

Paper Number RSC4/WP.7
Title MID-TERM PROJECT REVIEW OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Summary

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) is required to monitor and evaluate in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. A prescribed suite of evaluation and monitoring tools are set out in the Project Document. In addition to internal monitoring and evaluation processes, a series of independent evaluations are also required through contract using a balanced group of independent experts selected by UNDP in consultation with the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). The first of the critical independent monitoring and evaluation events is the Mid-term review.

The mid point of the OFM Project fell at the end of the first quarter in 2008. The third meeting of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) at its meeting in the Cook Islands in October of 2007 endorsed a process for the conduct of the Mid-term Review.

Through a process of interviews and consultations with the relevant project stakeholders, the appointed consultants completed the review and presented UNDP with their final report. The consultancy Team Leader, Dr Leon Zann will present the findings and recommendations to the fourth meeting of the RSC to held at Apia, Samoa, 17 – 18 October 2008 and UNDP will present management responses to the review.

Discussion and decisions by RSC will be captured in the record of proceedings and a revised document of UNDP Management Responses.

Recommendation

The Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) Discuss and provide comment on the Mid-term Review, its evaluation and recommendations in parallel with the preliminary Project management responses;
- ii) Consider and comment on the UNDP Management Responses, provide feedback and endorse the appropriate actions that need to implemented; and
- iii) Agree to the finalised UNDP Management Response report for submission to the UNDP Evaluation Centre.



FFA



GEF



IUCN
The World Conservation Union

MID-TERM PROJECT REVIEW OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Introduction

1. The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) is required to undergo a full package of independent monitoring through contract using a balanced group of independent experts selected by UNDP in consultation with the FFA. This package includes a mid-point review that will focus on project relevance, performance (effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness), issues requiring decisions and actions and initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. The review is also expected to seek to identify best lessons and practices for GEF projects which are transferrable and replicable.

Mid-term review arrangements

2. The third meeting of the project Regional Steering Committee (RSC3) held at Rarotonga, Cook Islands in October 2007 endorsed a process with which to undertake the Mid-Term Review (MTR) for the project. They agreed that UNDP would contract two consultants that would be engaged for the work based on a combination of two options (2 & 4 of the UNDP presentation at RSC3) suggested by UNDP.

3. UNDP advised on 16 April 2008 of the selection of Drs Leon Zann and Veikila Vuki as team leader and regional resource specialist respectively. Through a process of stakeholder interviews and consultations the consultants prepared and presented to UNDP a draft report which was made available by UNDP for initial comments on 21 June 2008 and cleared for wider circulation to project participating countries and executing agencies by UNDP on 14 August 2008.

Review Outcomes

4. A copy of the final Mid-term Review report is appended at **Attachment A**. The report and its conclusions will be presented to RSC4 by UNDP and the consultancy Team Leader Dr Leon Zann for further discussion.

5. A further requirement for project monitoring at UNDP is to provide a management response to the recommendations made in the MTR. The management responses to the review seek to explain which corrective measures should be taken to implement the recommendations, and to also provide explanations of why some recommendations of the review can not be addressed. A set of draft responses have been compiled by the UNDP Technical Advisor and Project Coordination Unit which are appended at **Attachment B** set out in a standardised UNDP format.

6. The management responses prepared are to be considered by RSC4 with the view to agree on and endorse the appropriate actions that are required before UNDP is able to forward a finalised version to the UNDP Evaluation Centre.

Other Independent Evaluations

7. The Project Document details in the indicative monitoring and evaluation work plan a further two critical evaluation events. The Project will be required to undertake a final evaluation (referred to as the Terminal Evaluation) that will focus on similar issues as the mid-term review but will also look at early signs of potential impact and

sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. From this recommendations on follow-up activities will also be provided.

8. Provision is also made for a post-project evaluation that will be undertaken in the third year after the completion of the technical activities¹ of the Project. In order to accommodate the budgeting for such post-project evaluation, the Project lifetime will be extended by up to three years beyond the expected completion of all other project activities and deliverables.

