

Project Evaluation Series

**Mid-term evaluation of the Coastal
Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership
Project**

**Project code: GCP/GLO/838/GFF
GEF ID: 9128**

Management response

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 1.</p> <p>GPP GCU should actively facilitate greater coordination and integration between CFI-GCF and site-based child projects.</p> <p>GCU should actively engage with child project managers and GCF to explore how investment support under GCF can be used strengthen other child project interventions. It may be that promotion and facilitation of the forthcoming GCF "competition" can be targeted at other child project fisheries.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>It is important to indicate that the aim of the CFI-GCF is to "strengthen capacity of government institutions, private sector and local fishing communities to generate a pipeline of return-seeking responsible investments in selected coastal fisheries" and no actual investment will be made during the project. So no results or impacts from the investments per se. In that sense there is no direct investment support foreseen from the CFI-CF.</p> <p>Regular coordination meetings are already held between the CFI-CF and all the other child projects.</p>	<p>The GCU (PMU) will suggest to the CFI-GCF lead to reinforce the involvement (already undertaken) of the national teams (Cabo Verde, Ecuador, Indonesia and Peru) of the other child projects in their activities. We will suggest to CFI-GCF to invite the other child projects in their activities (when possible) and seek for collaboration in case they target same fisheries and/or same partners in a country. This could also be done by availing the results of the CFI-GCF through, for instance, a sharing of the "Investment Readiness Assessments" or the analysis of ten fisheries (FPIs) in Peru with CFI Latin America and provide clearance (and technical assistance if needed) if they want to use some parts of these results. However, the organization of the CFI-GCF "global knowledge competition", which at the end, will develop a knowledge product (KP), is promoting sharing and exchanges and between CFI-GCF and all the other child projects. Presently, meetings between CFI child projects are organized by the GCU every two months to provide guidance on knowledge management and to foster learning and exchanges during the KP development process. Regarding the forthcoming CFI GCF competition, it is not targeting specific fisheries. Hence, all the fisheries selected by CFI child projects are invited to compete given the fact that it's seeking innovative solutions and ideas from "coalitions" of fishing communities, governments, businesses, and investors that will help resolve overfishing in coastal fisheries. The GCU will facilitate more exchanges and pursue the ongoing coordination meetings for the knowledge products development process, which involve all CFI child projects and serve as cross-fertilization and learning platforms between CFI</p>	<p>GCU (Project Management Unit of the CFI-GPP, Global Coordination Unit), Officers and Consultants from the Fisheries and Aquaculture Division (NFI)</p>	<p>2-1-2021</p>	<p>No</p>

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
		partners. For instance, six meetings have been already held between February and June 2021.			
<p>Recommendation 2.</p> <p>The GCU should convene the global reference group (GRG) to increase global stakeholder ownership and review remaining programme opportunities.</p> <p>The “Global Reference Group” has not yet been established. Despite the known difficulties of convening such a group it remains the only practical option for a “global platform” of stakeholders with an interest in these issues to review, debate, and advise the GSC on programme interventions, and disseminate programme learning. While it may be that the original formulation vision, or membership for the group is unworkable, it should nonetheless be possible to bring together an effective group of independent representative fishery professionals and stakeholders to provide at least some of the review and promotion functions originally envisaged. Some resources will undoubtedly be required to convene this group. If these are not available this highlights the need for more realistic project costing and budgeting.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Referring to its Terms of reference (ToR), it appears challenging to set up the GRG because its members have to serve in their individual capacities, as opposed to representing their institutions, and this, without any financial compensation.</p> <p>The ToR of the GRG are:</p> <p>“The GRG will provide an independent oversight on CFI implementation process and will report on a regular basis to the GSC. Initially, it will serve as a standard setting channel for the knowledge (experiences, lessons learned and other forms) shared in the context of the CFI Communication, Outreaching and Knowledge Management Strategy. The GRG will review the reports of consolidated peer reviews</p>	<p>Following a discussion with the CFI child projects, it was suggested that, instead of setting up the GRG, the GCU will reactivate the coordination meetings on knowledge exchange and communication and find ways to develop joint and periodic communication products between the Child projects. In addition, the foreseen global platform (refer to response on recommendation 6) will serve to wider the dissemination of CFI best practices. As for GRG members, the Global platform will include experts from RFBs, governments, donors, regional projects, groups of producers and others fisheries value-chains stakeholders, CSOs and the academia, who will meet periodically either virtually or physically, at least once a year. Here are the point of views from: CFI Challenge Fund (WB): - At this point of the project circle, the setting up of the GRG doesn't seem to be useful; if the CFI Global Partnership could jump it, it would be beneficial for the Challenge Fund, so to avoid additional burden in terms of discussion, meeting, and reporting;-Instead of having a GRG, CFI Challenge Fund is open to more coordination in knowledge exchange and communication. And it can do it on its own gathering inputs from reviewers without a GRG;CFI Latin America (UNDP)-In Ecuador and Peru, it will be difficult to find people that will be willing to take part in a GRG, since the CFI Programme already has other similar mechanisms;-Global communication plan, including regular coordination meetings and joint communication products between Child projects would be preferable; CFI Global Partnership (FAO):-As it is challenging to find people that are willing to get involved in the GRG, other actions can be taken to reach the goal of the GRG</p>	GCU (Project Management Unit of the CFI-GPP), Officers and Consultants from the Fisheries and Aquaculture Division (NFI)	12-31-2021	No

