



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations

## Office of Evaluation

### **Mid-term Evaluation of the Strategies for Trawl Fisheries Bycatch Management Project (GCP /RAS/269/GFF)**

*Annexes to the Final Report*

February 2013

# Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

## Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

*The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.*

*The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.*

© FAO 2013

*FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.*

*All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).*

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153  
Rome, Italy  
Email: [evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Annex 1</b>	<b>Evaluation Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Annex 2</b>	<b>Brief profile of evaluation team members .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Annex 3</b>	<b>FAO Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions, 2010-2019 .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex 4</b>	<b>Questionnaires for National Project Coordinators and National Technical Officers</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex 5</b>	<b>List of stakeholders interviewed .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex 6</b>	<b>Project Scoring Matrix .....</b>	<b>25</b>

## **Annex 1 Evaluation Terms of Reference**

### **1 Background of the Project**

1. The four-year Global Environmental Facility-supported project, Strategies for Trawl Fisheries Bycatch Management - GCP/RAS/269/GFF, also known as REBYC-II CTI,<sup>1</sup> began in 2011 and aims at contributing to the more sustainable use of fisheries resources and healthier marine ecosystems in the Coral Triangle and Southeast Asia waters, by reducing bycatch, discards and fishing impact by trawl fishing. The Coral Triangle region of Southeast Asia is one of the world's most biologically diverse, economically productive and potentially vulnerable marine zones. As a result of increasing human population, exploitation pressure, and pollution, a major ecosystem change is a particular concern in the region.

2. As more widely in the global context, the untargeted capture of fish and non-fish species, commonly called bycatch, is an increasing concern. Bycatch includes fish, turtles, marine mammals, and corals and other seabed fauna and flora, and part of this bycatch is discarded back to sea as dead or dying. Bycatch tends to be poorly monitored and not managed but could have an important impact on fishery resources, habitats and ecosystems. In some fisheries and regions in Southeast Asia, there is an increasing trend towards retention of the bycatch consisting of juveniles and small-sized fish for use as food for human consumption or for utilization as aquaculture feed. The issue is therefore complex, requiring resource and biodiversity aspects to be tackled alongside human needs, and involving a mix of policy, technical, private sector and community support measures.

3. Based on the principles of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (FAO 1995) and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), the project is building on the successes of the 2002-2008 FAO/UNEP/GEF global project, "Reduction of Environmental Impact from Tropical Shrimp Trawling through the Introduction of Bycatch Reduction Technologies and Change of Management". The REBYC-II CTI project focuses on multispecies bottom trawling, where bycatch issues are amongst the most serious and with potentially significant effects on ecosystems and livelihoods. It is implementing activities in countries of the region where the bycatch problem is most serious and where lessons for the future are needed. These include Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, The Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam.

4. The project seeks to address the challenges by promoting sustainable fishing practices and improved trawl management through activities at pilot sites in each of the participating countries. At the same time it aims to work at the national and regional levels to improve policy and strategic frameworks and to demonstrate best practices. It seeks to do so in part by promoting the implementation of the FAO International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards (FAO 2011), the results of which will be used to inform global initiatives on responsible fishing and thus contribute to a more sustainable use of existing fishery resources, protection of marine habitats and ecosystems, and more secure livelihoods.

#### **1.1 Project Objectives**

5. The project has two objectives:

---

<sup>1</sup> The acronym of the project – REBYC-II CTI – refers to the title and abbreviation of the earlier REBYC project, Reduction of Environmental Impact from Tropical Shrimp Trawling through the Introduction of Bycatch Reduction Technologies and Change of Management, adding CTI for the Coral Triangle Initiative

- The Global Environment Objective: Responsible trawl fisheries that result in sustainable fisheries resources and healthy marine ecosystems in the Coral Triangle and Southeast Asian waters by reduced bycatch, discards and fishing impact on biodiversity and the environment.
- The Project Development Objective: Effective public and private sector partnership for improved trawl and bycatch management and practices that support fishery dependent incomes and sustainable livelihoods.