Recommendation

9. The Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) Discuss and provide comment on the Mid-term Review, its evaluation and recommendations in parallel with the preliminary Project management responses;
- ii) Consider and comment on the UNDP Management Responses, provide feedback and endorse the appropriate actions that need to be implemented; and
- iii) Agree to the finalised UNDP Management Response report for submission to the UNDP Evaluation Centre.

¹ End of the third quarter 2010.

MID TERM EVALUATION

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

United Nations Development Programme
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency

Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project

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.

- **Contacts**

Team Leader:

Leon Zann BSc Hons PhD
SPEER Consultants
4 Sunderland Street
Evans Head, New South Wales 2473
Australia
lpzann@hotmail.com

Regional Resource Specialist:

Veikila Vuki BSc MSc PhD
PO Box 5214, UOG Station,
Mangilao,
Guam 96913.
vuki61@yahoo.co.uk

UNDP Project code PIMS 2992
Date June 15 2008

GLOSSARY

List of acronyms and abbreviations

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Background and context
- 1.2. Objective and Purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation

2. Project and development context

- 2.1. Logic and objectives
- 2.2. Components, outputs and activities

3. Approach and methodology of Mid-Term Evaluation

- 3.1. Approach
- 3.2. Methodology
 - 3.2.1. Desk study, literature review
 - 3.2.2. Site visits
 - 3.2.3. Consultation and questionnaires
- 3.3. Evaluation Team

4. Results

- 4.1 Project Impact
 - 4.1.1. General achievements
 - 4.1.2. Sustainable oceanic fisheries management
 - 4.1.3. Capacities of Pacific SIDS
 - 4.1.4. Governance
 - 4.1.5. Intended beneficiaries
 - 4.1.6. Lessons learnt and sustainability of results
 - 4.1.7. Recommendations from results
- 4.2 Project Design
 - 4.2.1. Relevance of overall design
 - 4.2.2. Relevance to capacity development and sustainability
 - 4.2.3. Impacts on root causes
 - 4.2.4. Effectiveness
 - 4.2.5. Potential for replication
- 4.3. Project Management and Administration
 - 4.3.1. General effectiveness
 - 4.3.2. Implementing agency UNDP
 - 4.3.3. Executing agency FFA
 - 4.3.4. SPC
 - 4.3.5. IUCN
- 4.4. Project Implementation
 - 4.4.1. Efficiency and cost effectiveness
 - 4.4.2. Applicability of logical framework tool
 - 4.4.3. Project reporting
 - 4.4.4. Information dissemination
 - 4.4.6. Adaptive management processes
 - 4.4.7. Partnership arrangements
 - 4.4.8. Cross-cutting issues
 - 4.4.9. Coordinating mechanisms
- 4.5. Project Finances
 - 4.5.1. Budget procedures
 - 4.5.2. Disbursements and spending
 - 4.5.3. Actual spending and budget expectations
 - 4.5.4. Co-financing and leverage
 - 4.5.5. Effectiveness

4.6. Lessons learned

- 4.6.1. Country ownership/drivenness**
- 4.6.2. Regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation**
- 4.6.3. Stakeholder participation**
- 4.6.4. Adaptive management processes**
- 4.6.5. Efforts to secure sustainability**
- 4.6.6. Role of M&E in project implementation**

4.7. Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations

5. Recommendations

- 5.1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project**
- 5.2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project**
- 5.3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives**

ANNEXES

- 1. TOR**
- 2. Itinerary**
- 3. List of persons interviewed**
- 4. Summary of country visits**
- 5. List of documents reviewed**
- 6. Questionnaire used and summary of results**
- 7. OFM Project Co-financing and Leveraged Resources**
- 8. OFM Project FFA Annual workplan and activities**
- 9. OFM Project Logical framework**

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).

1. 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 WCPFC 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 (WCPFC Convention) and in the development of 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 WCPFC 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 WCPFC 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).

