

Fisheries Management and Law Advisory Programme

Report of the Joint Review Mission



Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, December 1992

Fisheries Management and Law Advisory Programme

Report of the Joint Review Mission

by

J.J. de Almeida, M.C.LL. Gaiger,
C. Jusidman, R. L'Heureux, T. Loebach, H.D. Walters
(Consultants to FAO/Norway)

Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, December 1992

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations, or the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, or the Government of Norway concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The members of the Review Team received help and support from FAO staff, Representatives of Governments and Regional Organizations and members of the fishing industries of countries visited. It would be invidious to mention any particular person but the team wishes to record its gratitude to all those persons who so willingly contributed to the success of the mission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND	2
3. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN	3
3.1 Justification	3
3.2 Objectives	3
3.3 Programme Design	4
4. ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION	5
4.1 Programme Budget and Expenditure	5
4.2 Activities and Outputs	7
4.3 Government and Intergovernmental Support	11
4.4 Project Management	12
4.5 Technical and Operational Backstopping	15
5. ASSESSMENT OF RESULTS	15
5.1 Effects and Impacts	15
5.2 Major Factors Affecting the Programme Results	17
5.3 Sustainability	18
6. CONCLUSIONS	20
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	23
APPENDIX 1: Terms of Reference	26
APPENDIX 2:	
Part 1 - Countries Visited by Mission Members	30
Part 2 - Persons Met	31
APPENDIX 3: Documents Studied	36
APPENDIX 4: FIMLAP - Development of Activities	38
APPENDIX 5: FIMLAP - Non-undertaken Activities	47
APPENDIX 6: Reports Issued	49

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FIMLAP was sponsored by the Government of Norway for a duration of four and half years (July 1989/December 1993) with a total donor contribution of US\$ 1,695,000. The Programme followed the "Norway/FAO EEZ Programme" which ended in 1986 and which the joint evaluation recommended to be extended.

The Programme provides assistance to developing countries in order to increase their management capacities for a rational management and optimum use of the fisheries resources in the exclusive economic zones, extended as a consequence of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and other national waters.

The Programme is divided into two areas of output covering the following main subjects of assistance:

- Fisheries management, including policy and planning; assessment of country situations; diagnosis and quantification of opportunities and problems; formulation of national and regional policies and strategies; formulation of national management and development plans; institutional arrangements for management and development;
- Fisheries legislation: drafting of laws and regulations; preparation for negotiation of joint ventures and bilateral fisheries agreements; aspects of international cooperation; licensing systems.

The activities are undertaken after receipt of an official request for technical assistance from the targeted countries and organizations.

The Programme concept and design was well adapted to the new needs in fisheries resource management created by the adoption of UNCLOS.

The planned budget of the programme envisaged expenditure of US\$ 178,000 for six months of 1989 and US\$ 350-400,000 per year until 1993. After an initial delay in the first 18 months in the use of funds, the expenditure exceeded the allocated amount by 72% and 80% respectively in 1991 and 1992. Personnel costs and travel expenses represented about 80% of the expenditure. Almost throughout the Programme, difficulties experienced in the accounting system of FAO did not allow close monitoring of its financial position.

In 1991, due to a significant increase in the number of requests from developing countries and regional organizations, the total remaining budget was allocated to 1992, whilst the donor and the executive agency agreed that further allocation of funds would be subject to a review of the Programme.

During the period covered by the review, 91 requests were received and 71 activities undertaken. Of these, 30 activities were completed, 20 are at an on-going stage, and 21 at a preparatory stage. Seven of the 20 requests which did not stimulate FIMLAP activities were undertaken by other projects (usually TCPs), 3 were out of the scope of FIMLAP and, 2 were affected by security situations.

As required in the Programme document, priority was given during the first two years to activities in West Africa. Marine fisheries were the focus of around 85% of the activities. The geographical scope of the activities was: national around 61%, regional 36% and only 2% were global. Most of the activities were provided through technical assistance. FIMLAP provided major funding to 2 workshops. No activity was specifically directed to women. An important number of activities generated new projects or were complementary to other FAO and NORAD projects.

At first, the Programme management was undertaken by a Steering Committee (SC) comprising representatives of the main units of the Fisheries Department and of the Legal Office of FAO. At the end of 1990, a 3 member Task Force (TF) was set up in order to improve the delivery rate of FIMLAP. The Operations Service of the Fisheries Department is in charge of putting into operation the approved technical assistance.

This management structure has proved to be very effective in the implementation of FIMLAP. FAO technical and operational backstopping was effective. Most of the activities involved FAO staff using its technical and organizational capacities.

In general, the activities undertaken under FIMLAP produced a follow-up, which clearly indicates the usefulness of its outputs. It appeared clearly to the mission that FIMLAP activities were conducive to better management of fish resources.

The success of the Programme was to a great extent due to its open-ended character, dependent on requests, together with the high quality of the technical assistance which was provided, in particular by FAO staff. This was a major factor of interaction between the parties involved in the activities. In general, activities under FIMLAP produced clear outputs which could have an immediate use.

The activities developed under FIMLAP contributed to the enhancement of national and regional capacities. However, the complexity and volume of the activities to be undertaken by developing countries in order to benefit from its fish resources justify the continuation of the Programme with the same objectives and components.

Therefore, a general conclusion is that there is an evident need for FIMLAP and a general approval of the activities carried out under the Programme. It was also found that:

- The project concept and design were appropriate responses to the needs in developing countries originating from the declaration of EEZs under UNCLOS;
- FAO was found to be unique in its capacity to deliver such assistance;
- Some countries would like the programme to make more use of regional experts;
- The main constraints affecting the Programme were: in one case effectiveness was reduced by insufficient attention given to the economic context; a low awareness of FIMLAP among FAO representations; delay in delivery of reports; lack of accurate information on current expenditure due to difficulties experienced with the FAO accounting system; delays in giving assistance due to lack of clarity in requests; difficulties in matching assignments with government arrangements and non-availability of FAO staff or consultants; unfavourable political and economic situations;
- Programme activities have been implemented world-wide, although emphasis has been given to West Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America;
- The management assistance through regional groupings and workshops has proved worthwhile and cost-effective.
- Countries need a good knowledge of economic parameters, in order to negotiate more equitable fishing and joint venture agreements with distant foreign fleets; assistance to negotiations has produced significant and almost immediate effects;
- Budgetary constraints among recipient governments and organizations can limit Programme effectiveness;
- Many countries cannot afford to finance research and MCS activities. Although in some regions this problem has been solved by cooperating with neighbours;
- In some regions, distant foreign fleets have negotiated more favourable terms of access than fleets from the region.
- The Programme has in some cases increased the awareness of the importance of fisheries among political authorities;
- There is a need of short-term training;
- In some regions, there was a need for expertise in data analysis and interpretation to support fisheries management;
- Increased need of assistance on legislation related to fisheries was found in: coastal zone management, management of shared stocks, and aquaculture.

Apart from its flexible procedures, rapidness of response, high quality of inputs and outputs, and the open ended nature of the Programme, other elements which contributed to the success of most of its activities were: good professional competence and good leadership in countries and regions; previous contacts by FAO experts and good cooperation with national and regional staff; existence of a basic institutional structure and political and institutional stability; satisfactory cooperation between the executive and legislature concerning legislation and

receipt of assistance by newly established fisheries administrations at an early stage.

The mission, therefore, recommended that:

- The Programme still being relevant to the needs of developing countries, should continue;
- The Programme should be open to developing countries in general;
- US\$ 200,000-250,000 be allocated immediately to fund activities already accepted;
- A new four-year programme based on the recommendations in this report should be funded and commence as soon as possible;
- The flexible approach and procedures should continue unchanged, but taking into account considerations of cost-effectiveness;
- Regional cooperation should be assisted and encouraged;
- Exchange of ideas through workshops should also be encouraged;
- As far as possible, activities sponsored should have a clear practical objective and be a catalyst for further action by recipients;
- In order to make the best use of available funds, preference should be given to: use of FAO staff, and whenever appropriate to regional consultants;
- FAO representatives should be kept periodically updated on the programme;
- MCS activities should also be considered for artisanal fisheries, including traditional management systems;
- Concentration of funds on a small number of activities should be avoided;
- Assistance should be given to coastal countries by the provision of economic information for the purpose of negotiations with distant foreign fleets;
- The priorities of a new programme should be: drafting of laws and regulations including harmonization; formulation of management and development plans; legal aspects of regional cooperation; formulation of national and regional policies and strategies; assessment of country situations; advice on institutional arrangements; advice on negotiations of joint ventures and fisheries agreements;
- When the donor and FAO discuss criteria for activity selection, they be guided by the following: fisheries potential; social and economic importance of fisheries and nutritional dependence on fish in countries or regions; assurance on use of outputs; whether an activity is complementary to FAO or NORAD projects; political considerations of the donor;
- Secretarial and clerical support should be provided to the programme management.
- the programme be continued for four more years, with a low option budget of US\$ 450,000, a medium option of US\$ 600,000 and a high option of US\$ 900,000 per year.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CEAO	Communauté Economique de l'Afrique de l'Ouest
CECAF	Committee for Eastern Central Atlantic Fisheries (FAO)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIFA	Committee for Inland Fisheries of Africa (FAO)
CRODT	Centre de Recherche Océanographique de Dakar-Thiaroye
CSRP	Commission Sous-régionale des Pêches
EC	European Community
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FI	Fisheries Department (FAO)
FIDO	Fisheries Department: Operations Service (FAO)
FII	Fishery Industries Division (FAO)
FIMLAP	Fisheries Management and Law Advisory Programme
FINSYS	(FAO) Financial System (integrated computer based accounting system)
FIP	Fishery Policy and Planning Division (FAO)
FIR	Fishery Resources and Environment Division (FAO)
INP	Instituto Nacional de la Pesca (México)
ISPM	Institut Scientifique des Pêches Maritimes
ISSTH	Institut Supérieur des Sciences et Techniques Halieutiques (de la CEAO)
GOEG	Government of Equatorial Guinea
LEG	Legal Office (FAO)
LEGN	Law Development Service (FAO)
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
POO	Project Operations Officer (FAO)
ST	Steering Committee
SWIOP	Southwest Indian Ocean Programme/Committee (FAO)
TF	Task Force (also Trust Fund)
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme (FAO)
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

1. INTRODUCTION

FAO has since July 1989, administered Programme GCP/INT/466/NOR - Fisheries Management and Law Advisory Programme (FIMLAP), financed by Norway under a Trust Fund Agreement. In January 1992, FAO and the Government of Norway agreed to hold a joint review of this programme.

The review mission was undertaken from November 1 until December 6, 1992 and the mission team were:

- Joaquim J. TENREIRO DE ALMEIDA, Consulting Economist, (Team leader);
- Michael Charles LLOYD GAIGER, Legal Consultant;
- Clara JUSIDMAN, Consulting Economist;
- Richard L'HEUREUX, Consulting Economist;
- Terje Henning LOEBACH, Head of Section, Directorate of Fisheries, Government of Norway;
- Horace D. WALTERS, Chief Fisheries Officer, Government of St. Lucia.

The mission started with briefing sessions and a review of programme files and reports at FAO headquarters in Rome. The review team then divided into two groups for completion of field trips. A first group, composed of Ms JUSIDMAN, Messrs LOEBACH and WALTERS, visited Barbados, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Peru, Chile and Mexico. The other group, composed of Messrs TENREIRO DE ALMEIDA, GAIGER and L'HEUREUX, visited Morocco, Sénégal, Guinea-Bissau, Guinée-Conakry and Ghana.