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
	<p>on major project outputs and advise the GCU and GSC on required actions if needed".</p> <p>Asking people to devote their time to review these reports for free has been a major constraint to setting up this group, The PMU still expects the challenge to persist. Attempts will be made again to see how far we can go. Shall we not succeed, the alternative could be to reduce its composition and suggest a fee to the rest to do the work needed. Alternatively, it could be forgone.</p>	without having to set it up; for example, consolidate joint efforts to improve the coordination of knowledge exchange and communication among all the Child projects.			
<p>Recommendation 3.</p> <p>The GCU should implement its responsibility to report against the CFI Programme Results Framework to the Global Steering Committee on the progress and achievements of the programme.</p> <p>To date there has been no routine reporting of programme achievements against the programme framework results matrix. This should be rectified as a matter of urgency (i.e. an overall summary of programme progress to date) and undertaken annually until programme completion.</p>	Accepted	Following the ongoing set-up of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system for the CFI Programme, child projects will be requested to report, annually, the progress and achievements within the CFI Programme results framework and submit to GCU for assimilation into, overview reports. Overview reports will be shared with the Global Steering Committee.	GCU (NFI) and the Child projects Leads	12-31-2021	No

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>This process can be achieved either by child projects reporting against the programme results framework and submitting to GCU for assimilation into an overview report; or GCU obtaining and using the routine child project results-based reporting (PPR and PIRs) to generate a programme wide assessment against the programme level results frame.</p>					
<p>Recommendation 4.</p> <p>Agreement on a simplified framework and process for programme level reporting of experience, which directly supports programme wide learning and development of best practice, should be sought as soon as possible.</p> <p>Routine results-based reporting as in R3, should be supplemented and strengthened through reporting against key elements of holistic and participatory approaches to fisheries and coastal ecosystems management, as envisaged in the programme ToC. The issues or indicators to be reported against in the ToC can be simplified to some degree but cannot be reduced to three selected indicators (as agreed in the first two global consultations) if they are to underpin programme wide learning. The elements to be reported against do not need to serve as smart progress indicators or overlap with routine project and programme M&E, but rather should serve as a framework for reporting experience in seeking to apply the key elements of holistic, integrated, inclusive, participatory, ecosystem-based approaches – the driving rationale behind the whole programme. With appropriate follow up and synthesis by GCU, this process should supplement and strengthen the theme documents as a basis for best practice. While there are</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Given the nature of the institutional arrangement in which each child project (CP) acts as an autonomous entity, implementation of a simplified framework and process for programme level reporting of experience is contingent on agreement among the CPs. The GCU will report on final discussion outcomes.</p>	<p>The GCU is seeking agreement among Child Projects regarding the development of an appropriate framework and process for programme level reporting on “experience against key elements of holistic and participatory approaches to fisheries and coastal ecosystems management” as envisaged in the programme ToC. The purpose of this experiential reporting framework and process would be to supplement and strengthen the existing results-based reporting to support programme-wide learning and development of best practices. The GCU will continue to assume the leadership in that regard.</p>	<p>GCU (NFI) and Child project Leads with technical support of the hired M&E expert in charge of the set-up of the CFI Programme M&E system.</p>	<p>12-31-2021</p>	<p>No</p>

