. Public awareness remains limited. National commitments generally high.
Project branding, webpage and document catalogue system developed. Webpage operational and updated. Project information materials available.	Staff available to operate and update website, Sufficient interest among stakeholders to make website effective means of communication and information dissemination	Website poor, needs attention, some associated risk to Project outcomes	Partially disagree. Existing Website provides adequate technical information but not very 'user friendly' and not sufficiently promoted and used by stakeholders. Wide dissemination of project information media campaign is required.
Knowledge management strategy prepared and adopted.	Sufficient information and examples of best practices to drive a knowledge management strategy, or resources available to develop them.	Strategy prepared, and some elements may be adopted. Some risk to Project outcomes	Strategy requires implementation. Insufficient resources available.
Regular assessment and evaluations of performance and delivery as per UNDP and GEF requirements	PCU adheres to reporting and evaluation requirements (responsibility of IA)	No apparent risk, PCU reporting & evaluation performance seems good.	Agreed. But reporting obligations onerous, may be excessive.
Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status indicators adopted. National review and assessment mechanisms in place by end of year 1.	IW indicators developed for project are effective and comprehensive. Sufficient national and regional capacity to collect information on status of IW indicators. Effective support from project.	Indicators identified, but not closely integrated into the Project. No apparent risk	Agreed.
Co-financing agreements in place with Pacific ENGO. An ENGO participating in Commission. Information packages circulated to ENGOs (including access to website). National and regional ENGO workshops carried out. Public Awareness materials developed and distributed. National fora for civil society participation organised.	Commission members agree to ENGO participation. ENGO identified that is appropriate willing to participate. Civil society has sufficient interest in oceanic fisheries to participate.	Risk & assumption statement not well framed. No significant risk. WWF co-financing agreement concluded. 5 ENGOs attended WCPFC4.	Agreed.

<b>OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS</b>	<b>CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS</b>	<b>Assessment Annual Review 2007</b>	<b>MTE assessment</b>
Co-financing agreements in place with Pacific Industry NGO. An INGO participating in Commission. Information packages circulated to INGOs (including access to website) and national/regional INGO workshops carried out as appropriate.	Commission members agree to INGO participation. INGO identified that is appropriate willing to participate.	Risk & assumption statement not well framed. No significant risk. PITIA participating in the project and as observer to the WCPFC	Agreed.
Project Coordinator and other PCU staff appointed. Necessary PCU support equipment procured.	Effective and acceptable Project Coordinator identified within timeframe Project staff hired at appropriate time to suit workplan (and not too late to be of use). Realistic equipment procurement plan developed and adopted by PCU at earliest opportunity. IA and EA efficient in authorising expenditure of funds for procurement.	No risk, PCU operational and effective, good IA & EA performance	
Initial EA/IA consultations carried out. Necessary LoA finalised between EAs and IA. On-going consultations between EAs and IA throughout project lifetime	Appropriate EAs and IAs in project. Clear understanding of importance of on-going consultative process	No risk, EAs & IAs are appropriate	
Inception workshop carried out to begin project. Regular Steering Committees thereafter	All attendees committed to attending Inception Workshop. Appropriate presentations to ensure good understanding or project process.	No risk, 14 of 15 PICs attended RSC1,	
National Focal Points nominated and approved. National Consultative Committees active	Appropriate NFPs adopted by countries. Country commitment to NCCs. Appropriate level of membership on NCCs.	Significant risk, lack of commitment to NCCs	
Regular reporting as required by GEF, IAs and Steering Committee	PCU fully aware of reporting requirements (assisted and advised effectively by IA)	No risk, reporting requirements appear well understood by PCU	









The Resident Representative  
**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

---

Private Bag  
Suva  
FIJI  
Email: [registry.fj@undp.org](mailto:registry.fj@undp.org)

---

UNDP Project code PIMS 2992  
Date June 15 2008