The purpose of the field trips was to meet with fisheries authorities, fishermen's organizations, and representatives of regional organizations dedicated to international cooperation in the field of fisheries. Persons were interviewed concerning: programme efficiency, effectiveness, impact, relevance and sustainability, as well as possible priorities for a future programme. It was hoped that the interviews with countries and with organizations which had benefitted from programme activities, would give valuable indications as to what extent the Programme had met its objectives, and also would help the team define guidelines for a possible extension of the Programme.

This report presents an analysis of the programme concept and design, programme implementation and effectiveness in meeting expected results and objectives. It concludes with the mission's findings and recommendations, including priorities and options for a future FIMLAP programme. Terms of reference of the review mission, places visited, a list of persons met and a list of documents studied, are found in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

2. BACKGROUND

After the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea was opened for signature in December 1982, many developing countries declared Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), in most cases, extending to 200 nautical miles. The extension of the jurisdiction of the coastal States over fisheries considerably changed the framework of fisheries management and development. The authority of coastal states over resources which, for the most part, were previously accessible to all, were now in their exclusive economic zones and called for new effective management systems utilising new techniques.

The extension of national jurisdiction and the implementation of new management systems also called for a review of applicable national legislation and, in many cases, the adoption of new laws that would provide a proper legal basis for fisheries management and would be consistent with the new Convention. Most developing countries did not yet possess the human and physical resources to carry out such a task without technical and financial assistance.

In 1979, FAO anticipated the adoption of UNCLOS and approved a comprehensive programme of assistance in the development and management of fisheries in exclusive economic zones. For the purpose of assisting with setting up the new management systems and the drafting of the necessary legislation, the Norwegian Government financed three inter-related projects in the years 1982 to 1985 which were administered by FAO and known as the "Norway/FAO EEZ Programme".

The three components of that programme were:

GCP/INT/398/NOR: Policy and Planning Missions;
GCP/INT/399/NOR: Monitoring, Control and Surveillance;
GCP/INT/400/NOR: Fishery Law Advisory Programme.

A joint evaluation of that programme was carried out in September/December 1986 and following it a new joint programme known as the "Fisheries Management and Law Advisory Programme" (FIMLAP) was approved by the Norwegian Government in July 1989 to which it allocated a total sum of US\$ 1 695 000 to cover a period of four and a half years.

The programme included assistance in management-related disciplines and the legal aspects of fisheries which covered the following activities:

- (a) assistance in the assessment of country situations, in the diagnosis and quantification of opportunities and problems;
- (b) formulation of national and regional policies and strategies;
- (c) formulation of management and development plans and of institutional arrangements for fisheries management and development;

- (d) drafting of fishery laws and regulations;
- (e) negotiation of joint ventures and bilateral fisheries agreements;
- (f) advice on legal aspects of international cooperation and on licensing systems.

The input consisted of multi-disciplinary missions, to be carried out at a rate of 6-8 per year.

Each programme activity involved the production of a technical report. The programme was to be based on requests, except that one planned activity was the preparation of a regional compendium of fisheries legislation in West Africa. For the first two years, priority was to be given to the needs of West Africa.

The programme was to be implemented by the Fisheries Department, in collaboration with the Legal Office of FAO, through a steering committee involving the Legal Office and the relevant sections of the Fisheries Department. Each unit was responsible for the selection of consultants in its own sphere and for overseeing technical aspects.

Programme monitoring was based on the preparation of six-monthly progress reports which described scheduled activities and provided data on progress towards immediate objectives. A terminal report was also required.

3. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN

3.1 Justification

The adoption of UNCLOS had endowed coastal countries with extended maritime domains rich in economic potential including the prospect of improved food supplies, improved incomes and job opportunities and increased foreign exchange earnings. Yet, most of the developing coastal countries did not have the capacity for taking advantage of these new opportunities. Their legislation had to be adapted and they also lacked some capabilities of managing the use of those new resources in their best interests. In that sense, FIMLAP, as did the previous Norway/FAO EEZ Programme, fulfilled a very important need, by giving to the developing coastal countries convenient access to the resources of a UN international agency with unique capabilities in that area.

3.2 Objectives

The programme document does not include an explicit development objective or immediate objectives, although it is clearly implicit that it aims at giving support to developing countries in obtaining optimal use for the resources of their EEZs.

The terms of reference of the programme review mission stated as the development objective the "rational management and optimum use of the fisheries resources in the exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and other national waters of developing countries" and as immediate objective "the enhancement of the developing countries' fisheries management capacity".

Those objectives are in line with the rationale of the programme elements stated in the project document and the general orientation of the programme, and as the rational management and optimum use of fisheries resources within EEZs is critical for improving food supplies and economic opportunities in developing countries, the development objective is entirely relevant. Accordingly, the immediate objective which is closely related to the achievement of rational management of fish resources is also most appropriate.

It must also be mentioned that the programme document is orientated towards the management of EEZs, without any explicit or implicit reference to national waters not included in EEZ's.

3.3 Programme Design

The programme document does not mention immediate or ultimate beneficiaries of the programme. The terms of reference given to the mission identified governments of participating countries and inter-governmental organizations as direct target groups; people engaged in the fishing industry and other related activities as direct beneficiaries and the peoples of the developing countries in general as indirect beneficiaries. In the case of a fisheries law advisory and management programme, those groups are clearly the target groups.

It is well known that developing countries in general are still building their capacity to manage their fish resources and require much support in achieving such a goal, mainly in specialized areas like fisheries legislation and management. Therefore, the programme is well adjusted to the needs of the direct target group. As a result, it should eventually benefit the project beneficiaries.

It is however often difficult to measure the effect and impact of the programme on such groups, beyond the improved capacity of the governments and regional organizations to manage their fish resources, as the impact of activities are often delayed, as is the case for institutional support in general.

The type of outputs to be expected from such a programme are directly related to the type of activities which the programme is covering. Any output resulting from one of the activities covered by the programme should lead to a better use of fish resources. For this type of programme, what was most important was to have a clearly identified set of activities that could be covered, so that project management could select from among requests those that could be assisted by FIMLAP. One

area where the programme might have been too limited was in the choice of inputs. There are other types of inputs in addition to "ad hoc multi-disciplinary missions" which could be used in implementing programme activities, like workshops, meetings of experts, single-consultant missions, or other relatively low-cost inputs.

The management structure proposed by the programme document was most appropriate to this type of programme which reacts to government and institutional requests. It involved all relevant technical departments and included a simple approval mechanism.

Progress monitoring was based on six-monthly progress reports. It was not specified that such reports would have a financial component, to show the amount of funds spent on each activity. This is a shortcoming, as it is important to follow how funds are spent, activity by activity, as implementation progresses.

However, it can be said that, in general, the project document was a good one. It clearly stated the problem, what results should be obtained and what types of activities to implement in order to reach the programme purpose.

4. ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Programme budget and expenditure

The planned budget estimated an outlay of 350 000-400 000 US\$ per year and 178 000 US\$ for the last six months of 1989. A comparison of the planned budget and the actual expenditure is:

	US\$ thousands	
	Planned expenditure	Actual expenditure
1989	178.5	94.5
1990	358.0	417.4
1991	372.2	643.3
1992	386.0	695.0
1993	400.0	5.2 (estimate)
	-----	-----
TOTAL	1 695.0	1 855.2

There was a small delay in the use of the resources in the first 18 months (24.6 thousand US\$) which is acceptable and understandable. However in 1991 there was an overexpenditure of 72% and in 1992 of 80%. Thus after three years, the resources budgeted for 4 1/2 years were exhausted.

In January 1992 the Steering Committee agreed that since a large part of the FIMLAP activities were undertaken by FAO HQ staff and that it was not possible to continue absorbing the full costs of this in the Regular Programme, and in order to maintain its effectiveness, part of the salary of HQ staff should be reimbursed. No reimbursements would be considered for

substantive inputs or backstopping provided whilst working at HQ in Rome, nor for participation in FIMLAP missions of less than 7 days. The claim for reimbursement is considered optional by the unit concerned.

The total budget was exceeded by 9.5%. The main reason was that the accounting system of FAO did not permit a close monitoring of the financial evolution of FIMLAP. No annual budgets were prepared.

However the Mission was informed that the Government of Norway agreed that the total funds be expended prior to the end of the budget period of 4 1/2 years.

Expenditure may be broken down as follows:

	US\$ thousands
Personnel costs	971.9
Travel expenses	507.7
General operation expenses	63.0
Fellowships, grants	87.0
Servicing costs	213.4

This is a reasonable distribution of funds for a programme like FIMLAP.

Of the total budget 80% was spent on personnel costs and travel.

General operational expenses were kept at a low level, an average of 3% per annum which was less than programmed.

Expenditure for publishing and editing reports were also below estimates. This might have been a reason for delay in publishing and editing the reports.

A large number of FAO technical staff undertook FIMLAP activities. An assessment prepared for 1991 estimates a cost for that year of the equivalent of 140 000 US\$ in salaries (416 person-days of FAO HQ staff). This represents a 22% addition to the 643 288 US\$ spent from FIMLAP resources in 1991. For 1992, to October 14 the figures were 130 days and 53 000 US\$.

Some criteria for the selection of projects were:

- (a) projects with costing kept to minimum;
- (b) participation of headquarters technical staff preferred;
- (c) no other alternative funding identified.

The mission did not obtain enough information to make a clear assessment of the budget allocation by activity, country

or region. FINSYS accounting system problems made it difficult to obtain such information.

Using the little available data for 1991, some activities appear to be more costly than others, mainly the regional activities and the multidisciplinary missions. In some cases, the cost of these more complex activities were shared with other FAO field projects, other international agencies or with national financial organizations. The quality of the outputs stemming from these activities however suggests that they should be continued.

To reduce the costs, FAO has sometimes combined FIMLAP activities with other missions.

4.2 Activities and Outputs

FIMLAP activities were initiated by requests from governments or intergovernmental organizations. Thus there was no detailed initial programme plan and schedule.

The main input was the provision of technical assistance.

The rate of delivery was high and there is general agreement that response to requests for assistance has been quick.

In order to review the activities and outputs of the programme it is necessary to take into consideration some important factors, mainly:

- FIMPLAP is structured according to areas of intervention rather than precise outputs (fisheries policy and management planning, legal advice);
- Under each area certain types of activities can be carried out under the programme;
- However, the activities have not been previously planned as they depend on requests from the direct target groups of the programme i.e. governments of participating countries and inter-governmental organizations;
- For the same reasons, indicators cannot be defined in order to measure how the results of the programme may be achieved.

As a programme the implementation of which is based on incoming requests, FIMLAP cannot be the object of a comparison between planned and implemented activities and outputs.

To enhance the effectiveness of the technical assistance inputs under the programme, FAO have required clear requests. The technical assistance then responds very well to the defined needs.

The quality of FIMLAP inputs, consisting mainly of consultants or FAO HQ technical staff, was of a very high quality. This assessment was made taking into account:

- (a) the written reports reviewed;
- (b) the opinion of local and regional staff interviewed;
- (c) the follow-up by governments and intergovernmental organizations.

In general, the quality of the staff concerned with activities under the programme at the national or regional level was also good.

Short term workplans of activities have been made on a regular basis by the FIMLAP Steering Committee (SC). These workplans were based on the requests presented by governments and international bodies targeted by the programme after being approved by the SC. However, no time schedule was usually established and new activities have been added to the workplan as they have been approved by the SC. Whenever requests were urgent, special attention was given by the Task Force (TF) and in general immediate action was undertaken.