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
issues with the programme level ToC, it would be confusing and costly to seek to develop a completely new programme level ToC at this stage. See Annex 10 for some suggestions in this regard.					
<p>Recommendation 5.</p> <p>Child projects should be encouraged to develop their own ToC for each project site (fishery, or coastal ecosystem).</p> <p>These theories of change should not be regarded primarily as part of an indicator-based reporting system (though they can be used in this way if desired) but rather as a process to develop a shared understanding of the logic and rationale for project interventions at the different sites, how these interventions exemplify a holistic approach, and how they relate to higher level programme objectives and outcomes. Developing these ToCs will focus minds on the fisheries system or ecosystem they are seeking to influence, promote holistic thinking, and promote shared understanding between project implementing partners. Once complete they will also serve to enhance understanding across the programme of the approaches being taken by the other child projects (see annex 10).</p> <p>The GCU should bring these ToCs together to allow for a synthesis and review of the different approaches being taken across the programme, and the reasons for these; as a basis for further exchange and learning; and to supplement and provide context for the information gathered through reporting against programme level ToC elements or indicators as proposed under R1.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>The GCU sees advantages and disadvantages of developing additional and site-specific TOCs</p> <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Improved or additional TOCs can help improve learning and focusing on results for the remaining period in each Child project (CP). ii. Site-specific or ecosystem-specific TOCs can provide a path for future upscaling to similar localities. <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Project-specific TOCs exist and have shaped implementation so far. Additional TOCs may confuse the rationale without having a real impact on implementation and results. 	<p>The GCU has initiated discussions with the Child projects regarding the development of Theories of Change (or appropriate alternative mechanisms) for each project site (fishery, or ecosystem) to develop or reinforce, where necessary, processes aimed at developing a shared understanding of the logic and rationale for project interventions in different sites, including how these interventions exemplify a holistic approach, and how they relate to higher level programme objectives and outcomes. The GCU will continue to assume the leadership in that regard. However, given the nature of the institutional arrangement in which each CP acts as an autonomous entity, the final decision on whether to develop further ToCs will be left to each CP individually, with analytical support from GCU. The GCU will report on final discussion outcomes. In parallel, the GCU is developing tools and processes to allow a synthesis and review of CP reports on the different approaches being taken across the programme, and their rationale; as a basis for further exchange and learning; and to supplement and provide context for the information gathered through reporting against programme level ToC elements or indicators as proposed under R1 (R1: GPP Global Coordination Unit should actively facilitate greater coordination and integration between Global Challenge Fund (CFI-GCF) and site-based child projects).</p>	<p>GCU (NFI) and child project leads with the technical support of the hired M&E expert in charge of the set-up of the CFI Programme M&E system.</p>	<p>12-31-2021</p>	<p>No</p>

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
	ii. The purpose of TOC is to shape project and program implementation ahead of project start; course corrections are possible, however within the framework of GEF, it is not possible to completely alter the results chain. iii. Any site-specific TOC should be nested in a project TOC and in an overall program TOC. The value of a TOC is in its universality: it highlights an intervention model that should be valid in any given location/ ecosystem, with minor adjustments for local circumstances. Alignment between the CPs and the program results can be achieved through an improved M&E framework.				