2. 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

Outcomes: *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.*

COMPONENT 2: LAW, POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REALIGNMENT AND STRENGTHENING

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).*

COMPONENT 3: COORDINATION, PARTICIPATION AND INFORMATION SERVICES

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.

3. 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 67th 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 POFM 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.

3.2.4. 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 summaries 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).

4. Results

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 POFM 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 WCP 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 PLOFM 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 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 WCP 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,	Benefit from lessons learnt,	OFM Project successfully developed and

geographic groups	and transferable best practices	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 Sea mounts 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 10% 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 WCF 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 a 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
Subtotal	5,147,250
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
Subtotal	3,883,850
3. Coordination, Participation and 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
Subtotal	1,915,120
TOTAL	10,946,220

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					
	<u>10,946,220</u>					

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 has 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 WTCF 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 WCTF 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) 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.

5. 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 CPWCPCF 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.

UNDP Management Response Template
 [Name of the Evaluation] Date:

Prepared by:	Position:	Unit/Bureau:
Cleared by:	Position:	Unit/Bureau:
Input into and update in ERC:	Position:	Unit/Bureau:

Overall comments:
 The MTR concludes that the project well designed and implemented, with significant impact on the immediate regional objectives and global objectives.
 Notably, the capacities of Pac SIDS to meet their WCPFC obligations are enhanced as a result of project intervention but that the smaller countries of this membership require more support. The review also recognizes that the management and administration of this large project owes to a large extent the high efficiency and effective rating to the execution through established regional organizations with extensive experience. The review recommendations range from minor to more strategic long term issues that need to be addressed both within the remainder of the project and in

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Results (4)²				
<p>Management Response: Future developments requires more specific attention on the smaller Pac SIDS capacity to fulfill their conservation & management responsibilities in the long term. The MTR identifies a number of issues that will need to be considered for sustainability.</p> <p>Continued support to capacity development in SIDS beyond the project will be provided by UNDP and FFA core programmes and efforts will be made to mainstream the objectives of the OFM project into long-term plans and strategies of the executing agencies that are supporting regional marine governance, including the Pacific Plan, in order to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>There is concurrence that any long-term strategic approaches to develop the capacity of in OFM and ensure sustainability should be encapsulated in future planning and funding initiatives</p>				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Status	Comments
Project Impact - Governance (4.1.4.) It is therefore recommended that the OFM Project should be more	Mainstreaming efforts in agencies are ongoing and will be	FFA & UNDP		

² Bracketed numeral references are the order in which evaluations & recommendations appear in the MTR Report.

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.	further strengthened in the second term of the project. Long-term capacity building needs will also be considered during the design of Phase III, late 2008 - 2009			
Recommendations from results (4.1.7.) It is recommended that: (a) the second term of the OFM Project, and any future developments of the Project, specifically addresses the needs of smaller Pacific SIDS; (b) alternative strategies should also be considered to support smaller Pacific SIDS in OFM (e.g. Sub-regional groupings, country-specific support from FFA); (c) 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)	Second term of ongoing project. Incorporate in the design of Phase III - Late 2008 - 2009	PCU, FFA, SPC		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2: Project Design (4.2)				
Management Response: See comments for issue 1. Long-term capacity building needs will also be considered during the design of Phase III which commence in late 2008 - 2009				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
Project Design (4.2.2) Relevance to capacity development and sustainability It is therefore recommended that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	For consideration during the design of Phase III (late 2008 – 2009)	PCU, FFA		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3: Project Management & Administration (4.3)				
Management Response: Efforts to address shortfalls during the second half of the project in terms of management & administration will need to be elevated, including information dissemination. There have been some developments at FFA since the review was				