### Project Components

1. The project is structured around four interrelated components:

- i Policy, legal and institutional frameworks component works towards the establishment of national or area specific trawl fisheries bycatch management plans and building institutional capacity for their implementation. The need for adequate legislation and regulations to support the implementation of improved management measures is also being addressed. At the regional level, a bycatch policy/strategy will be developed and project countries will be encouraged to adopt the International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards.  
**Outcome:** Agreed regional bycatch policy/strategy and national or area specific trawl fisheries bycatch management plans that are in line with the forthcoming International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards are adopted and supported by institutional arrangements and processes for public and private sector partnerships.
- ii Resource management and fishing operations component will lead to the adoption of more selective fishing gear and practices, provide a basis for implementing zoning of fishing areas and developing spatial-temporal closure management measures, and generate better data on number of vessels and recommendations for fishing effort and capacity management. The management measures will be supported by the identification of incentive packages that promote more responsible fishing. The results from this component will inform the regional bycatch policy/strategy and the national and/or area specific trawl fisheries bycatch management plans.  
**Outcome:** Measures that manage bycatch and reduce discards, and thereby improve fisheries resources and ensure long-term economic sustainability of trawl fisheries, are implemented in combination with incentives in all project countries. In these fisheries (covered by improved bycatch management measures) bycatch has been reduced.
- iii Information management and communication component include bycatch data collection (at landing sites and onboard vessels), mapping of fishing grounds, establishment of socio-economic monitoring procedures, and means for communicating bycatch data and information (website and information, education and communication – IEC – material). Standardized methods for bycatch data collection are being promoted across the project countries.  
**Outcome:** Standardized data for key indicators, including on economic performance, are available in all project countries and inform trawl fisheries and bycatch management planning and implementation at national and regional levels.
- iv Awareness and knowledge component is addressing awareness of and knowledge on trawl fisheries bycatch management issues and how they relate to sustainability, and what measures are available to make fishing more responsible. Private sector/fishers, policy makers, fisheries managers, officials, extension officers and NGOs are offered training and workshop opportunities to enhance their knowledge

on best management practices and responsible fisheries.

**Outcome:** Enhanced knowledge and understanding of responsible fishing by private sector/fishers, fisheries managers and decision-makers are supporting participatory management arrangements in all project countries.

2. The total original project budget according to the Project Document is USD 11,218,600. It is funded by GEF in the amount of USD 3.0 million, with the remainder of the budget supported by the participating national governments, FAO, the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) INGOs and the private sector. Box 1 below presents the planned amount for each funding source.<sup>2</sup>

**Box 1 Planned Funding Sources and Amounts**

Funding Source	Amount (in USD)
GEF allocation	3,000,000
Government co-financing	1,930,100
Private sector co-financing	2,050,100
Other country co-financing	262,000
By-catch Guidelines (FAO project)	160,000
FAO (in kind)	140,000
SEAFDEC	800,000
Centre for International Migration and Development	255,000
Sida	2,100,000
WWF	90,000
Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	75,000
International Fishmeal and Fish Oil Organisation	47,000
FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme for South and Southeast Asia	300,000
Sub-total co-financing	8,218,600
Total project budget	11,218,600

***Institutional Arrangements***

3. FAO is the GEF implementing agency for the project. The agency will be responsible for oversight of the GEF's resources and of the project as a whole. Its role is to ensure that GEF policies and criteria are adhered to and that the project achieves the objectives, expected outcomes and outputs as described in the Project Document and according to the established work plans and budget.

4. The FAO regional partner, SEAFDEC, based in Bangkok, Thailand, is the agency's main executing institution. SEAFDEC hosts the Regional Facilitation Unit (RFU), responsible for coordination of the project at its Training Department in Samut Prakarn, to which the FAO Project Regional Coordinator (PRC) is attached. The Center will execute the project components in cooperation with the participating national governments and relevant regional and international organizations and private-sector companies. The PRC and RFU are responsible for overall technical and administrative support and for delivery of the regional outputs. The project will also partner with relevant universities and research institutes, NGOs, and fisher and stakeholder associations and organizations at the site level.

5. The FAO Regional Office for Asia-Pacific (RAP) manages the administration of the Project through the support of the Budget Holder and assistant. The Fishing Operations and Technology Branch (FIRO) of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Department in FAO headquarters is the FAO Lead Technical Unit (LTU) for the project and provides technical backstopping and oversight. The LTU, specifically through a Lead Technical Officer assigned to the project, follows the implementation progress, ensures delivery of technical

---

<sup>2</sup> The actual funding of the project differs and is less. The evaluation will examine it and its effect on project implementation.

outputs and outcomes, and provides clearance to agreements, contracts, and technical and progress reports of the project. Accordingly, the PRC reports to the LTO.

6. A multi-disciplinary Task Force has also been established to provide guidance to the project and is composed of FAO experts in fisheries at the regional level, and from the RAP Field Programme Unit and the legal department in HQ. The FAO GEF Coordination Unit (TCID) has the responsibility of reviewing and approving project progress reports, implementation reviews, financial reports and budget revisions.