During the period covered by the review (July 1989-September 1993), a total of 91 requests were presented for financing by FIMLAP. Of this number, 71 were accepted and undertaken and 20 requests were not accepted.

The reasons for not accepting the requests were:

- Undertaken by other projects	7
- Out of FIMLAP's scope	3
- Security situation in the country	2
- Funds not available/urgent	2
- Postponement requested by government	1
- Unspecified	5

In two cases, the high estimated cost of the requested activity represented an additional constraint. These were a fisheries sector study in Bahrain, and a revision of fisheries legislation in São Tomé e Príncipe.

At the time of the review, the activities which have been accepted under the programme were at the following stage of execution:

- Completed	30
- On-going	20
- Preparatory stage	21

Most of the activities found to be in a preparatory stage were accepted in principle subject to an allocation of funds in 1993.

Despite a lack of precise information, the mission was able to deduce that the annual number of requests and activities

undertaken gradually increased from 1989 to 1992. One reason for the increase may be a better knowledge of FIMLAP among its potential beneficiaries.

An analysis of the development of activities was used as one of the main sources of information for the purpose of assessing how they have been implemented. A comprehensive list of the activities was made based on documents and other information available to the mission, particularly FIMLAP progress reports, minutes of the meetings of the SC and TF during the period covered by the review. Other sources of information were the field work and interviews with staff members in FAO.

For the purpose of the analysis of how activities have developed they have been classified as follows according to:

- subject:
 - Fisheries policy and fisheries management and development planning (assessment of country situations, formulation of policies and strategies, formulation of management and development plans, institutional arrangements for management and development):
 - Fisheries legal advisory (drafting of laws and regulations, assistance in the preparation of negotiations of joint ventures and bilateral agreements, licensing systems).
- region covered: West Africa, rest of Africa, Caribbean, Latin America, Asia and Pacific and global.
- type of fishery: EEZ, inland.
- geographical scope: national, regional, global.

Appendix 4 lists the activities undertaken by FIMLAP. Appendix 5 lists the requests which have not been accepted or undertaken by FIMLAP, respectively.

Looking at activities according to subject one finds the following breakdown:

- | | |
|---|----|
| - Assessment of country situations | 8 |
| - Formulation of policies and strategies | 4 |
| - Assistance in management and development planning | 32 |
| - Institutional arrangements for management and development | 6 |
| - Drafting of laws and regulations | 21 |
| - Assistance in the preparations for negotiation of joint ventures and bilateral agreements | 3 |
| - Assistance with legal aspects of international cooperation | 5 |

- Assistance with licensing systems

NOTE: some activities covered more than one classification criterion.

The main conclusion that can be derived from the figures shown in the above breakdown is that at least two thirds of the activities covered subjects related to "assistance in management and development planning" and "drafting of laws and regulations".

Activities relating to management subjects mainly concerned preparation of fisheries management (including advice on MCS) and development planning. Legal activities focused in drafting of fisheries laws and regulations. These often produced more than one output.

Looking at activities according to regional distribution, one finds the following breakdown:

-	West Africa	31
-	Rest of Africa	10
-	Latin America	13
-	Caribbean	7
-	Asia and Pacific	8
-	Global	2

Priority was clearly given to activities in the West African region, particularly from 1989 to mid 1991, as agreed for the first two years of FIMLAP by the Government of Norway and FAO. Activities in West Africa mainly concern management and planning and advice on fisheries legislation.

Most of the activities related to marine fisheries (around 85%) and the rest to inland fisheries. Both covered the main subjects referred to above. Activities on inland fisheries were carried out mainly in Africa (Lake Chad and East African Lakes) and South America.

The activities had the following geographical scope: country (43), regional (25), global (2).

Only 11 activities related to workshops and seminars, of which 2 had a major financing from FIMLAP (workshops on Management and Legal Issues in China, and on MCS in West Africa). The main reason was the high cost involving these activities. However, the general opinion of workshops was positive, as they were considered an efficient and effective means of achieving the objectives of the programme. Workshops gathering technical staff from a region with common interests and producing concrete outputs (drafting conventions, multi-lateral agreements, outlines for harmonization of management issues, for instance) have been generally stated to be very useful.

No activity was specifically directed to women, although most of them had as an indirect beneficiary the whole population of a country, a zone or a region. However, it is difficult to assess a clear link between the activities carried out by the programme and an impact on those groups.

A systematic follow-up of the outputs has not been made. However, through the information provided to the mission, it was found that an important number of FIMLAP activities either generated new projects or were complementary to on-going projects, in particular Norway/FAO, NORAD and UNDP/FAO's financed and executed projects. Most of the projects originated by FIMLAP activities were TCP projects.

All the completed activities ended with a report. Reports on issues like the assistance on the preparation of negotiations on joint ventures or bilateral agreements have been kept as confidential. Appendix 6 lists the reports issued by FIMLAP.

4.3 Government and Intergovernmental Support

Because FIMLAP activities were initiated in response to specific requests from national and regional bodies it has generally been supported by those bodies.

The Mission generally found a commitment by the recipients to follow-up technical assistance, except where major political or economic changes occurred.

More effective results from programme activities were achieved when there was also:

- political will to carry out the recommendations;
- basic professional and institutional capacity;
- previous contacts with FAO activities of national and regional staff;
- the existence of political and public service stability;
- good cooperation between FAO experts and national or regional staff;
- competent leadership at the national and regional levels;
- fluid access to Parliament or Congress;
- political good timing of the technical assistance.

The more the programme responded to the requests and involved participation from local and regional staff, the better the results and implementation of activities.

Due to the design of FIMLAP, it is not possible to make an assessment of resources provided by governments or regional bodies.

The quality of the persons involved at the national or regional level was of a high standard.

In general FAO has been trying to observe the guidelines concerning FIMLP implementation: regional and country priorities, use of Norwegian experts, and better monitoring of the budget, although until now not very successfully with the last one.

The Programme, taking into account the interests expressed by Norway, can be considered very successful. It is really addressing important needs of the fisheries sector in less developed countries, especially in West Africa.

4.4 Programme Management

The execution of FIMLAP was assigned by the Government of Norway and FAO to the Fisheries Department in close cooperation with all the units concerned in FAO, in particular the Legal Office. Policy guidelines are established and budgets reviewed for the different programmes and projects sponsored by Norway at annual meetings between Norway and FAO.

A Steering Committee (SC) was set up consisting of representatives of different units of the Fisheries Department and of the Legal Office. The chairman is the Assistant Director-General FI, and other represented units are: Legal Office, Law Development Service, Fishery Policy and Development Division, Fishery Industry Division, Fishery Resources and Environment Division, Fishery Operations Service, Fishery Management Support Unit.

The Operations Service (FIDO) of the Fisheries Department is responsible for executing the approved technical assistance.

After an initial period during which the SC had full responsibility for management of the programme, a Task Force of 3 of the SC members was set up in the last quarter of 1990 in order to improve the delivery rate of FIMLAP.

As a consequence of this arrangement, the SC meets three times a year to approve policy guidelines, review activities and approve workplans and the allocation of funds. The Task Force meets at least once each month.

During the period covered by the review (July 1989 - November 1992), the SC met 9 times and the TF 16. However, decisions were often taken through informal consultation between the members of the two management units, in particular by the TF with specific members of the SC. Six progress reports covering six-monthly periods have been prepared by the SC and transmitted to the Government of Norway.

The Programme works by specific request, thus the terms of reference for each activity are established by a close interaction between the executive agency and the recipient. The outputs of each activity are discussed with the recipients until there is an agreement on their content.

For the first two years, criteria for the selection of activities to be funded by FIMLAP were set by FAO. These are as follows:

- Focus on management and legal aspects of fisheries;
- Activities in West Africa;
- Existence of official request;
- Participation of headquarters technical staff in the selected activities;
- Interest of Norway;
- Government's ability to follow-up the activities, based on the assessment of their past performance in the previous EEZ programme, and
- Urgency

In addition, preference is to be given to:

- activities with cost kept to the minimum;
- where no other alternate funding identified, and
- preference for a catalytic/initiating type of project with follow-up activities to be funded from other sources.

Taking into consideration the information available to the mission and the field visits, the programme management units (SC/TF) observed these priorities carefully during the first two years of the programme's execution. After this initial period, the same criteria were basically used, with one single exception concerning the West Africa priority which has been dropped.

More recently (1991/92), larger activities have been undertaken (multi-disciplinary missions for assessing country situations and development plans, a workshop on management and legal issues in China, a workshop on MCS in West Africa), although in some cases financing was combined with other projects. The mission considers that if such activities are taken beyond certain limits, programme flexibility will eventually be affected.

The recruitment of highly qualified consultants associated with the assignment of competent FAO staff to undertake the programme activities contributed to the cost effectiveness of the programme.

In some cases, activities and outputs have been only partially or not adopted by recipients, although advice and proposals provided through FIMLAP were in general of high quality and were discussed with the recipients. The mission considers that this is not a responsibility of FIMLAP management and accords with the usual limits of consulting services.

Some activities have been negatively affected by economic and political changes in the recipient country and sometimes in a region. Additionally, in a few cases economic contexts seemed not to have been taken into full consideration during the preparation of the recommendations by the consultant and

eventually affected the expected results after being implemented. However, in all these cases the context in which the decision was taken by the management unit met the priorities. In addition, account must be taken of the fact that the situation in developing countries is highly unstable. This is a general risk affecting the programme.

The cost-effectiveness criteria used in the request approval process did not play an important role as relatively few projects were refused. The most common reason given for their refusal was that they were funded through other means. In the case of The Gambia, a request for assistance on MCS was refused for what could be interpreted as the small size of its fisheries potential. It could not be justified for The Gambia alone. In the case of a request by Bahrain, the question of the level of per capita income was raised. Otherwise, provided the requests corresponded to a type of activity covered by FIMLAP, they would be considered more or less on a "first come, first served" basis. Thus, the request of a country with an important fisheries potential would not carry more weight than if it came from a country with relatively little fish resources. The advantage of this approach is that it allows a flexibility and a speed of response in processing requests. In future a better knowledge of FIMLAP among potential beneficiaries may increase the flow of requests and justify the use of a cost-effectiveness criteria in order to improve the programme's capacity to attain maximum effects and impacts.

In a few cases there was a disproportionate ratio between the cost of an activity and the potential usefulness of its result. This has occurred in the case of studies conducted in countries with a low fishing potential (small inland/marine resources) or where fisheries do not play a major social and economic role (some oil exporters). However, the mission concluded that the criteria established for the selection of activities during the first two years of FIMLAP provide a good base for avoiding such kind of difficulties.

The lack of information on the expenditure, already referred to under section 4.1 "Project budget and expenditure" above, has adversely affected the management of FIMLAP. Additional efforts and extra-expenditures had to be made by the TF in order to assess the financial situation of the programme.

The use of FAO HQ staff represented an important financial contribution provided by FAO to FIMLAP. As already mentioned under section 4.1 the estimate of the FAO staff contribution to the programme was about 140,000 USD, in 1991 and 53,000 USD in 1992 (up to October).

Field visits to countries in the same region are often combined in order to reduce travel costs. Preliminary visits for clarification of requests made by governments and regional bodies have been carried out in combination with other visits in the same region, whenever possible.

In January 1992, it was decided by the SC that one half of the salary of HQ experts engaged with FIMLAP activities should be reimbursed. No reimbursements are required for substantive inputs or backstopping provided whilst working in the HQ in Rome, nor for participation in FIMLAP missions of less than 7 days. The claim for this cost is at the option of the unit concerned.

