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# Executive Summary

**Introduction to the Project**

The South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant agreement between the Republic of Kenya (on behalf of the participating countries) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (on behalf of the GEF) was signed on October 9th 2007, and became effective on 16th April 2008. The project closing date in the grant agreement was specified as 30th November 2011, but following the Mid-Term Review (MTR) and a re-alignment of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) and the grant agreement, the closing date was changed to the 31st March 2013, with an additional four month completion period to finalise all project audits and accounts. The total project budget planned during the design was US$22.65 million, with US$12 million provided by the GEF, US$6.68 from participating countries as counterpart finance, US$2.27 million from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the EAF Nansen project, US$1 million from the French Global Environment Fund, and US$0.7 million from the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations.

SWIOFP had the overall objective ‘*To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity*.’ This was to be achieved through identification and study of offshore non-tuna species and their exploitation within the South West Indian Ocean, development of institutional and human capacity for both fisheries science and management, development of fisheries management plans at both national and, where appropriate, regional levels, and mainstreaming biodiversity in fisheries management, policy and legislation. The project had six main components to achieve these outcomes. Component 1 addressed data and information technology. Components 2-4 covered assessment and sustainable use of crustacean, demersal, and pelagic species respectively. Component 5 focused on ecosystems and biodiversity issues, while Component 6 had responsibility for both the project management structures (e.g. the Regional and National Management Units) as well as for the preparation of management plans, a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), and a Strategic Action Plan (SAP).

The following countries participated in SWIOFP: Comoros, France (by virtue of its islands in the region although it is not a beneficiary of the grant agreement), Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa (East Coast only), and the United Republic of Tanzania. Somalia is also an observer to the project.

**Information about the ICR**

This Implementation Completion Report (ICR) was prepared by the participating countries, and facilitated by a consultant recruited for the purpose. Over a three week period during November-December 2012 the consultant consulted with all countries covered by the project to illicit their views about the project. With the exception of Reunion for which remote consultation was completed with the France National Management Unit (NMU), all other countries were visited by the consultant and meetings were held in person with country NMUs and stakeholders, the RMU, and other relevant international organisations (e.g. Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, the Indian Ocean Commission, the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission). A stakeholder questionnaire prepared by the consultant was completed by all NMUs based on facilitation provided by the consultant. The Regional Management Unit (RMU), The Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), and the South West Indian Ocean Commission also completed a questionnaire. The completed questionnaires form the basis for the findings presented in this ICR. In keeping with the participatory nature of the project’s design and implementation, this ICR has thus been prepared in a truly participatory manner. Based on the World Bank guidelines for the completion of ICRs[[1]](#footnote-1), the stakeholder questionnaires, and this report, were structured around three main areas: factors affecting implementation; success in achieving the project objectives; key lessons learned. Ratings of performance have been provided for key questions are suggested in the Bank’s ICR Guidelines, and a table of the ratings is provided below. The standard deviations for the answers/ratings to each question are low, and the ‘word ratings’ shown in the table below using averages, were found to be the same as those when using a median.



Notes: Responses in questionnaires are converted to numbers as follows: highly satisfactory=6, satisfactory=5, moderately satisfactory=4, moderately unsatisfactory=3, unsatisfactory=2, highly unsatisfactory=1. Average scores per question are then converted back to a word rating as follows: >5.5=highly satisfactory. >4.5=satisfactory, >3.5=moderately satisfactory, >2.5= moderately unsatisfactory, >1.5=unsatisfactory, <1.5=highly unsatisfactory".

**Factors affecting implementation**

Implementation performance of the SWIOFP has been ‘Satisfactory’. The project design was generally well conceived largely due to is participatory nature, financial safeguards used by the project in terms of financial reporting and audits proved sufficient, the monitoring and evaluation framework served the project well in ensuring that implementation was working towards achievement of project outcomes and objectives, and the decision-making mechanisms used by the project provided for sufficient participation and flexibility in implementation. The institutional structure for the project provided for a RMU, and NMUs in each participating country, with National Component Coordinators (NCCs) for each of the six components in each of the NMUs. Regional Component Coordinators (RCCs) were nominated for each of the six components so that for each component one of the NCCs was also the RCC. This structure was appropriate given the regional nature of the project and different types of activities to be completed within the different components. KMFRI also played an important role in the project given that it had responsibility for the special account for the project, and was responsible for ensuring due diligence in both procurement and disbursement of funds, and for providing overall supervision of the RMU. For all of these institutions individually, and taken collectively, performance was disappointing during the first 18 months of the project, but improved markedly in later years. The reasons for this were because a fully staffed RMU was not in place from the beginning of the project, and because the project was implemented primarily by government staff (without additional financial incentives being provided) rather than external consultants. This meant that progress was initially slowly, and that the capacity of the NCCs and the RCCs and their engagement with the project was variable. However over time all project participants came to realise the benefits and successes of the project, and this helped to increase implementation performance.

**Project Outcomes**

Performance in achieving the project outcomes was ‘Moderately satisfactory’, when considering: the relevance of the project objectives; the extent to which the global objective, the four project development objectives (PDOs), and whether their related indicators were achieved; and the efficiency of the project’s implementation. The project certainly generated considerable outcomes in the region, and contributed significantly to the intended objectives. However, in many cases success in achieving the objectives and indicators was only partial, with the project having made some progress and having laid the groundwork for the objectives to be realised, but with full realisation of the objectives only likely after the lifespan of the project and with additional follow up and action necessary by donors and stakeholders. The slow start of the project and poor implementation performance in the first 18 months meant that the project was thereafter trying to catch up, and this had a negative impact both on the project’s ability to achieve its objectives, and on the project efficiency with a focus at times on disbursing monies so as to complete project activities, but without sufficient thought about the resulting impacts/outcomes/benefits. In hindsight, while there were some positive examples of project efficiency, there was also considerable expenditure on cruises, Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs), tagging, and training of observers, which can be considered to have only marginally contributed to the project’s intended outcomes and objectives. The risk that project impacts may not be sustainable is rated as ‘Moderate’.

**Lessons Learned**

Lessons learned include the benefits of a project design process which is truly participatory, and the importance in the specification of a project in ensuring a suitable balance of responsibilities for project implementation between a) those within participating institutions in region, and b) a project management unit which is sufficiently staffed with technical and administrative experts. Success in achieving such a balance can help to ensure value-for-money, buy-in from stakeholders in the region, adherence to project timeframes, successful achievement of project objectives, and long-term sustainability of project impacts. Project designs which link projects and assume their parallel implementation can be risky. Key lessons learned from the project’s implementation are that having a functioning and fully staffed regional/core management unit from day one of a project, as well as agreed and efficient procurement and disbursement mechanisms, is critical in achieving the intended objectives, especially in the case of large regional projects involving many countries. Good partnerships with other projects, donors and institutions are also critically important in ensuring success in project implementation, and ultimately in achieving project objectives. Well designed and implemented M&E systems (e.g. reporting requirements tied to a project logframe and indicators, participatory internal project meetings to allow for a flexible response to project implementation, and rigorous oversight by an external steering committee), are invaluable in ensuring successful project implementation, and in identifying and correcting project deficiencies as they occur. World Bank rules prohibit additional payments from being made to government staff working on projects, and creative solutions to this problem, while not infringing Bank rules, should be sought during future projects to better incentivise government staff participation. Implementing institutions must complete proper staff time management to ensure that staff are available for project activities, and seek to minimise high turnover of project staff which can negatively impact on performance.

# Objectives and approach to completion of the ICR

1. The objective of this Implementation Completion Report (ICR) is to provide a complete and systematic account of the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) which captures and disseminates experience with regards to:

* the factors which impacted on the implementation;
* the degree of success in achieving the expected project objectives and outcomes; and
* key lessons learned.

1. Being completed by the participating countries, and as distinct from the World Bank’s own ICR for the project, this ICR is intended to provide a self-evaluation of performance so as to (i) improve the selection of future interventions, (ii) improve the design and implementation of future interventions through lessons learned, and (iii) help ensure greater development impact and sustainability of projects. By structuring the participating countries’ ICR in a format consistent with the requirements for the Bank’s own ICR, it is hoped that this report will also facilitate completion of the Bank’s ICR.
2. The ICR is based on the World Bank guidelines for the completion of ICRs[[2]](#footnote-2), and was facilitated by a consultant recruited for the purpose[[3]](#footnote-3). Over a three week period during November-December 2012 the consultant consulted with stakeholders in all countries covered by the project to illicit their views about the project. With the exception of Reunion for which remote consultation was completed with the France National Management Units (NMU), all other countries were visited by the consultant and meetings were held in person with country NMUs and stakeholders, the RMU, and other relevant international organisations (e.g. Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, the Indian Ocean Commission). A stakeholder questionnaire prepared by the consultant was completed by all NMUs based on facilitation provided by the consultant during the country visits. The Regional Management Unit (RMU), the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), and the South West Indian Ocean Commission (SWIOFC) also each completed a questionnaire. The 12 completed questionnaires are presented in see Annex 7 and form the basis for the findings presented in this ICR. In keeping with the participatory nature of the project’s design and implementation, this ICR has thus been prepared in a truly participatory manner.
3. For relevant questions in the questionnaire, ratings have been provided by those completing the questionnaire, and the ICR consultant also provided a set of ratings. The ratings are based on the Bank’s ICR guidelines, and have been assigned numeric values as follows so as to have a quantitative basis on which to report on project performance based on the views of all stakeholders: highly satisfactory=6, satisfactory=5, moderately satisfactory=4, moderately unsatisfactory=3, unsatisfactory=2, highly unsatisfactory=1. The numeric ratings have been entered into a spreadsheet based on the questionnaire responses[[4]](#footnote-4). The average scores for each question are then converted back to a ‘word’ rating as follows: >5.5=highly satisfactory. >4.5=satisfactory, >3.5=moderately satisfactory, >2.5= moderately unsatisfactory, >1.5=unsatisfactory, <1.5=highly unsatisfactory. A similar approach has been adopted when assessing the risks to sustainability, with High=1, Significant=2, Moderate=3, and Negligible=4, and with the average sustainability risk ratings converted from numeric values back to a word value as follows: >3.5=negligible, >2.5=moderate, >1.5=significant, <1.5=high. The views of each questionnaire respondent are thus treated equally and given equal weighting. A table showing all the ratings is provided below. Standard deviations for each answer/rating were found to be low, and median scores were also assessed but provided no material difference to the results.

Table : Summary ratings table



Notes: KMF = KMFRI, FC = SWIOFC, Con = ICR consultant

# Project Context, Development Objectives and Design

## The Project

1. The South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant agreement between the Republic of Kenya (on behalf of the participating countries) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (on behalf of the GEF) was signed on October 9th 2007, and became effective on 16th April 2008. The project was originally intended to run for 4-5 years[[5]](#footnote-5), with a closing date in the grant agreement specified as 30th November 2011[[6]](#footnote-6). Following the Mid-Term Review (MTR) and a re-alignment of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) and the grant agreement, the closing date was changed to the 31st March 2013, with an additional four month completion period to finalise all project audits and accounts.
2. The total project budget planned during the design was US$22.65 million, with US$12 million provided by the GEF, US$6.68 from participating countries as counterpart finance, US$2.27 million from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the EAF Nansen project, US$1 million from the French Global Environment Fund, and US$0.7 million from the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations.

## Context at Appraisal

1. The Project Appraisal Document (PAD) highlighted that The South West Indian Ocean (SWIO) contains several very high value commercial fisheries and also supports a large number of endemic and threatened species, many of which are under increasing direct and indirect pressure from commercial fishing. It noted that at the time of the project appraisal, developing countries in the SWIO faced enormous challenges in meeting the human development needs and expectations of the 140 million people who lived within the countries in the region and the estimated 28-30 million residing in the coastal zones. Fish represents the primary source of animal protein available to many local populations, and in a region faced with chronic scarcities of foreign exchange, exports of fishery products or income from licensing of fisheries represent vital sources of exchangeable earnings.
2. The SWIO is considered a distinct bio-geographical province of the Indo West Pacific, characterised by high biodiversity and levels of regional endemism, the presence of many ‘charismatic’ species such as cetaceans and turtles, and provision by the ecosystems of valuable environmental services in the form of food sources, fish spawning and rearing areas, wave buffers through coral reefs, mangroves, sea grass beds, beaches, and estuaries. This level of biodiversity underpins many of the fisheries in the region, but there are threats to the long-term sustainable exploitation of the SWIO marine and coastal ecosystems that are both anthropogenic and environmental. Particular threats caused by commercial fishing include: overexploitation of near shore and offshore fishery resources; unnecessarily high by-catch and incidental mortality of marine fauna in commercial fisheries operations; and fisheries induced habitat destruction and related alteration of the marine environment.
3. The situation at appraisal was that there were insufficient data, institutional and human capacity, and regional collaboration, both to a) determine which impacts are human related and can be addressed by collective actions and which are the results of natural cycles, and b) ensure wise management of the ecosystem, especially transboundary species and stocks.
4. Given this context, the rationale for the SWIOFP was based on the fact that:

* Almost all commercial fisheries are exploited by more than one country in the SWIO, and sustainable management cannot be achieved by responsible, environment-based, management of one country alone;
* with one exception (the large pelagic fishery), there were few bilateral or multilateral management agreements and systems in place in the SWIO, and those that were present had little data upon which to justify recommendations for total sustainable yield and allocation of that yield between countries;
* implementation of the project would be an important instrument for countries to meet international treaty obligations (such as the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries);
* the project would support improved information and data, aggregation and dissemination of such data at a regional level, and institutional and human capacity development to better manage fisheries activities within the LME.

## Project Objectives

1. The overall global objective of the project was ‘*To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity*.’
2. The project also had four specific project development objectives as follows:

* to identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts;
* to develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities;
* to develop a regional fisheries management structure and associated harmonized legislation in collaboration with the SWIOFC; and
* to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources

1. Neither the overall global objective, nor any of the project development objectives, changed during the course of the project (although as recommended by the Mid Term Review [MTR] the project development objectives have been considered by the project to be more appropriately defined as outcomes in support of the overall global objective).

## Main Beneficiaries

1. The beneficiaries as identified in the PAD are the participating countries in the region, namely: Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa (East Coast only), and the United Republic of Tanzania[[7]](#footnote-7). France also participated in the project activities by virtue of its islands in the region but is not a recipient/beneficiary of the GEF grant), and Somalia was a formal observer implying that the beneficiary countries agreed to collectively use project funds to support attendance of the Provisional Government of Somalia at important project meetings, that the Provisional Somali Government could access relevant project data, and that Somalia was included in the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) developed by the project.
2. Given that the SWIOFP focused primarily on generating knowledge and building capacity for regional fisheries management, the principal beneficiaries were those staff within the participating countries working for relevant Ministries and research institutions, and NGOs which were project partners.

## Project Components

1. SWIOFP was structured into six distinct components, which were not revised during the project, each with sub-components and related outputs and activities. The components and sub-components, are show in Table 1.

Table : SWIOFP Components and sub-components

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Sub-components** |
| Component 1: Data GAP Analysis, Data Archiving and Information Technology | Subcomponent 1: Fisheries data collection and evaluation  Subcomponent 2: Compiling of a data atlas for SWIOFP  Subcomponent 3: Establishment of Information Technology, data handling and communications systems |
| Component 2: Assessment and Sustainable Utilization of Crustaceans | Subcomponent 1: Assessment of deep-water crustaceans  Subcomponent 2: Assessment of shallow-water crustaceans |
| Component 3: Assessment and Sustainable Utilization of Demersal Fishes | Subcomponent 1: Assessment of deep-water demersal fish  Subcomponent 2: Assessment of shallower water demersal fish |
| Component 4: Assessment and Sustainable Utilization of Pelagic Fish | Subcomponent 1: Assessment of large pelagic species  Subcomponent 2: Assessment of small pelagic species  Subcomponent 3: Assessment of super small pelagic species |
| Component 5: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in National and Regional Fisheries Management | Subcomponent 1: Assessing of the state of knowledge of non-consumptive resources and marine biodiversity  Subcomponent 2: Identification of key biodiversity values  Subcomponent 3: Identification of interactions with fisheries including bi-catch  Subcomponent 4 Identification of bio-indicators of ecosystem health |
| Component 6: Strengthening Regional and National Fisheries Management | Sub-component 1: Identification of relevant national and international legislation and other instruments relevant to the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) goal  Subcomponent 2: Harmonization of legislation between countries  Subcomponent 3: Development of regional resource management structures and capacity |

## Other significant comments about the design and implementation arrangements

1. Key elements of the institutional design and implementation arrangements for the project were a Regional Management Unit (RMU), hosted by the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI) which provided a due diligence function with regards to procurement and disbursement. The RMU was staffed with a Regional Executive Secretary (RES), a Regional Finance and Procurement Manager (RFPM), a survey logistics coordinator, an information technology and communications manager, and administrative support staff. National Management Units (NMU) were established in all 9 participatory countries comprising of a focal point, a project accountant, a procurement officer, a project secretary, and National Component Coordinators (NCCs) for each of the components. Regional Component Coordinators (RCC) were specified for each of the 6 Components, with the RCCs for components 1-5 coming from 5 different countries and also being NCCs for the relevant component within NMUs, and with the RES acting as the RCC for component 6. All NCCs and RCCs were government or university staff embedded within existing institutions, rather than being consultants hired and paid specifically to work on the project. Regional Component Working Groups, composed of the NCCs and the RCCs for each component (and supported by the RMU) met each year to agree the workplan and budget for the following year. An ad hoc committee of the SWIOFC acted as the Regional Policy and Steering Committee (RPSC) for the project.
2. The project costs and financing, including information on component budget allocations and expenditure, are provided in Annex 2. A timeline presentation for the project is provided in Annex 9.
3. The SWIOFP design articulated the special importance of collaboration and relationships between the SWIOFP (implemented by the World Bank, and focussing on offshore non-tuna species[[8]](#footnote-8)), the WIOLaB project (implemented by UNEP, and focussing on land-based pollution), and the ASCLME project (implemented by UNDP, and focussing on marine ecosystems and inshore fisheries). The intended relationship between the SWIOFP and the ASCLME project was particularly important but the SWIOFP PAD highlighted that it was the intention for all three projects to work towards a harmonised Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and SAP, with an expected outcome being national commitments to address key transboundary fisheries management issues, and establishing monitoring and evaluation indicators (process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators) to monitor long term ecosystem health. The ASCLME and WIO-LaB projects were thus designed to provide the base upon which sustainable management of offshore non-tuna fisheries can be built.

# Factors affecting implementation

1. This section of the ICR reports on factors affecting the implementation of the project. A summary of the ratings provided for different factors (using the methodology described in Section 1) is provided in the table below, with subsequent text providing the justification for each rating. Full details on the ratings provided by individual country NMUs, the RMU, KMFRI, SWIOFC, and the ICR consultant, are provided in Annex 8.

Table : Summary table of ratings for factors affecting implementation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor affecting implementation** | **Section in ICR** | **Rating** |
| Project preparation, design, and quality and entry | 3.1 | Satisfactory |
| MTR | 3.2 | Satisfactory |
| Monitoring and evaluation | 3.3 | Satisfactory |
| Fiduciary aspects and safeguards | 3.4 | Satisfactory |
| Partnerships | 3.5 | Satisfactory |
| Institutional arrangements | 3.6 | Satisfactory |
| **Overall rating of factors affecting implementation** | 3.1 to 3.6 | Satisfactory |
| **Sustainability / risk to development outcomes** | 3.7 | Moderate |

## Project Preparation, Design, and Quality at Entry

1. The project preparation, design and quality at entry is rated as ‘Satisfactory’.

### Soundness of the background analysis supporting the project, lessons learned incorporated, and the rationale for the Bank’s intervention

1. The background analysis presented in the PAD is sound, and included a list of relevant policy, legislation and management documents in each partner country, with a description of the linkages, coherence and contribution of SWIOFP to them. The analysis also profiled previous projects and those existing at the time of the design, both to inform the appropriate technical content of the project, as well as the key lessons learned which were then incorporated in the SWIOFP design. Some of the key lessons learned and incorporated into the project include the benefits/importance of co-management, the importance of effective institutions to support resource management, and the need for a sound body of knowledge upon which decision making must be based. Other lessons were that historically, management of marine resources in the WIO has been fragmented and uncoordinated, that political instability and poor capacity has resulted in nations failing to benefit from their marine resources, and that programmes and organisations existing at the regional level have been focused on a single fishery (tuna) or did not include all countries in the region. The rationale for the Bank’s intervention was thus sound in that the intervention was designed to consolidate the scientific activities of all African countries that are riparian to the WIO, and to begin a process whereby these countries could make decisions about the value of their resources and sustainable management.
2. One area of weakness with regards to the background analysis and rationale for the project however were two assumptions made in the design. The first was that there are many offshore non-tuna/billfish stocks of a regional nature which need regional management, while project experience has showed that while there may be some offshore non-tuna stocks which are shared by neighbouring countries, most are not shared regionally. The second assumption was that improved management of inshore stocks would be sufficiently supported by the ASCLME project, whereas the ASCLME project has focussed very little on inshore stocks. These weaknesses in assumptions meant that the SWIOFP had to take a flexible approach during its implementation so as to support a) some tuna and large-pelagic related activities e.g. Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs), participation in IOTC meetings, and tagging of large pelagic species such as swordfish not covered by an EC-funded tuna tagging project, and b) inshore issues as long as stocks being researched are present in both inshore and offshore areas i.e. they are not exclusively inshore stocks.

### Assessment of the project design

1. Beneficiary countries view the project design as being well conceived in terms of a phased approach (see Annex 9), discrete components dealing with different issues, and recognition that countries would have different levels of interest in participating in different components and sub-components. However as noted in the Mid-Term Review (MTR), Components 5 and 6 were not given sufficient attention in the project design and as a result were not sufficiently funded at the outset within the overall project budget envelope.
2. The project design was not overly complex in terms of the institutional structure specified (as presented in Section 2.6). The functions and responsibilities at different levels of the institutional structure for the project were clearly and appropriately defined in the design, along with a clear specification of the relationships between the different hierarchies. As explained more fully later (see Section 3.6.1) the institutional structure in the design generally served the project well in terms of decision-making, and other strengths of the institutional design related to its positive impact on sustainability (as discussed later in Section 3.7) given that key project staff (e.g. NCCs) were embedded in, and part of, government institutions. One weakness however was the lack of dedicated technical scientific officer in the RMU. Given the highly technical nature of many of the activities and outputs planned for the project, this would have been useful in ensuring the quality of both inputs and outputs of the project, thereby better supporting achievement of the project outcomes and objectives.
3. With respect to the description of, and provision for, relationships with institutions and stakeholders outside of the internal project management structure, the design provided good articulation for how the project was supposed to collaborate with the SWIOFC, and with the WIOLaB and ASCLME projects. Provision for, and specification of the detail with regards to collaboration with other projects and parties such as NGOs, private sector parties, universities, and some important regional institutions, was however less well articulated in the design. Another specific weakness in the design was that the grant agreement did not provide clarity about the ability of KMFRI to be able to sign grant agreements on behalf of all participating countries for other grants and funds to be brought into the project by the RMU. This resulted in one case in an opportunity for grant funds from WWF being lost because funds became unavailable before a decision could be reached, and a decision was ultimately never reached on how to handle extra grants received by the project. Other weaknesses of the design highlighted in the MTR included the failure to include a scientific expert as part of the RMU, and a lack of sufficient detail of the activities to be completed in support of the results/outcomes.
4. The project design was ambitious in terms of achieving the objectives specified within the lifespan of the project, but stakeholders generally feel not overly so *if the project had commenced immediately on signature and proceeded without any delays and if piracy[[9]](#footnote-9) had not come to present such a problem during implementation*, although an additional year for implementation might be have been appropriate. The project design, covering 9 countries in the region with different institutional and human capacities and using different languages (French, Portuguese and English, as well as many local languages), is also something which might be criticised for introducing an unnecessary and unrealistic level of complexity and logistical difficulty. However, beneficiaries feel that the project’s efforts to overcome these challenges have resulted in positive outcomes of the project: some countries and institutions with stronger capacities have assisted those with weaker levels of capacity; and there is now communication and networking within research institutions in the region as a result of the project that was not present before the project, suggesting that the ambitious design was warranted even if it presented undeniable challenges during implementation. Also in terms of ambition in achieving project objectives during the timeframe, and with the benefit of hindsight, some parts of the project design were probably over-optimistic. For example: establishing an integrated region-wide fisheries observer programme covering all fisheries, given the existing infrastructure in the region was too ambitious; the scientific process (conceptualization; data collection; analysis; reporting and writing up to publication level) is generally a multi-year process, and many of the science outputs of SWIOFP (i.e. peer-reviewed scientific articles) will only be achieved after the project has concluded.
5. There was a very strong focus in the design on cruise surveys, which played a significant part in the overall project (and the related costs). The assumption for many of the surveys was that they would identify new stocks which the project would then seek to improve management of. However, it was not possible to identify many new significant stocks (even though countries now have a better idea of what stocks are available than was the case before the project), and the link between surveys feeding into good management was therefore not always evident. In addition the strong focus on surveys brought a significant administrative, logistical, and organizational research load that was challenging given the manpower and human capacity available to the project and in the region. This was especially the case given the difficulties in identifying suitable vessels to be used for research cruises, and the need to fit SWIOFP wet leases in around vessels’ schedules.
6. Another problem in the design of the project was that the PAD planned for implementation of the project over a five year period, while the grant agreement only provided for a four year project implementation period. This inconsistency was resolved following the MTR and a re-alignment of the project.
7. Finally with respect to the design, it is appropriate to highlight the overall approach to implementation incorporated into the design, whereby the project was implemented by and for staff already part of the institutions in the region in a truly participatory manner, rather than by external/international consultants. Given Bank rules which meant that the NCCs and RCCs could not be paid extra monies to implement project activities, and given existing workloads of government/university staff, this approach certainly had a negative impact on the speed of project implementation, and to some extent the motivation to participate in the project. However given the positive aspects of this overall approach in terms of stakeholder buy-in, capacity development, and support for lasting regional networks for improvement fisheries management, project beneficiaries feel strongly that such an approach was on balance preferable to the approach used by other projects (e.g. the ASCLME) which relied heavily on consultants or larger numbers of technical support staff.

### Adequacy of government’s commitment, stakeholder involvement, and/or participatory processes to design

1. The project’s design was truly participatory, and beneficiary countries all report good involvement in the design process. Following a GEF-PDF-A grant ($25,000) which facilitated a meeting in Maputo, Mozambique in 2000 to discuss a possible strategy for collective action in protection and sustainable development of shared marine resources, a project preparation phase began in January 2002 with a GEF-PDF-B grant agreement ($700,000). The development of the Project Appraisal Document was achieved through individual countries taking responsibility for key portfolios. Following progress with these portfolios, participating countries were invited to submit specific proposals for research within the broad objectives of SWIOFP and the science plan. Proposals received were collated into distinct project components so as to create the basic structure/content of the SWIOFP, which then went through several participatory iterations.

### Assessment of risks and mitigation measures.

1. The PAD provided detail on the perceived risks at the time of the project design, and proposed some mitigating strategies. The stated risks are clearly articulated and comprehensive. The most notable risk not considered during the design of the project, and one which could not have been foreseen during design, was piracy in the region. This problem developed into a major concern in East Africa during the project. Given the focus of the design on research cruises and ship/observer time at sea, piracy had a considerable bearing on implementation. However, the project managed to find ways around the problem e.g. while the project design had always intended to use some wet lease vessels, the project used a greater amount of wet lease vessel time compared to the amount of *Fridtjof Nansen* cruise time than was envisaged during design, and ensured that relevant governments provided armed guards on cruise vessels. A second main risk not well articulated, and with no mitigating strategy, was the lack of incentive for NMU staff to fully engage with the project, given that the project provides them with no additional payments for conducting SWIOFP activities in addition to other responsibilities.

## MTR

1. Project performance in completing the actions recommended by the MTR, and the usefulness of the MTR recommendations, are rated as ‘Satisfactory’.
2. A Mid-Term Review of the project was completed in March 2011. The MTR resulted in a list of 58 specific recommendations, with assigned responsibilities (most of which were for the participating countries [RMU, NMU, KMFRI] to complete) and timeframes. Performance in terms of completing the recommendations was good, with forty-seven of these recommendations completed in full subsequent to the MTR, and a further 3 partially completed (see Annex 10, which includes comment on why some of the recommendations were not completed/appropriate). Beneficiary countries reported (see stakeholder questionnaires in Annex 7) that the impact of the recommendations and their completion, was a positive and marked change in implementation which assisted with solving many of the implementation problems highlighted during the MTR.
3. Most of the recommendations related to implementation issues, and the extent of proposed changes to the original design was minimal. The only significant changes to the design recommended by the MTR were to: align the PAD and grant agreement; better fund components 5 and 6 of the project; revise the logframe; and grant a generic approval by the RPSC for KMFRI to sign agreements with other funders for grant monies on behalf of participating countries.

## Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

1. The M&E for the project is rated as ‘Satisfactory’, with design, implementation, and utilisation all individually rated as ‘satisfactory’.

### M&E design

1. M&E requirements for the project were specified in the PAD (Annex 3 in particular), and elaborated in greater detail in the Project Implementation Manual (Section 6 and Annex 11). The principal monitoring reports used by the project as required in the PAD or PIM were: quarterly interim financial reports; quarterly activity reports; annual audits; and annual progress reports. Neither the PAD nor the PIM included all the necessary monitoring reporting templates, and their inclusion at the outset of the project would have been useful, but in general terms these requirements for monitoring project progress were appropriate and well-defined.
2. However, the project logframe and result/outcome monitoring framework in the design and Annex 11 of the original version of the PIM was weak. This was addressed during the MTR, and subsequent revisions made to the logframe in the PIM so as to: correct the hierarchy within the logframe to better define what were objectives, outcomes, outputs, and results; ensure consistency and logic between rows for the objective(s), results/outcome, outputs and inputs/activities, and columns for the indicators, means of verification and risks/assumptions at each level; better match the indicators proposed with the overall project objective, and the specific project objectives, as presented in the PAD; allocate indicators to specific sub-components; and provide better specification of some indicators so as to be more measurable.
3. One additional weakness in the design was that the project lacked a mechanism to monitor and evaluate the quality of research / science completed (at all levels from data collection through to final write-up) in real time. The weakness of this was that any weak science could not be redressed with improved results feeding into management improvements supported by the project, because it only became evident after the peer-review process when scientific articles or papers were submitted to journals or FAO for publishing.

### M&E implementation

1. The quarterly and annual M&E reports were prepared as required at NMU, RMU and component levels, reviewed and amalgamated by the RMU which had overall responsibility for monitoring progress, and then submitted to the World Bank, KMFRI, The Kenyan Treasury, the RPSC, and other relevant supervisory project structures as appropriate. The reporting requirements for the NMU and RMU were adhered to, and while the MTR observed that quarterly reports submitted by the NMUs to the RMU were sometimes late, and that as noted during some RPSC meetings (e.g. September 2009) annual national progress reports lacked details that would allow proper reporting on the status of the project and implementation of activities, such weaknesses were corrected following the MTR.
2. Post-MTR, the revision of the logframe and indicators allowed for considerable improvements in tracking the progress of the project, both within the project institutional structure and by its supervisory bodies (RPSC, KMFRI and the Bank). Following the MTR, all RPSC and World Bank recommendations were also presented in a tabular format and included the timing and responsibility for each recommended action. The RMU then reported back to the supervisory bodies using these tabular recommendations to as to easily track progress over time. M&E implementation through these mechanisms however perhaps focussed too strongly at times on tracking progress in implementing project *activities and outputs*, and not sufficiently on progress in moving towards fulfilment of the project *outcomes and objectives*.

### M&E utilization

1. The data and information contained in the NMU and RMU reports proved useful in terms of related agreement by project partners about how to modify project implementation so as to better achieve progress towards project outputs, outcomes and objectives. Supervisory organisations prepared their own reports (e.g. RPSC meeting reports, World Bank Aide Memoires from implementation support missions, etc) on project progress based on the NMU/RMU reports, highlighting critical issues and recommendations. M&E information was used well in a feedback loop so as to better improve the likelihood of ultimate project success.

## Fiduciary aspects and safeguards

1. The overall rating for fiduciary aspects and safeguards is ‘Satisfactory’, given the individual ratings for the topics discussed below.

### Procurement

1. Procurement performance was moderately satisfactory. The project experienced delays in procurement, with reasons articulated in the MTR and relating to slow action by NMUs and KMFRI, by the lack of a dedicated procurement officer in the RMU, and Kenya financial management rules which were in conflict with World Bank procurement guidelines. Performance since the MTR was however markedly improved, although was not completely free of delays, and the dedicated procurement officer proposed for recruitment during the MTR was not recruited to the project before its completion, ironically due to long procurement delays.

### Disbursement

1. Disbursement was satisfactory, and was particularly impressive during the last 2 years of the project. Annex 2 provides project data on disbursement, and the tables show that overall disbursement of GEF funds was 84% by December 2012, with an expectation that 100% of funds would be disbursed by project completion at the end of March 2013. This strong performance was reflected across all 6 components, although was weakest for component 2 in terms of final project expenditure compared to the initial budgeted amounts. Expenditure data by country (see Annex 2 ) also demonstrate that all countries benefited from the project, with the hosting of regional meetings being shared, with all countries participating in activities they were interested in being part of, and with funds disbursed by the RMU benefitting all countries.
2. With respect to disbursement from i) the EAF Nansen project, ii) FAO, and iii) French funds, actual disbursements are estimated to have been i) $1.14 million by the EAF Nansen project for co-financing of the R/V Dr. *Fridtjof Nansen[[10]](#footnote-10)*, and an additional $350,000 for other activities related to fisheries management plan developments, working groups and trainings ii) $944,000 from FAO in terms of SWIOFC staff involvement and support for SWIOFP, which was more than originally planned in the project design, and iii) $2.26 million by France ($1.06 million of expenditure by FFEM, and an additional $1.2 million by IRD and IFREMER [primarily for salaries, operational costs, and research vessel lease costs]) representing around double the initial commitment.
3. There were a number of causes for delays in disbursement during the first two years of the project, which were resolved during the life of the project. A key issue affecting the slow start up of the project was the lack of sufficient funds during the design stage to recruit RMU staff before the project started. It was originally planned to fund the procurement of the RMU staff with GEF Project Preparation funds (PDF-B grant). This was not possible as all the GEF Project Preparation funds were used. Much of the first year was thus spent trying to recruit full-time RMU staff, with an acting/interim RES finally appointed until August 2009, and the process to fill all the RMU posts was held up because the Kenyan Treasury was reluctant to disburse funds to KMFRI because there was no RMU financial manager in place (one of the conditions of effectiveness was the appointment of the RES and the RFPM in the RMU before the project started). Thus the first disbursement took place almost 7 months after project effectiveness.
4. After effectiveness of the project, and as per normal practice on World Bank projects, a designated account was opened by the Treasury in Kenya. However this was contrary to the grant agreement, which specified that KMFRI (rather than the Treasury) should open the designated account on behalf of the RMU to disburse funds. It was later agreed that the Treasury would close its account, that KMFRI would open a new account, and that the project funds would be transferred from the former to the latter. The time required to clarify this issue resulted in delays in opening the KFMRI account and transferring the funds, and in the first disbursement of funds. In addition, the modality for verification of disbursements was initially for the RMU RFPM and KMFRI accounting staff to do this separately. This resulted in delays due to clarifications sought by KMFRI and back and forth remote discussions between the RFPM and KMFRI. This issue was later resolved with the RFPM and KMFRI staff jointly providing the necessary verification. Delays in disbursements were also sometimes experienced during the first two years of the project once verification had taken place, due to the necessary approvals required by the Director of KMFRI (or the acting director when he was away), and because of the availability of signatories of the main project account in KMFRI. Finally, some issues related to disbursement were that while most NMUs opened separate SWIOFP $ accounts into which the RMU cheques/transfers could be paid direct, this was not the case in Kenya and Mauritius, and resulted in delays in these two countries.