7. In the participating countries, the national fisheries authorities are the execution partners, and each has assigned and supports a National Project Coordinator (NPC). The NPC is the main project interlocutor in each country and assumes overall responsibility for all project activities there. Supporting the NPC and to guide project implementation at national level are also National Working Groups (NWG). At the local level, the project is to work with Consultative Groups composed of fishers, the post-harvest sector, seafood companies and consumer representatives, local communities, and NGOs. These report to the NPC and are to create the foundation for the establishment of permanent and officially recognized Management Councils.

8. At the regional level, a Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of members designated by the governments and other stakeholders provides the project with guidance and approves the annual work plans.

## **2 Purpose of the Evaluation**

9. As per GEF requirements, a mid-term evaluation of all full-size projects is to be conducted after two years of project implementation. The review will determine progress being made towards the achievement of objectives, outcomes, and outputs, and will identify corrective actions if necessary. The evaluation will serve the purposes of both accountability to stakeholders, including project participants, and organizational learning.

10. The Mid-term evaluation will, inter-alia:

- Review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- Investigate if principles of equitable development and gender equality are being adhered to;
- Analyze the effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements;
- Identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- Identify lessons learned about project design, implementation and management;
- Highlight technical achievements and lessons learned;
- Propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary;

## **3 Evaluation framework**

11. The evaluation will critically assess the project through internationally accepted evaluation criteria, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. However, it should be noted that the project has experienced some challenges in making progress due to both funding and management issues. Therefore, while the MTE will evaluate the outcomes of the project, it is recognized from the outset that these may be limited. In order to be useful to the project, the exercise will focus to a larger extent on assessing the design and approach of the project, and the relevance of each of its objectives to the bycatch-related contexts in the participating countries, for the purpose of identifying what issues and strategies it should focus on to be effective for the remainder of the project's duration.

12. Emphasis will also be given to evaluating the efficiency, institutional set-up, management arrangements and resource availability of the project since it appears to have faced hindrances in these areas that have affected project implementation. Given that the evaluation is carried out at mid-term and the project has seen modest progress, there may not be significant evidence of impact and sustainability and hence the MTE will not concentrate on these criteria as much as on others.

13. The aim of the MTE is hence to assess the project's results but, of equal importance, to also develop and recommend well-informed, comprehensive and feasible solutions to the challenges faced that will allow the project to create an impact on the bycatch problem in the remainder of the project's lifespan. An expanded Conclusions section may detail the suggested ways forward for the project, and specific recommendations based on these will follow in the section on Recommendations.

14. The project was declared operational in November 2011. However, in practice the project activities commenced in late April 2012. Therefore the MTE is planned for February 2014, which would allow for an assessment of 22 months of actual project execution. This scheduling also allows for presentation of the evaluation findings to the PSC Meeting scheduled for May 2014.

### **3.1 Evaluation criteria**

In addition to employing the internationally accepted evaluation criteria, the MTE, in line with the new FAO project cycle, will also assess compliance with the following UN Common Country Programming Principles where relevant: Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA)/ Right to Food/ Decent Work; Gender equality, Environmental sustainability, Capacity Development and Results Based Management.

### **3.2 Evaluation issues**

Within the evaluation criteria, the evaluation will analyze the following features of the project, as appropriate.

- I. Relevance of concept and design
  - a. Project relevance to
    - FAO Global Goals, Strategic Objectives and Core Functions regarding the sustainable and responsible management and use of fisheries and aquatic resources;
    - The Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, related technical guidelines including the FAO International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards, Guidelines for responsible fishing operations, use of fish feeds, etc.);
    - GEF International Waters (IW) Strategy, and the GEF strategic programme, SP1 Marine Fisheries-Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity;
    - The Asia-Pacific's Fisheries Commission (APFIC) Regional Guidance for the Management of Tropical Trawl Fisheries in Asia;
    - The participating countries' development and fisheries management priorities, and the characteristics of their fisheries sectors, including the activities of the private sector and other organizations addressing bycatch
    - other aid programmes in the sector.
  - b. Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project;