4.5 Technical and Operational Backstopping

As most of the technical assistance has been provided by FAO Headquarters staff and there is no technical field staff there is no requirement for backstopping.

The difficulties in the monitoring of FIMLAP activities after the technical assistance is supplied have already been referred to in this report. The least costly method of follow up would be to use FAO Representatives.

FIMLAP activities have helped in defining areas or identifying projects for further international assistance by other FAO programmes or donor agencies.

Several FIMLAP activities were held in conjunction with other FAO field programmes, other regional or national programmes, and with local financial agencies. The best example is the multidisciplinary mission that worked in Kenya assisting in the preparation of a National Fisheries Development Plan. There were two consultants sponsored by FIMLAP, three from FAO Regional Projects in which Kenya participates and an FAO Senior Fishing Planning Officer (FIPP) who gave continuous support to the team work, both in Kenya and at headquarters.

Also the OECS FIMLAP activities are strongly interrelated with the CARICOM Fisheries Resource Assessment and Management Programme (FRAMP) sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

5. ASSESSMENT OF RESULTS

5.1 Effects and Impact

The assessment of programme effects and impacts relies on observations made during the field trips, as there is no system of programme implementation and follow-up monitoring (like activity reports) which will provide relevant information.

The "spot checks" made on the field trips showed that practically all activities which have been implemented under FIMLAP had some type of follow-up which clearly indicates the appreciation of their usefulness. Particular examples are: the support given to the Ministerial Conference in Rabat; support for fishing agreement negotiations in Guinea-Bissau; for the redrafting of fisheries legislation in Guinée-Conakry; the

institutional support given to the National Institute of Fisheries in Mexico (INP); or the fisheries development plan of Peru.

In Mexico, two more reports were made as a follow-up to the institutional support given to the National Institute of Fisheries. The support given through FIMLAP contributed to making this organization much more effective and dynamic.

In Guinée-Conakry, the request for a consultancy in legislation formulation came after a similar consultancy financed by another agency had unsatisfactory results. The assistance provided through FIMLAP was well received and was later followed by complementary requests which have been agreed and implemented.

In the case of the Ministerial Conference in Rabat, the meeting of legal experts held in Rome in 1991 and financed by FIMLAP led to the finalization of a Convention which has so far been signed by seven countries.

The support given by FIMLAP to legislation harmonization in the OECS has been a significant step towards better integrated fish resources management in the region. Common fishery zones were established and sub-regional MCS systems were put into place.

In some other cases, the results have not been as conclusive. For example, a report on the privatization of seven 14 m Spanish-built vessels was well received and its recommendations for a lease-purchase scheme applied. However, because of a lack of experience and financing means, few of the owners who acquired the vessels have respected the payment schedule, so that the whole privatization operation has accumulated a strong deficit.

It is probable that the activity with the most immediate effect has been the support given to negotiations with foreign fleets, which could have a significant impact on the amount of foreign exchange earnings of the recipient country. This is relevant to the West African countries, where close to 60% of total catches are by distant foreign fishing fleets. A country like Guinea-Bissau, earns 40% of its foreign exchange revenues through fishing licence fees. In 1991, Sénégal earned \$20 million from its licensing agreement with EC, while Mauritania earned \$12.9 million and Angola, \$12 million. It is thus easy to appreciate the effect of a consultancy aimed at helping a country to negotiate fishing agreements with foreign fleets.

FIMLAP thus contributed to the strengthening of national capacities and capabilities in recipient countries and organizations. In some cases, it has also triggered a streamlining of existing plans and programmes.

In all cases, the direct target groups have been the government ministries in charge of fisheries management. Those have significantly benefitted from FIMLAP in terms of enhancing their capacity to manage their fisheries resources in both EEZ and inland waters.

In general, it is probably too early to clearly assess the impact of FIMLAP on direct beneficiaries (people engaged in fishing industry) as the activities financed through the programme will only produce their full effect if recommended and complementary actions are implemented. What clearly appeared to the Mission was that the activities financed through FIMLAP were conducive to better management of fish resources; that they were seen as relevant and useful by the recipient countries and organizations. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that they will eventually lead to positive effects on the fishing industry.

The same comments apply to the indirect beneficiaries (the populations who would benefit through improved incomes, improved food supplies and increased aggregate consumption). One exception would be the effect of support of negotiations with foreign fleets. In that case, although it is hard to assess the effect, it can be assumed that the recipient country has benefitted from FIMLAP through increased foreign exchange earnings. This would mean immediate effects and impacts for the population in general.

One of the impacts of the programme was to create an awareness of the importance of fish resources as a potential for development. Overall, the FIMLAP programme has significantly contributed to the achievement of rational management and optimum use of fisheries resources in the EEZs and other national waters.

5.2 Major Factors Affecting the Programme Results

The nature of resource to be exploited is itself a factor of success. It has been only ten years since coastal countries have been in a position, with the passing of the UNCLOS, to reap important economic benefits from exploitation of fish resources in their EEZs. They gain a clear advantage by equipping themselves with the proper legislative tools and planning resources necessary for taking the maximum benefit from their fish resources. In such a context, a programme like FIMLAP is most welcome and the reception often enthusiastic.

One of the key factor in the success of this programme has been the quality and diversity of human resources available at FAO in the field of fisheries management and law. This enabled FAO not only to provide the right type of expertise, whether from its permanent staff or its pool of consultants, but also to deliver backstopping and follow-up. During the field trips, the Mission was informed of assistance provided by other organizations which were not in a position to provide

backstopping. These examples clearly show the advantages offered by a specialized agency such as FAO.

The use of permanent FAO staff has been a factor of success in programme implementation. Permanent staff are in a position to feel more committed and to ensure follow-up to their actions. Synergy with professional colleagues can also be more effective than when using outside consultants.

Another factor of success has been the great flexibility of the programme, which facilitates a quick reaction to requests and fast execution. Besides, activities financed through FIMLAP produced clear, outputs which can have an immediate use.

One factor which is impeding Programme effectiveness is the financial constraints faced by recipient governments and international organizations. Many of the activities implemented by the Programme lie at the head of a stream of successive steps which will end in increased benefits for the fishing community, fish consumers and the population in general. For instance, the best fisheries legislation will have an impact only to the extent that it is enforced through an effective MCS system. In the case of Guinée-Conakry, the planned MCS project financed by the World Bank and CIDA, is clearly a positive factor which will allow the legislation project financed through FIMLAP to be fully effective. Again in Sénégal, existing budgets are insufficient and MCS activities more limited. Research activities in particular are adversely affected.

5.3 Sustainability

In considering the prospects for continued use of project results by beneficiaries, attention must be given to the varied scope of activities undertaken by the programme.

In general terms, both government and intergovernmental organizations, being the direct target groups, have been receptive to the results of the programme. This is highlighted by the adaptation of the outputs of the programme to enhance development activities and to promote new initiatives.

Examples of the receptivity to, and adaptation of, project outputs can be cited from visits to Mexico, Guinea-Bissau and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS).

In the case of Mexico, several steps have been taken to strengthen the institutional capacity of the INP both in terms of recruitment of professionals and staff training at local universities. Dialogue between and acceptability of advice of the INP to the Secretariado de Pesca have become standard practice. Arrangements are also being made to sell services of the INP with a view to augmenting the budget of the Institute. The project report was a starting point for restructuring of the INP. A plan for modernizing the INP (1991-99) was a direct outcome of the FIMLAP report. A further FIMLAP activity was

carried out giving advice on the use of fishery research vessels with an emphasis on the use of fishery vessels. As a follow-up, Mexico has made a long-term plan (1993-97) based on the recommendations of the FIMLAP Report. Regarding Guinea Bissau, where a fisheries bill was drafted with the assistance of the programme, changes at the political level have dictated a new direction of policy. In this regard, the draft bill is being used as a basis for the changes enunciated by the new policy makers. The acceptability of the basic text indicates a positive response to outputs of the programme, although the text is not used in its original form.

In the OECS region where a draft fishery bill was prepared under FIMLAP in the early 1980's the momentum has been sustained in the development of initiatives related to fisheries law and regulations. The visit of the Mission indicated that follow-up actions have been undertaken with the assistance of the programme. These activities include the development of MCS systems which precipitated the governments of the region into declaring a common fisheries zone for the purposes of surveillance and more recently, into declaring a common fishing zone for all Member States belonging to the organization.

Such actions demonstrate the usefulness of the programme and the propensity of governments and intergovernmental organizations to sustain at both the national and regional levels, support for activities undertaken by this programme.

In recognition of the diverse nature of the outputs of the programme, including among others, human resource development, along with the receptivity to and adaptation of the outputs by governments and intergovernmental organizations, there is every reason to believe that there will be a maintenance of acquired capabilities at both the local and institutional levels. This view is strengthened by the fact that the direct target groups continue to place emphasis on fisheries management and development in keeping with the requisite legal framework to enable such management and development to evolve in an orderly setting.

Assistance of the programme is usually sought in the areas of fisheries management and law advisory services. In this regard it is considered appropriate to acknowledge that the results of programme assistance are intended to have positive impacts on existing natural resources and in the regeneration of the production base. It can, therefore, be concluded that both government and intergovernmental organizations respond positively to the outputs of the programme to the extent that actions are taken to ensure that both the direct, as well as the indirect beneficiaries, are assured of improved and sustained management of the major fisheries resources of their EEZs.

Since FIMLAP has received such positive reaction from both government and inter-governmental organizations and satisfies both the immediate and development objectives of the programme there is an evident need to ensure the continuation of the

programme. This is particularly important since it has been gleaned from the mission that some activities have spin-off effects and need to be supported through follow-up activities, while others satisfy immediate needs in a very short-term context.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The mission found that there is an evident need for FIMLAP, and a general approval of the activities carried out under the programme. Some indicators of this are:
- (a) the increasing number of requests for aid;
 - (b) the opinions expressed by persons interviewed by the mission;
 - (c) the continuing need for technical assistance in fisheries management.
- 6.2 The project concept and design were a well appropriate response to the needs for assistance in fisheries legislation and management, in particular those originating from the adoption in 1982 of the UNCLOS. FAO was found to be unique in its capacity to deliver such a range of assistance in fish resources management and fisheries legislation: there is no comparable alternative.
- 6.3 There was the opinion expressed in some countries that more use could be made of regional experts in consulting missions to enhance regional capabilities and expertise and lessen the dependence on the use of foreign experts.
- 6.4 There are some constraints affecting the programme. The mission found in particular that:
- (a) the effectiveness of recommendations given through FIMLAP activities in at least one case was reduced by the fact that they were formulated without sufficient attention given to the economic context in which they were to be implemented;
 - (b) there was a low awareness of FIMLAP among FAO Representations which may have compounded a lack of knowledge at Government and inter-governmental levels;
 - (c) there have been some defects in editing and the delay in printing of reports produced under the programme which are of some concern;
 - (d) due to difficulties experienced with the FAO accounting system it has not been possible for the programme administrators to have easy access to accurate information on current expenditures under the programme to allow decisions on further assistance.