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
<p>Recommendation 6.</p> <p>The GCU should be more strategic and ambitious in developing CFI best practice, drawing on enhanced reporting of approach, experience and lessons learned by child projects (see R3,4,5)</p> <p>Development of knowledge products has been almost entirely focused on the four theme products to be led by the other child projects. These are unlikely to encompass the scope of an ecosystem approach, whose application goes well beyond 4 themes, or the potential learning from the CFI as whole, as reinforced through implementation of R4. The project has the potential to showcase lessons learned and best practice in applying the EAF and other holistic approaches and should ensure its knowledge products encompass this learning. Furthermore, there is an opportunity for GCU to review, compare and synthesise experience from across the programme – which is difficult for the theme leaders, but which - as global coordinator backed up with FAOs technical expertise and the learning framework - GCU is very well placed to do.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Development and capitalization of CFI best practices and lessons learned depend on the level of Child projects' activities implementation. Since there are delays and the Child projects are at different stages of implementation process, the process have been somehow slowed.</p> <p>Reated to the ecosystem approach: the four knowledge product (KP) themes on which the six CFI implementing agencies agreed on are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. "Women in fisheries value chains" led by CFI-West Africa; ii. "Ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM)", led by CFI-Indonesia; iii. "Mangroves", led by CFI-Latin America; iv. "Private sector engagement", led by CFI-Challenge Fund (CF). 	<p>The CFI Communication and Knowledge management (KM) Strategy is in place and under implementation. A KM expert (long-term contract) joined the CFI Communicaton Team in September 2020. Activities and initiatives have been undertaken to support the Child projects (CP) to capitalize the best practices they identified and to share experiences through systematic andregular cross fertilization meetings and exchanges. For instances: In preparation for the Global Partnership Meeting, nine cross fertilization meetings involving all the child projects were held, between January and February 2021, aiming at fostering lessons learned and experience sharing on knowledge management and other coastal fishery related topics. Four Committees, one per Child project, were set in place in order to consolidate knowledge exchange among CFI partners, through bimonthly meetings organized by the GCU. In April and June 2021, two meetings were held with the four committees allowing the child projects to share lessons learned in their knowledge management and experience capitalization processes. Six national stakeholder platforms are being set in place in the six beneficiary countries of the Child projects, to foster discussion, not only on the four themes selected, but on all relevant coastal fishery related thematic. As concrete and forseen actions to implement the recommendation:- D-groups discussions on specific topics selected by the Child projects;- Utilization of Mural, Mentimeter and Google doc platforms to encourage brainstorming among CFI Committee members on specific questions identified by the Child projects ; - "CFI Talks", a forseen virtual thematic event with experts to discuss on lessons learned and share experiences developed under the CFI Prgamme; The EAF and mangroves will be the first theme on which</p>	<p>The GCU (NFI), especially CFI Communication and Knowledge Management Experts.</p>	<p>2-1-2021</p>	<p>No</p>

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
	<p>Hence, the EAF is one of the themes; it will be developed by CFI Indonesia. The ongoing KP development process through regular meetings with all Child projects under the GCU coordination and guidance will foster experiences and lessons sharing and will favor cross fertilization between CFI partners.</p> <p>In addition, CFI child projects include the EAF in their results frameworks.</p>	<p>experts from the six countries will exchange and share experiences. A CFI global network (global platform) composed by the six national stakeholder platforms and involving the three CFI regions will be put in place for a wider dissemination of CFI best practices. Thus strategy and its implementation instruments seem to be producing good results. Hence, the GCU will pursue the KM strategy implementation.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 7.</p> <p>The CFI website should be substantially improved, with effective links to a wide range of EAF supporting resources, and to other partner and collaborator websites.</p> <p>What is needed here is a dynamic functioning web resource that compares activities in different child projects, relates these to EAF and EAF and other relevant guidance and international instruments, cross links EAF guidance to CFI as exemplars, and inspires participants in the CFI and similar coastal fisheries initiatives across the globe to link up and share experience, learning and best practices.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Naturally, improvements to CFI website can and should be made. But the premise underlying this recommendation is perhaps based on a partial understanding of the purpose of the CFI website, which is not aligned to the objectives of the CFI project. In the first place, the recommendation seems not to recognize the CFI</p>	<p>The GCU will improve the CFI website with regular updates and will work to include more links of the CFI child projects websites, EAF supporting documents and other relevant theme (such as fisheries value chain, voluntaries guidelines for small-scale fisheries, gender,... Building these linkages is already in progress and the CFI website is now available in three languages: English, French and Spanish. It features links to the D-groups platform and includes multi-media content produced by CFI partners. However, the main challenges encountered with the website is related to the FAO corporate policy on communication with branding and logo's position. The GCU through the communication specialist made a lot of efforts to reach a consensus with the FAO Office of communication (OCC) and the CFI implementing agencies to make the CFI website</p>	<p>The GCU (NFI), especially CFI Communication and Knowledge Management Experts.</p>	<p>3-31-2022</p>	<p>No</p>