<p>completed that have dramatically changed the work load at the PCU. FFA has finally recruited a very dynamic Media Information officer who is providing excellent assistance to the OFM Project (publications, newsletters, media releases and website). The need to allocate one more full-time position to the PCU is therefore not as urgent as when the review was conducted and funding constraints also makes this difficult.</p> <p>Opportunities to both continue and add to the development of oceanic fisheries science capacity within Pac SIDS should be maintained over the remainder of the project and should be a central element in the next phase.</p> <p>IUCN have appointed the coordinator who has responsibility for ensuring collaboration within the SPC/IUCN Seamounts programme, with other OFM Project activities, and with other agencies involved in seamount research in the region.</p>				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
<p>Project Management & Administration (4.3) Executing agency FFA (4.3.2.) It is therefore recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The OFM PCU is better supported in the second term of the Project. (b) 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). (c) GEF should be informed on the need for greater flexibility in allocations for Project management. 	By second quarter 2009.	PCU & UNDP (c)		
<p>SPC (4.3.3.) It is therefore recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Where possible, SPC should assist in the development of oceanic fisheries science within Pacific SIDS in this term of the Project. (b) Development in oceanic fisheries science within Pacific SIDS is a priority in the proposed new capacity-building Project. 	Ongoing during current project and for consideration during the development of a follow-up phase, late 2008 - 2009	SPC & for consideration during the design of phase III.		
<p>IUCN (4.3.4.) It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	Completed - IUCN have appointed a coordinator (Eric Gilman) early 2008	IUCN		

region				
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4: Project Implementation (4.4)				
<p>Management Response: The GEF Council adopted new focal area strategies at its June 2007 meeting. The IW strategy was thus updated and environmental process, stress and status indicators for the Strategic Programme on Fisheries were strengthened and updated. UNDP/GEF will provide further guidance on adjustment to the LFA & the appropriate indicators with which to monitor progress of Outputs & Activities and how they link to measurement of project outcomes/results and impacts. To date financial records and budgets have monitored output and activity progress. Reporting processes and their effectiveness could usefully be reviewed with UNDP/GEF taking the lead. Other project implementation recommendations should be implemented in the remainder of the project or are considerations for the next phase.</p> <p>The Baseline study for the project will investigate the issues that have arisen in relating to reporting against indicators and will make recommendations for changes to indicators. The outcomes of the Baseline study will also be the basis for discussions between the PCU & UNDP to review reporting processes and their effectiveness.</p> <p>After considerable time lapse the FFA has managed to fill the position of Media Information officer who is now providing some increased assistance to the OFM Project (publications, newsletters, media releases and website). She is also working with WWF on some joint initiatives.</p> <p>A number of issues require clarification in advance of developing further assistance focused on capacity building. This includes the need to understand GEF and UNDP policies on issues such as support for formal academic training, gender, human rights and equity in terms of resource projects of this nature.</p>				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
Project Implementation (4.4.) Applicability of logical framework tool (4.4.2) It is therefore recommended that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suite of appropriate indicators should be developed within the Logical Framework to better monitor progress in Project Outputs and Activities. 	December 2008	PCU & UNDP		
Project reporting (4.4.3.)	December 2008	PCU & UNDP		

<p>It is therefore recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 				
<p>Information dissemination (4.4.4.)</p> <p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>(a) 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.</p> <p>(b) 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.</p>	<p>December 2008</p> <p>FFA media officer now recruited and assisting</p>	PCU & FFA		
<p>Partnership arrangements (4.4.7.)</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>For consideration during the design of Phase III, late 2008 - 2009</p>	PCU & FFA		
<p>Cross-cutting issues: Institutional strengthening, innovation, national development, gender, human rights, and equity (4.4.8.)</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>By 3rd quarter 2010 & for consideration during the design of Phase III, late 2008 - 2009</p>	PCU, FFA, SPC		
<p>Coordinating mechanisms (4.4.9.)</p> <p>it is therefore recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>By RSC5 October 2009</p>	PCU		
<p>Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:</p> <p>Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project (5.1.)</p>				
<p>Management Response:</p> <p>See earlier comments on issues for corrective actions for design,</p>				