- (e) in some cases delays in giving assistance have been caused by:
- (i) lack of clarity in requests;
 - (ii) difficulties in matching assignments with government arrangements;
 - (iii) non-availability of FAO staff or consultants with specialized expertise.
- (f) political and economic situations in some countries have caused the postponement of some planned activities. In addition, a lack of trust between some countries has delayed the finalization of agreements, conventions and the harmonization of laws.
- 6.5 Programme activities were implemented in Asia, Africa, South and Central America. Emphasis has been on assistance to West Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America which benefitted from 72% of programme activities.
- 6.6 FIMLAP has provided valuable assistance to individual countries, and in the development of regional and subregional organizations. This assistance has covered among others, fisheries sector studies, management and development issues, fisheries law and regulations, national and regional policies and strategies.
- 6.7 The management assistance through regional groupings including regional workshops has proved particularly worthwhile and cost-effective.
- 6.8 The specific needs vary according to the size and level of development of fisheries resources of a country or region. Countries with an undeveloped fisheries sector require assistance in the preparation of laws, joint ventures and licensing. Countries with a more developed fisheries sector require mainly assistance with policy, planning and institutional structures. The needs of larger countries are more complex.
- 6.9 Countries need a good knowledge of economic parameters, including a knowledge of landing prices, catch rates, costs, etc, in order to negotiate distant foreign fleet access agreements. In some cases, fisheries legislation needs to be revised to ensure that foreign vessels cannot avoid payment of appropriate licence fees by using artificial use of joint ventures.
- 6.10 Many countries cannot afford to finance research and MCS activities. Some countries have partly resolved this problem by cooperating with their neighbours.
- 6.11 In some regions distant foreign fishing fleets have negotiated more favourable terms of access than countries bordering those granting access. In this connection, equitable access to the EEZs of neighbouring countries,

harmonization of legislation and integrated licensing systems were considered an important priority by representatives of the fishing industry.

- 6.12 The programme in some cases has increased the awareness of the importance of fisheries among the highest political authorities, and has also had spin-off effects in some regions.
- 6.13 Throughout the mission, a need for short-term training has been identified. However, not all of the needs for training are compatible with the scope of FIMLAP.
- 6.14 The mission identified the need for expertise in data analysis and interpretation, including the setting up of data bases to support fisheries management.
- 6.15 Some areas in which the mission found an increasing need for assistance in legislation related to fisheries are:
- (a) coastal zone management;
 - (b) management of shared stocks;
 - (c) environmental issues; and
 - (d) aquaculture.
- 6.16 Factors of success are: apart from its flexible procedures, rapidness of response; the high quality of inputs and outputs; and the open ended nature of the programme. Other elements which have contributed to the success of the programme are:
- (a) good professional competence of many national and regional fisheries officers;
 - (b) good leadership at the national and regional levels;
 - (c) previous contacts with FAO activities of national and regional staff;
 - (d) outputs resulting from good cooperation between FAO experts and national or regional staff;
 - (e) the existence of basic institutional structures at national or regional levels;
 - (f) the existence of political and public service stability;
 - (g) in the case of laws, satisfactory cooperation between the executive and the legislature;
 - (h) the receipt of technical assistance under the programme by new national fisheries administrations at an early stage after their establishment. This particularly applies to Latin America.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Because of the clear need for countries and regions to improve fisheries management the programme is still relevant and should be extended.
- 7.2 The programme should be open to developing countries in general.
- 7.3 The extension should be achieved in stages namely:
 - (i) ongoing and accepted activities should be completed and US\$ 200 000 to US\$ 250 000 allocated for this purpose. Any funds not used should be carried forward to the second stage;
 - (ii) a new four-year programme based on the recommendations in this report should be funded and commenced as soon as possible.
- 7.4 The flexible approach adopted under the present programme for applications for assistance and the procedures for processing applications should continue unchanged, taking into account cost-effectiveness considerations.
- 7.5 The programme should continue to assist and encourage regional cooperation and assist countries to help each other.
- 7.6 The programme should encourage exchange of ideas and assist relevant persons to participate in technical workshops inside and outside their regions.
- 7.7 Activities sponsored should have as far as possible a clear practical objective and wherever possible be a catalyst for further action by recipients.
- 7.8 In order to make the best use of available funds, preference should be given to using FAO staff.
- 7.9 There should be installed a system of follow up, where relevant, to discover difficulties in implementation and to provide guidance.
- 7.10 FAO representatives should be kept periodically updated on the Programme in order to create a better awareness of the Programme among countries and regional organizations.
- 7.11 MCS activities should also be considered for artisanal fisheries, particularly support of traditional management systems.
- 7.12 Secretarial and clerical support should be provided in order to facilitate early publication of reports.

- 7.13 Concentration of funds on a small number of expensive projects should be avoided.
- 7.14 FIMLAP should assist coastal countries by the provision of economic information for the purpose of strengthening their negotiating position with distant foreign fleets.
- 7.15 The priorities of FIMLAP should be:
- (i) drafting of fisheries laws and regulations including harmonization;
 - (ii) formulation of management and development plans;
 - (iii) legal aspects of regional cooperation;
 - (iv) formulation of national or regional policies and strategies;
 - (v) assessment of country situations;
 - (vi) advice on institutional arrangements for fisheries management and development;
 - (vii) advice on negotiations of joint-ventures and fisheries agreements.
- 7.16 When the donor and FAO discuss criteria for activity selection they should be guided by the following:
- (i) fisheries potential in countries or regions;
 - (ii) economic importance of fisheries and nutritional dependence on fish in countries or regions;
 - (iii) countries or regions giving more assurance of using FIMLAP outputs;
 - (iv) where the project is complementary to the FAO projects/NORAD projects;
 - (v) political considerations of the donor.
- 7.17 Funding for a further four-year period should be in accordance with one of the following options:
- (a) Low: US\$ 450 000 per annum
 - (b) Medium: US\$ 600 000 per annum
 - (c) High: US\$ 900 000 per annum

The three options cover assistance with activities which increase in number according to the annual sum that is allocated. The Programme contents recommended are as follow:

- (a) Low option The programme would be limited to low-cost activities like consultancies;
- (b) Medium option The programme would also include small workshops (FAO staff and national experts)
- (c) High option In addition to consultancies and small workshops, the programme would also finance a few seminars.

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference
Joint Review Mission by Government of Norway and FAO
of
GCP/INT/466/NOR
Fisheries Management and Law Advisory Programme (FIMLAP)

Background

Following upon a series of three inter-related projects under the "Norway/FAO EEZ Programme" and the joint evaluation of the latter in September-December 1986 the present FIMLAP Programme was approved by Norway in July 1989 for a duration of four and a half years with a total donor contribution of US \$1 695 000 and became operational immediately.

During 1991 the intensity of activities necessitated a bringing-forward of budgetary allocations, and in January 1992 the donor agreed the rescheduling of the total budget in order to permit the continuation of planned field activities through until end 1992, pending a joint Review of the Programme.

The Programme's development objective is the rational management and optimum use of the fisheries resources in the exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and other national waters of developing countries, many of which had gained increased authority and responsibility under the terms of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The immediate objective of the FIMLAP Programme is the enhancement of developing countries' fisheries management capacity. Programme input is the provision of technical assistance to carry out the following activities:

- Assessment of country situations;
- Diagnosis and quantification of opportunities and problems;
- Formulation of national and regional policies and strategies;
- Formulation of management and development plans, and of institutional arrangements for fisheries management and development;
- Drafting of fisheries laws and regulations, the negotiation of joint ventures and bilateral fisheries agreements;
- Presentation of advice on legal aspects of international cooperation and on licensing systems.

The direct target groups are the governments of participating countries and inter-governmental organizations. The direct beneficiaries are people engaged in the fishing industry and related activities, who are expected to benefit from increased

certainty and less risk from improved management, whilst the indirect beneficiaries are the peoples of developing countries who are expected to achieve better and standards of living from employment, increased food supplies and distributional effects derived from the wealth obtained from the improved and sustained management of the major fisheries resources of their EEZs.

The FIMLAP Programme has undertaken some 50 different activities to date which have culminated in the provision of consolidated studies, recommendations, amended laws and regulations to various beneficiary governments and inter-governmental bodies. Some of these outputs have been presented as FIMLAP field reports, but others have been given as confidential advice only.

Many activities are still ongoing but a major constraint encountered has been the fact that the requests for assistance exceed the planned budgetary allocations.

Purpose of the Review

Given the need for additional financial resources from the donor if FAO is to be able to meet the continued numerous requests for assistance from developing countries, the Government of Norway and FAO have agreed that a joint Review of the Programme should be undertaken in 1992. The Review shall document: Programme efficiency; effectiveness; impact; relevance and sustainability. It shall recommend: future Programme priorities, scope and budget size, and present different options for minimum, medium and maximum Programme budgets and activity plans. The focus of the Review should be on learning from experience and the provision of guidance for future action and strategy.

The findings and recommendations of the Review will be used by beneficiary governments, the Government of Norway, other potential donors and FAO, to learn from past experience, to consider a possible extension and adjustment of the Programme.

Scope of the Review

1. Review of experience

- 1.1 Assessment of the efficiency in the implementation and management of the project.
- 1.2 Assessment of the effectiveness of the Programme in realizing its immediate objectives, including the extent to which it has strengthened the technical and institutional capacities of the beneficiary governments and other inter-governmental organizations concerned, in contributing towards the long-term development objective.
- 1.3 Assessment of the Programme strategy to reach the direct target groups and the beneficiaries.

- 1.4 Identification of the major factors that have facilitated and impeded the progress of the Programme in achieving the intended outputs, and its effects (planned and unplanned) on the direct target groups and on the beneficiaries.
- 1.5 Assessment of the Programme's relevance within the beneficiary countries' socio-cultural and economic context.
- 1.6 Assessment of Programme sustainability.
- 1.7 Assessment of the extent to which the Programme activities and results are integrated with other related development projects and into relevant national or regional development activities.
- 1.8 Assessment of lessons learned for beneficiary governments, FAO and the donor.

2. Recommendations

Based on the above findings, make recommendations for a future FIMLAP Programme.

2.1 Recommended Programme elements:

- development objective)with indicators where possible
- immediate objective) " "
- outputs) " "
- target/beneficiary groups
- activities
- financial and technical inputs
- time frame

taking into consideration the priorities and needs of beneficiary governments and other beneficiaries, as well as the constraints and opportunities facing the fisheries sector, and taking into consideration the following criteria for sustainability: policy support measures in beneficiary countries, environmental factors, economic and financial aspects, socio-cultural and gender factors, technological aspects, institutional and management capacity, risks and the need for flexibility.

2.2 Identify key assumptions for Programme success.

2.3 The Team shall propose different Programme strategies, with minimum, medium and maximum time frames, and budgets.

Composition of the Review Mission

The Mission will comprise persons appointed by the donor (Government of Norway), of FAO, and of beneficiary inter-

governmental organizations. The Mission's Team Leader should have experience in similar review/evaluation exercises.

Method, Timetable and Itinerary

The Review shall take place during the third quarter of 1992, and include desk studies and interviews of personnel in FAO Headquarters, then prepare, send out questionnaires to beneficiary governments and organizations, undertake field visits, gather the completed questionnaires, and then reconvene in Rome for debriefing and preparation of the final report.

The itinerary of the team should be as indicated in Annex 1.

Contacts with authorities concerned

In each country to be visited the mission should establish contacts with the FAO Representative, with the relevant agencies of the local government and/or inter-governmental organization, as well as with the Representatives of the donor (Government of Norway), UNDP, and other assistance agencies as appropriate, including beneficiary groups within the fishing industry and related industries.

Although the mission team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorised to make any commitments on behalf of FAO or the donor (Government of Norway).

Reporting

The Team will be fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the beneficiary governments, organizations, Norway or FAO.

The Team's report (in English) should be completed as far as possible in the field. FAO Headquarters will provide secretarial support services in Rome.

The Team Leader will be responsible for finalising the report immediately after this debriefing. Subject to the agreement of the donor, the Review Team report will subsequently be distributed in English to all the beneficiary countries and inter-governmental organizations.