- c. Clarity, coherence and realism of the Logical Framework<sup>3</sup> of the project and of its design, including:
  - The causal relationship between inputs, activities, outputs, expected outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives);
  - Validity of indicators, assumptions and risks;
  - Approach and methodology;
  - Resources (human and financial) and duration;
  - Stakeholder and beneficiary identification and analysis;
  - Institutional set-up and management arrangements.
- II. Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes
  - d. Overall effectiveness of the project, actual or potential, in attaining its intermediate/specific objectives:
    - Description and analysis of the outputs produced, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness;
    - Description and analysis of the outcomes achieved, expected and unexpected, their robustness and expectations for further uptake and diffusion.<sup>4</sup>
  - e. Use made by the project of FAO's normative and knowledge products and actual and potential contribution of the project to the normative and knowledge function of the Organization. In particular, the team will assess the use made by the Project of the international instruments and FAO Technical Guidelines developed for the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards.
- III. Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation process
  - f. Assessment of project management:
    - Quality, realism and focus of work plans;
    - Assessment of delivery, causes and consequences of delays and of any remedial measure taken, if any;
    - Effects on project implementation and effectiveness of the reduced availability of financial resources.
    - Monitoring and feed-back loop into improved management and operations, based on GEF tracking tools as well;
    - Staff management;
    - Development and implementation of an exit strategy.
  - g. Institutional Setup:
    - Administrative and technical support by FAO HQ, regional, sub-regional and country office, as appropriate, with respect to both FAO and the RFU, and the Lead Technical Unit, the Budget Holder, project Task Force and TCID;
    - Institutional set-up, internal review processes, coordination and steering bodies, e.g. the NWGs, Consultative Groups and the PSC;
    - Inputs and support by the Government/s and resource partner/s, including co-financing from SEAFDEC, FAO, participating countries and resource partners.
  - h. Assessment of financial resources management, including:
    - Adequacy and realism of budget allocations to achieve intended results;

---

<sup>3</sup> The Logical Framework embodies the Results-Based Management approach in a project

<sup>4</sup> 'FAO projects should have (only) one outcome. Programmes may have more.' From FAO Project Cycle Guidelines, 2012

- Adequacy and realism of Budget Revisions in matching implementation needs and project objectives;
  - Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation and in relation to work-plans.
- IV. Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles and cross-cutting themes
- i. Analysis of gender mainstreaming for gender equality. This will include:
    - Extent to which gender equality considerations were reflected in the identification of beneficiaries and in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, with particular attention to those involved in local fish and bycatch marketing.<sup>5</sup>
    - Extent to which gender equality considerations were taken into account in project implementation: special attention will be paid to the extent of mainstreaming gender equality in awareness raising and capacity development, as well as under component 3 and 4 concerning information management, communication and socio – economic monitoring procedures;
    - The potential impact of specific bycatch strategies the countries have developed on women and gender relations in fisheries and bycatch activities;
    - Extent to which gender equality considerations were taken into account in project management.
  - j. Analysis of the Capacity Development dimension in the design, implementation and results of the project, at individual, organizational and enabling environment levels.<sup>6</sup> This will include CD on both technical and soft-skills, i.e. planning, budgeting, partnering and negotiating.
  - k. Analysis of the adoption of the Human-Rights Based Approach, namely:
    - the integration of the Right to Food dimension and principles, in the design, implementation and results of the project. Specifically, the MTE will assess whether the project would ensure access to food or the means for its procurement for fishers and families affected by bycatch reduction measures;
    - the integration of decent rural employment concerns in the design, implementation and results of the project.
  - l. Analysis of Partnerships and Alliances, namely:
    - how they were planned in the project design and developed through implementation;
    - their focus and strength; and
    - their effect on project results and sustainability.<sup>7</sup>
  - m. Analysis of how environmental impacts were taken into consideration and addressed, following the steps and criteria contained in the FAO Environmental Impact Assessment guidelines.
  - n. In the case of emergency projects, analysis of the extent to which the programme has effectively adhered to the principles promoted in the Humanitarian Charter and to the Minimum Standards as defined in the Sphere handbook.<sup>8</sup>

## V. Impact

---

5 See: [http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/gender/docs/FAO\\_FinalGender\\_Policy\\_2012.pdf](http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/gender/docs/FAO_FinalGender_Policy_2012.pdf)

6 See: <http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/en/>

7 See: <http://www.fao.org/partnerships/partners-home/en/>

8 In the Humanitarian charter, humanitarian agencies jointed expressed their conviction that all people affected by disaster or conflict have a right to receive protection and assistance to ensure the basic conditions for life with dignity. See: <http://www.spherehandbook.org/>

- o. Overall impact of the project, actual or potential, positive and negative, produced directly or indirectly, intended or unintended; and
- p. Overall contribution of the project to FAO Country Programming Frameworks, Organizational Result/s and Strategic Objectives, as well as to the implementation of the corporate Core Functions.