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>The proposed linking of the website with a d-groups platform is to be commended and should be implemented as soon as possible. However it is likely that to be effective D-groups will need significant technical moderation and leadership, especially if it is to feed into programme level learning and best practice.</p> <p>In addition to FAO technical guidance and resources, other programme related websites that need to be linked in both directions include:</p> <p>https://cfi-la.org/en/</p> <p>https://cfiamericalatina.exposure.co/</p> <p>https://pescaemprende.com/el-proyecto/</p> <p>https://elearning.fao.org/course/view.php?id=530</p> <p>https://wwfgef.org/gef/portfolios/cfi/</p>	<p>website as a cornerstone of CFI's communications as the public face of the initiative, as well as significant progress made to reinforce the role and prominence of the website over the reporting period. More fundamentally, the recommendation implies that the principal function of the CFI website should be that of a knowledge hub for the exchange between child projects and related partners on best practices in coastal fisheries. This is only partially true; the website is set-up as a public face that invites a broader audience to get involved in CFI. In addition, it is still a work in progress with a view to integrating the knowledge sharing function.</p>	<p>more partnerial. Related to D-groups the GCU has carried out extensive promotional activities to demonstrate the "development through dialogue" objective outlined by D-groups, a platform which serves for KM purposes. The KM expert is responsible for its technical moderation. He will work to engage partners in utilizing it with greater regularity. The platform is currently used for sharing technical documents from child projects, sending invitation to CFI partners and having discussions.</p>			

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
<p>Recommendation 8.</p> <p>D-Groups or similar exchange fora should be professionally and technically facilitated to draw out lessons learned and best practice.</p> <p>The proposed incorporation of a D-groups portal may enhance its utility for exchange and learning in the future but will need strong technically informed leadership/moderation to inform lessons learned and best practice development.</p>	Accepted	The use of a knowledge sharing platform does indeed require significant moderation and significant technical expertise to ensure that the CFI's ambition in the field of knowledge management can bear fruit. It should be noted however, that the architecture for this has just been set-up and that it is only now ready to be put into practice. Since April 2021, D-groups is being technically managed by the KM expert with regular updates and the uploads of technical documents and communication material. D-groups discussions on specific topics selected by the Child projects are planned in the KM work plan. Aside from D-groups, the four Committees are using Mural and Google doc platforms to foster brainstorming among CFI Committee members on specific questions identified by the Child projects. A CFI talks, a virtual thematic event with experts to discuss on lessons learned and share experiences developed under the CFI Programme is under establishment.	The GCU (NFI), especially the CFI Communication and Knowledge Management Experts.	10-31-2021	No
<p>Recommendation 9.</p> <p>The GCU should take a more proactive role in support for and coordination of fisheries performance assessment of child project fisheries, and this support should not be restricted to FPAT training, but responsive to local management institution needs and capacity.</p> <p>It is now too late to undertake fisheries assessment in the manner envisaged in the CFI programme and child project documents. It is important nonetheless that fisheries assessment in some form is undertaken across all child fisheries, and that experience gained is shared within the programme and beyond.</p>	Partially accepted	Despite the fact that there are delays in the FPAT development process, the GCU think that it is not too late to undertake the fisheries assessments as initially envisaged and progress have been made in the FPAT development process. The fisheries performance assessment toolkit includes two modules: Module 2 (the "Governance Module") is the FPAT application (developed by "Blue Matter" in coordination with UW). This module 2 named "Governance Supplement" and corresponding manual, have been developed and reviewed, and is now ready for translation and application. In addition: the Data preparation manual for the FPAT is finalized. It has been translated into French by the CFI West Africa project and will be translated in Spanish by CFI Latin America project. -	GCU (NFI) with support from the national and regional FPAT focal points of the child projects.	12-31-2021	No