### Financial management safeguards

1. The financial safeguards associated with the project were satisfactory, and included the requirements for quarterly financial reports to be provided by the NMUs and for annual audits of all NMUs and the RMU, and periodic fiduciary assessments made by the Bank. Performance by NMUs in completing financial reports and audits and submitting them to the RMU in a timely manner was varied between countries, but improved during the project as project staff became more familiar with the requirements, as training was provided, and as the financial management guidelines were clarified and improved (see below). The individual audits completed did not result in any significant issues or concerns being identified.
2. The project used a voucher system of payment (jointly approved and authorised before payment), and record keeping was semi-automated, relying on both excel and the use of some manual ledgers. The RMU migrated to a fully automated financial management system mid-way through the project, using specific software (Solomon Dynamic Solutions) for this purpose. However country NMUs did not take up this software preferring to continue with the use of excel, although they nevertheless provided financial reports in the format required by the RMU.

### Revisions in fund allocations

1. The project adopted a flexible and adaptive approach to fund allocations which proved satisfactory. The annual budget and planning meetings enabled the project to revise fund allocations. The interactive approach to budgeting had its merits but also it disadvantages. In a positive sense it enabled the project to expand activities based on need, performance of components and NMUs, the MTR recommendations, and policy changes and direction. However, some activities got put aside because of a lack of interest or progress from those implementing them, for example the funds budgeted for grants to NGOs to address key biodiversity issues were not utilised. And a negative aspect was that there were no funds set aside to assist countries with urgent and immediate issues which were not budgeted.

### Financial management guidelines

1. The financial management guidelines were satisfactory. A Financial, Disbursement and Procurement manual should have been approved within the first six months of the start of the project but was not done so. On initiation of the project the acting RMU RFPM (from KMFRI) used the KMFRI financial management system as it was well known and familiar, and prepared a draft manual but it was never formally approved. The World Bank implementation support mission in 2010 highlighted the importance of the manual as a reference document. An updated manual was then prepared by the RPFM, discussed during a RPSC meeting, circulated to countries for comments which were incorporated, and approved by the World Bank. The manual was then used by the RMU, and as a reference document for all project member countries, on procurement and financial management practices acceptable to the World Bank under the Grant Agreement. The RMU and participating countries found the manual to be clear and useful. However, while it was seen to be complimentary and to be used in cases or financial areas not covered by their own regulations, there were sometimes difficulties for NMUs in fully understanding and integrating the requirements at the NMU/country level because the institutions had their own financial mechanisms and guidelines which were well established.

## Partnerships

The overall rating for partnerships fostered by the project is ‘Satisfactory’, based on the ratings below for the partnerships achieved by the project with different stakeholder groups outside of the project.

### Partnership with ASCLME

1. The partnership with the ASCLME project was satisfactory. Given the design of the project, it was especially important for SWIOFP to engage with the ASCLME project (as well to a lesser extent with the WIOLaB project). In terms of timing of the activities originally designed to take place in parallel, the linkages between the projects were poor because of the different speeds of progress within the projects. The combined ASCLME and SWIOFP TDA and SAP were therefore drafted before many of the relevant SWIOFP activities had been completed, and the TDA and SAP therefore rely on a smaller fisheries information base than would have been possible if the projects had moved in parallel.
2. During the first years of the project, the partnership forged between the projects was weak, with little regular contact and coordination, although SWIOFP and ASCLME jointly funded some survey cruises. However the partnership strengthened considerably over the life of the SWIOFP. For example:

* a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between the SWIOFP and the ASCLME project in 2011 to better foster the partnership;
* in light of the need to ensure continued coordination between the projects, a Stock Taking meeting was organised in Nairobi in March 2010, which had the overall objective of providing a platform for discussion of the roadmap towards the development and implementation of a synergistic GEF programme for the WIO region based on the principles of ecosystem-based management
* the SWIOFP and ASCLME project also jointly collaborated on a Governance study looking at nested systems of governance across vertical and horizontal scales for planning and decision-making at national and regional level for improved LME management;
* ASCLME funded a series of ‘science to governance’ meetings aimed at ensuring that scientific outputs are turned into improved governance, and these meetings involved SWIOFP staff;.
* While the ASCLME project had the overall mandate for the single TDA and SAP, the SWIOFP funded most of the activities involved in preparing the SAP up to project completion in March 2013, and it is intended the ASCLME project (which has been extended up until the summer of 2013) will take responsibility for pushing through the formal adoption of the SAP by countries in the region; and
* Project completion dates for the projects were better aligned in the latter stages of both projects to enable a joint SAP to be prepared.

### Partnerships with other projects, donors and international organisations

1. The linkages and partnerships forged by the SWIOFP with other donors, projects, and international organisations were satisfactory. The partnership between the project and the SWIOFC was particularly good, and important. SWIOFP RPSC and SWIOFC meetings were held back-to-back given that the RPSC was an *ad hoc* committee of the SWIOFC, and this arrangement worked well. Given the potential role of SWIOFC in future management issues, this linkage was particularly critical for sustainability of the project. The project also forged good partnerships more widely: a MoU was signed by the project with the EAF Nansen project, and the project invited relevant parties e.g. the RAC Coordinator of the African Union Commission, the EAF NANSEN project coordinator, Indian Ocean Commission (IOC/COI) representatives, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) Executive Secretary, to the RPSC meetings. Other communication has taken place with: the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD); the Southern African Development Community (SADC); and the West Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA). Towards the end of the project, particular efforts were made to partner with other ongoing donor projects e.g. the WWF Coastal East Africa Initiative, and the EU-funded Smartfish project implemented through the IOC, so as to ensure sustainability of SWIOFP-supported activities and outcomes.

### Partnerships with government

1. The linkages fostered by the project with government through the NMU’s were satisfactory. This was to a large extent due to the fact that NMU staff were staff from government fisheries institutions. Partnerships have thus been created at both the national level, and at the regional level between government implementing institutions. Partnerships by the project with high level of government policy makers was less satisfactory; while it was intended that Permanent Secretaries and other high level government staff should attend the RPSC meetings, this was not always the case, and the project implementing institutions could have been more pro-active generally in ensuring that the progress and successes of the project were communicated to high-level government officials.

### Partnerships with NGOs and local stakeholders

1. Partnerships formed by the project with civil society and other local level stakeholders were only moderately satisfactory. To some extent this was understandable and intended in the design of the project given the science-based nature of the project, and any follow-up projects would be expected to foster greater partnerships with local level stakeholders. However, the project could have done more to link with NGOs and the local private sector stakeholders. In some cases the failure to do so had a serious negative impact on the project e.g. a failure to complete sensitisation of fishermen to the introduction of FADs led to their vandalism in some countries. Many countries failed to hold national NMU/stakeholder meetings which had been envisaged as a way of fostering partnerships and disseminating information. And some grant monies which were available for use by NGOs was not utilised for the purpose within the project and then reallocated. However on a more positive note some countries (e.g. Tanzania) and components (e.g. component 5) did have some success in involving NGOs in the project. Another notable way the project created partnerships was through the funding of MSC students to work on project activities through universities in the region. And the development of the national fisheries management plans also helped to bring a number of stakeholders together and to improve linkages (although it happened late in the project).

## Institutional arrangements and their functioning

The overall rating for the institutional arrangements for the project and their functioning is ‘Satisfactory’, based on the individual ratings provided for the issues and different institutional structures discussed below in sections 3.6.1 to 3.6.8.

### Decision-making and administrative guidance documents

1. Decision-making processes are rated as satisfactory, The main decision-making mechanism used by the project was one where annual budgets and plans for the next year were prepared during six Regional Component Working Group (RCWG) meetings, one for each component, during which RCCs and NCCs agreed on component activities (based on guidance from the both the PIM, the RES and the RPFM). The RFPM then compiled the budgets from all 6 components into one overall budget for the coming year for submission to the RPSC. This process allowed for good participation in decision-making processes, as well as flexibility in the project’s implementation so as to react to the relative needs of the project each year and the performance of different NMUs, components, and activities.
2. The administrative guidance documents are rated as moderately satisfactory. A project communication strategy would have been useful to have been included in the PAD. Some M&E reporting formats contained in the PIM were not provided in the initial PIM, there was a lack of clarity/specification over how joint cruises should be paid for, and other concerns about the PIM have been discussed above in relation to monitoring and evaluation (see Section 3.3.1). However subsequent revisions to the PIM during the project incorporated various changes to increase its usefulness and to ensure that the MTR recommendations were reflected. Country NMUs generally felt that the PIM was a useful guidance document for them in implementing the project. Comment on the Financial, Disbursement and Procurement manual has already been provided in Section 3.4.5 above.

### RPSC oversight

1. Oversight provided by the RPSC was moderately satisfactory. The RPSC meetings were not frequent enough in the early stages of the project, even though progress was slow and critical problems were emerging at the time. In addition, members of the RPSC should have been be high-level political appointees (as distinct from those involved in implementation of the project itself), with the same individuals attending successive meetings so as to ensure that the Committee’s composition was able and empowered to take the critical decisions needed, with participants being fully aware of the historical evolution of the project and the discussion and recommendations of the previous meetings. While Permanent Secretaries were invited to sit as members of the RPSC they did not always attend (and in hindsight it was perhaps unrealistic to expect them to do so), instead nominating people lower down in the institutional hierarchy to sit in their place. This meant that in some cases those individuals part of the budget and work planning meetings that took place prior to the RPSC, then sat on the RPSC with the responsibility for approving their own proposals. Following a recommendation of the MTR, invitations to the RPSC were sent by the SWIOFC rather than by the RMU, and this resulted in some improvements with regards to those attending the RPSC in the latter stages of the project. However, despite these criticisms, some members of the RPSC were regular attendees, some useful guidance and advice was provided by the RPSC at critical stages of the project, and the RPSC fulfilled its role in approving the workplans and budgets for the project.

### Bank oversight

1. Beneficiary countries report the oversight provided by the Bank as having been satisfactory. The Bank Task Team Leaders (TTLs) were communicative with NMU and RMU staff, and struck an appropriate balance in terms of being supportive of the project’s progress while asking necessarily probing/challenging questions designed to improve implementation performance. Bank staff completed implementation support missions every six months, with associated Aide Memoires being prepared. These missions generally, but not always, consisted of regional visits/meetings by the TTL to coincide with the RPSC meetings, and parallel fiduciary assessments in Kenya by a Bank financial management specialist and a Procurement Specialist. Procurement plan reviews and financial management supervision reviews were also produced regularly.
2. Specific training was provided to all country teams in Kenya by Bank staff on financial management in the first year or so of the project, although training was in English, and therefore relatively difficult for the French speakers involved with the project. Consequently, in the subsequent years (relatively late in the project life) those from Madagascar and Comoros participated in another procurement and/or financial training organized by the Bank in Comoros. The Bank’s financial management specialists also supported/provided on-the-job training on financial management, procurement and disbursement for the RMU. Specific support was also provided by the Bank’s procurement team in Madagascar and Comoros.
3. In addition, the TTLs visited project countries frequently over the duration of the project while engaged with other Bank activities in the region, and used these opportunities to provide additional ad hoc supervision and support to the SWIOFP.

### Participating countries’ co-financing contributions

1. Co-financing performance is rated as satisfactory. Based on information collected during the MTR for some countries, and updated towards the end of the project for all countries, an estimate has been made of the co-financing provided by the countries participating in the project (excluding France). Co-financing was $6.1 million over the duration of the project, and was comprised primarily of the costs of staff time spent working on SWIOFP activities (89% of the total), with NCC salaries being paid by participating countries not by the GEF monies provided for the project. Other co-financing costs involved recurrent expenses related to office space and running costs (e.g. electricity, consumables, petrol, etc), and some development costs in the form of depreciation on assets used for the project and other investment costs associated with the implementing institutions concerned which were attributed to the project. The data in the table below compare to a figure in the original project design of $6.68 million[[11]](#footnote-11), and demonstrate that 91% of the intended co-financing was provided. Individual country contributions are provided in Annex 2.

Table : Co-financing from countries participating in the project

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries** | **Recurrent / Operational** | **Development (works, goods, services)** | **Total** |
| 2008/09 | $1,049,892 | $77,888 | $118,667 | $1,246,447 |
| 2009/10 | $1,191,901 | $104,113 | $123,000 | $1,419,014 |
| 2010/11 | $1,167,734 | $123,190 | $122,500 | $1,413,424 |
| 2011/12 | $1,118,266 | $149,401 | $191,000 | $1,458,667 |
| 2012/13 | $898,075 | $135,986 | $146,150 | $1,180,210 |
| TOTAL | $5,425,867 | $305,191 | $364,167 | $6,095,225 |

Source: NMUs

### KMFRI performance

1. KMFRI performance is rated as moderately satisfactory. KMFRI played an important role in the project, empowered through a subsidiary agreement with the Government of the Republic of Kenya (signed 24th April 2008) to ‘supervise the smooth operations of the project with the assistance of the RMU, hosted by KMFRI’. The special account for the project was under the responsibility of KMFRI rather than central government, and KMFRI was responsible for ensuring due diligence in both procurement and disbursement of funds, and for providing overall supervision of the RMU.
2. Some problems and poor performance at the beginning of the project with regards to the speed of approvals for procurement and disbursement, the working relationship between KMFRI and RMU, and internal staffing issues within KMFRI which had an impact on the project, all improved markedly over the course of the project, although were not always totally resolved. Another problem encountered related to the KMFRI server which was periodically either offline, or functioned slowly due to bandwidth issues.
3. On a more positive note it should be appreciated that the time commitments and support provided by KMFRI were significant, but not charged to the project. KMFRI provided around 19 staff working to varying degrees on SWIOFP, either as part of the NMU or in a supporting role to the RMU (through the provision of staff in the RMU and the use of other KMFRI staff in supporting RMU activities such as procurement). KMFRI also provided office space and covered recurrent cost items for the RMU and the NMU in the KMFRI offices in Mombasa.

### RMU performance

1. RMU performance is rated as satisfactory, but can be divided into two distinct phases, the first 18 months of the project when performance was unsatisfactory, and the latter period of the project when performance was highly satisfactory.
2. Slow recruitment of RMU staff and the fact that a fully functioning RMU was not put in place prior to the start of the project, was a major cause of the slow start up of the project, and for the failure of the project to progress as planned in the project design documents. An administrative assistant (bi-lingual) was recruited October 2008, with an acting/interim RES appointed until August 2009. However, the full complement of the final RMU staff was only completed with the recruitment of the current RES in August 2009, the RFPM in May 2009, the Ship’s Logistics Coordinator in November 2010, and the Information Technology and Communication Manager in July 2010.
3. However beneficiary countries report that once all staff were in place, performance by the RMU was highly satisfactory, in terms of its responsiveness, flexibility, participatory approach, efforts to forge linkages outwith the project management structure, and creativity in facilitating project implementation. The RMU was also proactive in addressing languages issues: key project documents were translated into French; preference was generally given to polyglot experts for project implementation where possible; and simultaneous interpretation took place during the annual workplan and RPSC meetings.

### NMU and NCC performance

1. NMU and NCC performance is rated as moderately satisfactory. Performance of the different NMUs and NCCs was variable based on different capabilities and willingness to fully engage with project activities given the constraints of having other regular functions/jobs to complete. Participation and the quality of NMU inputs/outputs was constrained by: the inability under Bank rules for the project to pay any additional monies to staff for project activities on top of existing responsibilities which meant that there was no strong incentive to prioritise SWIOFP activities over other activities; the location in some countries of NMU staff in different locations, meaning that there was less cohesion in these ‘virtual’ NMUs than in countries where all staff were located in one institution; turnover and replacement of NCCs; and delays in procurement and disbursement. Performance could have been better with clearer specification by the implementing institutions about the allocation of staff time to the project, and more pro-active participation rather than being re-active to requests/demands by the RMU. However, NMU and NCC performance in terms of both engagement and the quality of activities improved significantly over the course of the project, and the project resulted in a mutually supporting mechanism whereby NMU/NCC capacity was strengthened by/during project activities, which then resulted in improved project implementation performance. By the end of the project NMUs/NCCs were engaging well with the project, and had a real sense of ownership and an appreciation of the positive impacts which the project had managed to achieve - the slow start to the project prevented this good performance from being realised earlier in the project, and represented a missed opportunity. Turnover of NCC staff, a problem at the beginning of the project, also improved over time.

### RCC and RCWG performance

1. RCC and RCWG performance is rated as moderately satisfactory. The project design intended for the RCCs to play a critical role in driving the implementation progress of the project. However performance was mixed in terms of both capacities and engagement, with resulting impacts on the implementation progress of different components. To some extent, performance of the RCCs was hampered for the same reasons discussed above e.g. no additional financial benefit for taking on SWIOFP responsibilities, and some unavoidable turnover of RCC staff. Additional problems related to RCCs not spending sufficient time travelling to project countries to work with NCCs, not following up NMU/NCC activities sufficiently, and not sufficiently engaging with and briefing NCCs prior to budget and planning meetings which reduced the ability of NCCs to actively participate in RCWG meetings. The knock-on impact of that, at least in the first years of the project, was that some RCWGs proposed activities that were either not supportable given the project budget, or which didn’t link well with and support the project outcomes and objectives.

## Sustainability / risk to project outcomes

### Steps taken to ensure sustainability

1. Key outcomes of the SWIOFP have included strengthening of institutional and human capacity, fostering a regional identity, development of regional protocols and standards (e.g. for cruises, management plans), and establishing regional networks which were not present before the project started. These outcomes will themselves serve to support the sustainability of other project outcomes. Of particular note is that staff working on the project were staff from, and embedded in, the implementing institutions, rather than being consultants brought in to implement the project. On completion of the project, stakeholders in the region feel confident that staff will remain in these institutions, and that the capacity and networks built by the project, and not previously in existence, will remain.
2. A critical issue however is both to get the SAP formally adopted by all countries as this was not possible during the project, and then to agree on the institutional mechanisms to take the SAP and management plans forward. The project agreed with the ASCLME project before its completion in March 2013 that during the extension of the ASCLME project until the summer of 2013, the ASCLME project would take over responsibility for ensuring that the SAP was formally adopted. With respect to longer term sustainability, the project design documentation was ambiguous as to whether SWIOPF should support the establishment of a new regional management organisation, or whether SWIOFC should play the key regional fisheries management role. The establishment of some new overarching institutional structure to manage the large marine ecosystem, or indeed a new organisation with a fisheries-specific mandate, would be a mistake given the presence of existing institutions in the form of the Nairobi Convention (mandate for regional seas and environmental issues) and SWIOFC (mandate for fisheries issues). While the SWIOFC is currently only an advisory body, a review of the Commission undertaken by the project towards the end of the project considered whether it should be granted decision-making powers – a decision/agreement that would have to be reached by the countries involved - and the project’s working assumption towards its completion has been that the SWIOFC would act as the key institutional mechanism to ensure sustainability of SWIOFP outcomes. It was also recognized by the project that a coordination mechanism is needed between the Nairobi Convention and the SWIOFC. SWIOFP therefore considered whether a proposed ‘West Indian Ocean Sustainable Ecosystem Alliance’ would be the appropriate mechanism for such coordination in the future. The intention is for this alliance, which would be a partnership between countries, funders, and relevant institutions such as SWIOFC and the Nairobi Convention, to be a sustainability platform for implementation of the combined WIOLaB, ASCLME and SWIOFP SAP. Other possibilities explored towards the end of the project were the potential for the IOC/COI to act as a regional body for the coordination of donor activity in the region.
3. At the national level, many NMUs took specific steps towards the end of the project to ensure sustainability of project activities and outcomes. In some countries (e.g. South Africa) funding for observer programmes was identified from alternative sources, in almost all countries MSc students funded by the project to complete project-related activities were/will be absorbed within the implementing institutions or other related national organisations, and many of the scientists in the NMUs involved with the project will continue to use project outputs to prepare and publish scientific papers after the project’s completion which will help to disseminate and sustain the knowledge acquired during the project. Some countries (e.g. Seychelles, Comoros, Mauritius) have also committed to continuing with the maintenance and deployment of FADs, and the Mauritius government budget for 2013 includes funding for implementation of the fisheries management plan prepared with support from SWIOFP.
4. At a more regional level, while the project had no formally documented exit strategy, it (and the Bank) was active during its closing months in completing a number of activities designed to ensure sustainability. These included:

* Specification of the SAP itself, although this started rather late in the project;
* Specific consideration at a regional project meeting in Maputo in Dec 2012 of sustainability issues and of the potential use of remaining project monies on activities to support sustainability;
* Coordination with a second phase of the EAF Nansen project to help countries implement the management plans developed by the SWIOFP;
* Liaison with the EU-funded Smartfish project about supporting and picking up relevant SWIOFP activities e.g. observers, management plans;
* Getting agreement from the SWIOFC scientific committee to take up and publish the retrospective analysis and component reports through FAO;
* Working with the Bank during a number of meetings (e.g. in Mauritius mid-2012, and in Maputo, December 2012) to develop a second-phase project (to be called SWIOFish). The Bank also provided $1.1 mn of grant funding to be channelled through the IOC/COI and the SWIOFC, to cover the time gap between the end of the SWIOFP and the commencement of the proposed SWIOFish project);
* Holding discussions with IOC/COI and IOTC about observer deployment and a regional observer scheme to assist countries (in the proposed second phase of the project);
* Having discussions with countries in the region about continuing their support for turtle satellite tagging (and payment of data transmission fees);
* Reaching agreement with KMFRI that it would to continue to host the regional databases and that Seychelles would host a backup server of all the data;
* Upgrading the information contained on the project website to ensure that all useful and relevant information generated by, and about the project, could remain and be easily accessible; and
* Hosting a donor conference to market the project’s outputs and to generate interest in supporting follow-up activities or issues which would support sustainability.

### Sustainability risks

1. Risks to sustainability of the project’s activities remain despite the mitigating strategies and activities discussed above, and the overall sustainability risk is rated as ‘Moderate’.
2. Perhaps the key risk to sustainability is the availability of finance. Many SWIOFP-funded activities were project-type activities that are not likely to be budgeted into national government budgets in the immediate future. This in turn means that their continuation will rely on individual stakeholder motivation, but more importantly on future donor projects. The reliance on future donor projects is of some concern, however it should also be recognised that the project design always intended for the SWIOFP to be the first of a series of GEF-funded projects aimed at improved management of the LME, rather than it being possible for sustainable improvements in LME management to be dependent solely on one five-year project. Certainly without future support in the region in the form of a new Bank/GEF SCIOfish project, or from other donor projects such as the Smartfish project and the EAF Nansen project, sustainability risks would be significant. However these projects are expected to materialise and to build on SWIOFP activities, thereby reducing the sustainability risks that might otherwise occur.
3. Key risks to project sustainability due to a lack of political, staffing or financial commitments, and which to some extent remain even with future donor projects, are (in no order of importance):

* A failure to successfully implement the management plans and the SAP developed;
* A failure to maintain usage of regionally standardized observer data collection tools developed by the SWIOFP (forms, manuals and database);
* A failure to continue to support necessary efforts for the development/implementation of national/regional observer programs;
* A decline in the regional network of collaboration at the scientific level;
* A failure to maintain FADs;
* Cessation of tagging initiatives;
* A decline in surveys due to their high costs;
* SWIOFP databases not being used to their full potential and data updates not being provided;
* A failure to continue with the necessary strengthening of the SWIOFC; and
* A failure to think and act regionally i.e. a focus and prioritisation of national priorities at the expense of regional action.

# Project Outcomes

1. This section of the ICR reports on the project outcomes. A summary of the ratings provided for different factors (using the methodology described in Section 1) is provided in the table below, with subsequent text providing the justification for each rating. Full details on the ratings provided by individual country NMUs, the RMU, KMFRI, SWIOFC, and the ICR consultant, are provided in Annex 8.

Table : Summary table of ratings for project outcomes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project outcomes** | **Section in ICR** | **Rating** |
| Relevance of objectives | 4.1 | Satisfactory |
| Achievement of the global project objective | 4.2 | Moderately satisfactory |
| Achievement of the project development objectives | 4.3 | Satisfactory |
| Efficiency | 4.4 | Moderately satisfactory |
| **Overall rating of project outcomes** |  | Moderately satisfactory |

## Relevance of Objectives

1. The relevance of the project objectives is rated as ‘Satisfactory’.
2. The project objectives were highly relevant to the needs of both individual beneficiary countries, and the region as a whole. The main focus of the project objectives on improved management through building capacity, filling research gaps, and promoting regional networks and collaboration, were strongly supported by stakeholders. While the project objectives were specified some years before project completion, there were no government and/or policy changes in any of the countries which made the objectives any less relevant at completion than they were when the design took place. If anything the objectives became more relevant over time, as policy in many countries became increasingly focussed on the ecosystems-based approach to fisheries, and on regional collaboration.
3. The project objectives were also highly relevant to the Bank’s assistance strategy given the potential long-term impacts on beneficiaries in low income countries. Furthermore, the objectives were relevant for all the main funders of the project, with the project objectives having high relevance: for GEF in terms of its International Waters (OP8) and Biodiversity (OP2) focal areas; for FAO given their advocacy and support for an ecosystems-based approach to fisheries management; and for both the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the French Global Environment Fund given their focus on capacity development and sustainable management of resources.

## Achievement of Global Project Objective

1. The global project objective was “To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)”. There were three indicators to measure the success in achieving the objective, and comment on how satisfactory the project was in achieving the global objective is provided separately for each indicator, along with a rating. The overall performance in achieving the objective was ‘Moderately Satisfactory’.
2. *Indicator 1: Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC.* Performance in achieving this indicator was only moderately satisfactory, and proved problematic for the project given that the project itself demonstrated that there are few truly shared non-tuna fish stocks in the region. Nevertheless, the project did manage to progress the development of a regionally harmonised strategy for ecosystems-based management in the region in the sense that it was directly responsible for developing capacity in the ecosystems-based approach to fisheries (EAF) in association with the EAF Nansen project, *drafting and* *developing* a SAP, and ensuring that the SWIOFC has the EAF as an integral part of its objective. The SAP was not formally *adopted* during the project however, although as noted earlier the project made arrangements during its final months for the ASCLME project (which was extended by 6 months) to take over responsibility for its adoption. Achievement of this indicator within the lifespan of the project proved a challenge, particularly given the slow start to the project, but it was also recognised during the project that a second phase of the project would be critical in fully realising and cementing the strategy within regional fisheries management bodies. The project thus partly achieved the indicator, and laid a strong basis for it to be achieved in the coming years.
3. *Indicator 2: Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem .*Performance in achieving this indicator was moderately satisfactory. For this indicator the project also partially, but not completely, achieved the indicator, although good groundwork was laid for the future. Part of the SAP was submitted to the 6th Session of the SWIOFC along with a suite of ecosystems-based monitoring and evaluation indicators. However given the frequency/timing of the Commission’s Scientific Committee meetings, which needed to examine the indicators and make recommendations to the Commission about their adoption, and the need for the Commission itself to then approve the indicators, the full monitoring and evaluation framework was not formally adopted by the Commission during the project. It should also be noted however that many of the indicators proposed for regional monitoring and evaluation of ecosystem’s health, were incorporated into the national fisheries management plans developed by the project.
4. *Indicator 3: Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic).* Performance in achieving this indicator was moderately satisfactory. As with indicator 1, this indicator was flawed because the project design didn’t know the extent of transboundary stocks, and because developing and agreeing on joint management plans takes years and also requires institutional changes in the region. Within the timeframe of the project this was unrealistic. It was thus not possible to develop truly sub-regional management plans covering many countries. However due to slow progress in completing the cruises and the related analysis to determine the extent of shared stocks between neighbouring countries, the project also failed to make progress in developing any transboundary management plans involving two countries which might have been developed during the project if implementation progress has been better. However, regional exchanges did take place in the context of the national management plans developed e.g. between Comoros and Madagascar for their demersal fisheries management plans and similarly for Kenya and Tanzania on their small pelagic management plans. In addition, it is noteworthy that the national management plans developed, while reflecting the needs of different fisheries and countries, where to a large extent harmonised in terms of their content, scope, and style. This laid the groundwork for improved regional management post project. The project also completed work to specify and clarify the legal framework/status for shared management in the region; as part of the review of legislation in the region, a draft joint management framework agreement was prepared should countries start thinking of jointly managing resources.

## Achievement of Project Development Objectives

1. Overall performance in achieving the four PDOs (see Section 2.3) and the four associated indicators is rated as ‘Satisfactory’.
2. *Indicator 1: Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each participating country by the end of the Project.* Performance in achieving this PDO/indicator was satisfactory. The cruises completed by the project helped to determine existing fishing pressure on many stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences, and along with the retrospective analysis and component reports completed by the project underpinned national management plans that were developed by all countries during the project (see Annex 4 for a full list of management plans). However, many of the cruises were completed late in the project, and the related cruise reports were also often slow in being produced, which reduced their usefulness for the management plans (see text below on efficiency for more discussion on this point) within the timeframe of the project (but not beyond since the plans are to be revised and updated periodically as new information comes to light).
3. *Indicator 2: A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project.* Performance in achieving this PDO/indicator was satisfactory. A regional fisheries database (STATBASE) was fully operational by the end of the project and included data from the retrospective analyses completed. However it is also noted that its contribution to regional management plans was limited for the reasons mentioned above about the lack of many truly shared fish stocks.
4. *Indicator 3: Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project.* Performance in achieving this PDO/indicator was satisfactory. The baseline assessment was completed through the gap analyses, the retrospective analyses, and through the cruises and subsequent assessment of cruise data. Moreover, the project supported SWIOFC in defining the status of all the major fish stocks in the region though the assessments completed in the working groups and the Commission’s scientific committee.
5. *Indicator 4: Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.* Performance in achieving this PDO/indicator was satisfactory. PDO 3 was to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the SWIOFC and other relevant regional bodies, while PDO 4 was intended to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations, promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources at the regional level. Component 5 addressed some important biodiversity and ecosystems issues, although it could have been better funded and implemented. And while it is difficult to quantitatively measure the extent of mainstreaming, ecosystems-based management is now better reflected in national policy as reflected in the management plans developed by the project, and at the regional level as already noted the EAF and biodiversity is now core to the SWIOFC’s approach and objectives; the SWIOFC adopted a recommendation by EAF Nansen project that all countries should adopt biodiversity and ecosystems issues. However, SWIOFC remains an organisation in need of considerable strengthening, and it was for this reason that the project completed work towards its completion to review the SWIOFC and consider ways of improving its effectiveness, such as a more formal and obligatory protocol with the Commission having real management responsibilities and powers.

## Other outcomes and impacts

1. None of the indicators discussed above for the PDOs were well matched with the second PDO ‘to develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities’. The project performance in developing such capacity was particularly satisfactory, with many training opportunities provided by the project, and with an extensive programme of funding for MSc students (see Annex 4 for a list of MSc student topics by component and country). Indeed many project participants felt that institutional and human capacity developments, and regional networking, brought about by the project, were critically important outcomes of the project.
2. The EAF incorporated into the national management plans, and the suite of ecosystems-based indicators submitted to the SWIOFC for adoption, should help to ensure in the longer-term that there are positive outcomes in terms of poverty, food security, and social impacts, although such outcomes have not been realised during the lifespan of the project given management plans and indicators were only specified and agreed towards the end of the project, and not implemented during it.
3. It is also noted that the project had a positive impact on gender in terms of human capacity development, given that of the 100 or so staff involved with the project in the RMU and NMUs, around 30% were women.

## Efficiency

1. An assessment of efficiency considers whether the costs involved in achieving project objectives were reasonable in comparison with the benefits[[12]](#footnote-12). Performance in project efficiency is rated as ‘Moderately Satisfactory’.
2. On a positive note, examples of good efficiency included:

* Most staff time used on the project was provided by staff under existing government contracts, which meant no direct costs to the project for such inputs in terms of salaries. And given the relatively low cost of salaries co-financed by governments from participating countries compared to consultants which might otherwise have been used to implement the project, this represented enormous efficiency benefits by the project;
* Contracted inputs to the project which were used in terms of training and consultancy were generally provided from within the region at a lower cost than would have been incurred using consultants/institutions from further afield. The sparse use of more expensive consultancy inputs for some specialist inputs was justified given the skill requirements associated with the activities and the requirements for delivery under tight timeframes;
* Project activities e.g. the development of cruise protocols, often generated significant efficiencies because of their use across many countries;
* Project meetings were generally held back to back where at all possible so as to reduce travel costs e.g. combining of annual work plan, progress report, budget, and RPSC meetings;
* A high proportion of cruises were conducted using ‘wet lease’ vessels rather than the R/V Dr. *Fridtjof Nansen*, at lower daily rates than would have been the case if the Nansen had been used.
* Low cost solutions/locations were typically selected for project meetings; and
* The MSc programme was an efficient way to achieve two objectives at the same time and at a relatively low cost: to analyse SWIOFP research data and contribute to scientific outputs, and to contribute to capacity building.

1. However, there were also a number of areas where project monies were not spent efficiently in terms of the resulting outcomes. This was largely the result of the capacity of the countries to absorb and use funds within the limited timeframe based on a proper planning of the activities, and an assessment of the consequences. Some resulting examples of inefficiencies were:

* Expenditure on FADs was not sufficiently underpinned by detailed sensitization of the private sector and planning for maintenance. This resulted in a number of countries of FADs being vandalised or lost soon after deployment
* Cruises (see Annex 5) absorbed a very significant percentage of the overall project budget. However many were completed late in the project and trip and cruise reports were often slow to be produced, in both cases reducing their usefulness in supporting the development of management plans (at least during the lifespan of the project). There were delays in completing the cruises[[13]](#footnote-13), and some cruises took place during times of the year when the weather[[14]](#footnote-14) or fish behaviour meant that the resulting usefulness of the cruise results was significantly reduced. Some cruises (e.g. in Tanzania) were not regional in nature but used Kenyan wet lease vessels which significantly increased steaming time/costs with no scientific benefit;
* The observer programme was not implemented efficiently with training of observers completed in 2010 at considerable cost. However there are few national industrial vessels operating in the region, the amount of work required to set up an observer programme was underestimated, there was insufficient political will to deploy observers and institutional support for the change that was required, and training was completed without a clear idea about how observers would then be deployed. By the end of the project there was no regional observer programme in place which could use those observers trained. However it should also be noted that the expenditure on observers was not totally wasted given that observer schemes are increasingly a requirement of regional management bodies and the EAF approach to fisheries, and are also becoming a requirement of countries’ fisheries management plans. The project therefore requested SWIOFC to monitor progress post-project, and also funded a meeting towards the end of the project to examine a regional strategy for observers and how to address the huge disparities in terms of observer capacity and know-how between countries in the region;
* The Solomon financial management system for financial reporting was developed by the project, but there was little willingness by countries participating in the project to use it, accountants in countries changed, and countries preferred to use excel; and
* Trainings were in some case provided to people nominated by participating countries who were not the most suitable people to be trained, and in others training was provided to people who then left the project.

## Conclusion

1. As noted at the beginning of this Section, the overall rating for project outcomes is moderately satisfactory, when considering: the relevance of the project objectives; the extent to which the global objective, the four PDOs, and their related indicators were achieved; and the efficiency of the project’s implementation. The project certainly generated considerable outcomes in the region, and contributed significantly to the intended objectives. However, in many cases success in achieving the objectives and indicators was only partial, with the project having made some progress and having laid the groundwork for the objectives to be realised, but with full realisation of the objectives only likely after the lifespan of the project and with additional follow up and action necessary by donors and stakeholders. The slow start of the project and poor implementation performance in the first 18 months meant that the project was thereafter trying to catch-up, and this had a negative impact on the project’s ability to achieve its objectives, and on project efficiency.