The Team Leader shall complete the standard FAO project evaluation summary sheet.

Appendix 2Part 1Countries Visited by Mission Members1. West Africa

Morocco: Mr J. de Almeida
Mr M.C.LL. Gaiger
Mr R. L'Heureux

Senegal: Mr J. de Almeida
Mr M.C.LL. Gaiger
Mr R. L'Heureux

Guinea Bissau: Mr J. de Almeida

Guinea: Mr R. L'Heureux

Ghana: Mr M.C.LL. Gaiger

2. Caribbean and Latin America

Barbados: Ms C. Jusidman
Mr H. Walters
Mr T. Loebach

St. Vincent: Ms C. Jusidman
Mr H. Walters
Mr T. Loebach

St. Lucia: Ms C. Jusidman
Mr H. Walters
Mr T. Loebach

Trinidad and Tobago: Ms C. Jusidman
Mr H. Walters
Mr T. Loebach

Guyana: Ms C. Jusidman
Mr T. Loebach

Peru: Ms C. Jusidman

Chile: Ms C. Jusidman

Mexico: Mr H. Walters
Mr T. Loebach

Part 2List of Persons MetRome:

Mr B.F. Dada, Director Fisheries Policy and Planning Division
Mr J. Markie, Evaluation Service, PBEE
Mr P. Gonzalez-Alberdi, Assistant to ADG, FI
Mr A. Bonzon, Planning Officer, FIPP
Dr J. Caddy, Chief, Marine Resources Service, FIRM
Mr A. Mena-Millar, Fishery Liaison Officer, FIPL
Mr W.E. Edeson, Legal Officer, LEG
Dr W. Krone, Assistant Director-General a.i., FI
Mr G.V. Everett, Senior Planning Officer, FIPP
Dr R. Shotton, Fishery Resources Officer, FIRM
Dr Y. Kato, Director, FIDO
Mr M.J. Mann, Trust Fund Coordinator, FIDO
Mr Y. Wehelie, Evaluation Service, PBEE
Dr David J. Doulman, Senior Fishery Planning Officer, FIPL

Barbados:

Mr Egbert Patrick Alleyne, FAO Representative
Mr Jan Winderickx, FAO Senior Programme Officer
Mr Stephen Willoughby, Acting Officer of Fisheries (C.F.O)
Mr Ralph Jones, Principal Fisheries Assistant
Ms Joyce Leslie, Senior Fisheries Assistant

St. Vincent:

Ms Claudia White, Acting Permanent Secretary, Ministry of
Agriculture Industry and Labor
Mr John Neilson, Fisheries Biologist, CARICOM Fisheries Resource
Assessment and Management Program (CFRAMP)
Ms Susan Singh-Renton, Deputy Fisheries Biologist (CFRAMP)
Mr Daven C. Joseph, Development Officer, Fisheries Unit,
Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)
Mr David V. Robin, Surveillance Coordinator, Fisheries Unit,
(OECS)

St. Lucia:

Mr Cosmos Richardson, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of
Agriculture, Forestry, Lands Fisheries and Co-operatives

Trinidad and Tobago:

Mr Lance B. Hayles, FAO Representative
Mr Bisessar Chakalall, FAO Regional Fisheries Officer
Mr Naoto Yoshikawa, FAO Programme Officer
Mr Farouk Y. Tarzi, UNDP Resident Representative

Ms Norys Lewis-Vivas, UNDP Assistant Programme Officer
 Dr Ronald Barrow, Chief Technical Officer, Ministry of
 Agriculture, Lands and Marine Resources (MALMR)
 Mr M. La Croix, Director of Fisheries, Fisheries Division, MALMR
 Mr B. Fabres, Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division, MALMR
 Ms Jennifer Yearwood, Planning Officer, Fisheries Division,
 MALMR
 Ms Ann-Marie Jobity, Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division,
 MALMR
 Mr Tedwin Herbert, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 Ms Sita Keeruvilla, Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division, MALMR
 Mr J.A. Goodridge, Institute of Marine Affairs

Georgetown, Guyana:

Mr Ruben Charlos, Chief Fisheries Officer
 Mr Ronald Gordon, Officer-in-Charge, Agricultural Development
 Section, Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM)

Lima, Peru:

Mr Jean-Francois Ghyoot, FAO Representative
 Mr Alfredo Garcia Mesinas, Fisheries Vice-Minister
 Ms Isabel Tsukayama, Advisor to the Minister of Fisheries
 Ms Martha Toledo, Advisor to the Minister of Fisheries
 Mr Jorge Zuzunaga, General Director of Fisheries Production
 Mr Jaime Sobero, Minister of Fisheries

Santiago, Chile:

Mr Severino de Melo Araujo, FAO Representative
 Mr Norman Bellino, FAO Deputy Representative
 Mr Carlos F. Wurmann G., Marine Resources Manager, Fundación
 Chile
 Mr Morten V.H. Aasland, First Secretary, Royal Norwegian Embassy
 Mr Patricio Bernal, IFOP General Director

Valparaiso, Chile:

Mr Maximiliano Alarma, Chief of the Fisheries Unit of the
 Undersecretary of Fisheries
 Ms Edith Saa, Executive Secretariat of the National Council of
 Fisheries
 Mr Omar Rojas, Chief of the Department of Fisheries
 Oceanography, (IFOP)

Mexico City, Mexico:

H.E. Ambassador Rolf Berg, Royal Norwegian Embassy
 Mr Helge Selsand, Secretary, Royal Norwegian Embassy
 Dra. Margarita Lizárraga Saucedo, Director General, Instituto
 Nacional de la Pesca (INP)

Dra. Concepcion Rodriguez de la Cruz, Director of Fisheries Analysis, INP
 Biol. Luis Lopez Guerrero, Director for Research Support and Coordination, INP
 Capt. Octavio Diaz Gonzalez, Special Advisor for the Operation of Research Vessels, INP
 Ing. Gabriel Suarez Toriello, Director of Quality Assurance of Fisheries Products, INP
 Lic. Esmeralda Negrete, Private Secretary of Dra. Margarita Lizarraga, INP
 Profa. Juliana Jasso O., FAO Deputy Programme Officer
 Mr Benito Roitman Schultz, Consultant, FAO
 Mr Guillermo Compean, INP, (Programa atún-delfin)
 Mrs Hilaria Sisto, FAO/Oficial de Programas
 Mr Manuel Calvero Rios, FAO Project Coordinator

Mazatlan, Mexico:

Dr Ernesto A. Chavez-Ortis, Director of CRIP, Mazatlan
 Dr Carlos A. Martinez Palacios, Research Aquaculture and Nutrition
 Biol. Anatolio Hernández Carballo, Coordinador Regional , camaron
 Dr Arturo Ruiz Luna, Coordinación Posgrado, Research in Small Pelagics
 Biol. Remigio E. Bush Medina, Subdirector of CRIP, Mazatlan
 Tec. Pes. Victor M. Valdêz Orncas, Coordinador Prog. Aguas Continentales

Morocco:

Mr M. Rouighi, FAO Representative
 Mr Bonanni, FAO Project Officer
 Mr Abdelaziz Taleb, Special Assignment Officer, Ministry of Fisheries and Merchant Marine
 Mr A. Rafky, Chief of Division, International Department, Ministry of Fisheries and Merchant Marine
 Mr M. de ait Allal Tourig, Director of International Relations, Ministry of Fisheries and Merchant Marine
 Mrs H. Neryzom, Chief of the Legal Division, Ministry of Fisheries and Merchant Marine

Fisheries Research Institute (ISPM):

Mr Abdellatif Berraho, Acting Director
 Mr Abdelouahed Idelhaj, Head Fisheries Division
 Mr Salah Bencherifi, Head Pelagic Resources Sector
 Mr Mostafa Chbani, Acoustic Biologist

Senegal:

Mr B. Ndiaye, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Permanent Secretary,
Comité sous régional de pêche
Mr M. Diop, Director, DOPM
Mr T. Mukendi, FAO Representative
Mr Antonio Tavares de Pinho, FAO Legal Advisor

Representatives of the Fishing Industry:

D. Coulibaly, Secretary General, GAIPES
Y. Wade, Director-General, Interco
El-Hadj Mansour Tambeson, President, Interco
Dr Ibrahim Malik, Director-General SISCA
Mr Jean Claude Neau, representing Neau & Fils
Mr Jacques Marec, Director-General, Marcc

Ghana:

Dr Q.B-E. West, Senior Regional Officer, Acting FAO
Representative
Mr M. Ansa-Emmim, Senior Regional Fisheries Liaison Officer, FAO
Mr M. Mensah, Deputy Director of Fisheries (Marine), Government
of Ghana
Mr Charles Asafo, Deputy Director of Fisheries (inland
fisheries), Government of Ghana
Commander Mohd Munir Tahirn, Director of Personnel,
Administrator and Training, Ghana Navy
Commander M. Quarshy, Director of Operations, Ghana Navy
Mr Solomon Aboagye, Director of Administration AFKO Fisheries
Flt. Lient Tackie, Director of Operations, AFKO.

Guinea Bissau

Mr Eduardo Nogueira, Minister of Fisheries
Mr Artur Silva, Director for Industrial Fisheries
Mr Malal Sane, Head of the Legal Department
Mrs Luisa C. Ferreira, Director of Fisheries Research
Mr Cirilo Vieira, General Director for the Development of
Artisanal Fisheries
Mrs Guilhermina S.G. Teixeira, FAO Representative
Mr Daniel Beaumont, Programme Officer.

Guinee, Conakry

Mr G.J. Bernard, FAO Representative
Mr Moens, FAO Programme Officer
Mr Magassouba, FAO Assistant Programme Officer
Mr Alkaly Dieng, Fisheries Advisor to the Minister of
Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mr Oumar Barry, Head of International Cooperation, DNPA,
Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources

Mrs Fatoumata Konate, Head of Legal Affairs, DEC/DNPA, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mr Izboulaye Diallo, Chargé d'études, Legal Affairs Section, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mr Aboubacar Dem, Chargé d'études, Fisheries Planning, DNPA, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mr Bilivougui Oua, Head of Aquaculture, DNPA, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mr Mahmoudou Barry, head of Inland Fisheries, DNPA, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mr Kourouma Mamba, Head of Fisheries Planning, DNPA, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Mrs Katrien Holvoet, APO, Community Development and Women Affairs, IDAF Project
Mr Jean-Luis Lauzière, CTA, MCS Project
Mr Karifa Camara, 1st Vice-President, Union National des Entreprises des Pêche, de Mareyage et des Activités Connexes (Board of Fisheries Industries)
Mr Alfa Camarra, Secretary of Production, Board of Fisheries Industries
Mr Mohammed Bangoura, Advisor, Board of Fisheries Industries

Appendix 3**List of Papers Studied**1. FIMLAP Reports (see Appendix 6)2. Other Documents

- OECS Commercial Marine Species: St Vincent and the Grenadines. Field Manual. Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Industry and Labour, April 1991.
- CARICOM Draft Caribbean Community Agreement on Cooperation in the Development and Management of the Living Resources of the Exclusive Economic Zone. Caribbean Community Secretariat, Bridgetown, Barbados, June 1992.
- OECS Report of the Third Workshop on Fisheries Management and Development. July 1992.
- SWIO Proceedings of the Seminar to identify Priorities for Fisheries Management and Development in the Southwest Indian Ocean. FAO Rome, 1991.
- Chile Memoria Anual del IFOP 1991. Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile, 1992.
- Chile Proyectos de Evaluación Directa FIP-1992. Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile 1992.
- Chile Abate Molina: Buque de Investigación Pesquera y Oceanográfica. Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile 1992.
- Chile Ley de Pesca y Acuicultura. Edit. Juridicer Manuel Montt S.A., Santaigo, Chile, 1992.
- Chile IFOP - Políticas institucionales 1990-1992. IFOP, Chile, Septiembre 1992.
- México Programa indicativo de investigaciones pesqueras que requieren el uso de embarcaciones pesqueras 1993-1997.
- México Plan de desarrollo y modernización del Instituto Nacional de la Pesca, 1991-1994.
- Mexico Legal framework for Fisheries, 1992.
- Ghana Fisheries Law, 1991.