ATTACHMENT B

implementation and evaluation of the project.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
Design (5.1.1.), Implementation (5.1.2) (a) 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. 5.1.2. Implementation (b) The OFM PCU should be better supported in the second term of the Project. (c) GEF should be informed on the need for greater flexibility in allocations for Project management. (d) Pacific SIDs should be assisted where possible in developing their capacities in oceanic fisheries science.	(a) Completed & ongoing (b) Ongoing (c) December 2008 (d) 3 rd quarter 2010	PCU (a,b & d) UNDP Fiji – b & c		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6: Partnership agreements (5.1.3.)				
Management Response: Earlier comments apply to (a). Some engagement with USP (TSC Training) & SPREP (Turtle conservation and project oversight) occurs but the recommendation to increase the dialogue with these organization with the view to collaborate on capacity and oceanic biodiversity and conservation is well founded. Whilst the project has fulfilled the designed activities to engage Pacific tuna industry through stakeholder participation in the Commission and awareness raising, there is room to strengthen communication between the PCU & PITIA. The OFM Project is explicitly linked to the Pacific Plan and regular reports against the Vavau Declaration and the Plan are submitted to the Pacific Plan Action Committee ³ . Presently, the reports do not profile the activities as OFMP & GEF funded and this needs to be rectified immediately.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
(a) 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 held between FFA and	(a) For consideration during the design of Phase III, late 2008 – 2009 (b) Before 3 rd quarter 2010	PCU		

³ Please refer to the Jan – April and July reports of the Pacific Plan Action Committee and the 2007 Pacific Forum Leaders Communiqué (Vavau Declaration) and the 2008 Forum Leaders Communiqué (Annex A)

<p>the Pacific Forum Secretariat in developing this project.</p> <p>(b) Discussions should be held with USP and SPREP to more actively involve them in capacity-building and oceanic biodiversity and conservation.</p> <p>(c) 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.</p>	(c) By February 2009			
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 7: Monitoring and reporting (5.1.4.)				
Management Response: See earlier responses. At the time of writing, the baseline study for the project has commenced.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
<p>(a) A suite of appropriate indicators should be developed within the Logical Framework to better monitor progress in Project Outputs and Activities.</p> <p>(b) A baseline study of OFM in Pacific SIDS, including a summary of the achievements and shortfalls of WCPF Convention commitments, should be prepared.</p> <p>(c) The monitoring and reporting requirements of the major donor, GEF, and implementing agency UNDP, should be assessed to reduce unnecessary bureaucratic procedures.</p>	<p>(a) By December 2008</p> <p>(b) September 2008</p> <p>(c) December 2008</p>	PCU & UNDP		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 8: Coordination (5.1.5.)				
Management Response: To be commenced after the projects 4 th meeting in Apia in Oct 2008.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	December 2008	PCU		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 9: Information dissemination (5.1.6.)				
Management Response: To be implemented subject to available resources.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the OFM Knowledge Management Strategy should be fully implemented and there should be a greater focus on 	December 2008	PCU		

dissemination of information from the OFM Project by the PCU.				
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 10: Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project (5.2.)				
Management Response: See Issue 11				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
(a) The specific needs of small Pacific SIDS should be identified, and a strategic plan developed to provide appropriate support. (b) The Knowledge Management/Media programme should highlight significant achievements in the first term. (see 5.3). (c) Discussions should be held as soon as possible with potential donors for a future project (see 5.3).	(a) By 3 rd quarter 2010 (b) For consideration during the design of Phase III, late 2008 – 2009 (c) RSC4 to consider	PCU, FFA, UNDP		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 11: Proposals for future directions underlining (5.3.)				
Management Response: The MTR has highlighted a number of issues that will bear closer inspection in the development of a future phase of the project. Many of the recommendations relate to the gaps identified or a range of activities that simply could not be undertaken in the current project. A preliminary report will be prepared for the next RSC to draw to the attention of the stakeholders the need to consider a further project and taking into consideration the recommendations made by the MTR.				
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
New initiatives (5.3.1.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	For consideration during the design of Phase III, late 2008 – 2009	PCU, FFA & SPC		

* The implementation status is tracked in the ERC.