# Lessons learned

Drawing on the descriptions and analysis in earlier sections of the operation’s design, implementation, and outcome, and on the assessments of Bank, participating countries, and stakeholder performances, this section briefly presents the most significant positive and negative lessons learned from the project’s experience. All of the lessons learned discussed below are considered to have wider replicability for future projects both within the region and further afield.

## Lessons Learned about the project design

1. Lessons learned from the project design are that:

* A truly participatory design process helps to ensure stakeholder buy-in to the project, relevance of the project, appropriate institutional mechanisms for implementation, and suitable levels of complexity;
* It is easy to specify overly-ambitious objectives given the timeframe allocated for a project – the SWIOFP could have benefitted from at least one more year for its implementation given the objectives specified;
* Having a functioning and fully staffed regional/core management unit from day one of a project is critical for projects in achieving their intended objectives. If there any concerns that this may not be the case, then projects should build-in additional time for implementation and not assume that activities will commence immediately/rapidly following grant agreement signature. A failure of the SWIOFP to have the RMU in place from the beginning of the project had a significant negative impact on the project that, even with good RMU performance in later years, was hard to recover from;
* Careful thought should be given to the amount of monies allocated to different activities, so as to ensure that the project is able to fully benefit from them in achieving project objectives. In the case of the SWIOFP, considerable funds were spent on cruises, with the project ultimately unable to use many of the outputs in a meaningful/timely manner to support the project’s main objectives (although benefits from the cruises are expected to be realised post-project);
* Linking fisheries management projects in their design with regional bodies (as was the case with SWIOFP linkages with SWIOFC) can provide significant benefits during later project implementation, as well as contributing to project sustainability post project completion;
* Involving large numbers of countries (and languages) greatly increases the complexity and challenges for successful implementation, but can result in very significant benefits in terms of regional collaboration, networking, and capacity development of institutions and individuals that may not have existed before. This was certainly the case for the SWIOFP;
* A regional project such as the SWIOFP which is designed to be implemented primarily by government staff (without additional financial incentives being provided) is likely to progress more slowly than one implemented largely by consultants. However, it may also provide good value for money, and provide more lasting and sustainable improvements due to the greater stakeholder buy-in and involvement that result from such an approach. A project design such as for the SWIOFP can ensure that ownership of data and research remains within, and is shared within, the region. However it is imperative if such an approach is used, for suitably qualified and motivated individuals to be nominated by participating governments;
* A suitably staffed regional management unit is critical for large regional projects such as SWIOFP. SWIOFPs implementation and the realisation of outcomes would have been greatly enhanced if the RMU had been staffed with one or two additional technical staff to support the RCCs, NMUs and NCCs;
* Using existing institutional structures within a project to pass science information to national and regional fisheries managers (as was the case for SWIOFP with the use of government research institutions completing much of the work and feeding information to fisheries departments and Ministries) provides a strong science/policy linkage;
* Project designs which link projects and assume their parallel implementation can be risky. The programmatic approach taken to the SWIOFP, the ASCLME and the WIOLaB projects, with three different implementing agencies, and ultimately differing timeframes for implementation, created varying degrees of difficulties for all three projects given the intended integration of many activities, outputs and outcomes; and
* A strong focus on activities related to marine science is important in underpinning the achievement of higher level objectives focussing on sustainable fisheries and ecosystems-based management.

## Lessons learned about project implementation

1. Lessons learned from the project’s implementation are that:

* Good partnerships with other projects, donors and institutions (such as those fostered by the SWIOFP), are critically important in ensuring success in project implementation, and ultimately in achieving project objectives;
* Well designed and implemented M&E systems, with clearly defined reporting requirements, logframe and indicators, are invaluable in ensuring successful project implementation, and in identifying and correcting project deficiencies as they occur. The SWIOFP experience was positive in this regard, with the M&E system serving project implementation well;
* Oversight bodies or steering committees for projects must be suitably rigourous and critical in their guidance of project activities, and their composition must be of people not involved directly with project implementation. This was not always the case for the SWIOFP RPSC during the early years of the project (although was rectified post MTR), and resulted in some cases in a failure to provide the necessary guidance needed for the project;
* Mid-Term Reviews must take place at the appropriate stage during a project’s lifespan, with clear recommendations and agreed actions provided (with assigned responsibilities and timeframes). In the case of the SWIOFP, successful completion of the agreed actions made a positive difference to many aspects of project implementation;
* NCCs and RCCs were not always as engaged with the project to the extent they might have been, largely due to the Bank rules prohibiting additional payments from being made to government staff. Creative solutions to this problem, while not infringing Bank rules, should be sought during future projects to better incentivise government staff participation, and implementing institutions must complete proper staff time management to ensure that staff are available for project activities. High turnover of project staff (as was the case for NCCs during the early stages of the project) can also negatively impact on performance;
* It is unlikely that any project can ever be implemented exactly as was expected during its design. Implementing institutions must therefore be flexible and adaptive, as SWIOFP was, so as to find solutions to problems that arise (e.g. piracy and the use of wet lease vessels rather than the R/V Dr. *Fridtjof Nansen*) and to adapt project budgets to needs (e.g. through the use of budget and work planning meetings). Timeframes for project implementation should be generous enough to allow for unplanned events; and
* Procurement processes, if slow or unresponsive to the demands of the project’s participants, can greatly de-motivate project staff and cause problems for implementation progress. SWIOFP procurement problems were largely resolved as the project proceeded, but could have been better in the early stages of the project.

## Lessons learned about project outcomes

1. Lessons learned with respect to project outcomes are that:

* A strong emphasis by donors, project management units, and project beneficiaries on disbursement can have a negative impact on efficiency. In the case of the SWIOFP, the project was very successful at disbursing funds, but could have done more to ensure that such funds were spent wisely in achieving project outcomes and objectives. In some cases funds were spent without sufficient thought taking place about the resulting impacts/outcomes;
* The SWIOFP’s success in achieving the objectives and indicators was only partial (despite the accrued progress in other areas), with the project having made some progress and having laid the groundwork for the objectives to be realised. However full realisation of the objectives is only likely after the lifespan of the project and with additional follow up and action necessary by donors, stakeholders, and particularly by the SWIOFC (which will provide a critical role in ensuring sustainability given the linkages established between the project and the Commission). Ensuring that projects ‘hit the ground running’ (not the case for the SWIOFP and perhaps the main reason why objectives were not fully achieved) is critical in ultimately achieving their stated objectives; and
* Having project outcomes that are highly relevant to the needs of project stakeholders/participants, as was the case for SWIOFP, is likely to result in strong stakeholder support for the project, and increase the likelihood of stakeholder buy-in and motivation in achieving a project’s objectives.

Annex  : Persons met and Consulted by ICR consultant

In completing the ICR report, the ICR consultant travelled to, and met with stakeholders, in all of the SWIOFP countries except for Reunion, with travel as follows:

Kenya 26th to 28th November  
Seychelles 29th to 30th November   
South Africa 1st to 4th December  
Mauritius 5th to 6th December  
Madagascar 6th to 8th December  
Comores 8th to 9th December  
Mozambique 10th to 13th December  
Tanzania 13th to 14th December

Consultations were held with the following (*all consultations face to face meetings unless otherwise stated)*

| **Name** | **Organisation** | **Position/designation** | **Contact details** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ms. Treza Odhiambo | RMU | Regional Finance and Procurement Manager | triza.odhiambo@swiofp.net |
| Mr. Rondolph Payet | RMU | Regional Executive Secretary | rpayet@swiofp.net |
| Dr. Johnson Kazungu (email) | KMFRI | Head of implementing Institution | jkazungu@kmfri.co.ke |
| Dr. Renison Ruwa  (email) | Kenya NMU | Focal Point | reniruwa@yahoo.com |
| Mr. Harrison Ong’anda | Kenya NMU | NCC and RCC Component 1 | honganda@kmfri.co.ke |
| Mr. Ricky Kambi | Kenya NMU | Project accountant | rkambi@kmfri.co.ke |
| Dr. Francis Marsac  (skype) | France NMU | NMU Focal Point | Francis.marsac@ird.fr |
| Ms. Khyria Karama | KMFRI | MSc student funded under Component 5 | kkarama@kmfri.co.ke |
| Dr. Edward Kimani | Kenya NMU | Component 2 NCC | ekimani@kmfri.co.ke |
| Dr. Dorcas Sigana | Kenya NMU | Component 4 NCC | dsigana@uonbi.ac.ke |
| Mr. Abraham Kagwima | KMFRI | Chairman Tender Committee | Abraham@kmfri.co.ke |
| Ms. Winnie Mwalimu | Kenya Treasury | World Bank desk officer | Wmwalimu@treasury.go.ke |
| Mr. Roy Clarisse | Seychelles NMU | NMU Focal point | royc@sfa.sc |
| Mr. Vincent Lucas | Seychelles NMU | NCC and RCC Component 4 | vlucas@sfa.sc |
| Ms. Elisa Socrate | Seychelles NMU | NCC Component 6 | [esocrate@sfa.sc](mailto:esocrate@sfa.sc) |
| Ms. Cindy Assan | Seychelles NMU | NCC Component 1 | cinassan@hotmail.com |
| Ms. Sabrina Lawrence | Seychlles NMU | NCC Component 3 | slawrence@sfa.sc |
| Dr. David Rowat | Marine Conservation Society Seychelles | Chairman | david@mcss.sc |
| Dr. Alejandro Anganuzzi | IOTC | Executive Secretary | alejandro.anganuzzi@iotc.org |
| Dr. Johann Augustyn | South Africa NMU | Head of implementing institution | augustyn@deat.gov.za |
| Dr. Andrew Cockcroft | South Africa NMU | Focal Point | AndrewC@nda.agric.za |
| Dr. Johan Groeneveld | South Africa NMU | NCC and RCC Component 2 | [jgroenveld@ori.org.za](mailto:jgroenveld@ori.org.za) |
| Dr. Rudy van de Elst (email) | South Africa ORI | n/a | rudyvanderelst@gmail.com |
| Mr. David Vousden | ASCLME project | Project director | David.vousden@asclme.org |
| Mr. Sreenivasan Soondron | Mauritius NMU | Focal point | ssoondron@mail.gov.mu |
| Mr. Khadun Kumar | Mauritius NMU | NCC Component 1 | [skhadun@mail.gov.mu](mailto:skhadun@mail.gov.mu) |
| Mr. V Chooramun | Mauritius NMU | NCC Component 4 | [vchooramun@mail.gov.mu](mailto:vchooramun@mail.gov.mu) |
| Mrs. Mira Hurbungs | Mauritius NMU | NCC and RCC Component 5 | [mhurbungs@mail.gov.mu](mailto:mhurbungs@mail.gov.mu) |
| Mrs. S. Rathacharen | Mauritius NMU | NCC Component 6 | srathacharen@mail.gov.mu |
| Mrs. Yasmin Naidoo | Mauritius NMU | Project accountant | ynaidoo@mail.gov.mu |
| Ms. Luvna Caussy | Mauritius Fisheries Division | MSc student funded under Component 3 | lcaussy@mail.gov.mu |
| Mr. V. Senedhun | Mauritius Fisheries Division | Assisting with Component 4 | vsenedhun@mail.gov.mu |
| Mr. M. Cunee | Mauritius Fisheries Division | Assisting with Component 4 | mcunee@yahoo.com |
| Mr. Rajendranath Mohabeer | IOC/COI | Officer in charge | Raj.mohabeer@coi-ioc.org |
| Ms. Alice Rasolonjatovo | Madagascar NMU | Focal Point | [rasolona@yahoo.fr](mailto:rasolona@yahoo.fr) |
| Mr. Joely Randrianantenaina | Madagascar NMU | STP SWIOFP | jhntenaina@yahoo.fr |
| Mr. Herimamy Razafindrakoto | Madagascar NMU | NCC Component 2 | [herimamylr@hotmail.com](mailto:herimamylr@hotmail.com) |
| Ms. Faratiana Ratsifandrhamanana | Madagascar NMU | NCC Component 3 | [moutyfarat@](mailto:moutyfarat@)yahoo.com |
| Mr. John Bemiasa | Madagascar NMU | NCC Component 4 | [j.bemiasa@odinafrica.net](mailto:j.bemiasa@odinafrica.net) |
| Mr. Rafidison Roginah | Madagascar NMU | NCC Component 6 | rogirafidi@yahoo.fr |
| Mr. Jean Rasolonjatovo | Madagascar NMU | Project Accountant | rabenadezy@yahoo.fr |
| Ms. Josephine Razafindrazay | Madagascar CSP | Chef du Service Tecnhique au CSP | Csp-tech@blueline.mg |
| Mr. Tony Razafindrazaka | Madagascar CSP | Dir aqua | n/a |
| Mr. Rija Andrianarivo | Madagascar CSP | Adj. Rep. Obs | Csp-obs@blueline.mg |
| Mr. Mikidar Houmadi | Comores DNRH | Head of Implementing Institutions | Mikidar.houmadi@yahoo.fr |
| Mr. Abdillah Hassani | Comoros NMU | Project Secretary | Swiof\_pcomores@yahoo.fr |
| Mr. Ibrahim Toihyr | Comoros NMU | Consultant | toihyr@gmail.com |
| Mr. Oirdi Aboubakar | Comoros NMU | NCC Component 4 | Oirdiasla@yahoo.fr |
| Mr. Kamardine Boinali | Comoros NMU | NCC Component | boinalikamar@yahoo.com |
| Mr. Misbah Said Attounamne | Comores NMU | Project accountant | misbahsaidattoumane@yahoo.fr |
| Mr. Badhoudine Ahamada | Comoros SNDPL | Private sector representative | n/a |
| Mr. Faissoil Mahamoud | Comoros Compeche Sarl | Private sector | n/a |
| Mr. Kizimbani Abdou | Comoros | Private sector |  |
| Mohamed Bastri | Comoros Twamaxa | NGO representative |  |
| Dr. Paula Afonso | Mozambique NMU | Head of implementing institution | psantanaafonso@gmail.com |
| Mrs. Nilza Dias | Mozambique NMU | NCC Component 2 | ndias@moziip.org |
| Dr. Ben Ngatunga | Tanzania NMU | Head of implementing institution | [bpngatunga@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:bpngatunga@yahoo.co.uk) |
| Dr. Baraka Kuguru | Tanzania NMU | NCC and RCC Component 3, and Focal Point | barakakuguru@gmail.com |
| Mr. Muhaji Chande | Tanzania NMU | NCC Component 4 | muhajichande@yahoo.com |
| Ms. Leticia Kubnoja | Tanzania NMU | NCC Component 5 | Lebige2001@gmail.com |
| Ms. Helken Murundi | Tanzania NMU | Project Accountant | h.murundi@yahoo.com |
| Ms. Joyce Kulekana | Tanzania NMU | Ex-NCC Component 3 | Kulekana3@yahoo.com |
| Mr. Xavier Vincent | World Bank | Task Team Leader | xvincent@worldbank.org |
| Aubrey Harris | SWIOFC | Secretary | Aubrey.Harris@fao.org |
| Teresa Athayde (email) | RMU | Survey Logistics Coordinator | tathayde@swiofp.net |

Annex : Project costs and financing

Table : Expenditure by component and cost category
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Table : Co-financing contributions by country



Annex  : Project Logframe (revised following MTR)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Global Project Objective**  *To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by SWIO-riparian countries of an LME-based ecosystem approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity* | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
|  | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC | No regional Strategy, partial data collection |  |  |  | Data analysis, drafting of Strategy begins | Draft Strategy distributed  Data collection complete | 100 percent completion  Formal adoption by all nine countries – countries with shared resources identified | Annual project reports to give updates on evolution of regional fisheries management | SWIOFP Annual Reports  SWIOFC publications | SWIOFP RMU |
| Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that defines ecosystem | SWIOFC newly established, No common M & E framework |  |  |  | Identification of environmental status and stress reduction indicators. | Drafting of regional M & E plan (and baselines based on input from Components 1-6) | Finalization and formal adoption of environmental status and stress reduction indicators, dissemination of M& E Plan within region | Quarterly and annual project reporting | SWIOFP Reports  Minutes and Proceedings of SWIOFC | SWIOFP RMU |
| Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub-regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic) | Outside of tuna, little joint management of transboundary stocks |  |  |  |  | Drafting of at least two sub-regional management plans, Identification of specific fisheries and countries to participate in joint management based on input from Components 1-4 | Formal adoption of at least one national or a sub-regional management plan | Annual project reporting | SWIOFP Reports  Minutes and Proceedings of SWIOFC | SWIOFP RMU |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Results/Outcomes (referred to in the PAD as the development objectives)**   1. *Identification and study of exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, and differentiation between environmental (LME-related) and anthropogenic impacts on shared fisheries;* 2. *Developed institutional and human capacity through training and career building to undertake and sustain an ecosystem approach to natural resource management consistent with WSSD marine targets; and* 3. *Development of a regional fisheries management structure fostered for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies.* 4. *To mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources* | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
|  | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fisheries by all countries participating in project | Relatively few multinational management agreements outside of tuna, some national management plans |  |  |  |  | Drafting of national plans (at least one national or sub-regional plan for each country). Dissemination in country Identification of specific fisheries for management based on input from Components 1-4 | Finalization and adoption of management plans (at least one national or sub-regional plan for each country). | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development regional management plans for at least 2 fisheries | National fisheries management plans exist but do not contribute to no national TDA or SAP for LME |  |  |  | Data collection complete, analysis, | 75 percent data capture into the database completed (STATBASE, NANSIS and GEONETWORK– draft inputs for TDA and SAP distributed and drafting of national or sub-regional management plans started. | 100 percent completion, 2 national or sub-regional management plans | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Production of baseline assessment (accompanied by database) that defines current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries leading to a sustainable fisheries management framework to mainstream biodiversity into the regional agenda. | Some national marine capture fisheries data collected but few baseline assessments on stocks available |  |  |  |  | On-going data analysis, production of eight preliminary country reports on baselines produced | Baseline assessment produced for relevant fisheries in each country and aggregated for specific transboundary species | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| To mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources. | The SWIOFC is formed but weak. No real agenda for ecosystem-based management of regional fisheries |  |  |  |  | Discussion at SWIOFC-level of TDA | Discussion of SAP for individual fisheries at the SWIOFC-level for ecosystem based management actions at regional level | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU which will be forwarded and presented to SWIOFC by the RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| **Output Monitoring tables** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Component One: Data Gap Analysis, Data Archiving and Information Technology** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Regional database piloted and ranked effective by majority of SWIOFP countries | Tentative agreement by SWIOFP countries on database platform | N/A | Formal agreement on database platform, procurement of services and licenses | Database structure established and piloted | Piloting of database completed | N/A | N/A | Quarterly | SWIOFP Project Reports  Informal user survey | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| An analysis of the gaps in knowledge of SWIO fisheries resources in response to the needs of fisheries management and a research agenda for implementation by SWIOFP | Preliminary review of gaps in knowledge as part of PDF B | N/A | Procurement of services for gap analysis, draft gap analysis disseminated by end of year | Gap analysis found acceptable by SWIOFP countries and research agenda adopted |  | Harmonised regional data gap analysis technical report | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Minutes of Steering Group Meetings | SWIOFP RMU |
| Historic data identified for inclusion in database/data atlas sourced or entered into database |  | N/A | N/A | N/A | Historic data identified based on input from gap analysis and agreement reached on composition of historic data in database/data atlas | 25 percent of data entered into fisheries database or sourced in form of a data or sourced in database/data atlas 75 percent of data repatriated | Data Atlas completed. | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU |
| National fisheries related IT and communications infrastructure procured or upgraded for each of nine SWIOFP countries |  | N/A | Beginning of procurement process | Continuous | Procurement complete in 75 percent of countries | Procurement completed in all countries | N/A | Quarterly | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Training in data handling and reporting provided for each of nine SWIOFP countries | Limited capacity in data handling and reporting | N/A | Identification of training needs by each country | Trainings scheduled or underway in all countries | Training underway in all countries | Training underway in all countries | Training completed in all countries | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |

|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Monitoring tables** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Component Two: Assessment and sustainable utilization of crustaceans** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data gap-analyses for 5 countries to identify priority species / fisheries for assessments on a regional scale, availability and quality of historic databases, and research surveys required. | None | N/A | Regional Data gap-analysis produced | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Detailed regional research plan for C2 developed to integrate individual projects, research surveys, and capacity building and research partners. | None | N/A | Development of projects | Detailed regional research plan for C2 developed, including individual projects, survey plans, capacity building and research partners | N/A | N/A | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications  Stock Assessments | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Production of Retrospective Analyses for the three major crustacean fishing sectors | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | Retrospective analysis of three fishing sectors completed | N/A | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Ship-based surveys and data-collection to support planned projects and assess the potential of new and existing fisheries | Some national but not on regional basis | N/A | N/A |  | 4 surveys completed | 10 surveys completed |  |  | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Completion of planned studies on fisheries, biology and genetic population structure of shallow- and deep-water prawns, langoustines, and spiny lobsters | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Completion and review of 40% of commissioned studies | Completion and review of the remaining 60% of commissioned studies | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Capacity building - Completion of 6 MSc studies in Component 2 | None | N/A | N/A | Recruitment and MSc grant applications approved: 4 students | Recruitment and MSc grant applications approved: 2 students | Completion and review of 2 of MSc projects | Completion and review of 2 of MSc projects | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Published / technical / popular articles based on SWIOFP retrospective analyses, survey data, and MSc projects | None | N/A | N/A | Data gap-analysis report | 2 cruise reports; 3 retrospective analysis reports | At least 3 peer-reviewed publications prepared and/or submitted; 10 cruise reports | At least 3 peer-reviewed publications prepared and/or submitted; 2 cruise reports | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |
| Provision of fisheries, biological and stock differentiation information on which to base regional management strategies | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Development of regional fisheries management strategies based on research for consideration by SWIOFC and countries. | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | | | |
| **Output Monitoring tables** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | | **Data Collection Instruments** | | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Component Three: Assessment and sustainable utilization of demersal fish** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ship-based surveys and data collection to assess the potential of new and existing fisheries. | None. | N/A | N/A | Survey methodology developed  Draft cruise plan produced | Finalization of cruise plan, 1 dropline cruise completed | 5 cruises completed  2 trawl and 3 dropline cruises completed | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats | |
| Production of seven preliminary country reports and consolidated sub-regional report on status of demersal fisheries | Some data available on stock dynamics, full baseline unknown | N/A | Gap analysis prepared | N/A | N/A | Data Analysis and seven draft reports produced | Dissemination of reports and finalization of 2 sub-regional reports | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications  Stock Assessments | | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats | |
| Published articles based on SWIOFP survey data | None | N/A |  |  |  | At least 2 peer-reviewed publications prepared and/or submitted |  | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats | |
| Capacity building | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | At least 2 MSc grants disbursed (RC3) | N/A | 2 MSc completed and reports submitted | Annually | MSC publications | | SWIOFP RMU/NMU | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | | | |
| **Output Monitoring tables** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | | **Data Collection Instruments** | | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Component Four: Assessment and sustainable use of pelagic fish** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ship-based surveys and data collection to assess the potential of new and existing fisheries. | None. | N/A | Survey methodology developed  1 cruise completed | Draft cruise plan produced  3 cruises completed | Finalization of cruise plan, 1 cruises completed  Data collection and analysis | 3 cruises completed  Data collection and analysis | Data analysis  Assessment completed | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports | | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats | |
| Studies on migration and movement of selected large pelagic species (including sharks). | Tuna tagging program in place, data on movement of other large pelagic incomplete | N/A | Study methodology developed  1 cruise completed | Data Collection  2 cruises completed | Data Collection  2 cruises completed | Data Analysis  4 cruises completed | Data analysis  Assessment completed | Quarterly | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | | SWIOFP RMU and National SWIOFP focal points | |
| Improved FADs tested and developed for large and small scale pelagic fisheries | Some work already underway | N/A |  | Study methodology developed | Data collection and deployment of at least 10FADS | Data collection and analysis | Data collection and Analysis  Assessment completed | Quarterly | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | | SWIOFP RMU and National SWIOFP focal points | |
| Production of country reports, articles, MSc Thesis, and consolidated sub-regional reports on status of pelagic fisheries | Some data available on stock dynamics, full baseline unknown | N/A | Data gap analysis report produced | Study methodology developed | Baseline data collected | Data Analysis and seven draft reports produced | Dissemination of reports and finalization of sub-regional reports | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications  Stock Assessments | | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats | |
| Published articles based on SWIOFP survey data | None | N/A | Survey Design stage (see above) | Data Collection Stage | Data collection. | Data collection and analysis | At least 4 peer-reviewed publications prepared and/or submitted | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific Publications | | SWIOFP RMU  National Executive Secretariats | |
| Capacity Building | None | N/A | N/A | Recruitment and MSs application approved: 3 grants | Recruitment and MSc Grant application approve: 1 student | Completion of 3 MSc thesis | Completion of at least 4 MSc thesis. | Quarterly and Annually | SWIOFP Reports  Scientific publications | | SWIOFP RMU  National secretariats | |

|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Monitoring tables** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Component Five: Mainstreaming biodiversity in national and regional fisheries management** | | | | | | | | |  |  |
| Data gap analysis for the participating countries to C5, and identification of specific gaps in existing knowledge. | None | N/A | Gap analysis completed and report submitted to RMU | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Retrospective Analysis | None | N/A | N/A | Interactions with stakeholders to identify key issues | Draft completed | Main RA report components assembled and finalised |  | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Mapping of hotspots, sensitive zones and protected areas & Biodiversity reference sites | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | Data Collection | MPA Mapping completed and hotspots Identified | Maps Produced | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Rapid By-catch assessment (RBA) | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | Training provided to at least 2 scientists per country | RBA report completed | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | Coordinating country for Components 2, 3, 4 |
| Ship base surveys / data collection / observer programme | None | N/A | N/A | 40 Observers trained | Observers to be deployed with C-5 tasks participation in cruises | Participation in 3 cruises; analysis and write up of cruise results  At least 1 cruise report |  | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Capacity building | Limited | N/A | N/A | Scientists trained in marine turtles identification, tagging | At least 2 MSc grants applications approved. | Turtle tagged and at least 10 tagged deployed | N/A | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Mainstreaming biodiversity into national and sub-regional management plans | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Component 2,3, & 4 harmonization meetings between countries | Production of fishery-level (demersal, crustacean and pelagic) action plan (a sustainable fisheries management framework) to mainstream biodiversity into national & regional mgt. plans | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |
| Key (#) bio-indicator species identified and relationships between target species and ecosystem health established | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | Methodology developed and species identified by country | Ecosystem Health Indicators established | Data analysis and baseline assessment produced and disseminated | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU |

|  |  | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Monitoring tables** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Component Six: Strengthening National and Regional Fisheries Management** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review of national fisheries regulations and identification of areas where harmonization is needed | **Harmonization of fisheries policy in SADC coastal countries[1]** | N/A |  |  | Draft report produced on fisheries regulations and Policies and harmonization workshops held if needed. | Action plan endorsed by SWIOFC and start implementation | Implementation of significant elements of the action plan completed | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU | |
| Establishment of a functional working relationship between SWIOFP and Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission | SWIOFC established in November 2004 | N/A | Participation in SWIOFC Sessions, Scientific Committee and technical working groups | Participation in SWIOFC Sessions, Scientific Committee and technical working groups. | Participation in SWIOFC Sessions, Scientific Committee and technical working groups | Participation in SWIOFC Sessions, Scientific Committee and technical working | Review by the SWIOFC of contribution of SWIOFP and of the compliance of countries to regional management decisions | Quarterly and Annually | Reports of SWIOFC Sessions and Scientific Committee,  Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU | |
| Establishment of regional RMU and national project offices | SWIOFP Secretariat functioning under project preparation | N/A | Regional RMU established, Procurement of equipment to nine countries and regional management office | RMU and National Offices fully operational | RMU and National Offices fully operational | RMU and National Offices fully operational | RMU and National Offices fully operational | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU | |
| The Project will leverage additional donor support for this component. | The SWIOFC is formed but weak. No real agenda for ecosystem-based management of regional fisheries | N/A | N/A | N/A | Donor conference held and monies pledged A |  | Implementation of support emanating from the Donor conference | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU which will be forwarded and presented to SWIOFC by the RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU | |
| Capacity strengthened for improvement fisheries management planning | Limited capacity | N/A | N/A | N/A | Training in Stock Assessment completed | Training completed in all countries on management planning  Stakeholder meetings completed in all countries  Development of national and/or sub-regional management in each of the country initiated | At least one national or Sub- regional plan agreed for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fisheries by all countries participating in project | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU | |
| TDA and SAP prepared | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Engagement with ASCLME on integrated TDA and SAP | Integrated TDA and SAP finalised | Quarterly and Annually | Individual country reports forwarded to SWIOFP RMU | National Executive Secretariats  SWIOFP RMU | |

Annex : Additional information on project outputs and activities

Table : Support by the project for Fisheries Management Plans, and their status

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Type of fishery | Baseline  Report | Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) | Draft of Management  Plan | Management Plan Adopted |
| Comoros | Demersal small scale fisheries | √ | √ | In preparation | X |
| Kenya | Small and medium pelagic fisheries | √ | √ | √ | X |
| Artisanal and semi-industrial shrimp fisheries | √ | √ | √ | X |
| Madagascar | Demersal fisheries | √ | √ | In preparation | X |
| Mauritius | Demersal Banks fishery | √ | √ | √ | X |
| Mozambique | Sofala bank shallow water shrimp fisheries | √ | √ | √ | X |
| Demersal Line fishery | √ | √ | √ | X |
| Seychelles | Artisanal demersal fishery | √ | √ | √ | X |
| South Africa | Large Pelagic fishery | √ | √ | √ | X |
| Tanzania | Artisanal small and medium pelagic fishery | √ | √ | √ | X |

Table : List of MSc students by country/component

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Student | Country | Title of Project | Contract Date | University Start Date | University End Date | Title of dissertation | | University |
| MSc/BSc Component 1 - Data & Information | | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Gilberto Antonio Ngoca (MSc) | Mozambique | Create a web based information for statistical analysis and data management of fishery data in Mozambique (IIP) | 1st July 2011 | 21th March 2011 | 21th March 2013 | Create web based information for Statistical Analysis and data management of Fishery data in Mozambique (IIP) | |  |
| Ms. Edna Nyakerario Onkundi (BSc) | Kenya | Effectiveness of web portals in improving fisheries data management | 26th July 2011 | May 2011 | April 2013 | Effectiveness of web portals in improving fisheries Data | | Kenya Methodist University |
| Mr. Samwel Oyieke Ng'ete (BSc) | Kenya | Fisheries Statistics Information system - Improving interactive web-based interfaces | 26th July 2011 | August 2009 | May 2012 | Fisheries Statistics Information System - Improving interactive web-based | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
| Component 2 - Crustaceans | | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Thomas Kalama | Kenya | Genetic population structure of Penaeid prawn in the South West Indian Ocean. | 3rd May 2010 | 5th Jul. 2010 | Dec-12 | Genetic population structure of Penaeid prawns *Penaeus monodon* (Fabricius, 1798), *Fenneropenaeus indicus* (H. Milne Edwards, 1837) and *Metapenaeus monoceros* (Fabricius, 1798) in the South West Indian Ocean | | University od Stellenbosch, South Africa |
| Mr. Collins Ndoro | Kenya | Assemblage structure of decapod crustaceans off the Kenyan Coast | 3rd Nov. 2010 | 18th Oct. 2010 | Dec-12 | Assemblage Structure of Decapod Crustaceans in the Malindi-Ungwana Bay, Kenya | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
| Mr. James Robey | South Africa | An Assessment of the Deep-water crustaceans trawl fishery off the Eastern Coast of South Africa | 4th Oct. 2010 | 16th Nov. 2010 | Nov-12 | An assessment of the deep-water crustacean trawl fishery off eastern South Africa: Abundance trends and biology of langoustines *Metanephrops mozambicus* and pink prawns *Haliporoides triarthrus* | | University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa |
| Mr. Lourenco D. Zakarias | Mozambique | Genetic Population structure of deep water prawns in the South West Indian Ocean | 7th Jan. 2011 | Aug. 2011 | Oct-2013 | Genetic Population Structure of Deep-Water *Haliporoides* *triarthrus* and *Metanephrops mozambicus* in the South West Indian Ocean: use of mtDNA to resolve relationships among species/populations from Mozambique, Madagascar and South Africa. | | University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa |
| Name of Student | Country | Title of Project | Contract Date | University Start Date | University End Date | Title of dissertation | University | |
| Ms. Mageshnee M. Reddy | South Africa | Are shallow-water spiny lobster (*Panulirus homarus* and *Panulirus ornatus*) populations in the SWIO region genetically panmictic or structured? Implications for regional management | 3rd Mar. 2011 | Mar. 2011 | Mar-2013 | An assessment of the phylogenetics and population structure of *Panulirus homarus* rubellus in the South West Indian Ocean: Implications for regional management. | | University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa |
| Component 3 - Demersal | | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murray Ian Duncan | South Africa | The genetic assessment of slinger (Chrysoblephias puniceus), stocks in the South West Indian Ocean and the implications for management. | 25th Feb. 2011 | 20th Feb 2011 | 20th Feb 2013 | The genetic stock structure and potential changes in distribution of *Chrysoblephus puniceus*, a commercially important Sparid in the South Western Indian Ocean | | Rhodes University, South Africa |
| Mr. Stephen Mwakai Mwakiti | Kenya | Retrospective analysis of marine demersal fisheries in South west Indian Ocean Region: identification, validation and calibration of long - term datasets to determine baseline abundance indices. | 13th Apr. 2011 | Sep-11 | Dec-13 | Stock identification of the Javelin grunter (Pomadasys kaakan Cuvier, 1830) on the Kenyan coast using morphometric and meristic characters | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
| Ms. Fatuma Ali Mzingirwa | Kenya | Genetic population structure of Crimson job fish *Pristipomoides filamentosus* (valenciennes, 1830) in the South West Indian Ocean Region; A case study of Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique and Seychelles waters. | 12th Apr. 2011 |  | December 2013 | Genetic population structure of Crimson job fish *Pristipomoides filamentosus* (Valenciennes, 1830) in the South West Indian Ocean Region. A case study of Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar, Seychelles and Comoros waters | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
| Ms. Luvna Caussy | Mauritius | Biology and Ecology of the fished deep water snapper *Polysteganus baissaci* (Smith, 1978) stocks of Mauritius - Implications for Management. | 11th Apr. 2011 | 21-May-12 | May-14 | Biology and Ecology of the fished deep water snapper *Polysteganus baissaci*(Smith, 1978) stocks of Mauritius - Implications for Management. | | University of Mauritius, Mauritius |
| Mr. Patroba P. Matiku | Tanzania | Assessment of the abundance, distribution, size composition and growth patterns of the demersal fish species for some regions in South West Indian Ocean waters. | 4th May 2011 | July, 2011 | June, 2013 | Msc in Aquatic Science | | University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania |
| Component 4 - Pelagics | | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Emmanuel Mbaru | Kenya | An assessment of species composition, catch per unit and behaviour of pelagic fishes around anchored fish devices on the Kenyan Coast | 3rd May 2010 | July 2010 | December 2012 | An Assessment of the Kenyan Marine Fishery in light of FADs (Provisional) | | Rhodes University, South Africa |
| Mr. Alan J. Foulis | South Africa | An assessment of pelagic shark by-catch in longline fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean | 5th May 2010 | 29th Oct 2010 | October 2012 | An assessment of shark catch in the South African pelagic longline fisheries in the south west Indian ocean (SWIO) and notes on the life history of the shortfin mako shark (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) | | University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa |
| Mr. Febian Forget | Mauritius | The development and assessment of fisheries for medium/large pelagic fishes around anchored FADs (Fish Aggregating Devices) | 15th Jan. 2010 | Jan-10 | Dec-15 | PhD: The diversity of fish assemblages around Fish Aggregating Devices with focus on the ecology of two major associated species and bycatch of purse seine fisheries: *Elagatis bipinnulata* and *Canthidermis maculatus* | | Rhodes University, South Africa |
| Mr. Brendon Lee | South Africa | The biology and fisheries of king mackerel (S*comberomorus commerson)* in the South West Indian Ocean with reference to future regional management initiatives | 6th Apr. 2011 | 22nd July 2011 | July 2013 | The biology and fisheries of king mackerel *Scomberomorus commerson* in the South West Indian Ocean with reference to future management initiatives | | University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa |
| Mr. Steven Ndegwa | Kenya | The study of feeding behaviour of large pelagics caught by longline and sports fishing in the Kenya and Tanzanian waters. | 1st Dec. 2010 | 26th Sep 2011 | 30th Sep 2013 | The study of feeding behaviour of large pelagics caught by sports fishing in the Kenyan waters. | | University of Nairobi |
| Component 5 - Biodiversity | | | | | | | | |
| Ms. Rose Bahati Machaku | Kenya | Mapping of nesting and foraging habitats of sea turtle species in Kenya | 26th Jan. 2011 | 15th February 2011 | 15th February 2013 | The status, nesting ecology and interaction with artisanal fisheries of sea turtles in Kenya | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
| Ms. Khyria Swaleh Karama | Kenya | Ecological risk assessment (ERA) for the prawn fisheries of Malindi - Ungwana, Kenya for development of a management plan | 13th Apr. 2011 | Sep-11 | 30th April 2013 | An ecosystem-based fisheries assessment approach; a case study of the Malindi-Ungwana bay Prawn Fishery, Kenya | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
| Mr. Benedict Kyalo Kiilu | Kenya | The status of the shark fishery in Kenya and the Western Indian Ocean | 5th Sept. 2011 | 6th Sept. 2011 | 6th Sept. 2013 | Distribution, Abundance and Biological Aspects of Elasmobranchs on the Kenyan Coast | | Moi University - Chepkoilel University College, Kenya |
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Annex : List of Project Documents and Scientific Papers