3. General documentation

- FAO FIMLAP project files.

FAO Minutes of meetings of the FIMLAP Steering Committee and Task Force.

FAO FIMLAP project progress reports.

FAO Some internal confidential FIMLAP reports and documents.

Economist Intelligence Unit - country profiles.

Appendix 4
FIMLAP - Development of Activities

Appendix 4
 FIMLAP - Development of activities

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject (a)	Region (b)	EEZ/Inland (c)	Scope (d)							
1. Harmonization of fishery vessel marking in the CECAF region	PLA	WAF	EEZ	GLO	X	X	X	X			
2. Assistance in the harmonization of fisheries legislation in Lake Tanganyika (CIFA)	LAW	RAF	INL	REG	X	X	Dec. 89				A second paper made regarding shared lakes in the region
3. Assistance on fisheries legislation and management in Angola	LAW	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	partially				2 reports
4. Workshop on fisheries management on the Sahelian region	PLA	WAF	INL	REG	X	X	May 90		X		Presented to the workshop; follow-up activity (see 44)
5. Regional seminar on fisheries development and planning in the Lake Chad Commission region	PLA	WAF	INL	REG	X	X	Jan. 90				Presented to the seminar.
6. Assistance in the preparation of fisheries regulation in Kenya	LAW	RAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X				
7. Assistance to Suriname in the review of fishery law and regulations	LAW	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	--					Third mission undertaken
8. Review of fisheries legislation and regulations in Guinea	LAW	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X				Marine fishery law drafted; follow-up

a) Subjects: Country situation and diagnosis (GEN); Policies/Strategies (POL); Management and development planning (PLA); Institutional arrangements (INS)
 Laws and Regulations (LAW); Joint Ventures and Bilateral Agreements (AGR); Legal Aspects of International Cooperation (COO); Licensing Systems (LIC);
 b) Region: West African (WAF); Rest of Africa (RAF); Caribbean (CAB); Latin America (LA); Asia and Pacific Ocean (APO); Global (GLO),
 c) EEZ/Inland: EEZ/INL
 d) Scope: Global (GLO); Regional (REG); National (NAT)

Symbols used: X Stage completed; ? Decision taken in principle; -- Ongoing stage

FINLAP - Development of activities

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Region	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
9. Fishery sector study in Vietnam	GEN	APO	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X				Report submitted to ASDB, not the Government
10. Assistance on fisheries legislation and MCS in Myanmar	LAW/PLA	APO	EEZ	NAT	X	X	partially				3 missions undertaken; MCS follow-up proposed
11. Assistance to the Ministerial Conference of West Africa in the preparation of documents for a follow-up of the recommendations	COO	WAF	EEZ	REG	X	X	X		X		2 papers presented in working meetings (2nd Min. Conference assisted)
12. Assistance for the preparation of a national fisheries development plan in Kenya	PLA	RAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	Dec. 90 Jan. 91		partially		Mainly financed by IFIP and SWIOP projects 2 reports (sector study and strategy)
13. Regional assistance to fishery legislation in Central America	LAW	LA	EEZ	REG	X	X	--				Coop. with project GCP/RLA/087/ODP; 6 draft laws prepared (Panama, Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua and El Salvador).
14. Marking of fishing gear	PLA	GLO	EEZ	GLO	X	X	July 91				Cost shared with Canada
15. Assistance in planning and management of fisheries in Bolivia	PLA/INS	LA	INL	NAT	X	X	X		I		
16. Planning and institutional strengthening for fisheries management in Paraguay	PLA/INS	LA	INL	NAT	X	X	April 91		X	partially	Follow-up: TCP/PAR/0051 (inst. support + legal), now finished. No follow-up UNDP project because of lack of funds.

FI MLAP - Development of activities

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Region	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
17. Workshop on legal issues associated with fisheries management in China	LAW/PLA	APO	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	Feb. 92			
18. Assistance in fisheries legislation to Namibia	LAN	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X		X	partially	EEZ act; Fishery law in coop. with Norway
19. Assistance in fisheries management and planning in Guinea - privatization of semi-industrial fleet	PLA/POL	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	X			A legal advise and report submitted; fish. policy assisted revision of fish. act
20. Assistance to the Ministerial Conference of West Africa. Preparation of a compendium of fisheries legislation in the region	LAW	WAF	EEZ	REG	X	X					A provisional report issued and presented to the 2nd Ministerial Conference in July 91
21. Assistance in fisheries legislation and advise on the negotiation of fishing agreements in Guinea Bissau	LAW/AGR	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	partially			4 missions carried out (law; fish agree. USSR, EEC; joint venture)
22. Assistance in fisheries planning and management to Namibia preparation of OPAS project proposal	PLA	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	X			Included in UNDP proj.
23. Assistance in fisheries planning and management in Guinea	PLA	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	X			Comments to UNCTC report

symbols used: X stage completed
 ? decision taken in principle
 -- ongoing stage

FIMLAP - Development of activities

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Region	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
24. Evaluation of the Fisheries Development Institute in Chile	INS	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	Dec. 90			Draft report in English
25. Multi-disciplinary mission on fisheries policy and planning in Costa Rica	PLA/POL	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	Feb. 92			Three project ideas presented
26. Fisheries policy and planning mission for revision of fishery development plan in Peru	POL/PLA	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X				Includes 9 areas for intern. assist. TCP proposal sent to FAO.
27. Fisheries sector review for the preparation of a fisheries plan in Sao Tome e Principe	GEN	WAF	EEZ	NAT	?						High cost (\$100 000) waiting for clarification from GOSTP
28. Study on inland fisheries in Guinea Bissau	GEN	WAF	INL	NAT	X	X	--				Translation into French in hand
29. Fisheries sector review in Pakistan	GEN	APD	EEZ	NAT	?						
30. Review of function of fisheries administration in Namibia	INS	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X				
31. Fisheries sector review and assistance in the preparation of development programme for marine and inland fisheries as support to IBAMA in Brazil	GEN/PLA	LA	EEZ/INL	NAT	X	X	X	Oct. 92			Includes draft project for follow-up (possible UNDP financing/FAO execution)

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Region	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
32. Institutional re-organization of the fisheries sector in Colombia	INS	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	X	X		Follow-up activities by other proj.; proj. proposal prepared. (COL/91/091 cost shared by Govt.)
33. Regional workshop on fisheries planning in the SWIOP region	PLA	RAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	Set. 92			Coop. with TCP proj.; 2 papers presented
34. Assistance to the Ministerial Conference of West Africa in the preparation of a draft convention	COO	WAF	EEZ	REG	X	X	X	X	July 91	X	
35. Assistance to the Ministerial Conference of West Africa - allocation to FAO regional office for the preparation of a directory of fisheries training, education and research institution	INS	WAF	EEZ/INL	REG	X	X	X	X			
36. Assistance in the fisheries statistics in Namibia	PLA	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	December 91			
37. Assistance to the National Fisheries Institute in Mexico	INS	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	X	X			2 complementary missions
38. Seminar on the management of EEZs in Africa (OAU/STRC)	PLA	WAF+RAF	EEZ	REG	?						Depending on complementary resources available to OAU/STRC
39. Study on the impact of industrial fishing in Mozambique and Madagascar (SWIO)	PLA	RAF	EEZ	REG	?						Funds not available

FIMLAP - Development of activities

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Reg.	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
40. Consultation on coral reef resources management in the CARICOM region	PLA	CAR	EEZ	REG	?						To be considered when sponsor is identified
41. Technical workshop on the shrimp resources of the Guyana/Brazil shelf in Suriname	PLA	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	--				Preparation of background papers; preparation of full reporting FIPL
42. Preparation of fisheries regulations in Cook Islands	LAW	APO	EEZ	NAT	X	X	--				Combined with FFP mission
43. Harmonization of conditions of access in the CARICOM region - draft inter-govern. agreement and assistance to workshop	COO	CAR	EEZ	REG	X	--					2nd draft of intergov. agreement June 92
44. Project formulation in the Sahel region - inland fisheries management and development planning	GEN	WAF	INL	REG	X						Subject to obtaining donors interest. Base line study REQUIRED
45. Workshop on fisheries regulations and joint ventures/ harmonization of fishing legislation in OECS region	LAW	CAR	EEZ	REG	X	X	X	X			
46. Workshop on institutional relationship between CARICOM and OECS in Caribbean region	COO/INS	CAR	EEZ	REG	X	X					

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted.	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Region	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
47. Assistance on fisheries legislation in Samoa	LAW	APO	EEZ	NAT	?						Preparatory work combined with FFP activity
48. Assistance to the Ministerial Conference of West Africa - Workshop on MCS	PLA	WAF	EEZ	REG	X	X	--				Report publication by RP/FIPP
49. Seminar on fisheries resources in Lake Chad (CIFA/LCBC)	PLA	WAF	INL	REG	?						Depending on resources and security
50. Review of Estrela do Mar joint venture in Guinea Bissau	PLA/AGR	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	X	--				Preparatory mission undertaken; out of FIMLAP scope
51. Mission on EEZ in Argentina	PLA	LA	EEZ	NAT	?						Not yet officially requested
52. Assistance on fisheries legislation in Central Africa Republic	LAW	WAF	INL	NAT	?						Preparations in hand
53. Preparation of a compendium of fisheries legislation for island states in the FFA region	LAW	APO	EEZ	REG	X	X	--				
54/56. Assistance to Cape Verde: - Assistance on fisheries legislation, - renegotiation of the agreement with EEC, - Assistance on planning	LAW AGR PLA	WAF WAF WAF	EEZ EEZ EEZ	NAT NAT NAT	? ? ?						Preliminary mission sent combined with other activity in the region
57. Multi-disciplinary mission in St. Vincent and Granadines	GEN	CAR	EEZ	NAT	?						
58. Assistance on policy and planning in Gambia	POL/PLA	WAF	EEZ	NAT	X	--					Mission now in field

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Region	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
59.Regional legal adviser for West Africa	LAW	WAF	EEZ/INL	REG	?						Major activities submitted to EEC for financing
60.Assistance on working groups of the CSRP	COO	WAF	EEZ	REG	X	X					
61.Assistance to meeting on current legal and regulation issues in the FFA region	LAW	APO	EEZ	REG	?						
62.Multi-disciplinary mission for the preparation of a project proposal, in Honduras	GEN	LA	EEZ	NAT	X	X	--				
63.Assistance on fisheries laws and regulations in Yemen	LAW	APO	EEZ	NAT	?						Preparations in hand
64.Revision of fisheries legislation in Trinidad e Tobago	LAW	CAR	EEZ	NAT	?						Preparations in hand
65.Evaluation of the ISSTH programme in CEAO region	INT	WAF	EEZ	REG	?						Preliminary missions completed: preparations in hand.
66.Assistance to the Ministerial Conference of West Africa - Regional MCS support programme proposal	PLA	WAF	EEZ	REG	?						