VI. Sustainability

- q. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
  - Institutional, technical, social and economic sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
  - Expectation of institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project;
  - Environmental sustainability: the project's contribution to sustainable natural resource management, in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base.

6. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by the project, FAO, the governments, SEAFDEC and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for follow-up or up-scaling action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons to be learned as they are of interest to other similar activities. Any proposal for further assistance should include specification of major objectives and outputs and indicative inputs required.

## **4 Evaluation methodology**

### **4.1 Approach and tools**

- 7. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards<sup>9</sup>.
- 8. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.
- 9. The evaluation will make use of the following methods and tools review of existing reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by check lists and/or interview protocols; direct observation of field work. In particular, the Evaluation will carry out the following activities:
  - A desk review of the project document, Project inception Report, outputs, monitoring reports, PSC Reports and reports from other relevant meetings; Project implementation Reports; quarterly and six-monthly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports;
  - A review of specific products including the content of the Project website, annual work plans, publications and other materials and reports;
  - Interviews with FAO and RFU staff, namely the Project Regional Coordinator, Project Technical Advisor, the Executing Agency, SEAFDEC, Regional

---

9 United Nations Evaluation Group, <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards>

Administrative Officer; the Lead Technical Unit, Lead Technical Officer, Budget Holder, TCID staff and FAO Representation staff in the visited countries;

- Interviews with national government staff involved in project implementation including, the National Project Coordinators, National Technical Advisors, National Working Group members, and if possible members of the local Consultative Groups. Phone interviews with project staff in the countries that will not be visited, to canvass their views on achievements, issues and ways forward;
- Interviews with the participating private sector companies, and regional and international organizational partners working on similar issues through in-person interviews in country or via telephone.
- Interviews and interaction with national governments and other participants attending a REBYC-II CTI regional meeting, if feasible.
- A survey submitted to staff, including of coordination bodies, of all the involved national governments, the GEF and other resource partners.

10. The evaluation team will visit three of the five participating countries, namely Thailand, Viet Nam and The Philippines in order to capture a representative sample of the experiences the project has had in the different contexts and the specific challenges and strengths it encounters. The countries have been agreed upon by the project stakeholders and OED. Site visits will occur as well where they are feasible, although site-level activities are yet to commence in most of the countries.

11. The RFU will make available comprehensive documentation available to the MTE team at least 2 weeks before the start of the Review (i.e. by the 3rd February 2014). A list of all documentation will be provided in advance of this date.

12. Particular attention will be devoted to ensure that women and other under-privileged groups will be consulted in adequate manner. Insofar as possible and appropriate, interaction will also take place with non-participants to canvass their opinions. The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework;<sup>10</sup> the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework can be used for assessment of project results.<sup>11</sup>

### ***GEF ratings***

13. In order to facilitate comparison with routine reporting to GEF and contribute to the GEF programme learning process (IWLearn), the evaluation will rate the success of the project on the GEF six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

14. Each of the items listed below should be rated separately, with comments. Also, an overall rating will have to be given as a synthetic expression of the project performance.

---

10 The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework identifies five different capitals (human, social, natural, financial, and physical), each including different assets. It helps in improving understanding of livelihoods, in particular of the poor. For more information, among others: [http://www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance\\_sheets\\_pdfs/section2.pdf](http://www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance_sheets_pdfs/section2.pdf)

11 SWOT is a widely used strategic planning tool, useful also in the assessment of development interventions, to canvass their strengths and weaknesses, as well as future perspectives. It is particularly used in focus groups, but it can be adapted to individual interviews as well.

- Achievement of objectives;
- Attainment of outputs and activities;
- Progress towards meeting GEF-4 focal area priorities/objectives;
- Cost-effectiveness;
- Impact;
- Risk and Risk management;
- Sustainability;
- Stakeholder participation;
- Country ownership;
- Implementation approach;
- Financial planning;
- Replicability;
- Monitoring and evaluation.

#### **4.2 Stakeholders and consultation process**

15. The evaluation team will discuss in detail with the key stakeholders of the project and will take into account their perspectives and opinions. These will include:

- Project Task Force members;
- Government representatives from the partner countries;
- the resource partner;
- Private-sector companies;
- NGOs;
- FAO Representatives in the participating countries; and
- Site-level stakeholders (including trawlers, bycatch traders, processors, fishery exporters, and organizations).

16. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with: the FAO Office of Evaluation, the Project Task Force members and Project staff at headquarters, regional, sub-regional or country level. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

17. The team will briefly present its preliminary findings at country level with each of the participating governments visited. In consideration of the regional nature of the project a debriefing on preliminary findings and conclusions will be provided in RAP to obtain feedback at the end of the data-gathering phase. It will include the following key stakeholders in-person or through teleconference:

- Project Task Force members, including TCID;
- SEAFDEC, the executing partner.

18. The draft ToR will be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by OED. The draft evaluation report will also be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

## **5 Roles and responsibilities**

19. FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Project Task Force (PTF) of the project to be evaluated are responsible for initiating the evaluation

process, drafting the first version of the Terms of Reference, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the team, make available information and documentation as necessary, and comment on the draft final terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the project Task Force will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.

20. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

21. FAO Office of Evaluation assists the BH and LTO in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the team's work; it is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and of the team composition;<sup>12</sup> it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations.

22. The Office of Evaluation has also a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

23. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report.

24. The Team Leader guides and coordinates the team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

25. The Evaluation team will be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available.

26. The team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

27. As a contribution to the OED Knowledge Management System:

- the Team Leader will be responsible for completing the OED quantitative project performance questionnaire, to be delivered at the same time with the final evaluation report;
- OED will ask all team members to complete an anonymous and confidential questionnaire to get their feedback on the evaluation process.

---

<sup>12</sup> The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team, will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

## **6 Evaluation team**

28. Mission members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

29. The evaluation team will comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the project, and as a whole, will have expertise in all the following subject matters:

- regional fisheries issues, particularly bycatch;
- Experience in the S.E Asia region;
- knowledge of FAO's internal management arrangements;
- Conduct of evaluations, in particular of regional programmes.

30. Furthermore, to the extent possible, the team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

## **7 Evaluation deliverables**

31. The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

32. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

33. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided in Annex I of this ToR. The report will be prepared in English/French/Spanish<sup>13</sup>, with numbered paragraphs, following OED template for report writing. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.

34. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within four weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Within two additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within maximum two weeks.

35. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of project outputs;
- Evaluation tools.

---

13 Select as appropriate

## **8 Evaluation timetable**

36. The evaluation is expected to take place during the period January-March 2014. The country visit phase is expected to last approximately two weeks. The timetable in the box below shows a tentative programme of travel and work for the evaluation team. It will be finalised upon the recruitment of the evaluation team.

**Box 2 Evaluation time-table**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>No. of days</b>	<b>Cumulative total days</b>
November	Finalization of TOR (including country and donor consultations)		
December	Finalization of team composition		
Early-Mid-February 2014	Background preparation for evaluation and development of surveys	5	5
Mid-February	Travel to Rome-FAO HQ	1	6
Mid-February	Interviews with Rome-based staff (LTO, FIRO, TCID), and team debriefing	3	9
Mid-February	Team planning	1	10
Mid-February	Travel to Bangkok	1	11
Mid- to Late February	Country 1-Thailand: Interviews with FAO RAP staff, RFU, SEAFDEC (Samut Prakarn), government and other stakeholders	4	15
Late February	Travel to Manila, The Philippines	1	16
Late February	Meetings with government, FAO and other stakeholders in The Philippines, and possible site visit	3	19
Late February	Travel to Ha Noi, Viet Nam	1	20
Late February	Meetings with government, FAO and other stakeholders in Ha Noi	4	24
Late February	Return to Bangkok	1	25
Early March	Preparation and presentation of debriefing on draft findings to FAO RAP and RFU	3	28
Early March	Return to home	1	29
Mid-March	Preparation of first draft of report	15	44
Within 7 Days	Delivery of comments from OED to Team Leader (TL)		
Within 2 days	Preparation of final draft report by TL and circulation to project stakeholders by OED	2	46
Two weeks	Comments from project stakeholders and selected PSC members and NPCs (TBC)		
Within 2 days	Finalization of report and its circulation	3	49
Within 1 day	OED sends request for Management Response to BH		
Within 2 weeks	BH submits Management Response to OED		



## **Annex 2    Brief profile of evaluation team members**

*Arne C.I. Andreasson*, Swedish national, independent consultant with more than 30 years of experience of fisheries and aquaculture management and development, in Asia, Africa, and Europe.