**Project design documentation and legal agreements**

* GEF Trust Fund Grant Agreement between the Republic of Kenya and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (October 2007)
* SWIOFP Project Agreement between the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Republic of Madagascar (October 2007)
* Subsidiary Grant Agreement between the Government of Kenya and the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (April 2008)
* MoU for transboundary marine scientific research and in support of the south west Indian ocean fisheries project among the governments of the French Republic, the Union of Comoros, the Republic of Kenya, the Republic of Madagascar, the Republic of Mauritius, the Republic of Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Republic of Seychelles, and the Republic of South Africa
* Project Appraisal Document (PAD)
* Project Implementation Manual
* Fonds Français Pour L’environnement Mondial SWIOFP project document

**Project monitoring and evaluation, and other project documentation**

All M&E reports and other relevant project outputs e.g. survey reports, newsletters, available at available at http://www.swiofp.net

**Regional data gap analysis reports**

* [REGIONAL DATA GAP-ANALYSIS FOR COMPONENT 2](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/technical-reports/regional-data-gap-analysis-for-component-2)
* [REGIONAL DATA GAP-ANALYSIS FOR COMPONENT 3](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/technical-reports/regional-data-gap-analysis-for-component-3)
* [REGIONAL DATA GAP-ANALYSIS FOR COMPONENT 4](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/technical-reports/regional-data-gap-analysis-for-component-4)
* [REGIONAL DATA GAP-ANALYSIS FOR COMPONENT 5](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/technical-reports/regional-data-gap-analysis-for-component-5)

**Project training reports**

* [SWIOFP/STATBASE WORKING GROUP N°3 7-11 DEC. 2009, MOMBASA, KENYA](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/swiofp-statbase-working-group-nb03-7-11-dec-2009-mombasa-kenya)
* [Nansen survey information system (NANSIS) Training Course November 2009, Mauritius](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/nansen-survey-information-system-nansis-training-course-213-november-2009-mauritius)
* [SWIOFP Fisheries Training Course Report (1 - 4 July 2009) at Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/swiofp-fisheries-training-course-report)
* [3rd SWIOFP/StatBase working group (WG)](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/3rd-swiofp-statbase-working-group-wg)
* [Geonetwork Training Report (14 – 16 DECEMBER 2009) KMFRI, MOMBASA](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/geonetwork-training-report)
* [Regional FAD and Longline Workshop, SWIOFP Component 4 Assessment and Sustainable Utilization of pelagic resources 9th – 15th December 2009, Seychelles Workshop Report](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/regional-fad-and-longline-workshop-swiofp-component-4-assessment-and-sustainable-utilization-of-pelagic-resources-9th-2013-15th-december-2009-seychelles-workshop-report)
* Report on the SWIOFP Observer Training Course (16 August – 8 September 2010) at Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa[Report RBA Training Mauritius 27-28 April 2011[FR]](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/report-rba-training-mauritius-27-28apr2011.pdf)
* [SWIOFP Bottom Drop line Gear Training Course and Fishing Trials on 14th – 19th May 2012 at Mauritius Fisheries Training and Extension Centre, Point aux Sables](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/swiofp-drop-line-gear-training-course-and-fishing-trials-on-14th-2013-19th-may-2012-at-mauritius-fisheries-training-and-extension-centre-point-aux-sables);
* [Deep Bottom Drop-line Fishing Training Manual conducted in Mauritius from the 14th to the 19th May 2012](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/deep-bottom-drop-line-fishing-training-manual-conducted-in-mauritius-from-the-14th-to-the-19th-may-2012)
* Report Fisheries Observer Database inception Training workshop (17 - 21 Sept 2012), Mombasa, Kenya[Regional FAD and Longline Workshop, SWIOFP Component 4 Assessment and Sustainable Utilization of pelagic resources 9th – 15th December 2009, Seychelles Workshop Report](http://www.swiofp.net/publications/training-reports/regional-fad-and-longline-workshop-swiofp-component-4-assessment-and-sustainable-utilization-of-pelagic-resources-9th-2013-15th-december-2009-seychelles-workshop-report)

**Scientific Output Publication List**

***1. Articles in peer-reviewed journals (incl Books and Book chapters)***

* Behagle N, Du Buisson L, Josse E, Lebourges-Dhaussy A, Roudaut G, Menard F. Mesoscale features and micronekton in the Mozambique Channel: an acoustical approach. In Rev for the Special Issue “The Mozambique Channel: Mesoscale Dynamics and Biological Production”, Deep Sea Research II
* Elwen S.H, Findlay K.P, Kiszka J, Weir C.R (2011) Cetacean research in the southern African subregion: a review of previous studies and current knowledge. African Journal of Marine Science, 33(3): 469-493
* Groeneveld JC, Boucher M, Kirkman SP (in press) – From biomass mining to sustainability – bugs in a troublesome deep-water lobster trap fishery. African Journal of Marine Science xx:xx (2012)
* Groeneveld JC, von der Heyden S, Matthee CA (in press) – High connectivity and lack of mtDNA differentiation among two previously recognized spiny lobster species in the southern Atlantic and Indian Oceans. Marine Biology Research xx:xx (2012)
* Groeneveld JC, Everett BI, Fennessy ST, Kirkman SP, Santos J, Robertson WR (In press) - Distribution, relative abundance and population structure of deep-sea red crabs Chaceon macphersoni caught in traps and trawls off eastern South Africa. Marine Biology Research (Submitted, September 2012)
* Menard F, Benivary H.D. Bodin N, Coffineau N, Le Loch F, Mison T, Potier M. Stable isotope patterns in micronekton from the Mozambique Channel. In Rev for the Special Issue “The Mozambique Channel: Mesoscale Dynamics and Biological Production”, Deep Sea Research II
* Munga CN, Mwangi S, Ong’anda H, Ruwa R, Manyala J, Groeneveld JC, Kimani E, Vanreusel A (In press) - Spatial and seasonal distribution and abundance of penaeid shrimps in the Malindi-Ungwana Bay, Kenya: inferences from experimental bottom trawl surveys. Fisheries Research (Submitted, June 2012)
* Potier M, Bach P, Menard F, Marsac F. Influence of mesoscale features on micronekton and top predators in the Mozambique Channel. In Rev for the Special Issue “The Mozambique Channel: Mesoscale Dynamics and Biological Production”, Deep Sea Research II
* Rabearisoa N, Bach P, Tixier P, Guinet C (2012) Pelagic longline fishing trials to shape a mitigation device of the depredation by toothed whales. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 432-433: 55-63
* Shin Y-J, Bundy A, Shannon LJ, Blanchard JL, Chuenpagdee R, Coll M, Knight B, Lynam C, Piet G, Richardson AJ (2012). Global in scope and regionally rich: an IndiSeas workshop helps shape the future of marine ecosystem indicators. Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries. DOI: 10.1007/s11160-012-9252-z
* Simon-Bouhet B, Ceyrac L, Berggren P, Dulau V, Amir OA, Jiddawi N, Kiszka J (in prep). Effect of geographic isolation on spinner dolphin (Stenella longirostris) population structure and genetic diversity in the SW Indian Ocean
* Van der Elst RP, Groeneveld JC, Baloi AP, Marsac F, Katonda KI, Ruwa R, Lane WL (2009) – Nine nations, one ocean: A benchmark appraisal of the South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (2008-2012). Ocean & Coastal Management 52: 258-267

***2. Unpublished scientific and technical reports***

* Alvheim O, Torstensen E, Groeneveld J, Fennessy S, Zaera D, Bemiasa J (2009) - Preliminary Cruise Report “Dr. Fridtjof Nansen” West Madagascar: Pelagic Ecosystem Survey, 25 August–03 October 2009. FAO-NORAD PROJECT NO: GCP/INT/003/NOR; SWIOFP / ASCLME / FAO 2009 Cruise 2. IMR, Norway. (46pp + Annexes)
* Bach P, Romanov E.V, Filippi T (2009). Report monitored longline fishing experiments carried out on board the fishing vessel “Manohal” from 27 November to 18 December 2008. IRD/SWIOFP report, May 2009, 74 p.
* Baraka K., Mathias M., Muhaji C., Silas M., Patroba M., Damian C., Marwa, G, Cosmas C (2012). Assessment of pelagic fish stock in the SWIOFP countries: FADs deployment in Tanzania, 10-15 January 2012. World Bank SWIOFP Implementation Supervision Mission, Johannesburg, South Africa, 11-12 May 2012.
* Chavence P, Damiano A, Billet N (2010). Statbase 3.1, User and Administration Manual for the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project. (41 pp).
* COFREPECHE (2011) Socio-economic impact assessment of local FAD fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean. SWIOFP France/FFEM funding, 50 p. (English and French versions)
* COFREPECHE (2012) Appui à la mise en oeuvre du suivi des impacts socio-économiques des DCP sur les pêcheries de ma zone Sud-ouest de l’Océan Indien. Etude financée par le SWIOFP France/FFEM, 95 p.
* Everett, B.I. 2011. WIOFish spreads its fins. SANCOR Newsletter No 197: 5-6
* Everett, B.I., van der Elst, R.P., Jiddawi, N., Santana-Afonso, P., Dorizo, J., Khadun, S., Okemwa, G., Fondo, E., Assan, C., Robinson, J., Ngoca, G., Ramkissoon, S. and Mohit, R. 2010. WIOFish database: A catalogue of small-scale fisheries of the western Indian Ocean: Annual Report, September 2010. 132p.
* Everett, B.I., van der Elst, R.P., Santana-Afonso, P., Jiddawi, N., Assan, C., Robinson, J., Fondo, E., Khadun, S., Boinali, K., Ramanantsoa, M. & Andriamaharo, T. 2011. WIOFish database: A catalogue of small-scale fisheries of the western Indian Ocean: Annual Report, September 2011. 168p.
* Fallier P, Kroese M (2011). Socio-economic impact assessment of the local FAD fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean. Study carried out as part of the French contribution to the SWIOFP by COFREPECHE, March 2011 (50 pp)
* Fennessy S, Abdou M, Kaunda-Arara B, Mkare T, Ombuki J, Ong’anda H, Faratiana R, Mootoosamy L, Mutombene R, Robinson J, Mhitu H, Sululu J, Kulekana J (2009) - Regional Data Gap-Analysis for Component 3 (Demersal Fishes) for SWIOFP. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa , Kenya (28 pp)
* Fennessy ST (2012) - Retrospective Analysis of existing data on shallow-water trawl-fisheries for crustaceans in the South West Indian Ocean. Specialist Report prepared for the South West Indian Ocean Project. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya. 53 pp.
* Groeneveld JC, Japp DW, and Wissema J (2009). Experimental fishing for spiny lobster Palinurus delagoae off South Africa. E) Report on the fourth year of the experiment: June – November 2007. Unpublished Report 273, Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa (22 pp)
* Groeneveld JC, Heinecken C (2010) SWIOFP Observer Manual – An Illustrated Manual for Training Fisheries Observers for Deployment on Commercial Fishing Vessels Active in the South West Indian Ocean. October 2010. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya (153 pp)
* Groeneveld JC, Cockcroft AC, Dias NM, Palha de Sousa L, Mwakosya C, Ulotu E, Kimani E, Munga C, and Rafalimanana T (2010) Regional Data Gap-Analysis for Component 2 (Crustaceans) for SWIOFP. Unpublished Report 283, Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa (45 pp) & SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya.
* Groeneveld JC (2012) - Retrospective Analysis of existing data on deep-water trap-fisheries for crustaceans in the South West Indian Ocean. Specialist Report prepared for the South West Indian Ocean Project. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya. 50 pp.
* Groeneveld JC (2012) - Retrospective Analysis of existing data on deep-water trawl-fisheries for crustaceans in the South West Indian Ocean. Specialist Report prepared for the South West Indian Ocean Project. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya. 65 pp.
* Hoareau M (2011) Marquage/relecture préalable à la pose de balises Argos et comptage de traces, Tromelin. Programme Symytile-SWIOFP C5. Rapport Ifremer/Kelonia/IRD/SWIOFP. 13 p
* Kimani E, Manyala J, Munga C, Ndoro C (2011) – Preliminary SWIOFP Survey Technical Report “FV Vega”. Component 2; Shallow-water prawn trawl survey in Kenya; January / February 2011. SWIOFP Survey Technical Report / SWIOFP2011C201a / Mombasa, Kenya. 97pp.
* Kiszka J (2012) Bycatch assessment of vulnerable megafauna in coastal artisanal fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean. Scientific Report, SWIOFP. 113 p
* Lucas V, Wardi A, Doorunamand K, Raboanarijadna HZ, Bach P, Pianet R, Sigana D, Matola H, Palha de Sousa B, Groeneveld JC (2010) Regional Data Gap-Analysis for Component 4 (Pelagic Fishes) for SWIOFP. Unpublished Report 284, Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa (47 pp) & SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya.
* Olsen E, Padera M, Funke M, Pires P, Wenneck T, Zacarias L (2009) - Preliminary Cruise Report “Dr. Fridtjof Nansen” Survey of the living marine resources of North Mozambique. 6 – 20 August 2009. SWIOFP / ASCLME / FAO 2009 Cruise 1. IMR, Norway. (48 pp)
* Osore, M. & Everett, B.I. 2011. WIOFish continues to spread its fins widely in the WIO region. WIOMSA Newsbrief 16(2): 8-9.
* Payet R,Vousden D, Groeneveld J, Attwood Claire, Kyalo O. Lorna , Osore, Stapley J – News from the SWIOFP/ASCLME projects A regional alliance VOL 1.ISSUE 2. JUNE 2011
* Rabarison Andriamirado GA (2012) Rapport De Prospection SWIOFP Campagne Numéro MAD2011 C210 – Prospection au chaluts des crustaces d’eau profonde a Madagascar, 46pp.
* Rabearisoa N, Filippi T, Martin-Baillet V, Lamoureux J-P, Cotel P; Bach P (2010) Marine mammal depredation and pelagic longline fishery: second trials to assess the efficiency of a scaring mitigating device in Saint Paul Bay (Reunion Island).IRD/SWIOFP report, Aug 2010, 13p.
* Rabearisoa N, Lamoureux J-P, Cotel P; Bach P (2011) Marine mammal depredation and pelagic longline fishery: second trials to assess the efficiency of a scaring mitigating device in Saint Paul Bay (Reunion Island).IRD/SWIOFP report, May 2011, 13 p.
* Roman R, Kaehler S, Mikhalsen K, Olsen M, Perri M (2009) - Preliminary Cruise Report “Dr. Fridtjof Nansen” Survey of the Comores Gyre, 5 October–3 November 2009. SWIOFP / ASCLME / FAO 2009 Cruise 3. IMR, Norway. (24pp + Annexes)
* van der Elst RP, Hurbungs MD, Soondron VS, Santana Afonso P, Mlewa C, Kamardine B, Razafindrainibe H, Crawford R, Bourjea J, Kiszka J, Yona GK, Payet R, Quatre RA (2010) Regional Data Gap-Analysis for Component 5 (Mainstreaming biodiversity in national and regional fisheries management) for SWIOFP. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa , Kenya (31 pp)
* van der Elst RP (2012) - Mainstreaming biodiversity in fisheries management: a retrospective analysis of existing data on vulnerable organisms in the South West Indian Ocean. SWIOFP RMU, KMFRI, Mombasa , Kenya (206 pp)
* Wilke C, Kerwath S, Cooper R, West W, Da Silva C, Goosen M, Snyders Y, Lamberth S, Mann B. (2011) Cruise report R.S Ellen Khuzwayo Voyage 99, 11 Oct - 2 Nov 2011.

***3. International conferences presentations (oral or poster)***

* Bourjea J, Muths D, Garnier J, Mortimer J, Okemwa G, Godley BJ, Hughes G, Coccione S (2011). Evidence of a more complex genetic stock structure in the South West Indian Ocean – implications for regional conservation. 14th SAMSS / 49th ECSA International Conference, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, 4-7 April (Oral presentation)
* Capello M, Soria M, Cotel P, Potin G, Dagorn L, Deneubourg J-L, Freon P (2012). Understanding the dynamics of a group of fish associate to a floating object: from acoustic experiments to modeling. Colloque annuel de la Société Française pour l’Etude du Comportement Animal, St Etienne, France, 9-11 mai 2012.
* Fennessy S, Everett B (2011). Fishes without passports – similarities and differences in SWIO demersal fish diversity. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Oral presentation; Book of Abstracts p43)
* Fondo, E.N., Okemwa, G., Everett, B.I., van der Elst, R.P., Munga, C.N., Wainaina, M. and Agembe, S. 2011. Small-scale fisheries of the Kenyan Coast. 7th Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association Symposium, 24 – 29 October 2011. (Poster; Book of Abstracts p45).
* Foulis AJ, Groeneveld JC, Dudley S (2011). Trends in shark bycatch in long-line fisheries for tuna and swordfish, and sampling of shortfin mako sharks off South Africa. The Southern African Shark and Ray Meeting, KwaZulu-Natal Sharks Board, Durban, South Africa, 8-10 February 2011 (Oral Presentation)
* Foulis AJ, Groeneveld JC, Dudley S (2011). Trends in shark bycatch in long-line fisheries for tuna and swordfish, and sampling of shortfin mako sharks off South Africa. 14th SAMSS / 49th ECSA International Conference, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, 4-7 April (Oral presentation)
* Groeneveld JC (2011). Scattered, disconnected and vulnerable to fishing? Exploring the seamounts and slopes of the South West Indian Ocean for spiny lobsters. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Oral presentation; Book of Abstracts p53)
* Kimani E, Manyala J, Munga CN, Ndoro CK, Kalama T, Kaka R (2011). Assessment of the Malindi-Ungwana bay prawn and fish stocks by bottom trawling. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Poster presentation; Book of Abstracts p70)
* KIPER, I. E., FENNESSY, S.T., & BLOOMER, P. 2012. Genetic differentiation in snapper kob (Otolithes ruber) from the South Western Indian Ocean revealed by mitochondrial and nuclear data. South African Genetics & Bioinformatics Society Conference – The Data-mining Revolution. 10 – 12 September 2012, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa. Poster.
* Lauret-Stepler M, Ciccione S, Bourjea J (2011). Monitoring of marine turtles reproductive activities using daily track count, Juan de Nova, Indian Ocean. Power Point presentation. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, Mombasa, Kenya, 24-29 Oct 2011
* Mkare T, von der Heyden S, Matthee C, Groeneveld J (2011). Genetic population structure of adult penaeid prawns and their juveniles in the Tana and Sabaki estuaries in Malindi- Ungwana Bay, Kenya. 14th SAMSS / 49th ECSA International Conference, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, 4-7 April (Poster presentation)
* Machaku RB, Kaunda-Arara B, Manyala J (2011). Mapping of nesting and foraging habitats of sea turtle species on the Kenyan coast. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Poster presentation; Book of Abstracts p84)
* Mwakosya CA, Kuguru B, Kangwe SJ, Kulekana JJ, Ulotu E, Sululu J, Mhitu H, Matola H, Ngatunga BP, Budeba YL, Mahongo SB, Silas M, Mgeleka S, Sekondo E (2011). Assessment of the effectiveness of the closure of commercial prawn trawling in Tanzania Coastal waters. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Oral presentation; Book of Abstracts p127)
* Ndoro CK, Kaunda-Arara B, Munga CN, Kimani E, Manyala J, Ruwa R (2011). Bathymetric assemblage structure of the Decapod Crustaceans: Preliminary findings off the Malindi-Ungwana Bay, Kenya. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Oral presentation; Book of Abstracts p163)
* Reddy MM, Macdonald AHH, Schleyer M (2011). Is shallow-water spiny lobster, Panulirus homarus populations in the SWIO region genetically panmictic or structured? Implications for regional management. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Oral presentation; Book of Abstracts p163)
* Robey J, Groeneveld J, Fennessy S (2011). Trawling off the east coast of South Africa: Abundance and biology of pink prawn and langoustine. 14th SAMSS / 49th ECSA International Conference, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, 4-7 April (Oral presentation)
* Robey J, Groeneveld J, Fennessy S (2011). Trawling for prawns and langoustines in the deep: trends in abundance, biology and catches in the South West Indian Ocean. 7th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, White Sands Hotel, Mombasa, Kenya. 24-29th October 2011 (Oral presentation; Book of Abstracts p167)
* Simon-Bouhet B, Ceyrac L, Berggren P, Dulau V, Amir OA, Jiddawi NS, Kiszka J (2012) Local and regional genetic structure of spinner dolphins off islands in the southwest Indian Ocean. 26th Annual Conference of the European Cetacean Society, Galway, Ireland, 26-28 March 2012.

***4. Scientific documents presented in regional meetings***

* Kiszka J, Muir C, Amir A.A, Cox T.M, Bourjea J, Poonian C, Razafindrakoto Y, Wambiji N, Bristol N (2008) Marine mammal bycatch in the South West Indian Ocean: review and need for a comprehensive status assessment. 4th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Bangkok 20-22 Oct 2008. IOTC-2008-WPEB-06,18p.
* Bourjea J (2008) Movement of sea turtle between nesting sites and feeding grounds in the South West Indian Ocean: regional migratory knowledge and interaction with open sea fisheries for management issues. 4th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Bangkok 20-22 Oct 2008. IOTC-2008-WPEB-07,6p.
* Romanov E.V, Bach P, Romanova N (2008) Preliminary estimates of bycatches in the western equatorial Indian Ocean in the traditional multifilament longline gears (1961-1989). 4th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Bangkok 20-22 Oct 2008. IOTC-2008-WPEB-10,18p.
* Bach P, Rabearisoa N, Filippi T, Hubas S (2008) The first year of SEALOR : Database of Sea- going observer surveys monitoring the pelagic longline fishery based in La Reunion. 4th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Bangkok 20-22 Oct 2008. IOTC-2008-WPEB-13,19p.
* Bach P, Rabearisoa N, Filippi T, Romanov E.V, Pianet R. (2009). Digest of major information collected from May 2008 to August 2009 in the frame of the longline observer program (SEALOR) based in La Réunion. 5th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Mombasa 12-14 Oct 2009. IOTC-2009-WPEB-10,12p.
* Rabearisoa N, Bach P., Lucas V., Giroux F., Vely M., Romanov E.V, Tixier P, Guinet C. (2009). Assessment of the efficiency of the physical protection of fish as a mitigation measure to depredation by marine mammals in pelagic longlining. 5th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Mombasa 12-14 Oct 2009. IOTC-2009-WPEB-12,12 p.
* Bach P, Romanov E.V, Rabearisoa N, Filippi T, Sharp A. (2010) Note on yellowfin and bigeye catches collected during fishing and research cruises onboard pelagic longliners of the La Reunion fleet in 2008 and 2009. 12th Session of the Working Party on Tropical Tunas, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Seychelles 18-25 Oct 2010. IOTC-2010-WPTT-11. 13 p
* Kiszka J, Bein A, Bach P, Jamon A, Layssac K, Labart S, Wickel J (2010) Catch and
* bycatch in the pelagic longline fishery around Mayotte. 6th Session of the
* Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission,
* Seychelles 27-30 Oct 2010. IOTC-2010-WPEB-19, 9p
* Kiszka J (2010) Marine mammals project in the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP): Ecology, interaction with fisheries and conservation. Power Point Presentation. 6th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Seychelles 27-30 Oct 2010. IOTC- 2010-WPEB-26,12 p.
* Palha de Sousa B (2011) Sharks caught as bycatch in Mozambican waters. 7th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Maldives 24-27 Oct 2011. IOTC-2011-WPEB07-24,11 p.
* Rahombanjanahary D.M. (2011). ) Sharks caught as bycatch by Malagasy national fleet in the Madagascar waters. 7th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Maldives 24-27 Oct 2011. IOTC-2011-WPEB07-26,10 p.
* Romanov E.V, Bach P, Richard E, Ternon J-F, Le Turc A (2011) PROSPER project : first year of operations. Preliminary results of ecosystem and bycatch studies in the waters of Reunion and Tromelin islands. 7th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Maldives 24-27 Oct 2011. IOTC-2011-WPEB07-26,19 p
* Bach P, Romanov E.V, Rabearisoa N, Akbaraly S, Le Turc A, Sharp A. (2011) Report for 2010 on exhaustive data collected by observers on board largest pelagic longliners based in La Reunion. Power Point presentation. 7th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Maldives 24-27 Oct 2011. IOTC-2011-WPEB07-Inf29
* Da Silva C, Wilke C, West W, Kerwath S, Marsac F (2012) Horizontal and vertical movements of swordfish tagged with pop up satellite transmitters in the southwest Indian Ocean, off South Africa. 10th Session of the Working Party on Billfish, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, Cape Town, South Africa, 11-15 Sept 2012.

***5. Theses***

* Ceyrac L (2011) Population structure of spinner dolphins (Stenella longirostris) in the SW Indian Ocean. MSc thesis, University of La Rochelle, France.
* Ng'ete Samwel Oyieke (2012) Fisheries Statistics Information System – Improving interactive web-based for SWIOFP . BSC thesis , Moi University – Chepkoilel University College, Kenya

***6. Software***

* COPAL : Maximum fishing depth and fishing tactics. English and French versions. IRD 2012.
* Microsoft Dynamics Financial Software User and Administrator Manual By Kyalo O. Lorna, Odhiambo T. Bwanzo (2011)
* Observer Database, Database User and Administrator Manual By, Wissema J. (2012)
* StatBase v3.1. User and Administrator Manual. By P. Chavance, A. Damiano et Norbert Billet, January 2011, 41 p

***7. Manuals***

* Observer Data Collection Forms for pelagic, demersal and crustacean fisheries in the SWIO, by Athayde T. South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (EN, FR, PT)
* Observer Data Collection Guide, by Athayde T (FR,EN);
* SWIOFP Fisheries Observer Manual- An Illustrated Manual for Training Fisheries Observers for Deployment on Commercial Fishing Vessels Active in the South West Indian Ocean (January 2011), Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa (FR, EN)

Annex : Stakeholder questionnaires

The following pages provide stakeholder questionnaires prepared by:

* Comoros NMU page 62
* France NMU page70
* Kenya NMU page 80
* Madagascar NMU page 90
* Mauritius NMU page 99
* Mozambique NMU page 108
* Seychelles NMU page 116
* South Africa NMU page 126
* Tanzania NMU page 115
* RMU page 138
* KMFRI page 155
* SWIOFC page 162

#### Comores NMU

**Questions sur la mise en œuvre du projet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu1. Conception du projet.** Pour tout projet, la préparation et la conception ont un impact significatif sur sa capacité d’être exécuté avec succès. L’EMP a examiné ces questions en détail et a constaté que le processus de conception du projet était suffisamment participatif, et le projet répondait aux besoins des pays et était cohérent avec la politique nationale / régionale / internationale. De même, l’EMP a conclu que les risques du projet ont été correctement identifiés (sauf pour le problème de piraterie) et que la structure institutionnelle du projet était généralement appropriée (bien que cela n’ait pas tenu compte de la nécessité de collaborer avec les universités et les ONG). A l’égard de la conception, deux critiques majeures identifiés par l’EMP étaient que le cadre logique du projet était faible et nécessitait une révision, et que les composantes 5 et 6 n’étaient pas suffisamment financées.    Pourriez-vous répondre à chacune des questions ci-dessous et indiquez si (et pourquoi)   1. vous êtes toujours d’accord avec les conclusions de l’Examen à mi-parcours en ce qui concerne la conception du projet   Réponse. oui, car le projet répond parfaitement aux besoins de chacun des pays participants. Ex. Recherche sur les thons qui est la production principale de la pêche artisanale, Sensibilisation par AEP sur les espèces menacées,   1. vous pensez que le projet est toujours aussi pertinent et cohérent aujourd’hui qu’elle l’était lors des phases de conception et d’EMP, et si non, pourquoi   Réponse. oui, cohérence avec les politiques de gestion de l’environnement malgré les retards enregistrés au démarrage   1. d’autres risques, non pris en compte dans la conception du projet ou envisagés lors de l’Examen à mi-parcours se sont concrétisés   Réponse. OUI, la piraterie   1. les délais prévus par le projet était suffisants, etc.   Réponse. oui, mais la période d’installation est confondu aux délais du projet   1. avez-vous quelques commentaires sur la complexité de la conception du projet   Réponse. lenteur dans le transfert de fond RMU vers NMU.   1. avez-vous d’autres commentaires ou observations que vous aimeriez faire à propos de la conception globale du projet en termes de son impact sur ​​la réussite de la mise en œuvre   Réponse. Tapez ici  Satisfaisant |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu2.** **EMP.** L’EMP a formulé un grand nombre de recommandations qui ont été discutées et approuvées par les parties prenantes du projet lors de la réunion aux Maldives en mars 2011. Pourriez-vous donner votre opinion sur   1. la mesure dans laquelle les actions convenues pour des groupes spécifiques (par exemple les NMU / NCC, les RCC, la RMU), etc. ont / n’ont pas été achevées. Sur la base des documents de suivi du projet, les dernières pages de ce questionnaire comprennent les recommandations de l’EMP. Veuillez commenter toutes les informations ci-dessous dans la colonne droite avec lesquelles vous n’êtes pas d’accord, en se référant au numéro de la recommandation.   Réponse. les actions sont achevées ou en cours d’achèvement  Exemple : les 2 DCPs prévus ont été déployés  La sensibilisation sur la conservation de la biodiversité ont été faite.   1. la raison de toute absence de mettre en œuvre toutes les actions convenues   Réponse. Tapez ici   1. si les mesures prises à la suite de l’EMP ont contribué à l’amélioration de l’exécution des projets, et pourquoi   Réponse. Oui, allègement des procédures, une certaine souplesse sur le traitement des dossiers |

**Qu3.** **Partenariats / liens du projet.** L’EMP a souligné la nécessité de partenariats et de liens. Merci de donner autant de détails et de justifications que possible pour votre point de vue sur

1. D’après vous, dans quelle mesure les liens entre le SWIOFP et l’ASCLME ont-ils été satisfaisants en particulier en termes de coordination de l’élaboration de l’ADT et du PAS

Réponse. Satisfaisant dans la mesure où cette coordination a permis de faire une étude assez large des grands écosystèmes marins du large avec leurs ressources. La coordination a été bien mais il a été commencé un peu tardivement et on pourrait mieux faire.

1. Dans quelle mesure le SWIOFP a-t-il été satisfaisant dans la création de liens / partenariats avec les projets d’autres bailleurs de fonds

Réponse. Satisfaisant, car la collaboration entre les experts d’autres organismes étaient franche et constructive

1. Dans quelle mesure le SWIOFP a-t-il été satisfaisant dans la création de liens / partenariats avec les gouvernements nationaux

Réponse. Satisfaisant car les points focaux désignés ont joué le rôle d’intermédiaire entre le projet et le gouvernement.

1. Dans quelle mesure le SWIOFP a-t-il été satisfaisant dans la création de liens / partenariats avec les intervenants locaux dans chacun des pays

Réponse. Satisfaisant car la désignation des coordinateurs des secteurs d’activités est efficace. Au niveau de la région, le projet a créé des liens entre les experts de la région pour les travaux des projets

1. Qu’aurait-on faire mieux / plus pour favoriser davantage de tels partenariats à différents niveaux?

Réponse. En mettant de moyens matériels et des appuis spécifiques selon le niveau de développement de chaque pays. Exple : il serait mieux si les chercheurs pourraient travailler ensemble

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu4.** **Prise de décision et exigences administratives,**   1. Dans quelle mesure les processus de prise de décision du projet ont-ils été satisfaisants tout au long des 5 dernières années, c’est-a-dire ont-ils été efficaces, pratiques et réalisables ?   Réponse. Satisfaisant, structures administratives efficace car il y avait une souplesse entre le RMU et NMU sur la prise de décisions.   1. Dans quelle mesure les documents d’orientation du projet ont-ils été satisfaisants par rapport aux procédures et exigences administratives   Réponse. modérément satisfaisant : exple quand le PIM est traduit en français ça a permis plus de compréhension du projet et des procédures |

**Qu5. Supervision du CRPP.** Veuillez donner vos commentaires sur les forces et les faiblesses de la supervision du projet par le CRPP, tout problème lié à son fonctionnement, et la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le CRPP a satisfait la nécessité d’orienter suffisamment le projet. (L’EMP a mis en évidence certaines faiblesses au niveau du CRPP et vous pouvez donc dire précisément si les choses se sont améliorées au cours des deux dernières années, et si non, pourquoi, par exemple, la cohérence des membres, ou le niveau des agents du CRPP, etc.)

Réponse. Fonctionnement du comité de pilotage amélioré - satisfaisant

**Qu6. Supervision de la Banque mondiale**. Veuillez commenter les forces et les faiblesses de la supervision du projet par la Banque mondiale, et la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que cette supervision a été satisfaisante. Merci de commenter les questions telles que les missions de supervision, l’appui au processus de passation des marchés, le soutien technique financier, vos impressions quant à la participation de la Banque, et comment le soutien et la surveillance ont été utiles. (Notez qu’il s’agit d’un aspect clé de l’ICR, et effectivement l’exigence selon laquelle la Banque préparera son propre ICR et je vous serais donc reconnaissant si vous donnez autant de commentaires que possible en répondant à cette question).