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>In practice, fisheries and ecosystem assessment and monitoring has been or is being undertaken using a range of existing tools in the CFI target fisheries in Indonesia and Latin America. Given the coordinating and learning facilitation role of GPP it would make sense for it to engage actively in reviewing and comparing experience applying these approaches, generating best practice, and how these might relate to FPAT. Review of existing approaches was an output of Component 3 and is even more pertinent now that experience is accumulating across the programme in taking different approaches to fisheries assessment and status monitoring. This relates also to RB2, since fisheries/ecosystem status assessment and monitoring should be a key issue reported on by all child projects.</p> <p>The relative roles of the FPAT contractors and GCU in undertaking this assimilation/review needs to be clarified, but it makes more sense for GCU as the global coordinator to take on this role.</p>	<p>coverage of the environmental, social and economic impacts of coastal fisheries; in close collaboration with CFI partners, the academia and research networks”.</p>	<p>Manuals, webinar and first workshop training materials are ready for translation. - Bio-economic framework for integrating entry and capitalization dynamics into MERA is finalized and shared with “Blue Matter”; calibration exercises are underway. Data preparation webinars have been offered to the Latin American, West Africa and Galapagos regions. They are preparing data for the scoring workshop phase, with support and check-in meetings from University of Washington (UW). The LTO supported by the other GCU members, is facilitating and coordinating the FPAT development process. Hence, the GCU will pursue actively to support the FPAT development process and will reinforce the coordination with the child projects to make effective the environmental, social and economic (triple-bottom line) assessments of selected fisheries (in the six CFI countries (since now CFI Indonesia project has started with its PMU designated in December 2020).</p>			
<p>Recommendation 10.</p> <p>FAO contributions in kind in support of GPP should be planned and programmed with clear allocation of time and responsibility. Professional time inputs, allocation and achievements should be rigorously reported.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>The recommendation is partially accepted because the co-financing monitoring mechanism applied so far, follows the GEF procedure and it is fully consistent with the Project Document endorsed by the GEF CEO. The project team is of the opinion that the GEF co-financing mechanism needs to be</p>	<p>The Project Team will strengthen the co-financing reporting mechanism by following up on a regular basis with executing partners on respective yearly expenditures detailed by type, if applicable. The same process will be followed for FAO’s reporting system, keeping track more closely of the amounts co-financed.</p>	<p>GCU (NFI) in its executing role and the FAO GEF-Unit (OCB) in its implementing role.</p>	<p>3-31-2022</p>	<p>No</p>

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
	adjusted to facilitate tracking and reporting mechanisms and to take into account the situation on the ground where some partners have shown difficulties in providing long and detailed reports for in-kind contributions.				
<p>Recommendation 11.</p> <p>The GPP should develop a staffing strategy for the GCU for the remainder of the programme (longer term staff positions, consultants, contributions in kind) with more emphasis on few longer-term staff or consultants.</p> <p>The GPP team should develop – as a matter of urgency - a detailed plan for strategic spend on staff resources for the remainder of the project, and recruit accordingly taking into consideration the following priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pro-active facilitation of partner collaboration and coordination, including creating stronger links and synergies between GCF and other child project interventions (R1). ii. Effective technical monitoring, reporting, synthesis and review of programme wide activities, achievements and lessons learned applying EAFM and other holistic approaches (R2, R4, R5, R6) based in part on a simplified ToC. iii. Effective fisheries technical leadership, and facilitation and coordination of production of the 4 	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>We agree to recruit additional consultants in fisheries governance, fisheries value chain and/or monitoring and evaluation for technical support to the GCU. However, the sharing, learning and knowledge management (KM) development facilitation support are already covered by a long-term consultant in knowledge management. Hired since September 2020, he is providing technical support and guidance to Child projects.</p> <p>Then, it could be envisaged to recruit long-term consultants, but</p>	<p>The profile and the tasks of the science to policy advisor as defined in the project document is, in many points, similar to a knowledge management expert profile. Following a resquest from the GEF Secretariat, a knowledge management expert has been hired (since September 2020). He is currently implementing the programme level knowledge management strategy and providing technical support and guidance to the CFI child projects to contribute to delivering the strategy at child projects level. However, the GCU will initiate discussions with the senior international consultants (in fisheries and in fisheries value chain analysis) who are currently under contract with CFI West Africa project and who have been involved in the CFI programme since its beginning. The discussions will be on how their contracts could be extended to allow them to support the GPP. They are fully immersed in the CFI Programme and could support the GPP right away instead of bringing in a new person who would take time to understand the Programme before he/she can provide the needed support. Moreover, extending their contracts will be faster than recruiting new consultants (a process that could take last at least six months to complete). These international senior consultants could</p>	GCU (NFI)	1-30-2022	No