*Ashwin Bhouraskar*, U.S. national, Evaluation Officer in the FAO Office of Evaluation with ten years of experience in monitoring and evaluation and natural resource management, including fisheries

### **Annex 3 FAO Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions, 2010-2019**

#### **Box 3 FAO Members Global Goals**

<b>Global Goals 2010-13</b>	<b>Global Goals 2014-17</b>
a) Reduction of the absolute number of people suffering from hunger, progressively ensuring a world in which all people at all times have sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life;	Eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition, progressively ensuring a world in which people at all times have sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life;
b) Elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all with increased food production, enhanced rural development and sustainable livelihoods;	Elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all, with increased food production, enhanced rural development and sustainable livelihoods;
c) Sustainable management and utilisation of natural resources, including land, water, air, climate and genetic resources, for the benefit of present and future generations.	Sustainable management and utilization of natural resources, including land, water, air, climate and genetic resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

#### **Box 4 FAO Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results 2010-13**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Lead Unit</b>
A	Sustainable intensification of crop production	AG
A01	Policies and strategies on sustainable crop production intensification and diversification at national and regional levels	AGP
A02	Risks from outbreaks of transboundary plant pests and diseases are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels	AGP
A03	Risks from pesticides are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels	AGP
A04	Effective policies and enabled capacities for a better management of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) including seed systems at the national and regional levels	AGP
B	Increased sustainable livestock production	AG
B01	The livestock sector effectively and efficiently contributes to food security, poverty alleviation and economic development	AGA
B02	Reduced animal disease and associated human health risks	AGA
B03	Better management of natural resources, including animal genetic resources, in livestock production	AGA
B04	Policy and practice for guiding the livestock sector are based on timely and reliable information	AGA
C	Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources	FI
C01	Members and other stakeholders have improved formulation of policies and standards that facilitate the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and other international instruments, as well as response to emerging issues	FI
C02	Governance of fisheries and aquaculture has improved through the establishment or strengthening of national and regional institutions, including RFBs	FIE
C03	More effective management of marine and inland capture fisheries by FAO Members and other stakeholders has contributed to the improved state of fisheries resources, ecosystems and their sustainable use	FIM

<b>Code</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Lead Unit</b>
C04	Members and other stakeholders have benefited from increased production of fish and fish products from sustainable expansion and intensification of aquaculture	FIM
C05	Operation of fisheries, including the use of vessels and fishing gear, is made safer, more technically and socio-economically efficient, environmentally-friendly and compliant with rules at all levels	FII
C06	Members and other stakeholders have achieved more responsible post-harvest utilization and trade of fisheries and aquaculture products, including more predictable and harmonized market access requirements	FII
D	Improved quality and safety of food at all stages of the food chain	AG
D01	New and revised internationally agreed standards and recommendations for food safety and quality that serve as the reference for international harmonization	AGN
D02	Institutional, policy and legal frameworks for food safety/quality management that support an integrated food chain approach	AGN
D03	National/regional authorities are effectively designing and implementing programmes of food safety and quality management and control, according to international norms	AGN
D04	Countries establish effective programmes to promote improved adherence of food producers/businesses to international recommendations on good practices in food safety and quality at all stages of the food chain, and conformity with market requirements	AGN
E	Sustainable management of forests and trees	FO
E01	Policy and practice affecting forests and forestry are based on timely and reliable information	FOM
E02	Policy and practice affecting forests and forestry are reinforced by international cooperation and debate	FOE
E03	Institutions governing forests are strengthened and decision-making improved, including involvement of forest stakeholders in the development of forest policies and legislation, thereby enhancing an enabling environment for investment in forestry and forest industries. Forestry is better integrated into national development plans and processes, considering interfaces between forests and other land uses	FOE
E04	Sustainable management of forests and trees is more broadly adopted, leading to reductions in deforestation and forest degradation and increased contributions of forests and trees to improve livelihoods and to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation	FOM
E05	Social and economic values and livelihood benefits of forests and trees are enhanced, and markets for forest products and services contribute to making forestry a more economically-viable land-use option	FOE
E06	Environmental values of forests, trees outside forests and forestry are better realized; strategies for conservation of forest biodiversity and genetic resources, climate change mitigation and adaptation, rehabilitation of degraded lands, and water and wildlife management are effectively implemented	FOM
F	Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture	NR
F01	Countries promoting and developing sustainable land management	NRL
F02	Countries address water scarcity in agriculture and strengthen their capacities to improve water productivity of agricultural systems at national and river-basin levels including transboundary water systems	NRL
F03	Policies and programmes are strengthened at national, regional and international levels to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity for food and agriculture and the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources	NRD
F04	An international framework is developed and countries' capacities are reinforced for responsible governance of access to, and secure and equitable tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources, with particular emphasis on its contribution to rural development	NRC