Réponse. La Banque s’était impliquée dans le processus de gestion du projet.- satisfaisant  (Les procédures ont été longues vu que ça transitait par KMFRI avant de parvenir les NMU)

**Qu7. RMU.** En soulignant les principales forces et les faiblesses au cours de la durée du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez commenter la mesure dans laquelle la RMU a été satisfaisante en ce qui concerne le soutien de l’exécution du projet

Réponse. satisfaisant , bonne coordination avec les NMU

**Qu8. KMFRI.** En soulignant toutes les principales forces et faiblesses au cours du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez donnez quelques commentaires sur la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le KMFRI (en tant qu’institution d’exécution) a soutenu de façon satisfaisante l’exécution du projet

Réponse. Au début du projet il y avait des retards de décaissement, mais ces derniers temps c’est beaucoup mieux – modérément satisfaisant

**Qu9. NMU et NCC.** En soulignant les principales forces et faiblesses au cours de la durée du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez faire des commentaires sur la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que les NMU et les NCC ont soutenu de manière satisfaisante la mise en œuvre du projet

Réponse. Manque de communication entre les différents NMU n’a pas été prévu dans la conception, bonne coordination et implication des NCC. - Satisfaisant

**Qu10. RCC / RCWG.** En soulignant les principales forces et faiblesses au cours de la durée du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez commenter la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que les RCC / RCWG ont soutenu de manière satisfaisante l’exécution du projet

Réponse. Communication insuffisante entre les RCC et les NCC. Visite manquée des RCCs au niveau des pays membres. Echange des opinions et points de vue dans le cadre des réunions de groupe de travail. Modérément satisfaisant

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu11. S & E.** En donnant des justifications et des exemples dans votre réponse, veuillez fournir trois réponses distinctes aux questions ci-dessous sur le S & E du projet   1. Dans quelle mesure la conception du S & E a-t-elle été satisfaisante, c’est-à-dire la mesure dans laquelle les indicateurs adéquats ont été identifiés afin de suivre les progrès vers l’objectif global et les objectifs de développement du projet (voir les questions 14 et 15 ci-dessous) en utilisant des méthodes de collecte efficaces, compte tenu des données spécifiques AOP / GEO et les données déjà disponibles ;   Réponse. le S&E a permis d’améliorer la gestion du projet à travers les rapports d’activité trimestriels, Satisfaisant   1. Dans quelle mesure la mise en œuvre du S & E a-t-elle été satisfaisante, c’est-à-dire la mesure dans laquelle les données appropriées ont été récupérées en utilisant des méthodes de collecte appropriées (pour assurer la qualité des données) ;   Réponse. par le biais des rapports d’activités des NCC. Parfaite cohérence et les rapports financiers Satisfaisant   1. Dans quelle mesure l’utilisation du S & a-t-elle été satisfaisante, c’est-à-dire la mesure dans laquelle les données appropriées ont été évaluées et utilisées pour éclairer la prise de décision et l’allocation des ressources.   Réponse. satisfaisant, il nous a permis d’éviter des doublons et de faire des aménagements sur les activités - Satisfaisant |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu12. Aspects fiduciaires et garanties**  Veuillez commenter séparément la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le projet a été satisfaisant en termes de   1. Passation des marchés   Réponse. Procédures respectées, au niveau NMU il n’y avait pas de problème Satisfaisant   1. Décaissements   Réponse. Satisfaisant   1. Garanties financières, par exemple, des audits, etc.   Réponse. Satisfaisant   1. Révision de l’allocation des fonds lors de l’EMP pour mieux soutenir la mise en œuvre   Réponse. Satisfaisant   1. Orientation de la gestion financière des NMU comme prévu dans le Manuel de gestion financière   Réponse. Satisfaisant |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu13. Durabilité / Risque au résultat de développement.** Cette question lie les mécanismes transitoires à l’opération post-achèvement et aux mécanismes de maintenance, et aux moyens de soutenir les réformes du projet et les capacités institutionnelles.    Pour les domaines, qui relevaient de votre responsabilité durant le projet, veuillez donner les informations sur   1. Les mesures que vous ou d’autres personnes ont prises pour s’assurer de la durabilité des activités ou des impacts du projet une fois le projet terminé, par exemple, observateurs, bases de données, croisières de recherche, réseautage, etc.   Réponse sensibiliser les politiciens sur les avantages du SWIOFP et la nécessité de la durabilité de ses activités   1. Selon vous, quels sont les principaux risques pour la durabilité des impacts du projet ? Merci d’énumérer autant que possible si vous jugez qu’ils sont pertinents, et pour les risques identifiés, veuillez me dire si vous pensez que le risque est : Négligeable ; Faible ; Modéré ; Significatif ; ou Elevé   Réponse. En général le risque est diminuées, car certaines activités sont continuées et sont attribuées à l’Etat. Modéré   1. Veuillez donner votre point de vue sur l’adéquation du soutien de la Banque en ce qui concerne la préparation de l’achèvement du projet et la durabilité de ses avantages   Réponse. |

**Résultats**

A noter : veuillez noter que dans cette section, l’ICR sera davantage centré sur la réalisation des objectifs de haut niveau du projet, et les résultats de développement, plutôt que sur les progrès réalisés par les composantes / extrants

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu14. Réalisation de l’objectif global du projet** (Promouvoir l’utilisation écologiquement durable des ressources halieutiques à travers l’adoption par les pays riverains du Sud-ouest de l’océan Indien d’une approche fondée sur les Grands écosystèmes marins (GEM) dans la gestion des pêches des GEM des Aiguilles et de Somalie tout en reconnaissant l’importance de préserver la biodiversité)  Donnez votre point de vue sur la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le projet a atteint (ou aura atteint d’ici la fin de mars) les indicateurs suivants associés à l’objectif global du projet   1. Elaboration d’une stratégie régionale harmonisée pour la gestion écosystémique des stocks de poissons partagés dans le SOOI adoptée par tous les pays participants au projet à travers le renforcement des organes régionaux de gestion tels que la CPSOOI   Réponse. Voir avec le SWIOFC pour accord du SAP à leur niveau. Nous estimons que les objectifs seront atteints car des projets au niveau national ont vu le jour et une avancé au niveau régional va rentabiliser les acquis du SWIOFC – Modérément satisfaisant   1. Adoption par tous les pays du SWIOFP à travers la CPSOOI d’un cadre de suivi et d’évaluation (y compris les indicateurs de l’état de l’environnement et de réduction du stress) qui définit l’écosystème   Réponse. Les indicateurs sont présentés à la SWIOFC ils seront validés par le comité scientifique, ces mêmes indicateurs sont dans le document du SAP qui sera adopté par les pays. Si le SAP était validé par le SWIOFC, les indicateurs seraient aussi validés. - Modérément satisfaisant   1. Production et adoption à travers la CPSOOI d’au moins deux plans sous régionaux de gestion (y compris les cadres politiques, institutionnels et juridiques) régissant la gestion d’une pêche transfrontalière spécifique pour chacune des trois catégories d’espèces du projet (crustacés, démersaux, pélagiques)   Réponse. il y a 8 plans de gestion nationaux. Il n’est pas encore possible de faire des plans sous régionaux mais on peut harmoniser les plans nationaux de gestion - Modérément satisfaisant |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu15. Réalisation des objectifs de développement du projet (ODP).** Les ODP du projet sont les suivants :   * identifier et étudier les stocks de poissons en mer exploitables dans le SOOI, plus précisément, déterminer la pression de pêche existante sur ces stocks et étudier le rôle des influences environnementales sur ​​les histoires de vie, la variabilité saisonnière et la santé des stocks afin de différencier entre les impacts environnementaux et anthropiques ; * renforcer les capacités institutionnelles et humaines par la formation et les possibilités de carrière ; et * favoriser le développement d’une structure régionale de gestion des pêches pour la mise en œuvre de l’approche fondée sur le GEM dans la gestion écosystémique par le renforcement de la Commission des pêches du sud-ouest de l’océan Indien (CPSOOI) et d’autres organismes régionaux ; et * intégrer la biodiversité dans la politique et la législation nationale en matière de gestion des pêches, et à travers la participation nationale dans les organisations régionales qui promeuvent l’exploitation durable des ressources halieutiques.   Veuillez commenter la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le projet a (ou aura atteint d’ici la fin de mars) les indicateurs suivants liés aux ODP   1. Adoption d’au moins un plan national ou multinational de gestion pour une pêche démersale, pélagique ou de crustacés spécifique par chacun des pays participants avant la fin du projet   Réponse. satisfaisant   1. Une base de données régionale sur les pêches pleinement opérationnelle et comprenant des données historiques et nouvelles, qui contribue à l’élaboration des plans régionaux de gestion des pêches pour au moins deux pêches avant la fin du projet ;   Réponse. les bases de données sont mises en place, il reste d’avoir des données des stock partagés pour les alimenter (données génétiques pour la structure des populations) - satisfaisant   1. Production d’une évaluation de base (accompagné des bases de données) qui définit le statut actuel des pêches des crustacés, démersales et pélagiques pertinentes dans chacun des pays participants avant la fin du projet;   Réponse. au moins une évaluation de base dans les pays du SWIOFP avec l’élaboration du plan d’aménagement. satisfaisant   1. Production d’un cadre de gestion durable des pêches s’appuyant sur les programmes des organes régionaux de gestion des pêches qui incluent la biodiversité en tant que principe sous-jacent.   Réponse.  Les pays ont déjà adopté l’AEP pour la gestion des pêches. Le SWIOFC a adopté les recommandations du projet EAF, harmonisation des législations des pêches au niveau régional par SWIOFP pour que soit intégré l’AEP dans la gestion des pêches - satisfaisant |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu16. Efficacité.** Veuillez indiquez si vous pensez que le projet a été efficace en ce qui concerne l’utilisation des ressources pour aboutir aux résultats du projet, avec la justification nécessaire. Si possible, veuillez donner au moins un exemple de la façon dont vous pensez que le projet a été efficace en contribuant aux résultats du projet, et au moins un exemple d’un domaine dans lequel vous pensez que le projet n’a pas été efficace ou d’un domaine où vous pensez que bien peu a été réalisé en dépit du fait que l’argent a été dépensé.    Exemple(s) positif(s) d’efficacité : Réponse. Tapez ici  Les activités des NCC ont été réalisées dans les budgets prévus par le gouvernement - satisfaisant  Exemple(s) d’absence d’efficacité :  Réponse.  Les activités du FV/Nansen a coûté trop cher et les activités ont été perturbées par la piraterie.  Diminution de l’efficacité à cause de la piraterie, concernant l’organisation des campagnes de recherche, les appels d’offre - Satisfaisant |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu17. Autres résultats**   1. Pensez-vous que le projet a d’autres résultats positifs ou négatifs en termes d’impacts sur la pauvreté, les questions genres ou sociaux   Réponse. Tapez ici   1. Dans quelle mesure pensez-vous que le projet a été satisfaisant en ce qui concerne le changement et le renforcement institutionnel, et pourquoi ?   Réponse. Tapez ici   1. Pensez-vous que le projet a d’autres résultats intentionnels ou non (positifs ou négatifs)   Réponse. Tapez ici |

**Leçons apprises**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu18. Leçons tirées des points positifs**  Veuillez citer au moins 3 leçons tirées de l’expérience du projet qui vous paraissent être des choses positives bien faites par le projet. Celles-ci pourraient se rapporter à la conception du projet, à la mise en œuvre, à l’atteint des résultats, et / ou à des intervenants particuliers du projet ou aux questions générales du projet global.  Pour chacune des leçons apprises, veuillez indiquer si vous pensez qu’elle est spécifique au projet, ou à une application / reproductibilité plus large dans d’autres projets.    Réponse. le déploiement des DCPs, le plan d’aménagement.  Le secteur privé a été intégré un peu tardivement mais ils sont intéressés par les activités  On aurait pu faire la sensibilisation sur la biodiversité et la pêche durable par le biais des ONG    ONG : Une expérience négatif, un problème organisationnel avant que ce soit un problème financier. L’état a supporté l’ONG toimaya pour la protection de la baie d’Itsandra. Comme c’est un ONG ils ont de problème d’avoir des crédits auprès des banques pour développer leurs activités  Le projet pourrait soutenir les ONG pour réaliser certaines taches qui entrent dans les objectifs du projet |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu19. Leçons tirées de points négatifs**  Merci de donner au moins 3 leçons tirées de l’expérience du projet qui vous paraissent être des choses négatives que le projet n’a pas bien faites ou dont l’impact sur le projet était négatif.  Encore une fois, veuillez dire si vous pensez que ces expériences sont spécifiques au projet ou choses que les interventions futures devraient s’efforcer d’éviter    Réponse. ONG : Une expérience négatif, un problème organisationnel avant que ce soit un problème financier. L’état a supporté l’ONG toimaya pour la protection de la baie d’Itsandra. Comme c’est un ONG ils ont de problème d’avoir des crédits auprès des banques pour développer leurs activités |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu20. Lier les leçons apprises à des activités post-achèvement**  Comment, le cas échéant et si pertinent, ces leçons sont-elles reflétées dans les activités post-achèvement en ce qui concerne les investissements financés, les opérations de suivi, et / ou toute autre étape future.    Réponse. Tapez ici |

**Qu22. Impressions générales**

En termes généraux, pensez-vous que le projet a été mis en œuvre avec succès

Oui

En termes généraux, pensez-vous que le projet a réussi à apporter les résultats escomptés ?

Oui

**Qu21. Cofinancement.** La conception du projet avait prévu un total de 6,68 millions de dollars en termes de contributions financières directes et en nature de la part des pays participants au cours de la durée de vie du projet. Pourriez-vous remplir le tableau ci-dessous

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Année** | **Salaires** | **Récurrent / opérationnel** | **Développement (travaux, biens et services)** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| 2008 / 09 | 9 500 | 4 740 | 4 000 | 18 240 | Les NCCs passent 40% de leurs temps sur SWIOFP |
| 2009 / 10 | 9 500 | 4 740 | 4 000 | 18 240 | Les salaires des NCCs sont stationnaires |
| 2010 / 11 | 9 500 | 4 740 | 4 000 | 18 240 | Les 4 740 $ reviennent à 395$/mois avec un taux de 379.71 |
| 2011 / 12 | 9 500 | 4 740 | 4 000 | 18 240 |  |
| 2012 / 13 | 9 500 | 4 740 | 4 000 | 18 240 |  |
| TOTAL | 47 500 | 23 700 | 20 000 | 91 200 |  |

#### France NMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. yes   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Its relevancy is still fine as many challenges remain at the end of the project (national and regional scales). The data acquisition for some sectors is still very incomplete and several knowledge gaps need to be addressed in a future phase   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Type here   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. 5 years is a usual timeframe. The countries did not realize how fast this can go and too many activities had a too slow pace into their implementation.   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. Type here   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. Type here  General response on design issues:  The ASCLME and SWIOFP designs took totally different approaches.  The ASCLME was built around core group of experts who drive the project process across the countries. As a result the project has been able to move very fast and generated some very good quality outputs/outcomes from consultants. However a criticism is that people in the countries may feel left aside. The project design also allows for financial incentives to be paid to selected country participants when asked to perform additional functions or produce specific outputs.  SWIOFP – the design process itself was really participatory. Approach to project based on design is for the project to be driven by people in the countries/research institutions. So if people are not motivated or busy with other activities things can go a bit slow as there is little direct control of the local scientists. Matters made worse by inability of project to pay government staff/scientists for specific outputs and they are expected to do as part of their jobs. Project progress has generally been disappointing in terms of speed of progress with lots of things done at end. But the design approach has resulted in a real sense of ownership in the project by people in the region and good building of capacity.  Difficult to say if one approach necessarily better than another. In terms of achievements of initial objectives, indeed the ASCLME approach is preferred. In terms of project ownership and participation (with real commitment into field activities and research outcomes), SWIOFP may be more appropriate. A combination of both could be envisioned for a future phase.  Project timeframe and complexity OK if had moved faster at the beginning.  Moderately satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. Indeed, for some NCCs, very limited improvements in their commitment since the MTR and still few communication internally   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. certainly not the only one, but lack of ownership of the project   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Type here |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Linkages have developed mostly at a later stage of both projects, because of the necessity to provide a unique TDA/SAP. Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Moderately satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Moderately satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Moderately satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Moderately satisfactory

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. Type here

General response:

Satisfactory in linking/partnering with ASCLME (but may be a bit too late in the project) especially for preparing the TDA/SAP and also other donor projects/high level institutions like SWIOFC.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Too many administrative burdens at times when decisions had to be taken. For instance, in procurement procedures. My feeling is that the procurement committee managed by KMFRI has shown poor performance, undermining fast implementation of activities, and without doing efforts to fast track and facilitate the process. On the other hand the Project Secretary has been able to take decisions without delays when all administrative burdens were sorted. Overall I would rate Moderately satisfactory   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Satisfactory |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. Steering committee tends to just endorse the technical working groups as same people often involved. Rarely any major recommendations on changes to proposals. So their role has been more approving and adopting. The score is then “Moderately satisfactory”

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Bank has tried very hard to motivate people. Bank have tried, but can only advise, but responsibility is for countries given the design. And difficult for them to control because of design. But oversight and engagement has been strong given those limitations. Satisfactory

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Very satisfactory

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. The handling of the procurement procedures has not been efficient. On technical aspects, the server has finally become operational and StatBase is now working from the KMFRI/SWIOFP server.

The overall rating would be “Moderately unsatisfactory”

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response.

Not always same people coming to meetings. Lack of communication between FC/NCCs (attending the meetings) and field teams in most of the countries. Not an active enough role to coordinate (again, linked to a lack of ownership of the project)

Moderately unsatisfactory

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Many RCCs not the right people and a lack of technical capacity to really control, guide and control the project activities

Moderately unsatisfactory

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Moderately satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Moderately satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Highly unsatisfactory   1. Disbursement   Response. Satisfactory (however, France is not concerned by this ; my rating is just an impression and should be seen as a low weight compared that of the other countries which experienced the system)   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Highly satisfactory   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Satisfactory  General response:  Difficult to comment on financial safeguards as French funding operated under different system (LoAs) to main SWIOFP activities.  But strong aspect of financial mgt/allocations was the ability and practice by SWIOFP of realigning/juggline budgets with monies moved from people/components that have not performed well to ones that are or need funds  General implementation performance has improved. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. SWIOFP has created a real momentum….has put countries together, identified shared interests and common ground, has built capacity which is important for sustainability (MSC students, training).  Also, likely SWIOFP 2 is being planned to ensure sustainability - will have a different approach and more focussed on governance, and with lighter project coordination.  Component 6 also a key part of ensuring sustainability – but took place too late. TDA and SAP will be critical and their preparation underway  MSc students are planned by the project to be incorporated into Gov employment as a key factor for sustainability also. Need to ask countries if MSc students are in fact going back into government  West Indian Ocean Sustainable Ecosystem Alliance (WIOSEC)   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response.  Project has had a big achievement is encapsulation of all the data. But it has to be made available from server and made available afterwards, with regular contributions.  Slow overall progress and many things done close to end of project will negatively affect sustainability  Lack of sufficient thought in some implementation issues has and will affect sustainability – e.g. FADs introduction slow, but also no awareness done with fishers…. so 2 days after their deployment were broken by fishers. So waste of money and time.  TDA and SAP will be prepared but not be formally approved/ratified before end of project  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. Type here  Overall assessment of risks: Moderate |

**Outcomes**

Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. This indicator not just the responsibility of SWIOFP but also of ASCLME. But don’t have a shared strategy yet, but basis is there and essential information is there to carry on. SAP is basically to be the strategy .   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Largely as for above - Not formally in place and adopted. Ground work is done. Has to come from SAP to some extent.   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. Same comments i.e. progress in moving towards achieving this indicator but not yet realised. National management plans largely done, but no regional ones. Again ground work being/been done. If national plans well done first, may not be that difficult to develop regional ones  Overall assessment of whether global project objective has been met: Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; Demersal not so good. Pelagics and crustaceans OK * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; Masters programme and thematic workshops have done a lot * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; Discussion taking place under SAP development and to merge ASCLME. Not sure that SWIOFC is the best institutional vehicle? IOC might be good umbrella for this, as covers fisheries, ecosystems and MCS, observers, and now extend to E African coast not just islands * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources. Component 5. Has addressed some interesting issue…marine mammals and turtles. Not an easy component. France has assisted quite a lot on component 5, along with ecological risk assessment. But not really mainstreamed into national policy and legislation?   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. An important achievement which I feel will be fullfilled at least for 50% of the proposed fishery management plans   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. realistic. Already StatBase works and the data base completion is almost 100% of initial plans   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. Almost achieved   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Realistic  Overall assessment of whether project development objectives have been met: Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response. Type here  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response. Type here  FADs slow, but no awareness done with fishers….didnt so 2 days afterwards were broken by fishers. So waste of money and time.  Plus insufficient engagement by countries and slow pace  Overall assessment of efficiency: Moderately Unsatisfactory? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. Type here   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response.Moderately unsatisfactory. This will take time and hopefully, the SWIOFP 2 will push more on governance aspects to induce such institutional changes   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Type here |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response.  Positive overall conclusion about project, and real benefits which will be realised in next 5 years if momentum continued and SWIOFP 2 is put in place. Have laid the ground for significant real progress over next 5 years and regional collaboration and capacities significantly enhanced. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response. Type here  Lesson is that for project like this need a stronger core team….dont such a large team like ASCLME, but need a trade-off and need some strong figures.  9 countries. Different capacities (financial and human), and in some countries people are overwhelmed with projects…always the same faces at meetings. Understand that very difficult for them. So big project like this a real challenge. Benguela LME only had 3 and was already difficult. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. Type here |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Generally Yes, but less administrative burdens would have resulted in much more results

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes – but only partially (see above comments)

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below.

**(In Euros)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries** | **Recurrent / Operational** | **Development (works, goods, services)** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| 2008/09 | 72 945 | 9 100 |  | 82 045 | 8 staff part time |
| 2009/10 | 92 700 | 9 800 | 252 000 | 354 500 | 9 staff part time |
| 2010/11 | 73 980 | 9 900 | 252 000 | 335 800 | 10 staff part time |
| 2011/12 | 52 740 | 10 900 |  | 63 640 | 7 staff part time |
| 2012/13 | 56 115 | 10 900 |  | 67 015 | 9 staff part time |
| TOTAL | 348 480 | 50 600 | 504 000 | 903 080 |  |

Notes :

* Recurrent refers to rental of premises (on a shared basis)
* Development refers to the lease of the IRD research vessel (R/V ANTEA)

#### Kenya NMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes.   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. The project is still as relevant and coherent especially for areas that were hard hit by piracy (Kenya, Tanzania and Seychelles) where cruises could only be undertaken using wet-leased vessels which were commercial vessels rather than research vessels. National fisheries not included in design enough   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. The major risk was piracy and has costed financial burden to the hard hit countries as they had to pay the costs themselves of providing security on board the vessels undertaking research cruises in their national waters.  Also significant risk is government remuneration of project staff….no extra funds for extra work.   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. The timeframe was adequate if the project had not experienced a slow start up and the major problem of piracy, which caused major delays in undertaking the research surveys timely as planned.   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. The project design was arrived at in a participatory way by the countries of the region and it was further agreed that for ownership each component would be lead at regional level by a participating country, thus we had Regional Component Coordinators and countries as Component Leaders. However it would have been desirable that at the RMU, a scientific specialist officer would have been recruited as well to oversee the scientific technical products generated since science in the project was core just as there were specialists recruited for finances, IT and Administration.   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. The design allowed flexibility which allowed making necessary changes to deal with emerging issues and challenges.  Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. Agreed with comments made.   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. Not clear, challenges were cross-cutting and not mutually exclusive, thus causing interlinked chain reactions with direct and indirect influence e.g. disbursement and procurement.   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Yes they assisted; and besides flexibility, proactive and innovativeness also assisted. |

**Qu 3Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. It was highly satisfactory. Policy makers could easily appreciate the complementarity of the information on environment generated by ASCLME and the information generated on the biological resources by SWIOFP and how science for governance could be practised for sustainability. This culminated in the development of a joint ASCLME –SWIOFP with full participation of the high level policy makers from all the countries of the region.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Moderately Satisfactory and this may have been due to the fact that the project design was not explicit how such partnerships could be managed. Satisfactorily with FAO EAF Nansen on use of RV Fridtjof Nansen and preparation of management plans. And with Nairobi Convention

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Satisfactory, especially in the management of the project. There were linkages with government through the RPSC

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Moderately satisfactory especially in the development of management plans.

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. A project communication strategy should have been included in the PAD and a Communication Specialist recruited to undertake this task; besides putting in place management guidelines for partnering with other projects that would include financial issues and sharing of capacity.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Satisfactory with RCCs, NMUs and RMUs all involved in implementation of decisions, noting that decision-making is by the Regional Project Policy Steering Committee. Where NCCs were not housed in NMUs this sometimes reduced communication and is mostly through internet with them  it was good that it was possible to review the budget in between annual meetings.   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Satisfactory.  Inter country cooperation for cruises between countries was good to a certain extent, but details about budget planning for cruises and who should pay, wasn’t clear in the project guidance documents (PIM)  However the RMU helped by directly paying for the costs of the cruises (both leases and sea-allowances to crew on board the vessels) because of the disbursement problems at country level. For timeliness the Regional Component 1 Budget had to similarly be managed by the RMU to ensure the regional tasks took place timely as planned. It should be further noted that the project documents included other core technical documents for facilitating cruises e.g . Sailing Orders, Observer Manuals, Templates for Cruise Reports, etc not just the PIM to ensure quality outputs.  Q4 Is cross-cutting and cannot effectively be addressed in isolation especially as it relates to feedbacks on: Q1(e), Q5, Q8, Q9, Q10. Issues from Q4 became very crucial in the project structure for the joint ASCLME-SAP Development including the management of the science |

**Qu 5.RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC,etc....)

Response. Satisfactory. It was overambitious to contemplate that such a high policy level committee to adequately monitor and manage a regional project without being backed by a supportive ad-hoc committee that could meet even at short notices to deliberate on emerging issues (both scientific and administrative) of the project.

**Qu 6.World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Satisfactory and to note that it supported fully the participatory approach and management practise agreed during the project development and even after changes in the Task Team Leadership. There was no feeling that while doing this; it ever compromised its policy to please the region.

**Qu 7.RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory noting that with a thin staff-strength of limited capacity and various challenges could still be innovative enough to deliver.

**Qu 8.KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory noting that it availed some facilities and staffs for the project support both directly and indirectly. However for KMFRI its major challenges were in the roles of disbursements and procurement.

**Qu 9.NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory noting that these are full time employees of their Institutions (KMFRI, Universities and Ministry of Fisheries Development’s Fisheries Department). Besides administrative and scientific tasks they undertake, some undertake academic supervision of the SWIOFP MSc Grantees in cooperation with the University Supervisors where the Grantees are registered. Weaknesses are due to various challenges associated with funds disbursement and procurement leading to delay in timely delivery according to the agreed time-frames despite working overtime which is not compensated.

**Qu 10.RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory noting that RCCs were country chosen so that each component could be country lead rather than based on a competitive professional regional criterion but for equity. The outputs of the RCWGs were not fully realized because the data collected is yet to be fully analyzed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Very Satisfactory within the stated challenges and the innovative approaches made but still remained scientific enough, due to unforeseen circumstances.   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Very satisfactory, noting that there were adequate preparations of sampling/research protocols before undertaking any research cruise and any subsequent laboratory analyses; and that at the conclusion of a research cruise, a post cruise meeting was held followed by data entries/processing and report writing. In some cases scientific papers for publication in refereed journals were generated.  logframe and indicators were used to monitor and drive project   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Moderately satisfactory noting that the data has not been fully analysed and that some of the cruises have just been completed due to the challenges explained earlier. A strategy is required to ensure that these data are analysed under the SWIOFC with the participation of the identified working groups in the project. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Satisfactory in terms of following the required processes in procurement.   1. Disbursement   Response. Satisfactory in terms of following the required processes in financial procedures.   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory noting that the audits were done timely as per the Auditor Generals procedures*.*   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Satisfactory but delays in disbursement still remained a bottleneck.   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Satisfactory in terms of clarifying the processes for adherence. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. The strategy taken to include various Institutions i.e. KMFRI (Research), Universities (Training and Research) and Department of Fisheries (Management) was to ensure that sustainability is achieved beyond the lifetime of the project as follows:   * Common research protocols adopted at regional level are practised both in research and training institutions and that the same are taught at Universities; * Science for governance is appropriately disseminated to management institutions through interlinkages of the research and training institutions; * Create a database that can be used by research, training and management institutions; * Create and sustain a capacity to collect and analyze the desired science for governance policy information through inter-institutional and multidisciplinary teams and in so doing also create common ownership of the outcomes.   But slow start up impacted on the likelihood that activities promoted by the project will be fully institutionalised and will continue on project completion i.e. if project activities had been completed earlier there would have been more time for the project to ensure their continuation.  Relying on SWIOFP2 (loan project). Regional coop is good. It should be noted that not all countries which participated in the ending SWIOFP are eligible for loans and this may bring a fundamental question on the sustainability of SWIOFP without linking to the ASCLME-SWIOFP SAP.  Donor conference planned for end of project  Planning to give proposal to SWIOFC for countries to adopt databases as a recommendation. nb that this was part of the SWIOFP PAD and has been a crucial issue in the ASCLME/SWIOFP SAP.   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Moderate: Loosing the inter-institutional bonding that has been created can occur, although personal professional bonding is unlikely to wither away; as there is a strong likelihood that the researchers are highly motivated to seek sponsors to continue with the research and generate science for governance to ensure the resource are sustainably utilised and conserved for the human well being.  2 data risks – SWIOFP is paying for some data generation (e.g. observers) and that will stop, and then also updating won’t happen at regional level. Risks will depend on SWIOFC and the extent to which recommendations are implemented or not. Political risks could impact on outcomes. But it is also important to think of the opportunities in the ASCLME-SWIOFP SAP. They will also be important in the Proposed Donor’s Conference as proactive approaches  Big risk is staff turnover – Staff are shared with Universities and what needs to be encouraged is the inter-institutional co-operations to work together and share research facilities through MOUs.  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. The Bank has proactively supported the development of the ASCLME-SWIOFP Joint Strategic Action Programme and The SWIOFish Concept note to come up with Projects that will sustain the efforts and gains made in these projects. |

**Outcomes**

*Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs*

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (*To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)*  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Satisfactory: Considerable capacity building and awareness was achieved and there is high realisation of the need for the researchers and managers including the decision –makers to work together as a region as evidenced in the joint ASCLME-SWIOFP SAP Development for sustainable development besides the agreement that SWIOFP is nested by SWIOFC and eventually the SWIOFP data is analysed by Working Groups under SWIOFC.   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Satisfactory: As stated above the joint ASCLME-SWIOFP SAP based on a regional TDA addresses bio-physical systems that will address this.   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. Satisfactory: The management plans are being finalized. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; and * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. Satisfactory: As stated above the management plans will be completed before March2013.   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. Moderately Satisfactory: Not all historical data will be available.   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. Satisfactory: The gap analyses were undertaken for each country.   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Satisfactory: The management plans are being finalised including regional legal assessments for harmonization. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Satisfactory  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Tanzania wanted cruises on their own, but used Kenyan vessels so lost time on steaming time one day each way so less cruise days. Switching security guards also contributed to inefficiencies because countries cannot share armed guards from other countries in their territorial waters. Another example was demersal gear not arriving in time for training and have to buy more gear  Provide overall rating for efficiency here (see footnote for rating scale): Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. Type here: Nil negative outcomes   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. Highly Satisfactory. Contributed to capacity building and great awareness to regional transboundary issues and net-working.   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Exposed KMFRI to regional and global organizations and besides Kenya will have a better current knowledge of the status of her offshore fisheries resources rather than depending on information that was collected 30 years ago. |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  A project designed with involvement of the beneficiaries, as the case with SWIOFP, is the best approach in project development than one written by a consultant remotely sitting at a desk deciding for the intended beneficiaries. It has a very high sense of ownership by the beneficiaries and in times of hardships it has been more resilient as the beneficiaries readily tried to find innovative ways of overcoming the obstacles so that they could eventually realise success. As it comes to an end there is a high tendency to support its extension or develop a further new project to address new emerging issues from the ended project. In such a case the capacity built and the trust shared comes in handy to strengthen the continued collaboration.  Key lesson learned mid-year reviews are very useful. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  The working relationship was collegial and therefore the challenges were proactively taken as catalysts for innovativeness.  with a lack of sufficient stakeholder consultation regarding the deployment of FAD’s led to many of them being displaced and lost.  IT platforms in many countries were poor, with insufficient bandwidth – the lesson being that technological issues can impact on project implementation.  Data mgt processes are an evolutionary process and it can be difficult to be too specific at outset of any project about what should be done as things can change so much, so flexibility is important.  Staff remuneration issue….but gov issue. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. Broadly there should be a serious awareness campaign to promote science for governance approach with an aim of creating policies that will support efficiency in implementing research project so that results can timely be delivered as per work-plans and support governance policies timely, and for support of socio-economic human-well being which depends on health of oceans. |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes

**Qu. 21.Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries**  **(US $)** | **Recurrent / Operational**  **(US $)** | **Development (works, goods, services)**  **(US $)** | **Total**  **(US $)** | **Notes**  **(As indicated earlier)** |
| 2008/09 | 826,057 | 45,000 | 105,000 | 976,057 |  |
| 2009/10 | 826,057 | 48,000 | 105,000 | 979,057 |  |
| 2010/11 | 826,057 | 51,000 | 105,000 | 982,057 |  |
| 2011/12 | 826,057 | 51,000 | 105,000 | 982,057 |  |
| 2012/13 | 619,543 | 38,250 | 78,750 | 736,543 |  |
| TOTAL | 3,923,771 | 233,250 | 498,750 | 4,655,771 |  |

#### Madagascar NMU

**Questions sur la mise en œuvre du projet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu1. Conception du projet.** Pour tout projet, la préparation et la conception ont un impact significatif sur sa capacité d’être exécuté avec succès. L’EMP a examiné ces questions en détail et a constaté que le processus de conception du projet était suffisamment participatif, et le projet répondait aux besoins des pays et était cohérent avec la politique nationale / régionale / internationale. De même, l’EMP a conclu que les risques du projet ont été correctement identifiés (sauf pour le problème de piraterie) et que la structure institutionnelle du projet était généralement appropriée (bien que cela n’ait pas tenu compte de la nécessité de collaborer avec les universités et les ONG). A l’égard de la conception, deux critiques majeures identifiés par l’EMP étaient que le cadre logique du projet était faible et nécessitait une révision, et que les composantes 5 et 6 n’étaient pas suffisamment financées.    Pourriez-vous répondre à chacune des questions ci-dessous et indiquez si (et pourquoi)   1. vous êtes toujours d’accord avec les conclusions de l’Examen à mi-parcours en ce qui concerne la conception du projet   Réponse. Oui   1. vous pensez que le projet est toujours aussi pertinent et cohérent aujourd’hui qu’elle l’était lors des phases de conception et d’EMP, et si non, pourquoi pas   Réponse. Oui parce que toutes les activités entreprises s’alignent vraiment et sont complémentaires à la politique et aux stratégies de développement de la pêche au niveau national.   1. d’autres risques, non pris en compte dans la conception du projet ou envisagés lors de l’Examen à mi-parcours se sont concrétisés   Réponse. Absence de motivation des NCCs   1. les délais prévus par le projet était suffisants, etc.   Réponse. Oui mais c’est au niveau de la lenteur administrative (déblocage du fond) où se trouvent tous les reports des différentes activités techniques des NCCs   1. avez-vous quelques commentaires sur la complexité de la conception du projet   Réponse. C’est tout à fait évident que la conception du projet est complexe du fait de la différence entre les pays du point de vue politique, social, économique   1. avez-vous d’autres commentaires ou observations que vous aimeriez faire à propos de la conception globale du projet en termes de son impact sur ​​la réussite de la mise en œuvre   Réponse. En fait, le Projet répond tant aux réalités du terrain.  Satisfaisante |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu2.** **EMP.** L’EMP a formulé un grand nombre de recommandations qui ont été discutées et approuvées par les parties prenantes du projet lors de la réunion aux Maldives en mars 2011. Pourriez-vous donner votre opinion sur   1. la mesure dans laquelle les actions convenues pour des groupes spécifiques (par exemple les NMU / NCC, les RCC, la RMU), etc. ont / n’ont pas été achevées. Sur la base des documents de suivi du projet, les dernières pages de ce questionnaire comprennent les recommandations de l’EMP. Veuillez commenter toutes les informations ci-dessous dans la colonne droite avec lesquelles vous n’êtes pas d’accord, en se référant au numéro de la recommandation.   Réponse. Oui ils ont été achevés   1. la raison de toute absence de mettre en œuvre toutes les actions convenues   Réponse. Ce sont les conditions de travail et/ou le non disponibilité des moyens qui ont conduit au non réalisation de certaines activités.  Par exemple : l’absence de bateau.   1. si les mesures prises à la suite de l’EMP ont contribué à l’amélioration de l’exécution des projets, et pourquoi   Réponse. Oui parce que l’EMP fait ressortir des dispositions en vue de rehausser avec méthode la qualité du projet, compte tenu d'une série de facteurs clés de réussite à laquelle viennent s'ajouter des observations et des suggestions d'une analyse technique par des pairs internes et externes. |

**Qu3.** **Partenariats / liens du projet.** L’EMP a souligné la nécessité de partenariats et de liens. Merci de donner autant de détails et de justifications que possible pour votre point de vue sur

1. D’après vous, dans quelle mesure les liens entre le SWIOFP et l’ASCLME ont-ils été satisfaisants en particulier en termes de coordination de l’élaboration de l’ADT et du PAS

Réponse. Très satisfaisante

Effectivement, les deux Projets sont complémentaires, ils couvrent le même domaine géographique, dont l’activité commune est l’élaboration d’une Analyse Diagnostique Transfrontalière (ADT) unique et un Programme d’Action Stratégique (PAS) commune pour la gestion des ressources selon une approche écosystémique. En fait, au niveau national aussi bien qu’au niveau régional, toutes les parties prenantes de l’ADT et du PAS collaborent dans une sérieuse et sincère ambiance, c’est pourquoi actuellement on arrive à un stage très avancé.