Activity	Classification				Under-taken	Field work completed	Report issued	Report completed and presented	Accepted	Recommendation implemented	Remarks
	Subject	Reg.	EEZ/Inland	Scope							
67. Bioeconomic modelling for fisheries management programme	PLA	GLO	EEZ/INL	GLO	?						
68. Legal Advise for the establishment of a Lake Victoria Fisheries Commission (CIFA)	LAW/COO	RAF	INL	REG	x	x	x	x			Cooperation with IFIP project RAF/87/099
69. Assistance on management plan for shrimp fisheries in Madagascar	PLA	RAF	EEZ	NAT	x						Arrangement on hand for 3 weeks consultancy
70. Assistance on the definition of MCS requirements in Madagascar	PLA	RAF	EEZ	NAT	?	.					
71. Assistance on fisheries planning, management and MCS in Nicaragua	PLA	LA	EEZ	NAT	x	--					

Appendix 5

FIMLAP - Non-undertaken Activities

FIMLAP - Non-undertaken activities Appendix 5

Activity	Classification				Remarks
	Subject (a)	Region (b)	EEZ/Inland (c)	Scope (d)	
1. Follow-up on MCS aspects after national seminar on fisheries planning, management and development in Indonesia	PLA	APO	EEZ	NAT	MCS being undertaken under TCP/INS/2252
2. Assistance in the revision of fisheries legislation in Equatorial Guinea	LAW	WAF	EEZ	NAT	GOEG asked to postpone mission
3/6. Assistance to Suriname:					Out of scope?
- Feasibility study on insurance scheme for small scale fishery	PLA	LA	EEZ	NAT	Out of scope?
- Review of MCS regulations					
- Study on revolving funds in the fisheries sector	POL	LA	EEZ	NAT	
- Advice on fisheries policy					
7. Assistance in fisheries policy in Sierra Leone	POL	WAF	EEZ	NAT	
8. Assistance to seminar in Cameroon	GEN	WAF	EEZ	NAT	
9. Assistance on options in the management of tuna in the SWIO region	PLA	RAF	EEZ/Indian Ocean	REG	
10. Assistance on institutional strengthening in Argentina	INS	LA	EEZ	NAT	Undertaken through TCP/ARG/9155
11. Assistance in fisheries development planning in Rwanda	PLA	RAF	INL	NAT	TCP/RWA/0052

(a) Subjects: Country situation and diagnosis (GEN); Policies/Strategies (POL); Management and development planning (PLA); Institutional arrangements (INS); Legal aspects of International Cooperation (COO); Licencing systems (LIC);
 (b) Region: West Africa (WAF); Rest of Africa (RAF); Caribbean (CAB); Latin America (LA);
 (c) EEZ/Inland: EEZ/INL
 (d) Scope: Global (GLO); Regional (REG); Country (NAT)

Activity	Classification				Remarks
	Subject (a)	Region (b)	EEZ/Inland (c)	Scope (d)	
12. Assistance in management plan for inland fisheries and aquaculture in Guinea	PLA	WAF	EEZ/INL	NAT	Financed by RP/FIPP/FIRI
13. Assistance in fisheries legislation and regulation and MCS in Somalia	LAW/PLA	RAF	EEZ	NAT	Security situation
14. Assistance in fisheries legislation and MCS in Belize	LAW/PLA	LA	EEZ	NAT	Considered under TCP/BZE/2251
15. Assistance on legislation in Paraguay	LAW	LA	INL	NAT	Eventually included in TCP/PAR/0051
16. Policy and planning mission in Sudan	POL/PLA	RAF	EEZ	NAT	Security situation
17. Assistance on MCS in Gambia	PLA	WAF	EEZ	NAT	Not feasible for Gambia alone
18. Study on fisheries sector in Baharein	GEN	APD	EEZ	NAT	Funding not available at time of urgent request
19. Review of fisheries legislation in Seychelles	LAW	RAF	EEZ	NAT	Implemented under TCP/SEY/0155
20. Assistance on the privatization of tuna fleet in Cape Verde	PLA	WAF	EEZ	NAT	Out of Scope?

Appendix 6**List of Reports Issued**

- | | | |
|------|---------------|---|
| 90/1 | Angola | Legislação e ordenamento pesqueiros em Angola (Versão provisória para fins de discussão) para Rackowe, R., P. Derham, e A. Tavares de Pinho, Maio 1991 |
| 91/1 | Paraguay | El sector pesquero de Paraguay: Lineamientos para su ordenación y desarrollo por A. Espinach Ros, A. Gumy, H. Lupin, M. Martínez Espinosa y E. Ruckes. abril 1991. |
| 91/2 | Chile | Report of the FAO Mission for Evaluation of the Research Programmes of the "Instituto de Fomento Pesquero" by G. Saetersdal, M. Sissenwine & M. Sinclair. FAO/IFOP, Santiago, Chile, December 1990 |
| 91/3 | Guinea | Privatisation de sept chalutiers 14-M en République de Guinée par J. Roullot et F.J. Doucet, mars 1991 |
| 91/4 | Guinea | Projet de code de la pêche maritime par A. Piquemal, mars 1991 |
| 91/5 | Guinée Bissau | Statut et Stratégie de Développement pour la Pêche continentale et l'Aquaculture en République de Guinée Bissau par Benedict P. Satia, juillet 1991 |
| 91/6 | México | La Estructura y Funcionamiento del Instituto Nacional de la Pesca de México (INP) por Csirke, J., A.A. Gumy y E-J. de Boer. Diciembre 1991 |
| 91/7 | Brazil | Informe preparado para el Gobierno de Brasil sobre la Estructura del Sector Pesquero : Sugerencias para su Reforzamiento en el Instituto Brasileño de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales Renovables (IBAMA), por A. Gumy, N. Ehrhardt, B. Roitman, y C. du Saussay, Octubre de 1992. pp 197. |
| 91/8 | OECS | Report prepared for the Governments of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) on the Implementation of the Harmonised Fisheries Legislation in the OECS Region, based on the work of Moore, G. K. F., H. Walters and D. Robin, October 1991. |

- 91/8 (Rev 1) OECS Report prepared for the Governments of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) on the Implementation of the Harmonised Fisheries Legislation in the OECS Region, based on the work of Moore, G. K. F., H. Walters and D. Robin, January 1992. [FL/WECAF/92/17]
- 91/9 MINCONF Report of a Meeting of Legal Experts to examine the Draft Convention concerning Fisheries Cooperation amongst African States bordering the Atlantic Ocean. October 1991
- 91/10 Angola Propositions pour la création d'une inspection des pêches maritimes. P. Derham. September 1991
- 91/11 SWIO Report of a Seminar to identify priorities for Technical Assistance to Fisheries Management and Development in the Southwest Indian Ocean. November 1991.
- 92/12 Myanmar Report prepared for the Government of Myanmar on Fisheries Law. by T.D. McDorman. March 1992 pp 94. (FL/IOR/92/28).
- 92/13 Costa Rica La Estructura del Sector Pesquero de Costa Rica: Medidas para su Ordenación y Desarrollo. por A. Gummy, J. Csirke, E. Ruckes, y M. Giudicelli. Febrero de 1992.
- 92/14 China, P.R. The National Workshop on Legal Issues Associated with Fisheries Management, by the Development Law Service, FAO, Rome, February 1992. [FL/WPSCS/92/19]
- 92/15 Peru La Ordenación y Planificación y la Reactivación del Sector Pesquero en el Perú, por J. Csirke, L. M. Bombin, J. González de la Rocha, A. A. Gummy, N. Jensen, A. F. Medina Pizzali, E. Ruckes, y M. Sawyer. FAO, Rome, Junio, 1992, pp. 192.
- 92/16 Central America Informe preparado para los Gobiernos de Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, y Panamá, sobre la Legislación Pequera en el Istmo Centroamericano, por A. García Mesinas y L. M. Bombín. FAO, Roma, draft Mayo 1992. pp. (FL/WECAF/92/19)
- 92/17 Trinidad & Tobago Report to the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on the Need for Revision of their Fisheries Legislation, by W. R. Edeson, FAO, Rome, June 1992 pp 5. (FL/WECAF/92/20)

- 92/18 Myanmar Report prepared for the Government of Myanmar on Monitoring, Control and Surveillance of the Fisheries within the Exclusive Economic Zone, by L. Nicholas Schowengerdt Jr. FAO, Rome, September 1992. pp 13.
- 92/19 CIFA: Lake Victoria Report prepared for the Governments of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda on a Proposal for a Convention on the Establishment of the Lake Victoria Fisheries Commission, by R.J. McManus FAO, Rome, October 1992
- 92/20 Cook Islands Preliminary Report prepared for the Government of the Cook Islands on the Preparation of Fisheries Regulations by Lodge, M. and W.R. Edeson, FAO, Rome, draft October 1992 pp (FL/WPSCS/92/19.
- 92/21 México Report prepared for the Government of Mexico on Fishery Resources Research, with emphasis on the use of Fishery Research Vessels, by Saetersdal, G., FAO, Rome, draft October 1992, pp [to be issued in Spanish.]
- 92/22 (En) MINCONF Report of a Regional Workshop on Monitoring, Control and Surveillance for African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean (Accra, Ghana, 2-5 November 1992). FAO Rome, draft November 1992 94pp.
- N/N CECAF Provisional Version: Regional Compendium of Fisheries Legislation, West Africa (CECAF Region), Vol I (A-G), Vol II (M-Z) by Development Law Service (LEGD), June 1991.
- N/N Angola Drafts of EEZ law and a Fisheries Law Tavares de Pinho, FI clearnce july 1991
- N/N CIFA Stratégies d'Aménagement des Pêcheries continentales au Sahel / Management Strategies for Inland Fisheries in the Sahel. FAO Fisheries Report No. 445 (Fr/En). FAO Rome 1991, 151p.
- N/N MINCONF Inventory of Human and Material Capacities in Fisheries in African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean / Inventaire des Potentialités humaines et matérielles des Pêches dans les Etats africains riverains de l'Océan atlantique. FAO Regional Office for Africa, Accra, (April) 1992, pp 164, RAFR/92/01.

- N/N SWIO Proceedings of the seminar to identify Priorities for Fisheries Management and Development in the Southwest Indian Ocean. FAO Fisheries Report No. 457. FAO Rome, 1991, 196 pp.
- N/N Guinea Bissau Assistance in Preparation for the renegotiation of a Fisheries Access Agreement between the Republic of Guinea Bissau and the USSR (Preliminary Report), by Noemia De Oliveira Novaes (consultant) and Robin Rackowe (consultant), October 1990. [Internal confidential document]
- N/N Guinea Bissau Considerations for the Renegotiation of the Fisheries Access Agreement between the Republic of Guinea Bissau and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, by R. Rackowe, consultant, April-May 1991. [Internal confidential document]
- N/N Guinea Bissau Considerations for the Renegotiation of the Fisheries Access Agreement between the Republic of Guinea Bissau and the European Economic Community, by R. Rackowe, consultant, April-May 1991. [Internal confidential document]
- N/N Guinea Bissau Assistance in the preparation for the renegotiation of a Fisheries Access Agreement between the Republic of Guinea Bissau and the USSR, by Noemia C. M. De Oliveira Novaes and Considerations for the Renegotiation of the Fisheries Access Agreement between the Republic of Guinea Bissau, the EEC and the USSR, by Robin Rackowe, FAO Rome April-May 1991. FL/CECAF/91/27
- N/N Guinea Bissau Some Considerations in Respect of the Situation of the Company Estrela do Mar, by Robin Rackowe, consultant, October 1990. [Internal confidential document]