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>theme documents or knowledge products, supplemented and reinforced by pro-active leadership and moderation of D-groups discussion groups related to all aspects of the implementation of EAF and other holistic approaches.</p> <p>iv. Pro-active technical facilitation, exchange and learning in relation to fisheries performance assessment across the programme (R8).</p> <p>v. Compilation and dissemination of CFI “best practices” both within and beyond the CFI programme (R6, R7) and within and beyond the theme documents.</p> <p>While some of these functions might be served through contributions in kind (for example from the existing LTO, the Budget Holder) successful implementation would be dependent on the allocation or recruitment of a single longer term staff member or consultant who can become fully immersed in the programme for a substantial period in order to be effective as a technical support, learning and knowledge development facilitator. Strong fisheries technical skills, good writing skills, and ideally relevant languages will be required. The outline for this position already exists in the TOR for a science to policy advisor as specified in Annex 4 of the project document. He or she would be supported as necessary by shorter term technical or communications specialists drawn primarily from FAO in kind contributions.</p>	<p>his/her role will be to complete the tasks non yet covered by the knowledge management expert such as “collating, analysing relevant project outcomes and outputs to influence decision making by fisheries sector stakeholders at all levels” as well as “coordinating the monitoring and evaluation work of the Programme and the two FAO projects”.</p>	<p>also provide additional support to the KM expert in the development of a range of products to inform policy at global, regional and national level to influence decision making by fisheries sector stakeholders at all levels, and to promote best practices for sustainable marine resource use and improved seafood value chain opportunities. In addition, a monitoring and evaluation consultant (long-term) will be hired to support the CFI projects in terms of monitoring progress towards the delivery of programme outputs, illustrating impact and providing, where possible, evidence of outcomes, by reporting in appropriate formats for diverse audiences (in coordination with the KM expert). The length of the contracts will depend on budget availability.</p>			
Recommendation 12.	Accepted	The next Global steering committees (GSC) will be chaired by the GEF Secretariat (GEF Sec) Representative. Acting as secretariat of the GSC, the GCU will request support from the chair (GEF Sec) to make the progress	GCU (NFI)	10-31-2021	No

Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative Global Partnership Project					09/2021
Evaluation recommendations	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>GEF should chair the GSC with GCU as secretariat and should require programme level reporting as set down in R3, R4, R5.</p> <p>Ambiguity in responsibility for programme success may lie behind lack of progress in programme M&E. The Global Steering Committee (GSC) is ultimately responsible for project and programme oversight. It is chaired by FAO, which is also an implementer and executor of 2 projects, and which lacks any executive or budgetary power over the other implementing partners, or the power to demand progress reports. GEF – the funder – is a member of this committee but does not exercise executive power https://www.gef.org/gef/portfolios/cfi/</p>		reports and the reports against the programme results frameworks by the child projects available.			
<p>Recommendation 13.</p> <p>The project will likely need to request an extension of one to two years. An extension is recommended, provided that, at the time of the request, the project is actively progressing on recommendations R1-12 made in this report, and in particular R1, R4 and R11.</p>	Accepted	An extension of 18 months will be submitted to the GSC with a new work plan and a revised budget which will take into account the recruitments suggested in R11.	GCU (NFI) under the guidance and support of the FLO from FAO GEF Unit (OCB).	10-31-2021	No

Office of Evaluation
evaluation@fao.org
www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.