1. Dans quelle mesure le SWIOFP a-t-il été satisfaisant dans la création de liens / partenariats avec les projets d’autres bailleurs de fonds

Réponse. Très satisfaisante. Worked with WWF and also on FADs with AFDB.

Le Projet SWIOFP a créé des liens avec les projets d’autres bailleurs de fonds, aussi bien au niveau régional qu’au niveau national : Par exemple au niveau national à Madagascar, il y des étroites collaborations entre du SWIOFP NMU et le WWF, et le Projet d’Appui aux Communautés des Pêcheurs de Toliara (PACPT), Madagascar National Park (MNP) de Diégo, Institut Halieutique et des Sciences Marines (IHSM), SMARTFish, ASCLME, EAF Nansen, Centre de Surveillance des Pêches (CSP).

1. Dans quelle mesure le SWIOFP a-t-il été satisfaisant dans la création de liens / partenariats avec les gouvernements nationaux

Réponse. Très satisfaisante.

Dans le cadre de l’élaboration du Plan de Gestion de la pêche aux poissons démersaux et du Programme d’Action Stratégique (PAS), le Projet SWIOFP Madagascar a pu développer une franche collaboration avec d’autres Organisations et d’autres Institutions gouvernementales. Par exemple, lors de la Consultation nationale pour le PAS, tous les Ministères concernés et les Institutions concernées ont participé activement à l’Atelier.

1. Dans quelle mesure le SWIOFP a-t-il été satisfaisant dans la création de liens / partenariats avec les intervenants locaux dans chacun des pays

Réponse. Satisfaisante

A chaque mission effectuée au niveau des régions nationales, toutes les parties prenantes (la direction régionale de la pêche concernée, les pêcheurs, les communautés locales, les institutions) sont invitées à participer aux différents réunions et ateliers, voire à des interventions techniques autant qu’elles sont concernées.

1. Qu’aurait-on faire mieux / plus pour favoriser davantage de tels partenariats à différents niveaux?

Réponse. Tapez ici

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Prise de décision et exigences administratives**   1. Dans quelle mesure les processus de prise de décision du projet ont-ils été satisfaisants tout au long des 5 dernières années, c’est-a-dire ont-ils été efficaces, pratiques et réalisables ?   Réponse. En général satisfaisants, mais difficile dans un grand pays comme Madagascar, avec quelque NCCs pas dans le Ministère.   1. Dans quelle mesure les documents d’orientation du projet ont-ils été satisfaisants par rapport aux procédures et exigences administratives   Réponse. En général, satisfaisant. Mais quelquefois, les procédures sont longues. |

**Qu5. Supervision du CRPP.** Veuillez donner vos commentaires sur les forces et les faiblesses de la supervision du projet par le CRPP, tout problème lié à son fonctionnement, et la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le CRPP a satisfait la nécessité d’orienter suffisamment le projet. (L’EMP a mis en évidence certaines faiblesses au niveau du CRPP et vous pouvez donc dire précisément si les choses se sont améliorées au cours des deux dernières années, et si non, pourquoi pas, par exemple, la cohérence des membres, ou le niveau des agents du CRPP, etc.)

Réponse. On peut dire que la réunion du CRPP s’est fait dans la bonne direction, donc satisfaisante.

Effectivement, la réunion du CRPP a donné des recommandations qui ont servi de corrections pour le projet afin de prendre la donne direction pour atteindre les objectifs. C’est la raison pour laquelle on constate que le Projet a beaucoup progressé dans la réalisation des différentes activités au niveau des 6 Composantes aussi bien nationales que régionales.

**Qu6. Supervision de la Banque mondiale**. Veuillez commenter les forces et les faiblesses de la supervision du projet par la Banque mondiale, et la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que cette supervision a été satisfaisante. Merci de commenter les questions telles que les missions de supervision, l’appui au processus de passation des marchés, le soutien technique financier, vos impressions quant à la participation de la Banque, et comment le soutien et la surveillance ont été utiles. (Notez qu’il s’agit d’un aspect clé de l’ICR, et effectivement l’exigence selon laquelle la Banque préparera son propre ICR et je vous serais donc reconnaissant si vous donnez autant de commentaires que possible en répondant à cette question).

Réponse. Ça a été très satisfaisant.

La participation de la Banque Mondiale ont été utiles du fait que la Passation de marché est indispensable pour la bonne gestion financière d’un projet.

**Qu7. RMU.** En soulignant les principales forces et les faiblesses au cours de la durée du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez commenter la mesure dans laquelle la RMU a été satisfaisante en ce qui concerne le soutien de l’exécution du projet

Réponse. NCCs feel performance satisfaisante. Le même avis pour la NMU qui était très satisfaisante.

En fait, le KMFRI nous a toujours soutenus durant le Projet : conseils, instructions, corrections, appui, assistance.

**Qu8. KMFRI.** En soulignant toutes les principales forces et faiblesses au cours du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez donnez quelques commentaires sur la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le KMFRI (en tant qu’institution d’exécution) a soutenu de façon satisfaisante l’exécution du projet

Réponse. Très satisfaisante

Le programme de recherches du KMFRI rejoint les besoins des pays concernés, c'est-à-dire par exemple pour Madagascar, les recherches effectuées contribuent à la gestion durable des ressources halieutiques relative aux objectifs du Gouvernement : recherches sur les crevettes qui constituent une des activités de pêche génératrices de devises, recherches sur les poissons démersaux et les poissons pélagiques qui concernent les pêcheurs traditionnels et industriels.

**Qu9. NMU et NCC.** En soulignant les principales forces et faiblesses au cours de la durée du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez faire des commentaires sur la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que les NMU et les NCC ont soutenu de manière satisfaisante la mise en œuvre du projet

Réponse.

Some problems with availability/approval of funds by NMU for NCC activities in year 5 as budget removed and fiche changed because activities had not been completed, but NCCs don’t understand the process well of having to use funds or lose them.

NCCs have participated well in component meetings.

NCCs able to complete SWIOFP activities because were aligned well with their existing jobs.

Satisfaisante

Les NCCs ont réalisé leurs activités autant qu’ils ont disposé les moyens y afférents.

**Qu10. RCC / RCWG.** En soulignant les principales forces et faiblesses au cours de la durée du projet et en donnant des exemples, le cas échéant, veuillez commenter la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que les RCC / RCWG ont soutenu de manière satisfaisante l’exécution du projet

Réponse. RCC performance mixed, and better for some components than others. Many RCCs not sufficiently engaged and communicating with the NCCs.

Modérément insatisfaisante

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu11. S & E.** En donnant des justifications et des exemples dans votre réponse, veuillez fournir trois réponses distinctes aux questions ci-dessous sur le S & E du projet   1. Dans quelle mesure la conception du S & E a-t-elle été satisfaisante, c’est-à-dire la mesure dans laquelle les indicateurs adéquats ont été identifiés afin de suivre les progrès vers l’objectif global et les objectifs de développement du projet (voir les questions 14 et 15 ci-dessous) en utilisant des méthodes de collecte efficaces, compte tenu des données spécifiques AOP / GEO et les données déjà disponibles;   Réponse. Satisfaisante.  La conception du Suivi et Evaluation était satisfaisante car ils nous permettaient de recueillir régulièrement des informations et la vérification à intervalles rapprochés des progrès réalisés. En fait, pour piloter un projet de façon à en accroître l’impact, il est indispensable de disposer d’informations fiables sur le déroulement des activités et les résultats obtenus, sur les motifs de succès et d’échec, et sur le contexte dans lequel se déroulent les activités engagées. Ces informations sont le produit de système de Suivi et Evaluation. Leur analyse avec les acteurs clés peut contribuer à la prise de décisions qui amélioreront le projet.   1. Dans quelle mesure la mise en œuvre du S & E a-t-elle été satisfaisante, c’est-à-dire la mesure dans laquelle les données appropriées ont été récupérées en utilisant des méthodes de collecte appropriées (pour assurer la qualité des données) ;   Réponse. Satisfaisante.   1. Dans quelle mesure l’utilisation du S & E a-t-elle été satisfaisante, c’est-à-dire la mesure dans laquelle les données appropriées ont été évaluées et utilisées pour éclairer la prise de décision et l’allocation des ressources.   Réponse. Satisfaisante.  Le suivi et l’évaluation des activités du projet étaient satisfaisants parce qu’ils nous ont permis de juger de la progression réalisée en direction des objectifs et des résultats, c’est à dire pour la prise de décision pour améliorer le travail au sein du projet |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu12. Aspects fiduciaires et garanties**  Veuillez commenter séparément la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le projet a été satisfaisant en termes de   1. Passation des marchés   Réponse. C’est la meme procedure que la comptabilite nationale. Pas de problemes.   1. Décaissements   Réponse. Pas de problems majeure.   1. Garanties financières, par exemple, des audits, etc.   Réponse. Les procedures de verifications mises en place ne pose pas de problems et evident les risques de dérives.   1. Révision de l’allocation des fonds lors de l’EMP pour mieux soutenir la mise en œuvre   Réponse. Satisfaisante   1. Orientation de la gestion financière des NMU comme prévu dans le Manuel de gestion financière   Réponse. Pas de problèmes, mais le logiciel prévus n’est pas encore utilisées, par faute de connexion internet. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu13. Durabilité / Risque au résultat de développement.** Cette question lie les mécanismes transitoires à l’opération post-achèvement et aux mécanismes de maintenance, et aux moyens de soutenir les réformes du projet et les capacités institutionnelles.    Pour les domaines, qui relevaient de votre responsabilité durant le projet, veuillez donner les informations sur   1. Les mesures que vous ou d’autres personnes ont prises pour s’assurer de la durabilité des activités ou des impacts du projet une fois le projet terminé, par exemple, observateurs, bases de données, croisières de recherche, réseautage, etc.   Réponse. Relying on other projects to follow up on many SWIOFP activities. Tried to integrate FADs in AfDB project, but still have maintenance issues with FADs – need fishermen to be trained in diving.   1. Selon vous, quels sont les principaux risques pour la durabilité des impacts du projet ? Merci d’énumérer autant que possible si vous jugez qu’ils sont pertinents, et pour les risques identifiés, veuillez me dire si vous pensez que le risque est : Négligeable ; Faible ; Modéré ; Significatif ; ou Elevé   Réponse. Difficult to communicate project activities to the private sector for uptake of new ideas and project introductions e.g. FADs. Sustainability depends to a large extent on other/future projects, as need some way to ensure maintenance of FADs. Observers may be supported in longer-term by Smartfish. Modéré   1. Veuillez donner votre point de vue sur l’adéquation du soutien de la Banque en ce qui concerne la préparation de l’achèvement du projet et la durabilité de ses avantages   Réponse. Actuellement, en période de veille de la fin du Projet, la Banque nous procure sn soutien en termes de possibilité d’achèvement de toutes les activités qui n’ont pas été réalisées. Donc à la fin du Projet, on peut souhaiter que sa continuité soit assurée. |

**Résultats**

A noter : veuillez noter que dans cette section, l’ICR sera davantage centré sur la réalisation des objectifs de haut niveau du projet, et les résultats de développement, plutôt que sur les progrès réalisés par les composantes / extrants

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu14. Réalisation de l’objectif global du projet** (Promouvoir l’utilisation écologiquement durable des ressources halieutiques à travers l’adoption par les pays riverains du Sud-ouest de l’océan Indien d’une approche fondée sur les Grands écosystèmes marins (GEM) dans la gestion des pêches des GEM des Aiguilles et de Somalie tout en reconnaissant l’importance de préserver la biodiversité)  Donnez votre point de vue sur la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le projet a atteint (ou aura atteint d’ici la fin de mars) les indicateurs suivants associés à l’objectif global du projet   1. Elaboration d’une stratégie régionale harmonisée pour la gestion écosystémique des stocks de poissons partagés dans le SOOI adoptée par tous les pays participants au projet à travers le renforcement des organes régionaux de gestion tels que la CPSOOI   Réponse. Not achieved, but that is because there are few if any regionally shared stocks, and analysis of genetic results not complete at time of questionnaire completion. So no regional strategy. Indicator and objective may not be that relevant. Modérément insatisfaisante   1. Adoption par tous les pays du SWIOFP à travers la CPSOOI d’un cadre de suivi et d’évaluation (y compris les indicateurs de l’état de l’environnement et de réduction du stress) qui définit l’écosystème   Réponse. SAP under preparation, and list of environmental indicators submitted to CPSOOI for consideration by their scientific committee. Won’t happen during the project due to timing issues. Indicator only partially completed. Modérément satisfaisante   1. Production et adoption à travers la CPSOOI d’au moins deux plans sous régionaux de gestion (y compris les cadres politiques, institutionnels et juridiques) régissant la gestion d’une pêche transfrontalière spécifique pour chacune des trois catégories d’espèces du projet (crustacés, démersaux, pélagiques)   Réponse. Not achieved for the same reason as indicator 1. Problems with project design. Modérément insatisfaisante |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu15. Réalisation des objectifs de développement du projet (ODP).** Les ODP du projet sont les suivants :   * identifier et étudier les stocks de poissons en mer exploitables dans le SOOI, plus précisément, déterminer la pression de pêche existante sur ces stocks et étudier le rôle des influences environnementales sur ​​les histoires de vie, la variabilité saisonnière et la santé des stocks afin de différencier entre les impacts environnementaux et anthropiques ; * renforcer les capacités institutionnelles et humaines par la formation et les possibilités de carrière ; et * favoriser le développement d’une structure régionale de gestion des pêches pour la mise en œuvre de l’approche fondée sur le GEM dans la gestion écosystémique par le renforcement de la Commission des pêches du sud-ouest de l’océan Indien (CPSOOI) et d’autres organismes régionaux ; et * intégrer la biodiversité dans la politique et la législation nationale en matière de gestion des pêches, et à travers la participation nationale dans les organisations régionales qui promeuvent l’exploitation durable des ressources halieutiques.   Veuillez commenter la mesure dans laquelle vous pensez que le projet a (ou aura atteint d’ici la fin de mars) les indicateurs suivants liés aux ODP   1. Adoption d’au moins un plan national ou multinational de gestion pour une pêche démersale, pélagique ou de crustacés spécifique par chacun des pays participants avant la fin du projet   Réponse. Demersal fishery mgt plan in Madagascar will be validated and adopted by the end of the project. Indicator will be achieved. Satisfaisante   1. Une base de données régionale sur les pêches pleinement opérationnelle et comprenant nouvelles et historiques données, qui contribue à l’élaboration des plans régionaux de gestion des pêches pour au moins deux pêches avant la fin du projet ;   Réponse. Indicator largely completed. Generally very happy about capacity development of the project. Satisfaisante   1. Production d’une évaluation de base (accompagné des bases de données) qui définit le statut actuel des pêches des crustacés, démersales et pélagiques pertinentes dans chacun des pays participants avant la fin du projet;   Réponse. Yes for Madagascar. Satisfaisante   1. Production d’un cadre de gestion durable des pêches s’appuyant sur les programmes des organes régionaux de gestion des pêches qui incluent la biodiversité en tant que principe sous-jacent.   Réponse. Yes. Training in ecosystems-based approach by the project means that such approaches are now more widely accepted in the region and by SWIOFC countries. Satisfaisante |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu16. Efficacité.** Veuillez indiquez si vous pensez que le projet a été efficace en ce qui concerne l’utilisation des ressources pour aboutir aux résultats du projet, avec la justification nécessaire. Si possible, veuillez donner au moins un exemple de la façon dont vous pensez que le projet a été efficace en contribuant aux résultats du projet, et au moins un exemple d’un domaine dans lequel vous pensez que le projet n’a pas été efficace ou d’un domaine où vous pensez que bien peu a été réalisé en dépit du fait que l’argent a été dépensé.    Exemple(s) positif(s) d’efficacité : Réponse. Tapez ici  Research work done in the region was completed a low cost  Efficient introduction of FADs provided good value for money    Exemple(s) d’absence d’efficacité : Réponse. Tapez ici  Turtle tagging was not completed during the best season, and not with sufficient education with fishermen.  Observer data fiche changed because the quality of data being provided was different  Problem also with requiring observers to complete forms by/on computer provided by project, not paper. Observers prefer to submit on paper (or dont know well how to use computers even after the training) and computers not being used but still being taken to sea by observers.  Modérément satisfaisante |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu17. Autres résultats**   1. Pensez-vous que le projet a d’autres résultats positifs ou négatifs en termes d’impacts sur la pauvreté, les questions genres ou sociaux   Réponse. En fait, le Projet a des résultats positifs en termes d’impacts sur la pauvreté car le fait d’avoir mis en place le DCP a développé la zone de pêche, donc permet aux pêcheurs d’avoir plus de capture qui va augmenter leur revenu et ainsi améliorer leur niveau de vie.   1. Dans quelle mesure pensez-vous que le projet a été satisfaisant en ce qui concerne le changement et le renforcement institutionnel, et pourquoi ?   Réponse. Le Projet a renforcé la collaboration du département chargé de la pêche avec d’autres projets et institutions (WWF, Madagascar National Park, le Projet d’Appui aux Communautés des Pêcheurs de Toliara, le Ministère de l’Environnement et des Forêts, l’IHSM, les Directions régionales de la pêche concernées, le Centre National des recherches Océanographiques, le Projet Blue Ventures, etc….)   1. Pensez-vous que le projet a d’autres résultats intentionnels ou non (positifs ou négatifs)   Réponse. Les femmes des pêcheurs ont aussi bénéficié du Projet parce que ce sont elles-mêmes qui assurent le vente des produits pêchés par leurs maris. |

**Leçons apprises**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu18. Leçons tirées des points positifs**  Veuillez citer au moins 3 leçons tirées de l’expérience du projet qui vous paraissent être des choses positives bien faites par le projet. Celles-ci pourraient se rapporter à la conception du projet, à la mise en œuvre, à l’atteint des résultats, et / ou à des intervenants particuliers du projet ou aux questions générales du projet global.  Pour chacune des leçons apprises, veuillez indiquer si vous pensez qu’elle est spécifique au projet, ou à une application / reproductibilité plus large dans d’autres projets.    Réponse. Tapez ici   * Have been some very positive impacts of the project e.g. capacity building (national, institutions) * Strong participation by stakeholders in the region in project design * Importance of strong partnerships. * Change in attitudes because of the success of interventions |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu19. Leçons tirées de points négatifs**  Merci de donner au moins 3 leçons tirées de l’expérience du projet qui vous paraissent être des choses négatives que le projet n’a pas bien faites ou dont l’impact sur le projet était négatif.  Encore une fois, veuillez dire si vous pensez que ces expériences sont spécifiques au projet ou choses que les interventions futures devraient s’efforcer d’éviter   Réponse. Tapez ici   * Project duration not really sufficient, so needs to be first phase * Should have moved faster at beginning of the project in order to finish all activities. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu20. Lier les leçons apprises à des activités post-achèvement**  Comment, le cas échéant et si pertinent, ces leçons sont-elles reflétées dans les activités post-achèvement en ce qui concerne les investissements financés, les opérations de suivi, et / ou toute autre étape future.    Réponse. En ce qui concerne les activités au niveau des Régions concernées, ce sont les Directions régionales de la pêche concernée qui vont assurer la continuité du suivi et de la collaboration des activités avec les pêcheurs et les communautés concernées. |

**Qu22. Impressions générales**

En termes généraux, pensez-vous que le projet a été mis en œuvre avec succès

Oui

En termes généraux, pensez-vous que le projet a réussi à apporter les résultats escomptés ?

Oui

**Qu21. Cofinancement.** La conception du projet avait prévu un total de 6,68 millions de dollars en termes de contributions financières directes et en nature de la part des pays participants au cours de la durée de vie du projet. Pourriez-vous remplir le tableau ci-dessous

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Année** | **Salaires** | **Récurrent / opérationnel** | **Développement (travaux, biens et services)** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| 2008 / 09 | 15 600 |  |  | **15 600** |  |
| 2009 / 10 | 15 600 | 5 580 |  | **21 180** |  |
| 2010 / 11 | 15 600 | 2 000 | 1 500 | **19 100** |  |
| 2011 / 12 | 11 000 | 5 000 | 3 000  15 000 | **34 000** | Building cost of the Office of NMU |
| 2012 / 13 | 9 000 | 3 300 | 2 400 | **14 700** |  |
| TOTAL | **66 800** | **15 880** | **21 900** | **104 580** |  |

#### Mauritius NMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Still very relevant in terms of the overall objectives.   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Piracy considered in MTR, no other significant risks have arisen which were not envisaged during the design.   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. No. Even if RMU had been set up earlier and been more active, would still have been insufficient time due to different capacities across countries. Timeframe was sort of ‘theoretical’ rather than ‘realistic’. Different sizes of countries meant that it is more challenging in some countries to collect data and implement the project   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. Institutional structure and component structure is good. But secifically for Component 5 the design underestimated the complexity.   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. In design many risk problems could not be foreseen. So when problem crops up difficult to solve problems. Borrowers knew that when signing project many of the problems would arise e.g. institutional capacity weaknesses/differences, challenge of insufficient staff time on project given extra work load resulting from the project. Would have been better to identify people to work specifically/only on that project. There has also been an impact of government procedures impacting on implementation which was not sufficiently considered in design.  Some implementation risks were not articulated as weren’t envisaged they could/would ever arise….e.g. FADs being lost. Equipment for acoustic surveys in Mauritius didn’t work…so didn’t get data.  Would have been better to have design which better ensured participation of permanent secretaries and higher level people.  Good that procurement could be done using country systems  But broadly speaking happy with the design.  Overall rating: Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. Yes   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. n/a   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Yes |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Satisfactory, and better in recent times that in the early stages of the project

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Highly satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Highly Satisfactory. Very good that NMUs are the government, and linkages with higher level government supported through briefings

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Have had several meetings with local stakeholders. Highly Satisfactory

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. Would have been better if easier to give funds to NGOs. Not possible under government procedures. In ASCLME project they have contracted out to NGOs.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Highly Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Satisfactory PIM was reviewed and improved, but generally good. Finance manual also useful and relevant. Have had 3 project accountants as they get circulated within the government |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. High level people weren’t part of the meetings. So RPSC made up of people within project, not outside it providing oversight. People in budget meetings then approving their own proposals. Has improved over last couple of years.

Moderately Satisfactory

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Bank supervision missions don’t visit all countries, but try to link with regional meeting. TTL been well involved with the project. Good level of trainings for accountants and procurements. Satisfactory

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Beginning in first year was insufficient, then gathered momentum, but very happy with recent performance. Satisfactory

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Improved a lot since MTR and recommendations, but are still issues. Their key role is financial issues. Moderately satisfactory

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Have been highs and lows in terms of performance and engagement. Participation in meetings was good in terms of interactions, but less engagement once people back in their own countries. Communication was main problem. Problem with changes in NCCs which has been a big issue for project implementation in terms of follow up. Overall feeling that project has been satisfactory and that has been the result of NMUs generally. Satisfactory

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately satisfactory because difficult for RCCs to deliver given other functions and responsibilities. SWIOFP should have been a full time job. Too difficult to travel to support NCCs. Problem of project design.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. No real M&E in place in first year or so, but now much better. M&E problem was that came as a new project, and didn’t have that sort of M&E system in place also. First few years took some time to really implement. Moderately satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Yes feedback system in place to use data. Highly satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Received items, but communication and admin issues which meant received very slow and were problems. For procurement done by RMU, NMUs didn’t always know where things were (e.g. FADs, drop lines, turtle tags). Admin problems in countries meant letters not going to right people. Local procurement takes time. KMFRI speed issues, but improved since MTR. Moderately unsatisfactory   1. Disbursement   Response. Type here   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Satisfactory   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. A few activities have been incorporated into government budgets and practices (e.g. use of drop lines in surveys, and are planning to continue to upload data). But most/many not e.g. tagging wont be continued through a replacement of tags. Don’t even know yet how to process the data from listening stations e.g. to download data, process it, etc Training planned for Jan/Feb. Observer programme not implemented. SWIOFP paying for satellite communication on turtle tags  SWIOFC responsibility for some activities and platform from reporting will be a mechanism for sustainability.   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Availability of finance (from either government or future donor projects) will be key risk.  But also external factors can impact on sustainability e.g. willingness of private sector to take up new technologies supported by the project (e.g. collapsible traps), even if the technology itself is good.  Insufficient show-casing of successes could result in a lack of sustainability.  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. Type here  Overall sustainability risk: Moderate |

**Outcomes**

*Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs*

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (*To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)*  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Not in place, but no shared non-tuna stock on regional basis. But management plans on national level do incorporate EAF.   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Not in place but identified in SAP, and list submitted to SWIOFC for consideration by their scientific committee   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. *Not in place, only national mgt plans*  But have made steps in right direction, and timeframe unrealistic. TDA/SAP will help  Moderately unsatisfactory to Moderately satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; Almost   To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and yes  to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; yes  to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources. yes  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. *Yes and the case for all countries*   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. *Yes*   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. *All retrospective analysis done, January meeting to analyse and finalise cruise reports.*   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. *Review of SWIOFC completed*  Overall between satisfactory and highly satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response. *Type here*  Very positive impact of surveys in providing information, and cheaper using wet lease vessels  MSC courses cheap and good value  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response. *Type here*  Policy makers don’t view any positive impact yet on fishermen.  Drop line money hasn’t resulted in uptake into sector  Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. *Not that sort of project – n/a*   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. Satisfactory – as discussed above, big impact of project on capacity development in the region   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. *Type here* |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response.   * Key strength of project was the participatory approach during the design of the project by scientists in the region, to be implemented by people in the region through the NMUs. This has resulted in 9 country regional cooperation and networking which is more sustainable * Usefulness of review and harmonization of legislation * Capacity building has been very important, with intra-regional capacity building |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response.   * Design meant that strength also a weakness in terms of NMU staff too busy with other things and no additional incentives * Slow start of RMU and lack of cruise coordinator had negative impact. Lessons learned is need to have all relevant staff in place from day 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. *Type here* |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries**  **US$** | **Recurrent / Operational**  **US$** | **Development (works, goods, services) US$** | **Total**  **US$** | **Notes** |
| 2008/09 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009/10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010/11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011/12 | 105 000 | 70 000 | 50 000 | 225 000 |  |
| 2012/13 | 110 000 | 75 000 | 50 000 | 235 000 | forecast |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Mozambique NMU

**Questions on project implementation Mozambique**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Highly Satisfactory, Yes we agree with the need of revision of the project logframe   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Highly Satisfactory, Yes it still relevant and coherent, some changes were made to adequately address the regional and national needs of the region   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. (Verificar)  the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.  Response. Moderately Satisfactory, Mozambique is a country that hasanimportant fishery sector to follow up, the time provided to implement the project was very short to incorporate all national needs.   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. The project design was very good to integrate relevant aspects of different fisheries and allowed for transparency and control of funding at national and regional level. However the major weakness on the project was the component 5 for biodiversity issues, which had shortage of funds and no well defined objectives and orientation at the beginning of the project.   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. Satisfactory , No comments |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. It contributes substantially to improve the performance of the implementation and help to clarify the time frame involved and responsibilities.   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. No comments   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Satisfactory, Yes the actions assisted in improving project implementation Nationally and regionally, because it brought together and elucidate the series of recommendations to follow up in order to improve the performance of the project. |

**Qu 3Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Satisfactory, this partnership provided a good mechanism to address the ecosystem of the region

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Moderately Satisfactory, It brought together the contribution of most important donors in the region, i.e., Norad and the EAF Nansen.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Moderately Satisfactory, the linking/partnering would had been better built from the beginning, particularly the management plans of component 6 which is the very important result of the project, should have been addressed not only at the final stage of the project.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in Satisfactory, due to this first approach, the many partner was the government research Institutions but other stake holders should have been better involved, i.e. Universities

Response. Satisfactory, at National level it some linking and partnership were built, particularly with Micoa, and a MoU with the AICMO\_Associação de Investigação Marinha e Costeira de Moçambique, to carry on a regional study of sea turtles. But other institutions such as the Universities and others should have been included.

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. partnerships should had been involved early on the gap analysis.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Highly Satisfactory. No Comments   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Moderately Satisfactory. The PIM and Financial Mgt Manual, description of administrative information - the explanation of the mechanisms should have been better introduced at the beginning of the implementation of the project. |

**Qu 5.RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and howsatisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. Moderately Unsatisfactory, even though the MTR has helped to indicate the responsibility of senior people to participate in the RPSC meeting in order to implement the decisions, in early stage of the project there were not enough political involvement in the project. Some countries were not well represented to take into account political involvement to provide a proper implementation of activities.

**Qu 6.World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and howsatisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Moderately satisfactory.

**Qu 7.RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response.Moderately Satisfactory, the establishment of the RMU took almost t 1.5 year to be active, which may had an impact on implementation of most activities, for example consultancies, cruises , observer program, contract of consultants

**Qu 8.KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

No sufficient information to comment

**Qu 9.NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response.Satisfactory. In Mozambique all the technical components were directly managed by the similar national programs in place, which enhanced the national and the regional program. But there were constraints in overburden of work.

**Qu 10.RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately Satisfactory. Some RCCs were more efficient than others, nevertheless after some regional support all the RCCs has reach good standards

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactorywas M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Moderately Satisfactory. In the last year of the Project , better indicators were developed   1. How satisfactorywas M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Moderately Satisfactory,   1. How satisfactorywas M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactoryyou think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Moderately Satisfactory   1. Disbursement   Response. Moderately Satisfactory, some delays on disbursements were observed   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Moderately Satisfactory, a database were provided but there were very litle usage of it.   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Satisfactory   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Satisfactory, there were sometimes difficult to understand and integrate at Institutional/ national level. This because the Institutions have its own mechanisms and the project brought some differences to be addressed; this might have been the reason of some delays observed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.**This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc 2. Response. Moderately Satisfactory, although a very good guidance and support were provided during the duration of the project, the research activities need to be supported over time. For example ongoing research and administrative activities were only provided for short period of 4-5 year. The sustainability of research activities is completely unrealistic for the situation of our countries. 3. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. HIGH. The capacity to carry on many research work were built at regional and national level, like genetics analysis , observer programs, research surveys but due to operation cost related to this activities in the future is in High risk.  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. We feel that the World Bank is real concerned with the sustainability, for that reason in the last year there is a great commitment in design new mechanisms or projects to support on the sustainability and adequacy to address marine and fisheries issues in the region. |

**Outcomes**

Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Unsatisfactory, there is no indication of any regional management plan for sharing resources, although the information of turtles could be considered for a regional management plan.  In addition, the SAP strategy has pointed very good aspects to be addresses, but we feel that this process took place at very late stage of the project and the adoption by the member countries would need to disseminate and understand well what and how we are going to implement it at national and regional level.   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Moderately unsatisfactory, The list of indicators have been submitted to SWIOFC, but were not yet approved and objectives might not be achieved by the end of the project  Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)  Response. Highly Unsatisfactory, Due to time involved in genetic studies no subregional management plan were achieved. Only national mgt plans achieved. Within the national program, before the implementation of SWIOFP , Mozambique has endeavored to develop the shallow water shrimp fishery management plan, and before the end of the project is expected to be adopted. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; and * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. Satisfactory, Mozambique made progress on the Line fishery Management plan.  During the implementation of SWIOFP, Mozambique had opportunity to finalize Shallow Water Shrimp fishery management plan for adoption.   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. Satisfactory Need more comments to statbase and other databases!!!!   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Satisfactory, some retrospective analysis were well prepared and others not, this had an impacts in the scope of existing resource and status of exploration in the region.   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response .Moderately unsatisfactory, The biodiversity were addressed at later stages of the project, and the research cruise had no harmonized orientation |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supportingjustification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Response. Satisfactory  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response. In general the project had a good value for the money provided. The main value was the gap Analysis for different fish resources and the fisheries in the SWIO region.  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Deployment of FADS, presumably due to a top down approach, the fishing community had lack of commitment |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. No There were no direct impacts, because of the nature of research project   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. Satisfactory, the project really provided support to scientific implementation of national and regional research activities, the institutions involved had the opportunity to carry on activities that previously were not sustainable to support, it also improved the conditions of work, building capacity. On the other hand the implementation of the project originated some disagreements at national level that there did not existed before.   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Type here |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  1.Creation of Regional Networks  2. Capacity Building  3.SWIOFP and ASCLME contribute to the visibility of SWIOFC |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response. Lack of basic resources to the implementing institutions hampered the implementation of activities, such as no attribution of vehicle,  Adoption of the Nansis program only for storage of data but not operational to analyze trawl surveys, which delays the analysis of wet leasing survey data.  The delays in contracting of wet leasing vessels, and the poor quality of vessels |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. Type here |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

**Yes**

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

**Yes**

**Qu. 21.Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries** | **Recurrent / Operational** | **Development (works, goods, services)** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| 2008/09 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009/10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010/11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011/12 | 30,549 | 9,244 | 10000 | 49,793 |  |
| 2012/13 | 22,912 | 6,933 | 7,500 | 37,345 | Only estimated 75 % of the year |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Seychelles NMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Yes   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. No, piracy has been key risk not envisaged as identified by MTR.   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. Timeframe would have been sufficient if time wasn’t lost at the beginning   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. Don’t consider project to be too complex per se, but difficulties of working across so many counties with different capacities as well as language barrier, has been an issue and resulted in slow implementation progress   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response.   * Design suitably participatory, even with NGO sector * Demands on RCCs probably unrealistic. * Underestimated the amount of time involved for staff involved, while working for institutions. Not properly estimated in design. * Should have a science coordinator in the RMU. * Activities should have been incorporated in national workplan and given more priority and more commitment from participating institution and government   Overall rating: Moderately Satisfactory to Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. See below   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. See below   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. See below  General response on MTR   * Project progress at start of project was very slow , but certainly picked up after the MTR. * MTR definitely useful and gave opportunity to take stock and see what else needed to be done. * MTR took place at the right time. |

**Qu 3 Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Highly satisfactory linkages fostered by RMU with ASCLME (and WIOLaB), particularly recently for TDA and SAP

1. Howsatisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Linkages also good satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Linkages good in sense that project staff are government. But could have been better linkages between research staff involved with project and other elements of government. Moderately satisfactory?

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Not so good in terms of NGO involvement.NGOs involved in the design stage, but not so much in implementation. Most interested in biodiversity issues – bycatch and LL depredation – but didn’t really happen in Component 5. Even if though requested information from RCC (in Mauritius). Was bycatch assessment training in Mauritius but NGOs not involved.Focal points didn’t sufficiently engage NGO sector. Project design had some funds for NGO grants to be used for issues identified. Budget component 5 budget planning didn’t include them, so not completed.

Will be stakeholder workshop on demersal line fishery mgt plan in next few weeks

Moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. Type here

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.Decision-making and administrative requirements**   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Decision making was satisfactory and participatory given working group and workshop approach. But some people more technically strong and vocal and pushing their agenda. Workplans done by RCWGs and approved through RPSC was good process.  At beginning of project was annual component planning,, but towards end was more just tweaking the budget as activities had by then been decided.   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. PIM wasn’t specific enough about need for RCCs to tell NMU accountants about the need for allocation and reporting of their budgets by component. Capacity building on the bank procedures were provided however t was not until the project was well on the way that a proper system was developed for financial management and reporting.  Moderately satisfactory |

**Qu 5.RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC,etc....)

Response.

Commitment was lacking at beginning, but much improved since MTR. Since then higher level people involved….SWIOFC invite participants and held back to back with Commission meetings. But still not perfect. Moderately satisfactory

**Qu 6.World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Great assistance provided by the Worldbank. Represented in all the annual meetings and other meetings and provided guidance. Good communications and support via emails as well.

Highly satisfactory

**Qu 7.RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response.

Generally good performance since existing RES was installed, but would have benefitted from a science coordinator (for technical support), and RMU performance was very weak at the beginning of the project and not sufficiently involved with NMU. A fully functioning and strong RMU should be a prerequisite for future similar projects. Satisfactory overall

**Qu 8.KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Type here. Slow decision making process often resulted in delays in the implementation of activities, particularly at the beginning of the project. Improved towards the end.

Moderately Satisfactory.

**Qu 9.NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response.

NCC turnover has been an issues which has impacted on implementation, but improved since MTR but still there to some extent. NCCs differing capacities. Overall rating Moderately satisfactory

**Qu 10.RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response.

Technical demands on RCCs were significant and wide ranging. And may not have time to do all the research/functions needed.

Financial issues – RCCs could have better supported NMUs on how budget divided between components and activities. Got better during project….Should have been in PIM for RCC to provide info on breakdown of budgets.

Moderately satisfactory or moderately unsatisfactory

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Type here   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Type here   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Type here  Generally useful in keeping track of activities and funds allocation (to be reallocated which was good). Improved after MTR with new forms. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Satisfactory;   1. Disbursement   Response. Moderately satisfactory; Delays encountered at the begining   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory after MTR,   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Satisfactory. But some component (6) not in accordance with PIM and at expences at other component   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Moderately satisfactory  Project financial mgt software was never used, because problems with access. There was a manual on the software, but never used. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.**This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. Type here   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Type here  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. Type here  General comments across issues above   * Timeframe for implementing component 6 was too short, and that will impact on sustainability. * Project has developed good frameworks, e.g. for mgt plans, protocols…so can use in future. * Training provided will be useful for future, e.g. in FADs. * Not so sure about collaboration between countries continuing. * Ecosystem approach to fisheries is becoming so much part of other projects that legacy of project will go on. * Refresher courses for observers would be useful to support sustainability. Training has been provided, but countries slow to implement observer programmes and just now implementing (and its an IOTC requirement). * Data provision after project is a risk i.e. Component 1. Could be useful for SWIOFC to require countries to report to Commission on data provided (if, and what). * SWIOFP 2 is planning to have funds for moving SWIOFC from Zim to Moz and make it stronger. Stronger SWIOFC and secretariat would be important for sustainability. Judith Swan funded under SWIOFP to look at options and detail/implications for improving SWIOFC. * SAP also important for sustainability * Transmission costs of tags put on turtles will finish with project. RMU working to ensure that countries keep paying for tags   Overall risk to sustainability: Moderate |

**Outcomes**

Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. SAP will be developed before project end. Won’t be adopted by all countries before project, perhaps just a few. Indicator doesn’t talk about implementation. UNDP will play role in driving countries to adopt/sign SAP. Need to have all countries on board for GEF to provide funding for implementation. Will probably need to wait for GEF 6 from 2014….so will be a gap. But Smartfish and other Bank activities may partly be able to bridge gap. So given that developed, but not adopted given rating of Moderately satisfactory to Moderately unsatisfactory.   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Indicators discussed in Mauritius to discuss indicators to be collected (environment, economic and socio-economics), and submitted to SWIOFC who have agreed to submit to the SWIOFC scientific committee (early 2013) to finalise and send back to Commission for adoption (early march 2104), but not approved and adopted by SWIOFC. Project design issue that SWIOFC cycle means difficult to achieve indicator. Given work started by objective itself not achieved rating of Moderately unsatisfactory   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. No regional plans relevant to Seychelles. Demersal handline fishery mgt plan is in draft form, need to have stakeholder meeting (planned for 11th December in Mahe and 14thin Praslin), then to Cabinet, and adopted – so wont be done by end of project.  Seychelles currently twinned with Tanzania would be better to be with Madagascar or Comores which also have demersal plans. But link with EAF Nansen project and use of same consultants to facilitate plans, and Mauritius meeting to present mgt plans and share ideas, along with manual on development of management plans, all mean that is some harmony between national mgt plans – this might be considered a better indicator given no regional shared stocks. So given all of that comment given an overall rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts;   Retrospective analysis and gap analysis and cruises have assessed existing fishing pressure, but not adequate data work on other issues on environmental issue like life histories. So rating of Moderately unsatisfactory. But note that  Project lifespan is too short really to achieve indicator itself. Haven’t been able to link ASCLME and SWIOFP surveys (in terms of project timeframe and also logistics of doing so). Don’t really have enough long-term good data in region to develop species specific MSYs.  Crustacea had proper gear for sampling stocks and environmental factors, but not on EAF for demersal cruises.   * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities;   NMU staff positive about capacity development across components, observer logistics training, etc.  But project should have supported qualifications. No MSc students for Seychelles.…..difficult to send people for MSc courses as don’t then have people in SFA to do the jobs. Would have been good for project not just to focus on MSc but on other qualifications that could have been useful in some countries. MSc programme not evenly distributed between countries. And issue of MScs to be completed during lifespan of the project.  But as a project regional capacities have been been developed. Rating of Moderately satisfactory to satisfactory   * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies;   Data analysis and stock assessment groups were new for SWIOFC and funded by SWIOFP. Now assessment groups are meeting every 2 years.  EAF approach was not involved with mgt plans in the region before, but SWIOFC is now pushing mgt plans based on ecosystem approach  Different workshops fed information/data to SWIOFC.  But perhaps some questions about capacity/knowledge of people that are actually attending the SWIOFC meeting from countries.  Linkages from technical to political levels that are part of SWIOFCis still sometimes weak.  Moderately satisfactory   * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Seychelles law being revised at the moment. No new policy document since 2005 – Smartfish engaged to revise.Project did legislation harmonisation and gaps review.  Management plan for demersalhandline fishery will become law. Other mgt plans under development in Seychelles (not directly supported by SWIOFP but project helping to support general trend/development of biodiversity and ecosystems issues.  Rating Moderately satisfactory  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. Demersal mgt plan will be developed but probably not adopted=. Moderately satisfactory   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. The cuurent databases developed under the project will address some of the objectives particularly historical data. However it is not clear as far as new data are concern; Moderately unsatisfactory.   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. Type her Largely completed through data gap analysis and restrospetive analysis. Satisfactory   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Largely under SWIOFC. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Moderately satisfactory  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response. Implementation and development of FAD fishery. Not as successful as anticipated. However the capacity building and lesson learnt will be beneficial for future activities.  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response. Capacity building at MSC level. No benefit for Seychelles at all |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. Type here   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. Satisfactory. Have built technical capacity as well as established standards that would useful to institutions   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Type here |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response.   * Component structure with a leader was good to focus on specific issues * Participatory approach * Strong focus on capacity building * Regional networking during project…hope it can be sustained. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response.   * Not sufficient NGO involvement, perhaps because of weak relationships in many countries between government and NGO sector. Not always the case and some countries has been NGO involvement * Integration of SWIOFP into national workplans hasn’t been well done, so feeling that SWIOFP on the side with priority given to national activities. Lack of financial incentives has had an impact, and would have been minimised if integrated. Need better planning at design stage re government commitment to staff involvement. * Inadequate technical support from the RMU because of lack of technical/ scientific expertise in RMU. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. Type here |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

YES

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

YES although too optimistic in conceptualisation.

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries** | **Recurrent / Operational** | **Development (works, goods, services)** | **Total** |
| 2008/09 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009/10 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010/11 |  |  |  |  |
| 2011/12 | (2x120000x0.05) + (3x144000x0.1) + (15000x12x0.2) |  |  | (SCR 91,200 |
| 2012/13 |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |

#### South Africa NMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. The development of the project design was definitely visionary, fully participatory and took most stakeholders, particularly governments into account. It is difficult to comment on the project design, because it operates at different levels. At the scientific level (i.e. 6 components, each driven by a country), I think it was sound, because it gave all participant countries a stake in SWIOFP. Not all countries were equally adept at managing their allocated component at RCC level, and some components fell behind because of weak leadership. Nevertheless, this was not the fault of the design, but rather of varying skills and interest levels. At the management level (RMU with NMU in each country) the design was similarly logical – in practice it was difficult to implement smoothly because of the many different languages, governments (each with its own procedures), etc. At the operational level, with hindsight, some parts of the project design were probably over-optimistic. For instance, establishing an integrated region-wide fisheries observer programme covering all fisheries was probably not realistic, given the existing infrastructure in the region. Also, the design relied on too many surveys at sea – this brought a heavy administrative / logistic/ organizational / research load that was probably too much for the limited manpower available in the region. Therefore the overall project design can be rated as moderately satisfactory.   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Even more so, especially because a culture of collaboration has taken root, and many of the subprojects are about to bear fruit. SWIOFP is a large project that took a long time to build up momentum. This has now been achieved; systems are in place and working, and producing. However, the scale of the challenge was underestimated and thus underfunded and especially short-timed. Should have had a year of preparation   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Yes – the risk that momentum would only be achieved after a long run-up in a project of this size, so that most of the work (scheduled for 5 years) had to be condensed into 3 years. Also, there is a risk that the strong collaborative linkages built between fisheries departments, governments and individual scientists will decline after the conclusion of the project – this merits the planning and implementation of an exit strategy and bridging funding to support regional activities so that networks can be supported in the interim (i.e. waiting period before GEF follow-up projects). The lack of “passion” in some quarters has proved a risk.   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. No. It needed to be at least 1-2 years longer to achieve most of its initial objectives. As it stands, the initial project design was for 5 years, but operational efficiency was only achieved in the last 3 years. Also, the scientific process (conceptualization; data collection; analysis; reporting and writing up to publication level) is generally a multi-year process – so that many of the science outputs of SWIOFP (i.e. peer-reviewed scientific articles) will only be achieved long after the project has concluded – i.e. they will not be evaluated as outputs of the project. Note that year 1 was supposed to do a baseline data atlas with which to plan the programme. Instead it was done as a Retrospective Analysis in the final year   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. The design itself was simple and logical – implementing it across many countries / cultures / languages / governments / skills-levels and agendas was complex. Many issues were not considered during planning (or were underestimated) – i.e. the effects of piracy; scarcity of skills in the region; difficulty of finding the right vessels for wet-leased surveys and the length of the vessel procurement process; that government scientists would be unenthusiastic towards doing SWIOFP administrative work etc. (the latter because it is typically not included in their performance agreements or job descriptions, where those are used). It may seem complex to some but it matches the diversity of fisheries and participating countries   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. An additional year would have made a huge difference to the outputs of the project, particularly because of the momentum that has been achieved now, and the present culture of trust among SWIOFP workers. The project design was probably overambitious, taking the scarcity of resources / skills in the region into account. If bridging funding were available for a year, and a final report could be delivered after that, the output from the programme could be considerably enhanced.  The basic design was OK. Implementation was erratic, not for design but more capacity and person issues. Creating a single TDA/SAP and sharing cruises with ASCLME proved a flaw. Note also that the actual research (work) was supposed to have been done by government scientists – which was embedded in the co-financing. This was to build capacity. However, much was left to students or very junior staff as many of the scientists were “busy” . Note that the “enticement carrot” of job promotion if committed to SWIOFP hardly worked if at all.  Overall rating for design: satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. Responses to agreed actions were satisfactory and are accurately reflected in the MTR. Most of the actions from the MTR seem to have been addressed. However, they are all administrative and deal with the admin problems identified at the time. Whether it made actual achievement of objectives more successful I am less certain   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. Several of the actions that could not be completed are as a result of incompatible working methods (or expectations) between the RMU and the Kenyan government.   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Yes, for example issue 58. The project has been extended and therefore it will be able to achieve many of its original objectives. A further extension will allow for far more of its objectives being met. Communication improved and problem issues seemed better resolved /greater clarity over some |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Moderately satisfactory. The linkage between the two projects is much stronger now than at the time of the MTR – again, better collaboration was preceded by a run-up phase, and several combined meetings, newsletters and activities. In terms of timing, the linkage is weaker, because the combined TDA and SAP was drafted before many of the relevant feeder SWIOFP projects had been completed – thus the TDA and SAP rely on a smaller fisheries information base than would have been possible. In addition despite the original plan the two programmes are very different and so are its people. There could have been separate 3 TDAs which could have been amalgamated later.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Moderately satisfactory, because there were relatively few donor projects / partners over the duration of SWIOFP. Some of the linkages were, however very successful, such as with the EAF-Nansen project, FFM, and the linkage with ORI. The overall research outputs will benefit enormously as a result of these linkages. Some weaknesses however did exist – e.g. SA hosted a donor conference in Maputo early on with keen support from several embassies. But it was never followed up.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Satisfactory. The linkages through the NMU’s worked very well – indeed, the strong linkages forged between fisheries authorities through SWIOFP over the past few years will likely be one of the main outcomes of the project. This was, however, not as successful at the policy level, because top managers were often not available to make inputs and approve policy decisions. Most of the countries dedicated senior personnel to SWIOFP. However, it is not sure if it was for the regional vision as much as the funds.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Moderately unsatisfactory. In some cases it worked well (i.e. South Africa; ORI), but mainly SWIOFP operated at government level, with fewer linkages at local stakeholder levels. The project was not designed or funded to accommodate a wider involvement except academia which evolved during the course of the programme

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. SWIOFP went the extra mile in most cases, through inviting partners / potential donors to planning meetings, visiting potential partners, improving the website, and even developing an exit strategy etc. etc. However specific allocation of budgets and tasks could have fostered great partnerships besides the main players

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Moderately Satisfactory. Most important decisions were made at Working Group level, and ratified by the RPSC. Decisions on awarding tenders were sometimes delayed. However the arrangements at KMFRI proved a huge delaying hurdle and was a major flaw.   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Moderately satisfactory – big documents, difficult to read and digest, and therefore I suspect that few actually read them – certainly at the scientist level and definitely at the management level! Plus WB rules can be perplexing |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. Moderately unsatisfactory – The RPSC did not really provide guidance but merely endorsed the recommendations put to it. The role of the RPSC remained low-key throughout the project and was not really engaged in the project. The support by senior government members varied between countries but overall the oversight role was weak. So while the RPSC has several excellent persons, their involvement was too infrequent and superficial to be considered as guidance

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Moderately Satisfactory – most interaction occurred through the RMU and at Annual workplan and RPSC levels. Guidance was generally clear. The change of team leader midway was a bad idea as it placed an extra burden on the new person. When missions did take place they were OK. Financial advice & support was good.

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory. The RES and his team responded promptly at all times and were always supportive. Key strengths were clear guidance and support structures. Good staff appointments at RMU level. Annual feedback, workplan and budgeting meetings were effective, informative, and provided clear direction over the duration of the project. Weaknesses were a (sometimes) opaque financial reporting and disbursement system (probably following stringent WB regulations) – this led to some delays in disbursements and project implementation. Likewise, the tender process for SWIOFP projects was sometimes slow, with long delays before awards - I think the latter might not have been a RMU issue, rather a tender board issue, or as the result of signatories being away from the office.

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately unsatisfactory. The unilateral control over most decisions created tension and I believe retarded the programme. Several examples are: delays in disbursements; slow adjudication of tenders; slow processing of contracts; and the debacle with armed security not arriving for a demersal survey, thus leading to the cancellation of the survey at cost to the project. Servers frequently offline.

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Variable, depending on country and the particular NCC with a range of superficial involvement to passionate participation. Also, levels of capacity were too variable. Very few NMUS actually held meetings. Overall, moderately satisfactory. A weakness of the system was that government officials were expected to manage the NMUs or act as NCCs in addition to their normal duties, without tangible (monetary?) returns. In most cases these duties are not included in performance agreements/job descriptions, where these exist. Some NCCs were really interested and did a good job, whereas others gave SWIOFP scant attention.

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. RCCs - Again, variable, for the same reason as above. Most RCCs were keen but not all shared the same drive. Also, many were not given time and space by their employers. However, the RCCs did contribute to being the glue in the project. RCCs had a larger impact on components than the NCCs, because RCCs were expected to coordinate / lead research in components, across boundaries. So a weak RCC would affect the outcome of an entire component across the region. Overall, probably moderately unsatisfactory. In hindsight a strong scientist / leader should have been appointed to each component as RCC on a full-time basis; not part-time government officials.

RCWG - (i.e. annual meetings to provide feedback on progress, develop workplans, calculate budgets).

These were satisfactory, with clear aims and outcomes.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Moderately Satisfactory. The first series of templates were difficult, but after redesign they were much easier to complete. The project lacked a mechanism to evaluate the quality of research / science being done (at all levels from data collection through to final write-up) in real time. The weakness of this is that bad science cannot be redressed, because it will only become evident after the project conclusion – i.e. during the peer-review process when scientific articles are submitted to journals.   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Moderately Satisfactory. This improved over time.   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Evaluation, decision-making and resource allocation based on M&E reports completed by RCCs and focal points were mainly used by the RMU.  Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Moderately satisfactory – had to follow WB guidelines, which were sometimes difficult to apply in this project. For instance wet-lease of commercial fishing vessels. Improved over time. Delays at tender board level experienced.   1. Disbursement   Response. Moderately satisfactory – some delays as a result of misunderstandings of reporting framework.   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Satisfactory – relatively easy. Took some time.   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. Probably not enough although the network(s) that developed will stay in place and is already playing a role in other regional projects. Publications and students provide a further lasting thread. Remember that SWIOFC is the real core thrust which benefited from SWIOFP  For Component 2 and South Africa: Observer programme to continue in SA (crustacean trawl fishery) using a different funding base (MLRF); Crustacean databases collected during SWIOFP to be lodged at KMFRI; Post project observer programme for shallow-water lobster developed for Comoros – to be funded by Smartfish(?); Observers to be placed on an SA vessel undertaking an experimental trap / trawl fishery in deep-water in Madagascar – to link to ACEP and Suitcase Project (funding?); ex-SWIOFP MSc student hired by ORI for 2013 as research assistant to continue working up SWIOFP data; ex-SWIOFP MSc student to continue with PhD on shallow-water lobster genetics (funded from various sources; i.e. ORI, ACEP, NORHED); at least 6-10 additional scientific publications still to be produced from SWIOFP data – mainly from Component 2, but also from Component 4; SWIOFP network at ORI to be used for other regional projects, for instance, a NORHED (Norwegian higher education project) project presently being developed that utilizes the SWIOFP network.     1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Collapse of regional observer programme due to lack of funding and decentralized management – High  Decline of regional network of collaboration at scientific level over time – High  SWIOFP databases not used to their full potential – High  Lack of political will to implement regional management strategies developed through SWIOFP – Moderate to high  lack of personal passion High  Government also fails to fully allocate staff time and support to projects (High)  National priorities overwhelm regional efforts (Moderate)  Legislation and policy differ between nations (moderate). There is a need for greater harmonization – such as was attempted with the SADC Fisheries Protocol  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. Moderately satisfactory although some NCCs felt it to be poor. |

**Outcomes**

Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Moderately satisfactory –good progress made by SWIOFP in conjunction with EAF Nansen project. The feedback from SWIOFP/EAF NANSEN project via SWIOFC Scientific Committee has been good. Definite progress is being made here. Plus although a formal strategy is lacking (until SAP is in place) the project has positively influenced attitudes and actions towards this overriding goal. So progress by default and promoted via SWIOFC   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Same as above. Also note that not really achieved (superficially?) but given a further year could be a reality if set as a formal (funded) target   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. Moderately satisfactory – the data from various cruises are still being analysed. Without scientific recommendations the development of sub-regional management plans are not possible |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; and * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. Moderately satisfactory. While many of the management plans have been drawn up they have not been implemented as yet. It depends on the management system used by the various countries – some countries have to get high level political endorsement while others only need local or regional go-ahead. The management plans for linefish and shrimp in Mozambique were really ancillary to SWIOFP but with a strong EAF thrust.   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. Component 1 – parts of it already developed and available - should be completed by end of project. Unclear whether it will be fully available to all SWIOFP member countries after project completion. But considering the Retrospective Analysis and Gap Analysis – this was very well achieved.  Rating: Moderately Satisfactory   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. Mostly completed for Component 2 as Data gap-analysis, 3 Retrospective analyses, and a series of research surveys with their data and findings described in a series of Technical reports. Should be completed by March 2013.  Rating: Moderately Satisfactory   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Moderately unsuccessful – see 2 above. Technically this happens via SWIOFC – but practically it remains weak and much too much like a friendly and very polite assembly of administrators. A more formal and obligatory protocol is needed with some potential benefits and sanction |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response.  Efficient handling and combining of annual workplan / progress report / budget and RPSC meetings  Efficient framework provided for implementation / operations  Efficient use of MSc programme to achieve 2 objectives at the same time: analyse SWIOFP research data and contribute to scientific capacity building  Outsourcing specialist tasks was generally money well spent. E.g. training, Retrospective Analysis, Gap Analysis, MTR etc. under pressure and with deadlines people deliver. Government officials are paid even if they do not deliver.  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response.  Inefficient use of the framework provided by SWIOFP by some NMUs / member countries – i.e. lack of response.  Working on SWIOFP often unpopular with government scientists – seen as additional burden without rewards – for example, little effort expended to complete survey technical reports, which are still outstanding long after due dates.  The observer programme was not handled efficiently – training of observers was done in 2010, however the deployment of observers to sea never really got off the ground. Possibly a different approach should have been taken from the onset.  Processing and award of consulting projects often took too long – thus losing momentum  Money wasted on cruises that were badly planned, poorly supervise and failed to generate useful data.  Overall rating for efficiency: Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| Qu 17. Other outcomes   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. The gender balance in the meeting participants and country representatives was good - on a project level gender balance was good but cannot comment on whether the project made impacts on general gender and social issues. Most of the project meetings were male-dominated. Not significant other outcomes really – except perhaps new communication channels between regions.   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. It is doubtful whether the project brought about meaningful institutional change, but it did contribute positively to capacity building and to awareness of ecosystem-based approaches, at least in South Africa. Highly satisfactory at least in institutional approaches to biodiversity and collaboration. Strengthening was not adequately achieved as too few senior personnel were directly involved in cruises and other activities that would have been of benefit to them (except meetings with *per diems*)   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. It has contributed hugely towards building a regional network of researchers built on familiarity / shared interests / respect / and collaboration. The mere fact of working together as a region has enormous positive implications as a basis to build on. Whether this network will remain after the completion of SWIOFP is still unsure. It might depend on the actions of individual researchers. Further support and particularly bridging funding would likely increase the chances of future sustainability. |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response. The project design (RMU & NMU’s; 6 Components; RCCs and NCCs; restriction to offshore fisheries) was appropriate for a project of the size and extent of SWIOFP. This has wider application and is replicable.  The participatory approach taken throughout the whole process (from development to completion) was one of the most positive issues. It might have been more costly and time-consuming, but stimulated a collaborative culture among institutes and countries that have not worked with each other before. The philosophy has wider application and can be replicated.  The focus on Marine Science in the MSc programme was very positive, and is likely to lead to an enduring increase in the knowledge base for the region. The outputs from this programme should support many peer-reviewed scientific articles; apart from their inherent scientific value, publishing their work is a major learning curve for junior scientists (i.e. scientific capacity building). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response. Lethargy or no response from some NCCs regarding project activities. The lesson learnt is simple: Choose your collaborators well!  With hindsight, the surveys at sea were probably not all justified, and in some cases (deepwater trap and trawl surveys in Kenya, Tanzania; deepwater trap survey in Mozambique) they were not good value for the money and effort spent. Lesson: Fewer surveys with more realistic goals. Also, make sure you have the best vessel and skipper for the job – despite SWIOFP’s considerable efforts to achieve this, it was not always possible because of the limited number of vessels / skippers available in the region.  Also, with hindsight, it is probably better to aim for small achievable goals (well-defined) rather than using a shotgun approach. As a result of the latter approach during surveys, heaps of data are now available, but it is unlikely that it will all be analysed to its full potential.  Combining the two LMEs may have been a poor decision as they are so very different in almost every respect |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. No comment |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes (but not felt strongly)

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes, some of them. The original intended outcomes have been poorly met – but other aspects emerged that were well met (such as students). Overall SWIOFP has advanced the state of information and regional collaboration in the WIO greatly and has created a platform for future development

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries** | **Recurrent / Operational** | **Development (works, goods, services)** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| 2008/09 | 100000 | 4000 | 1000 | 105000 |  |
| 2009/10 | 166000 | 4000 | 2000 | 172000 |  |
| 2010/11 | 130000 | 4000 |  | 134000 |  |
| 2011/12 | 100000 | 4000 | 2000 | 106000 |  |
| 2012/13 | 100000 | 4000 | 2000 | 106000 |  |
| TOTAL | 596000 | 20000 | 7000 | 623000 |  |

#### Tanzania NMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Yes, still just as relevant   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Piracy was the biggest risk not considered which has impacted on the project   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. Would have been sufficient if project had started on time and piracy hadn’t impacted on the project   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. Not too complex, but complexity increased because of slow start and piracy which meant everything was more pressurised , and so some activities not covered as expected.   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. The needs of each country are different, and it might have been better to have had money allocated to countries at the beginning based on what was really needed to be done, rather dividing money for a specific activity between the countries involved.  Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. MTR recommendations were mostly implemented   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. Type here   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Based on the recommendations the problems with the implementation were improved, so the MTR formed the basis for implementation improvements |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Partnering was important as dealing with fisheries within the LME so needed to know the environmental variables. Good coordination on SAP. Partnership with ASCLME has been much better than with WIOLAB project, and rated as Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Partnering has been good with other donors and institutions e.g. WWF, FAO (EAF Nansen and database. Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. National policy makers could have been a bit more involved/supportive/informed about the project. Moderately satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Generally good, and project has worked with NGOs e.g. Sea Sense in Tanzania, which brought good results for the project. Satisfactory

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. Type here

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Decision-making process was participatory through the working groups and steering committee. But some NCCs felt that while they had a chance to make their input to decision making, the RCCs were ultimately responsible. So for examples many cruises for component 4 were not done in Tanzania. Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. PIM had to be reviewed half way through project as there were some weaknesses and changes were necessary to make sure project was implemented smoothly because some things weren’t envisaged in the design. But generally the PIM and Financial Management Manual were Satisfactory |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. RPSC gave good advice in the meeting in which NMU staff participated. But perception that RPSC didn’t treat the different needs of different countries sufficiently. But overall rating Moderately Satisfactory

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Very good/tough supervision which has helped a lot with improving implementation of the project. Highly satisfactory

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. RMU were very active in driving the project, and given all the responsibilities they had, they did a very good job. Design of the project was not good and the RMU should have been better staffed with more people e.g. dedicated procurement officer. Ships coordinator slow to be recruited but did a good job once recruited. Satisfactory

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. At beginning performance was not good and delays due to conflicts with the RMU which led to delays in procurement and disbursements. But has improved over the duration of the project. Moderately satisfactory

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. NCCs were the implementing part of the project and without them no progress would have been made. They have done their job well which is why there has been good progress in the project. Satisfactory

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. RCCs have been coordinating NCCs and components and making sure when budgets reviewed that budgets prepared well, and they have been justifying/defending activities and making sure they are implemented. RPSC has given RCCs some tasks which have been completed. Some weaknesses with RCCs in reporting, and not all RCCs seemed to treat all countries equally. Moderately satisfactory

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Good design. Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Moderately satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Tracking of the indicators was used to focus the project on what needed to be done, the earmarked outputs and outcomes. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Moderately satisfactory, because some delays   1. Disbursement   Response. Moderately satisfactory, because sometimes overspend   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Fund revisions frequently done and very good flexible approach to fund management. Satisfactory   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. SAP is the main strategy to ensure sustainability.   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Funding is the main risk for project sustainability. Many countries have different perceptions about the science and contribution to governance, and priorities differ. So some countries put more information on research on others. Certainly some project activities will continue and wont die/stop, but not everything will continue. The capacity development achieved by the project will greatly help with sustainability. Moderate  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. Bank SWIOfish proposal is being developed. The realignment of the project agreed/facilitated by the Bank gave extra time for the project implementation which will help to ensure sustainability. |

**Outcomes**

*Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs*

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (*To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)*  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. SAP will be strategy. Satisfactory   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Indicators identified through the marine ecosystems diagnostic analysis (MEDA) and used to see if we have common issues. Using indicators in the SAP. Indicators wont be adopted by SWIOFC before end of project. Moderately satisfactory   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. EAF Nansen project has been supporting development of management plans. But no regional management plans. Moderately unsatisfactory. National mgt plans should/could evolve into a regional mgt plans as they are structured in a consistent manner and harmonised. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; and * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. Yes. Satisfactory   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. STATBASE is established. Satisfactory   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. Yes will be completed by end of project. Moderately Satisfactory   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Yes. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Satisfactory  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response.  Generally the planning and budgeting sessions provided a good mechanism to ensure that money wasn’t spent on unnecessary activities/items.  In Tanzania money on crustacea survey had a direct positive impact as was used to advise politicians not to open fishery again yet.  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response.  FAD deployment was followed by vandalism in Kenya and Tanzania because there was insufficient awareness/sensitisation completed with fishermen, but also true that adoption of new technology can take a long time to be adopted.  Some cruises not completed because of the weather, in part because the timing was not done in the best season – late start up of project meant rushing to finish the cruises, and late disbursement of monies meant delays that affected the timing of the survey. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. *Type here*   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. Some human capacity development (from training) and also investment in small assets/equipment for institutions which have been useful. Moderately satisfactory   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. *Type here* |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response. *Type here*  Design was very good because it was participatory and brought in many countries to define a shared goal with activities relevant to the countries involved and reflected in, and aligned with, the project objectives.  RMU was particularly important in finding an alternative solution to the use of the Nansen when the problem of piracy arrived. The lesson learned is the need for a strong and flexible/adaptive RMU, and the need for a back up plan.  Flexibility is critical for good implementation e.g. success because could adapt to piracy and survey issues. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response. Procurement and disbursement issues can be critical in terms of implementation and related reporting – so the hub that controls procurement and disbursement must be designed and implemented properly.  World bank rules saying that you cant provide more money to NMUs until they have spent existing allocated money for a given quarter, placed some constraints on the implementation.  A key lesson learned is the need for good private sector sensitisation for activities, like FADs, which involve the private sector.  Countries have different needs so fund allocations for specific activities should not necessarily be divided equally between countries involved in that activity. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. *Type here* |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Salaries** | **Recurrent / Operational** | **Development (works, goods, services)** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| 2008/09 | 28560 | 4000 | 2000 |  |  |
| 2009/10 | 28560 | 4000 | 2000 |  |  |
| 2010/11 | 28560 | 4000 | 2000 |  |  |
| 2011/12 | 28560 | 4000 | 2000 |  |  |
| 2012/13 | 21420 | 3000 | 1500 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |

#### RMU

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Yes   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Piracy: although this brought some added benefits, pushing the countries to look inwardly to implement there has been however some shortcoming – lack of techincal expertise at national level to run cruises, delays in delivery of cruise reports, poor cruise results ( in some few cases): the postive side is capacity building in this process has been immense, countries can now conduct their own cruises.  Piracy made the logistics and identifying suitable vessel (these were mainly fishing vesssel) for the cruises rather complicated – in terms of modifying those vessel to carry out particular cruise.   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. Time frame not sufficient (I guess also due to the late start of the project), - countries have their own level of capacity and resources. To organised field activities took longer than expected, langauge and human capacity an issue.   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. The project design was rather simple but implementtion was complex depending on the level of interaction at the national level and regional level. The interactive approach to budgeting had its merits but also it disadvantages. In a positive sense we could expand activities based on some immediate needs and also adapt to policy changes and directon - the negative side are that some activities gets put aside because lack of interest from those implementing – that is there we were other choices… e.g compoent in terms of grant to NGO to address key biodiveristy issues.  f)You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation  Response. Expert availability in the region. Staff dedicated to the project.  Overal Rating: Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. The recommendation have been largely been completed   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. There has been some delays in implementation of recommendation due to procurment delays.   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Yes, increase in funding to some component and also pushed activities that were stalling.  Highly Satisfactory. |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Initially nonexistent but improved during the last two years of the project when starting the discussion on the Transbounday Diagnostic analysis and the preparation of the Strategic Action Programme. SWIOFP also contributed financially to the process. The process should have started earier in particular when they started to dicuss the MEDA which lead up up to the TDA drafting. SWIOFP had to quickly contribute a fisheries chapter to the TDA.

Moderately Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Where possible this has been done, for example linking with EAF Nansen Project (fisheries management plans) and SMARTFISH (COI) Project where our objectives and outcomes are more aligned.

Linkages with ACP FISH II were not possible since ACP FISH II was more on consultancy and demand basis. We could indentify synergies with ACP FISH II.

Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Satisfactory – SWIOFP is linked to Government but I think there was a lack of coordination and linkages – the focal institutions tended to keep to themselves – a lack of intersection dismension to project implementation although I must note that the project was more or less a fisheries focused project.

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Moderately Satisfactory, it could have been better - Most countries failed to have national NMU meetings, if they happen they were seldom. The development of the management plans however did help to bring number of stakeholder togethe and improve the linakges but happened a little too late.

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response.

Satisfactory.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. It has been effecttive, practical and workable – highly satisfactory.   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Highly satisfactory |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. A difficult questions for the RMU. The RMU’s objective is to get a budget and work plan approved. I think appropriate guidance was provided when needed, although it could have been better

Satisfactory

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Satisfactory….They provided guidance as and when required. Although issues regarding procuremment queries (Nairobi Office) sometimes takes very long to get a repsonse.

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory . I think we have delivered adequately…. We could have done better with respect in support the countries with their science outputs. But this was not possible due to the lack of science manager at the RMU level.

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately Satisfactory, the only issue is procurement, it is a constant pushing to get things done.

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible.

Response. Satisfactory, The NMU and NCCs have provided adequately support to the project implementation execpt in few circumtances where it was extremely difficult to get into contact with certain NCCs.

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory :

Strengths – planning support was good by the RCCs,

Weakness - Lack of follow of actvities at national level by the respective RCCs, Travel to assess progress in critical areas during implementation was lacking, the RCCs already had heavy work load and on top coordinate regional activities.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Satisfactory - it was adequate.   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Satisfactory – it is adequate sometimes not obviously in terms of how to measure it based on data collections.   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. Highly satisfactory – it was constantly to ensure the implementation focuses on the targets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Moderately unsatisfactory : there were difficulties on both ends, procurement process slow but also delivery times slowm due to selection of supliers that are unable to supply based on the argument of lowest bidder, which in end cost more – e.g procurement of dropline fishiung gears.   1. Disbursement   Response. Satisfactory – improved considerably after dicsussion with KMFRI on how to improve disbursement.   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory – at the RMU level, internal audits every 6 months couple with independent external audits.   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. satisfactory   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. satisfactory – provided through the Financial Manual. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc.,   Response.   * Observers deployment discussion with COI to assist countries ( in the second phase of the project. * turtle satelitte tagging – discussing with countries to continue to support maintaining the tags (pay the data transmission fees) * data bases – KMFROI to continue to host the data and Seychelles to host a back server of all the data. * Management plans – EAF nansen has second phase which will help countries with implementation, this include the COI SMARTFISH project as well to support countries that have an nationally adopted EAF management Plan  1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Financing these activities, staff moving to do other things and activities not part of institutional work plan – e.g maintenance of FADS, deployment of observers etc…Moderate  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. satisfactory |

**Outcomes**

Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Moderately satisfactory, no shared stock however. The capacity has been built and will this process to be undertaken. It is however extremely difficult to agree to on a multilateral or bilateral management plan within the timeframe of the project. This is more for the second phase of the project. Nonetheless a spirit of cooperation has been built in the region which is a good foundation for such arrangments.   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Moderately satisfactory – Part of the SAP and also a monitoring and evaluartion framework submitted to the 6th Session of the SWIOFC but needs to validated by the SWIOFC scieitnific Committee.   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. No sub regional management plans because no transboundary stocks identified. National Plans are being developed and about 5 in final draft. However regional exchanges have taken place in the context of these national management plans, e.g Comoros and Madagascar for their Demersal fisheries management plans and similary for Kenya and Tanzania on their small pelagic management plan.  Moderately satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; and * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. Highly satisfactory by the end of the project   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. Fully operational databases satisfactory   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. Baseline assessment done through the retropective analysis. Further assesment of the all cruise data planned in January/Feb 2013. Moreover, the SWIOFC also defines the status of all the major fish stocks in the region though assessment done in the working groups and the scientific committee. satisfactory   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Review of SWIOFC and improving its effectiveness.  Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response. Type here  The cruises carried by the project, use of funds for deployment of turtle tags,  Moderately Satisfactory:  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response. Type here  Observer training – a huge amount of funds were used to trained observers, currently only three countries actually deployed observers.  Deployment of Fads in some countries, those vandalised shortly after deployment which could have been avoided. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. Not visible at this stage…but .I guess the deveopment of the EAF management plans will provide better outcomes for improved food security.   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. In term SWIOFC, the process have started, at country level pushing EAF approach in all efforts to manage fisheries.   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Regional coorperation enhanced… |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response. Training of fishermen – dropline fishing,  Built capacity in cruises planning and execution of the cruises  Development of networking.  Sense of the ownership  Development of management…  Standard protocol scientific work |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response. Publications…….designed and developed by the countries themselves.  Delays, Financial incentive to enhance delivery by civil standards.  Country commitments -  Slow start of the project – funding – |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Li-nking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. observer programme |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below based on the guidance notes which are provided underneath it.

n/a

#### KMFRI

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes I agree with the MTR findings   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Yes as the issues identified are still relevant   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Not identified   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. The timeframe was adequate   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. Financial and Procurement issues for a regional project like KCDP are complex and requires a lot of patience by the coordinating institution as the grant agreement places a lot of responsibility to the coordinating country.   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. Type here  Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. Type here   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response. Type here   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Type here |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Unsatisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Type here

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Moderately Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Moderately Satisfactory

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. NCC’s should have been more proactive

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Highly Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. Moderately Satisfactory |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. One major weakness was with the level of representation at RPSC. In most cases, the Permanent Secretaries delegated to officers who were also implementers. In almost all the cases, budgets were left hanging and minutes were not signed.

Moderately Satisfactory

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. WB technical officer’s attitude and engagement are very important in the overall supervision of the project. It is our opinion that in this project, the WB technical officer had no strategy of how to deal with the RMU and how to deal with the coordinating institution. For example, requests for NO OBJECTION sent out and approved by WB before the procurement issues discussed by the Tender Committee. This created a bias by the committee when awarding tenders. There are times when a tender which has already received a WB No Objection is again rejected by the tender committee after scrutiny for not going thru procurement process.

Moderately Satisfactory

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Highly Satisfactory

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. SWIOFP was a complex project since it involved 8 countries of the region. Parameters for assessing a WB project which is being implemented wholly within one country should be different from parameters used to assess performance of a coordinating institution of a regional project. Procurement challenges for a regional project are heavier than those encountered for a project wholly within a country. If financial disbursement is seen as a big problem for WB projects in individual countries, it was expected to be a nightmare for a regional project like KCDP. However, KCDP has done very well on this as it records more than 90% disbursement despite the many challenges.

Moderately Satisfactory

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately Satisfactory. NMU’s have been week i releasing quarterly and annual reports.

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. Satisfactory  How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.  Response. Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Satisfactory   1. Disbursement 2. Response. Highly Satisfactory 3. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc 4. Response. Highly Satisfactory 5. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation 6. Response. Highly Satisfactory 7. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual 8. Response. Highly Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. KMFRI will continue to maintain the database and appropriate personnel have already been identified for the same. KMFRI is also receiving a research vessel from Belgium for the EEZ research.   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. The main risk is for the government of the region not to use the iformation generated by the project  Moderate overall risk  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. No comment |

**Outcomes**

Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Not achieved as a regionally harmonized strategy has not yet been done though data is now available   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Not yet   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. Not yet  Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; and * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; and * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. This will be achieved   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. This will be achieved   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. This will be achieved   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. This will be achieved  Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response. Coordinated ship movements  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response. Type here  Moderately Satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. It will have positive impact once the management plans are effected   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. Highly Satisfactory. We now have a better working arrangement and coordination in the region   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Type here |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response. This was the first time that the Kenya Government signed a world Bank grant agreement and the funds were not managed by the Ministry of Finance but managed by a third party (KMFRI). This could be one of the reasons why the project had a high rate of disbursement as we had less level of bureaucracy.  For KMFRI to have coordinated the regional project, the institute gained good experience placing it at an advantaged level in coordinating the new KCDP world Bank project which involves many agencies but coordinated under the supervision of KMFRI. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response. The WB not appreciating the complexities associated with managing a regional project |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. Type here |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes/No

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes/No

#### SWIOFC

**Questions on project implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 1 Project design**. For any project, its preparation and design has a significant impact on its ability to be implemented successfully. The MTR examined these issues in considerable detail and found that the project design process was sufficiently participatory, and the project relevant to country’s needs and coherent with national/regional/international policy. The MTR concluded that project risks were also adequately identified (except for the issue of piracy) and that the institutional structure for the project was generally appropriate (although failed to take account of the need to engage with universities and NGOs). Two major criticisms in the design which the MTR identified were that the project logframe was weak and needed revision, and that components 5 and 6 were not sufficiently funded.  Could you please answer each question below in turn and say whether (and why)   1. you still agree with the MTR findings on project design   Response. Yes   1. you feel the project is still as relevant and coherent today as it was at the design and MTR stages, and if not why not   Response. Yes   1. other risks not considered in the project design or considered at MTR have materialised   Response. Piracy was the main issue not considered in design. Other risk was the number of cruises and the difficulty in completing them,   1. the timeframe provided for the project was sufficient, etc.   Response. Timeframe to really achieve objectives was not sufficient   1. you have any comments about the complexity of the project design   Response. Recognised that the design is complex, but not an avoidable element if you want to engage the countries in the region in a substantive manner   1. You have any other comments or observations you would like to make about the overall project design in terms of its impact on successful implementation   Response. Project had such a significant survey element, but how those surveys feed into good management is not always evident. Basis for the many of the surveys for new stocks, but had not really been possible to identify new significant stocks. There was an assumption that new significant stocks would be identified and then appropriate mgt put in place for them  Moderately satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 2** **MTR**. The MTR made a large number of recommendations which were discussed and agreed by project stakeholders at the meeting in the Maldives in March 2011. Could you please provide your views on   1. The extent to which agreed actions for specific groups (e.g. NMU/NCC, RCCs, RMU), etc have/have not been completed. Based on project monitoring documentation, the final pages of this questionnaire include the MTR recommendations. Please comment below on any entries in the right-hand column which you do not agree with, referring to the number of the recommendation.   Response. Yes generally good performance.   1. The reason for any failures to implement any agreed actions   Response.   1. Whether the actions that have been taken following the MTR have assisted with improved project implementation, and why you feel that   Response. Yes, improved performance from KMFRI, more focus on management |

**Qu 3** **Project partnerships/linkages**. The MTR highlighted the need for partnerships and linkages. Please provide as much detail and justification for your views as you can on

1. How satisfactory do you think the linkages have been between SWIOFP and the ASCLME, in particular in terms of the generation of one coordinated TDA and SAP

Response. Increased considerably after MTR, have an MoU, have had joint meetings, some joint cruises. Satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with other donor projects

Response. Highly satisfactory – with EAF, Smartfish, WWF East Africa, etc

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with national governments

Response. Highly satisfactory

1. How satisfactory has SWIOFP been in linking/partnering with local level stakeholders in each country

Response. Moderately Satisfactory

1. What could have been done better/more, to further foster such partnerships at different levels?

Response. Local level NMU stakeholder consultation – could have done more.

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 4.** **Decision-making and administrative requirements**,   1. How satisfactory have the project’s decision-making processes been throughout the last 5 years i.e. have they been effective, practical and workable   Response. Satisfactory   1. How satisfactory have any project guidance documents been on the project’s administrative procedures and requirements   Response. not applicable for SWIOFC to comment on |

**Qu 5. RPSC oversight.** Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the RPSC, any problems with its functioning, and how satisfactory you feel the RPSC has been in providing sufficient guidance to the project. (The MTR highlighted some weaknesses in the RPSC, so you may wish to comment specifically on whether things have improved over the last two years, and if not why not, for example, level of consistency of members, or level of the official of the RPSC, etc....)

Response. Better improvement in representation since the MTR as evidenced by list of participants. How critical RPSC is of things put before it to approve is difficult to say. Satisfactory

**Qu 6. World Bank oversight**. Please provide your comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the project oversight provided by the World Bank, and how satisfactory you feel this oversight has been. Please comment on issues such as supervision missions, procurement support, financial technical support, your impressions of Bank involvement, and how useful support and oversight has been. (Note that this is a key aspect of the ICR, and indeed of the Bank’s requirement to prepare its own ICR, so I would be grateful for as much comment as you can provide in responding to this question).

Response. Regular supervision mission, helped to identify issues, suitably critical of performance. Satisfactory to Highly satisfactory

**Qu 7. RMU.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the RMU have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Satisfactory. Early phase was unsatisfactory and latter phase highly satisfactory. Slow start with temp RES, then much improved

**Qu 8. KMFRI.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think KMFRI (as the implementing institution) has been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately satisfactory. Improved performance lately but still some bottlenecks in procurement. Settling in process. MoU issue with WWF never passed because of uncertainty over whether they could sign or not and the implications of signing it. Some internal issues had an impact an impact on the project.

But support costs not charged to project which is a positive aspect.

**Qu 9. NMUs and NCCs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think the NMUs and NCCs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately satisfactory. Mixed performance. New process for many countries which generated more work for them. Unclear allocation of time to project by the institutions. Need for continuous driving from the RMU. But strong point of involving them is capacity building, and performance has improved.

**Qu 10. RCCs/RCWGs.** Please provide some comment on how satisfactory you think RCCs/RCWGs have been in supporting project implementation, highlighting any key strengths and weaknesses over the duration of the project and giving examples where possible

Response. Moderately satisfactory. Mixed performance of RCCs, Prawns highly satisfactory, pelagic satisfactory (because of French support), demersal moderately unsatisfactory, biodiversity moderately satisfactory, statistics/databases satisfactory. Component 6 satisfactory – unsatisfactory before MTR and then very good performance

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 11 M&E.** Could you please provide three separate answers to the questions below on project M&E, providing justification and examples in your response   1. How satisfactory was M&E design i.e. the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward the global objective and project development objectives (see Questions 14 and 15 below) using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;   Response. Moderately satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E implementation i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality);   Response. satisfactory   1. How satisfactory was M&E utilization i.e. the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.   Response. highly satisfactory |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 12. Fiduciary aspects and safeguards.**  Please provide some comment separately on how satisfactory you think the project has been in terms of its   1. Procurement   Response. Moderately unsatisfactory   1. Disbursement   Response. Satisfactory   1. Financial safeguards e.g. audits, etc   Response. Satisfactory   1. Revising fund allocations at the MTR to better support implementation   Response. Satisfactory   1. Financial management guidance to NMUs as provided in the Financial Management Manual   Response. n/a |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 13. Sustainability / Risk to development outcome.** This question relates transition arrangements to post-completion operation and maintenance arrangements, and the means of sustaining project reforms and institutional capacities.  For the areas which have fallen under your responsibility during the project, please provide some information on   1. What steps you or others have taken to ensure that project activities or impacts are sustained once the project has finished e.g. observers, databases, research cruises, people networking, etc   Response. Continuous engagement. Databases Kenya required to make a proposal on how to ensure sustainability. Link with EAF Nansen to continue with management plans. Smartfish project involved in implementation of management plans. SWIOFC scientific committee taking up the retrospective analysis and component reports.   1. What do you consider to be the main risks to sustainability of project impacts? Please list as many as you can that you think relevant, and for all risks you identify, please say whether you think the risk is: Negligible to Low; Moderate; Significant; or High   Response. Potential gap between end of SWIFP and a future regional Bank project. Risks to management plans are low as things in process now. Risks to data is low as Kenya will have to spell out it will be maintained. Retrospective analysis and information from components low – will be an FAO publication. Scientific Committee will use country report. People networking moderate risk unless intermediary support set up. Risks to capacity building low as good work has been done. Cruise data is moderate to high at this stage. Strengthening oc SWIOFC risk is low because number of processes are already place. Overall low risk  In addition   1. Please provide any comment about your views of the adequacy of Bank support in preparing for project completion and the sustainability of benefits.   Response. Satisfactory. Continual reminders being provided to the project and consideration of post project process. Strong support of SWIOFC to continue. Provision of $1.1 million grant to be used to implement the obligation countries have under IOTC and to examine rights-based fisheries, use of licences, governance, and to address prawn fisheries in particular. Plus examination of follow up project (SWIOfish) – started in June 2012, supported by the Commission in terms of concept, and Bank then facilitated Maputo meeting to further specify project details, and will then be formulation process. |

**Outcomes**

*Note: Please note that in this section, the ICR will focus more on achievement of high level project objectives, and development outcomes/results, rather than on progress by components/outputs*

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 14. Achievement of global project objective** (*To promote the environmentally sustainable use of fish resources through adoption by countries riparian to the Southwest Indian Ocean of a Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)-based approach to fisheries management in the Agulhas and Somali LMEs that recognizes the importance of preserving biodiversity)*  Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the global project objective  General comment that objective largely been done. Are working at an LME approach.   1. Development of a regionally harmonized strategy for ecosystem-based management of shared fish stocks in the SWIO adopted by all countries participating in the Project through strengthening existing regional management bodies such as the SWIOFC   Response. Satisfactory. In terms of the strategy being to have the Commission having EAF as an integral part of its objective – to a large extent this has come about because of the project.   1. Adoption by all SWIOFP countries through the SWIOFC of a monitoring and evaluation framework (including environmental status and stress reduction indicators) that define as ecosystem   Response. Satisfactory. In terms of stocks an ongoing M&E framework in terms of the scientific committee which includes continuous montoring based on EAF. Indicators proposed to Commission to be considered by scientific committee and then to be approved by the Commission. But indicators already incorporated into national management plans.   1. Production and adoption through the SWIOFC of at least two sub--‐regional management plans (including policy, institutional and legal framework) governing management of a specific transboundary fisheries for each of the three species categories of the project (crustacean, demersal, pelagic)   Response. Indicator is flawed because design didn’t know the extent of transboundary stocks. It was a conceptual indicator. Moderately satisfactory because the project has identified what is transboundary, it has left the framework for a legal status for shared management (Judith Swan’s recent work). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 15. Achievement of project development objectives (PDOs).** The PDOs for the project are:   * To identify and study exploitable offshore fish stocks within the SWIO, more specifically, to determine existing fishing pressure on these stocks and to investigate the role of environmental influences on the life histories, seasonal variability and health of stocks in order to differentiate between environmental and anthropogenic impacts; Retrospective analysis and component reports have been done. satisfactory * To develop institutional and human capacity through training and career opportunities; highly statisfactory * to foster development of a regional fisheries management structure for implementing the LME-based approach to ecosystem based management through strengthening the, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) and other relevant regional bodies; highly statisfactory * to mainstream biodiversity in national fisheries management policy and legislation, and through national participation in regional organizations that promote sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources. statisfactory   Please provide any comments on the extent to which you feel the project has (or will have by end of March) managed to meet the following indicators associated with the PDOs   1. Adoption of at least one national or multi-national management plan for a specific demersal, pelagic or crustacean fishery by each Participating country by the end of the Project   Response. satisfactory. Reservation that South Africa didn’t need new management plans.   1. A regional fisheries database fully operational and inclusive of new and historic data, which contributes to the development of regional management plans for at least two fisheries by the end of the Project   Response. satisfactory, but contribution to regional mgt plans questionable because regional plans not developed/appropriate.   1. Production of a baseline assessment (accompanied by databases) that defines the current status of relevant crustacean, demersal and pelagic fisheries in each of the participating countries by the end of the Project   Response. highly satisfactory.   1. Production of a sustainable fisheries management framework leveraged onto the agenda of regional fisheries management bodies that include biodiversity as an underlying principle.   Response. Highly satisfactory. As above the Commission now has EAF as an integral part of its objective – to a large extent this has come about because of the project. EAF now enshrined in mgt plans. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 16. Efficiency** Please provide comment on whether you feel the project has been efficient in its use of resources in bringing about the project outcomes, with supporting justification. If possible please provide at least one example of how you think the project has been efficient in supporting project outcomes, and at least one example of an area in which you think the project has not be efficient or an area where you feel little has been achieved despite money having been spent.  Overall rating: satisfactory because even though some examples of inefficiency, these examples are just a few activities among many completed by the project  Positive example(s) of efficiency: Response.  Efficient in embedding project in existing institutions (nationally in fisheries and research institutes, and regionally in SWIOFC  Example(s) of lack of efficiency: Response.  FADs  Observer programme training took place before observer scheme in place at signficiant cost and effort with low impact |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu 17. Other outcomes**   1. Do you feel the project has any other positive or negative outcomes in terms of poverty, gender or social impacts   Response. National fisheries mgt plans address small-scale fisheries so will have an impact on poverty – explicit part of mgt plans is the poverty/social issues, as per the EAF approach. No gender specific projects/activities not programmed, but participation in project has been gender representative.   1. How satisfactory do you feel the project has been in bringing about institutional change and strengthening, and why   Response. highly satisfactory instrumental in moving SWIOFC to a mandatory role   1. Has the project had any other intended or unintended outcomes (positive or negative) you can think of   Response. Has helped with collaboration on tuna issues within SWIOFC |

**Lessons learned**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 18. Lessons learned from positive issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are positive things the project did well. These might relate to project design, implementation issues, bringing about outcomes, and/or relate to particular project stakeholders or be general across the project more generally.  For each lesson learned please state whether you think it is specific to the project, or has wider application/replicability to other project.  Response.   * Project adaptation to deal with issues e.g. piracy * Overall much cooperation, and no country which feels left out, because of intense levels of consultation and buy-in of countries. * Importance and benefits of good collaboration with cooperating projects, NGOs and institutions – has been particularly good by the project * Home-grown and implemented – importance and benefits of participation in terms of sustainability and long-term sharing. Project staff stay in the region * Use of existing structure to pass information through to management so much easier to do that, and don’t have to the discussion that other projects have about how to get science to managers. * Use of region to recruit personal if available. External consultants only used in a very targeted sense. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 19 Lessons learned from negative issues**  Please provide at least 3 lessons learned from the project experience which you feel are negative things the project did not do well or which impacted negatively on the project.  Again, please say if you feel these lessons learned are specific to the project or if they are things which future interventions should strive to avoid  Response.   * Ensure that all staff are in place early on in the project…impact of the RMU staffing on the project. * Avoid setting over ambitious targets e.g. regional mgt plans when you didn’t even have a single national management plan at time of design. * Large part of budget went to exploratory surveys which were naturally high risk in terms of their impacts, and were expensive. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Qu. 20 Linking lessons learned to post-completion activities**  How, if at all and if relevant, are these lessons being reflected in the arrangements for the post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps.  Response. This should be for the Bank and the SAF to take up in design of future project. |

**Qu 22. Overall impressions**

In general terms do you think the project has been successfully implemented

Yes

In general terms do you think the project has been successful in bringing about the intended outcomes?

Yes

**Qu. 21. Co-financing**. The project design envisaged a total of $6.68 million of direct financial and in-kind contributions from participating countries over the lifespan of the project. Please could you complete the table provided below

n/a

Annex  : Timeline presentation of project

**Year 1** July07/08

**Year 2** July 08/09

**Year 3** July 09/10

**Year 4** July 10/11

**Year 5** July 11/12

Grant Agreement signed 9th Oct 07

Grant Agreement effective 16th Apr 2008

MTR – Jan to March 2011

**Year 6** March 12/13

Grant money to KMFRI Nov 2008

Current end project 31st May 2011

Current closing date project 30th Nov 2011

Project completion 31st March 2013

Project closing 31st July 2013

Phase 1 data collection and gap analysis

Phase 2 Shipboard sampling and research cruises

Phase 3 Data analysis, preparation of TDA and SAP

Phase 1 data collection and gap analysis

Phase 2 Shipboard sampling and research cruises

Phase 3 Data analysis, preparation of TDA and SAP

**PAD**

**Reality based on late start and agreement at MTR**

Recruitment of permanent RMU staff

RFPM May 2009

RES Aug 2009

Admin Oct 2008

IT and Comms Jul 2010

Ships Logisics Coordinator November 2010

**PAD specifies 5 years compared to 4 year GA**

Annex  : MTR recommendations

| **Recommended Action** | **Responsibility** | **Timeframe** | **Action/Comments (‘completed’, or ‘not completed’)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendations intended to address design issues** | | | |
| 1. A new logical framework to be developed and used to guide both the monitoring (inputs and outputs) and the evaluation (results/outcomes and objectives) of the project | RMU, NMUs | End March 2011 | Completed, and in PIM |
| 1. Rework the budget to better support components 5 and 6 | RMU, NMUs at annual budget and workplan meeting | End March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. The Project Implementation Manual (currently under revision and in draft final form), to be amended so as to a) remove the need for PICs to be established, and b) require the need for collaboration with all relevant NGOs, Universities and other relevant institutions. | RMU | End March 2011 | Completed  in both English and French versions |
| 1. Regional Policy Steering Committee (RPSC) to grant a generic approval for Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI) to sign agreements with other funders for grant monies on behalf of participating countries, as long as such grants are requested/negotiated by the Regional Management Unit (RMU) and complement project activities provided that any risk are internalised within the grant received. | RPSC | End March 2011 | Completed |
| **Recommendations intended to address procurement issues** | | | |
| 1. NMUs to ensure that all procurement requests made to the RMU are supported by appropriate documentation | NMUs | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing, and now being done |
| 1. The KMFRI procurement/tender committee should handle SWIOFP issues separately to other KMFRI issues | KMFRI | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing |
| 1. KMFRI procurement/tender committee should be able to take decisions without the Chairman being in attendance, with alternates being nominated | KMFRI | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing with better peformance, but some delays in meetings/decisions still observed |
| 1. KMFRI to ensure that the Deputy Director of KMFRI can act for the Director for final procurement approvals | KMFRI | End March 2011 | Completed and ongoing, but some delays in approvals still observed |
| 1. RMU and KMFRI should agree standard timeframes for responding to requests for approvals | RMU, KMFRI | End March 2011 | Not completed. No formal commitment made by KMFRI on timeframes, but speed of approvals improved although still some delays |
| 1. Government of Kenya to be asked to increase the threshold for procurement decisions to be taken by the KMFRI procurement/tender committees from KSh 30,000 to KSh 150,000 | KMFRI | End March 2011 | Not completed |
| 1. RMU to appoint a procurement assistant to work under the supervision of the RFPM and the RES | RMU | End April 2011 | Not completed  Procurement of assistant itself took a long time, and when a candidate was selected it was decided she should work on the KCDP project. |
| 1. Government of Kenya to be asked to raise the RMU petty cash monthly limit to KSh 250,000 | KMFRI | End March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Training in procurement to be provided to NMU staff | RMU, NMU | August 2011 | Completed |
| **Recommendations intended to address disbursement issues** | | | |
| 1. Treasury to transfer remaining monies from its designated account and the interest account to the KMFRI dedicated account, and the Treasury account to be formally closed. RMU to provide supporting documentation to the Treasury account as necessary | Kenyan Treasury | End March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Increase the number of signatories on the project account from 3 to 4 | KMFRI | End March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Kenyan Treasury to address the bottlenecks that contribute to the untimely disbursements of funds to the Kenyan NMU. | KMFRI, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Fisheries | End March 2011 | Not completed  Bottlenecks still exist |
| 1. NMUs to provide detail on contributions per country in quarterly reports | NMUs | Quarterly, ongoing | Not completed  All the NMUs have not been indicating their in –kind contributions together with the quarterly IFR |
| 1. World Bank office in South Africa to retain country detail on disbursements provided to it by the RMU | World Bank | Ongoing | Completed |
| **Recommendations intended to address budget planning issues** | | | |
| 1. RCWG meetings (to prepare component budgets) to take place at least 1 month before the AWPB and RPSC meetings, and the RPSC meetings to take place at least 1 month before the start of the financial year | RMU | Yearly, ongoing | Partially completed |
| 1. RCCs and RMU staff to provide sufficient guidance to ensure that all activities and related budgets proposed by the six RCWG meetings are realistic in terms of the overall budget allocation for the project | RCCs, RMU | Yearly, ongoing | Completed and ongoing |
| **Recommendations intended to address issues related to financial management systems** | | | |
| 1. The Financial, Disbursement and Procurement manual should be submitted to the World Bank, so that the World Bank can consider signing off on the manual | NMUs, World Bank | End April 2011 | Completed and World Bank approval provided |
| 1. All vouchers to be reconciled and a clear cut off date to be agreed by the RMU for commencement of the fully-automated financial management system | RMU | End March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Once the automated financial management system is proven to be working well, RMU staff to train all NMU accountants in the new software | RFPM | April 2011 to Sept 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Resolution of attribution of costs for reporting (analytical – per component, country/RMU and cost category) and accounting (financial – per schedule 1 and the grant agreement in terms of country/RMU and cost category) purposes to allow for identification of country benefits (using a proportional process for shared costs) | RFPM | End April 2011 | Not completed |
| 1. Training in financial management to be provided to NMU staff | RMU, NMU | August 2011 | Partially completed - only for English-speaking countries |
| **Recommendations intended to address issues of budget provisions and audits** | | | |
| 1. RMU/KMFRI/World Bank to clarify rules and workings of an escrow account, and to request no objection from the World Bank for its establishment | RMU, KMFRI, World Bank | March 2012 | Completed  No need for escrow account as 4 month closure period approved to pay final accounts e.g. auditors |
| 1. NMUs in participating countries to ensure timely submission of interim financial reports and annual audits | NMUs, management of institutions | Quarterly, ongoing | Completed and ongoing, performance much improved and all audits up to date |
| **Recommendations intended to address issues relating to value-for-money** | | | |
| 1. All implementing institutions to ensure improved care in selection of those attending trainings and meetings, and where possible to ensure consistency where follow-up training/meetings are involved | NMUs, host institutions, Ministries, and departments | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing  Improvements noted but some continuing problems |
| 1. Implementing institutions, focal points, RCCs and NCCs to pay special attention in ensuring that the benefits of training are being implemented/used in the participating countries | Institutions, foccal points, RCCs, NCCs | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing  Improvements noted but some continuing problems |
| **Recommendations intended to improve project management** | | | |
| 1. Additional budget resources to be identified to ensure an integrated TDA and SAP for the ASCLME, WIOLaB and SWIOFP, and GEF and implementing agencies (UNEP, UNDP and World Bank) to agree on a way forward | RMU, donors | End March 2012 | Completed |
| 1. Additional MOUs to be signed by SWIOFP with other projects and institutions as appropriate, following initial review and comment by countries | RMU | Ongoing | Partially completed and ongoing  ASLCME – SWIOFP Aide Memoire finalised  SWIOFP-WWF MOU prepared but not signed due to lack of agreement over whether countries, RMU or KMFRI should sign |
| 1. RMU to further upgrade and improve the project website, and thereafter to ensure continuous and regular uploads of relevant project outputs, planning documents, etc | RMU | April 2011, and ongoing | Completed |
| 1. SWIOFC (rather than the RMU) to invite permanent secretaries to attend RPSC meetings, through letters to the Ministries, in order to generate more ‘political push’ for their attendance | SWIOFC | Yearly, ongoing | Completed and ongoing |
| 1. RPSC to be empowered to take decisions remotely in exception circumstances, when suitably informed by written documentation provided by the RMU and submitted through the focal points | RPSC, RMU | Onging | Completed and ongoing  SWIOFC confirmed that the existing arrangement for approving and communicating the RPSC decisions remotely is working |
| 1. RES and the KMFRI Director to hold project progress meetings at least once a month | RES, KMFRI | Monthly, ongoing | Completed and ongoing  Meeting every first Tuesday of the month |
| 1. A relevant scientific consultant to be procured to provide ad hoc technical input and on-going support to the scientific coordination role of the RCCs (and the RMU) for components 3 and 5. With respect to Component 4, in particular for small pelagics, the necessary support may be requested as well | RMU, ORI | End march 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Host institutions must strive to reduce NCC turnover of staff if at all possible | Host institutions | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing  Improved performance |
| 1. National stakeholder meetings should be held in all cases | NMUs | Yearly, ongoing | Not completed |
| 1. While the project cant pay NMU staff extra monies to undertake SWIOFP activities, if Governments can or can otherwise provide incentives to staff to work on the project, they should do so | Governments | Ongoing | Not completed or possible |
| 1. Directors of hosting institutions should hold reviews of the impacts of engagement with SWIOFP on all NMU staff in terms of the actual time commitments involved, so as to find solutions to distribution/reallocation of workloads, etc | Host institutions | May 2011 | Not completed |
| 1. RCCs to more fully use available travel budget to visit and support NCCs in implementation of project activities, and to more actively engage with NCCs on a regular basis through a more ‘hands-on’ approach | RCCs | Ongoing | Partially completed  Improved RCC travel |
| 1. RMU to continue to provide strong guidance in RCWG meetings to ensure logical consistency between activities, outputs, outcomes and objectives | RMU | Yearly, ongoing | Completed |
| **Recommendations intended to address component progress** | | | |
| 1. MSc approvals to be carefully assessed by the panel, and informed by the timing of future research cruises and availability of data. The panel, and respective NMUs, to encourage students to be available for SWIOFP work on completion of their studies | MSc panel, NMUs | Ongoing | Completed |
| 1. RMU to explore the issue of co-financing remaining under the Nansen cruise budget e.g. technical assistance in fisheries acoustics | RMU | Ongoing | Completed, co-financing was not possible |
| 1. All Host Institutions/NMUs to engage with relevant authorities (CoastGuard, Military/Navy) in participating countries to request military support to research cruises in the respective EEZs | NMUs | Ongoing | Completed |
| 1. Unused component budgets to be reallocated to other components | RMU, budget and worplan meeting | March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. To oversee Component 6 in respect of its fisheries management activities SWIOFC is to be requested to provide the regional framework for development of management plans under a panel of experts driven by RMU. | RMU | March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. NCCs for component 6 to be hosted by fisheries departments/ministries | NMUs | April 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Component 6 management plan activities to start immediately, and to include management plans in its PIM outcome table | RMU | April 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Component 1 Statbase data input should be completed immediately and where appropriate the RCC should travel to relevant countries to oversee the database updating. | RCC1, NCC1 | August 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Donor conference to be held to raise funds for, amongst other things, integration of SWIOFP, ASCLME and WIOLaB TDAs and SAPs | RMU | End 2011 | Not yet completed. Waiting until TDA and SAP prepared |
| **Recommendations to address monitoring weaknesses** | | | |
| 1. Quarterly activity monitoring report template to be revised by the RMU to focus on corrective and preventative actions, potentially with a better linkage, or at least with full coherence, between activity and financial reporting | RMU | April 2011 | Completed and ongoing |
| 1. NMUs to ensure that all monitoring reports are submitted on time | NMUs | Quarterly, annual, ongoing | Completed and ongoing |
| 1. All recommendations made by the RPSC and the World Bank to be provided in tabular format with clear allocation of responsibilities and proposed timelines | RPSC, World Bank | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing |
| 1. All trainings provided by the project should be evaluated by participants, and results provided to the trainers, the relevant NMUs and the RMU | Trainers, participants, RMU | Ongoing | Completed and ongoing |
| **Recommendations to ensure project results and project objective** | | | |
| 1. Revision of budget to be spread over 6 years, with changes in component budgets, country budgets and cost category budgets, and Revision of Annex 11 of PIM | RMU, budget and worplan meeting | March 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Kenya Government (on behalf of all participating countries) to request amendment of grant agreement to reflect extension, amended budget/activities/indicators/monitoring, etc., and this should be accompanied with a comprehensive narrative providing justification | Ministry of Finance | April 2011 | Completed |
| 1. Project to be granted a two year no-cost extension to enable project objective and outcomes to be realised | World Bank / GEF | End April 2011 | Completed  but termed a re-alignment of PAD and grant agreement |

1. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTOPMANUAL/0,,contentMDK:20064620~menuPK:64701637~pagePK:64709096~piPK:64709108~theSitePK:502184~isCURL:Y,00.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTOPMANUAL/0,,contentMDK:20064620~menuPK:64701637~pagePK:64709096~piPK:64709108~theSitePK:502184~isCURL:Y,00.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Graeme Macfadyen, Poseidon [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The consultant also provided his own ratings, and provided a rating for co-financing contributions based on the data provided by NMUs. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Project duration in the PAD was 5 years, while the grant agreement provided for 4 years [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. ‘or such later date as the Bank shall establish’ – Grant Agreement [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The United Republic of Tanzania consists of the Tanzanian Mainland and the People’s Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar. Fisheries is not a “Union” issue and representatives of both the mainland fisheries and Zanzibarian fisheries agencies have participated in the SWIOFP. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Tuna and other large pelagic billfish fisheries being under the remit of the IOTC [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Piracy peaked around late 2008, started regressing late in 2012 just as the project was ending. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. FAO contributions to co-financing of R/V Dr. *Fridtjof Nansen* surveys days under the ASCLME project were US$3.79 million [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. the original basis on which thee $6.68 million was estimated is not known or documented [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Traditional measures of efficiency e.g., NPV, ERR, cost effectiveness, unit rate norms, service standards, least cost analysis and comparisons, and FRR are not appropriate for this project, so text focusses more on aspects of design and implementation that either contributed to or reduced efficiency. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. These delays were the result of multiple factors such as: piracy; the supply of suitable wet lease vessels to carry out the cruise and the modifications required, the lack of scientists to board cruises, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Weather was considered seriously in the planning and no cruises were carried out in SE monsoons. However sudden weather changes occurred during a number of cruises, and it was not possible to change the vessel schedule while the contracts compensated for loss of days at sea due to bad weather. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)