<b>Code</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Lead Unit</b>
F05	Countries have strengthened capacities to address emerging environmental challenges, such as climate change and bioenergy	NRC
F06	Improved access to and sharing of knowledge for natural resource management	OEK
G	Enabling environment for markets to improve livelihoods and rural development	ES
G01	Appropriate analysis, policies and services enable small producers to improve competitiveness, diversify into new enterprises, increase value addition and meet market requirements	
G02	Rural employment creation, access to land and income diversification are integrated into agricultural and rural development policies, programmes and partnerships	ESW
G03	National and regional policies, regulations and institutions enhance the developmental and poverty reduction impacts of agribusiness and agro-industries	
G04	Countries have increased awareness of and capacity to analyse developments in international agricultural markets, trade policies and trade rules to identify trade opportunities and to formulate appropriate and effective pro-poor trade policies and strategies	EST
H	Improved food security and better nutrition	ES
H01	Countries and other stakeholders have strengthened capacity to formulate and implement coherent policies and programmes that address the root causes of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition	ESA
H02	Member countries and other stakeholders strengthen food security governance through the triple-track approach and the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security	ESA
H03	Strengthened capacity of member countries and other stakeholders to address specific nutrition concerns in food and agriculture	AGN
H04	Strengthened capacity of member countries and other stakeholders to generate, manage, analyse and access data and statistics for improved food security and better nutrition	ESS
H05	Member countries and other stakeholders have better access to FAO analysis and information products and services on food security, agriculture and nutrition, and strengthened own capacity to exchange knowledge	ESA
I	Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies	TC
I01	Countries' vulnerability to crisis, threats and emergencies is reduced through better preparedness and integration of risk prevention and mitigation into policies, programmes and interventions	TCE
I02	Countries and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture-related interventions	TCE
I03	Countries and partners have improved transition and linkages between emergency, rehabilitation and development	TCE
K	Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas	ES
K01	Rural gender equality is incorporated into UN policies and joint programmes for food security, agriculture and rural development	ESW
K02	Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender and social equality issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes, projects and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other relevant information and resources	ESW
K03	Governments are formulating gender-sensitive, inclusive and participatory policies in agriculture and rural development	ESW

<b>Code</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Lead Unit</b>
K04	FAO management and staff have demonstrated commitment and capacity to address gender dimensions in their work	ESW
L	Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development	TC
L01	Greater inclusion of food and sustainable agriculture and rural development investment strategies and policies into national and regional development plans and frameworks	TCI
L02	Improved public and private sector organisations' capacity to plan, implement and enhance the sustainability of food and agriculture and rural development investment operations	TCI
L03	Quality assured public/private sector investment programmes, in line with national priorities and requirements, developed and financed	TCI

**Box 5      FAO Strategic Objectives 2014-17**

1	Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition
2	Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner
3	Reduce rural poverty
4	Enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national and international levels
5	Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises
Objective 6	Technical quality, knowledge and services

**Box 6      FAO Functional Objectives 2014-17**

8. Outreach
9. Information Technology
10. FAO Governance, oversight and direction
11. Efficient and effective administration

**Box 7      FAO Core Functions 2010-13 and 2014-17**

Core functions 2010-13		Core functions 2014-17	
a	Monitoring and assessment of long-term and medium-term trends and perspectives		
b	Assembly and provision of information, knowledge and statistics	2	Assemble, analyze, monitor and improve access to data and information, in areas related to FAO's mandate
c	Development of international instruments, norms and standards	1	Facilitate and support countries in the development and implementation of normative and standard-setting instruments, such as international agreements, codes of conduct, technical standards and others
d	Policy and strategy options and advice	3	Facilitate, promote and support policy dialogue at global, regional and country levels
		4	Advise and support capacity development at country and regional level to prepare, implement, monitor and evaluate evidence-based policies, investments and programmes
e	Technical support to promote technology transfer and build capacity	5	Advise and support activities that assemble, disseminate and improve the uptake of knowledge, technologies and good practices in the areas of FAO's mandate
f	Advocacy and communication	7	Advocate and communicate at national, regional and global levels, in areas of FAO's mandate
g	Inter-disciplinarity and innovation		
h	Partnerships and alliances	6	Facilitate partnerships for food security and nutrition, agriculture and rural development, between governments, development partners, civil society and the private sector

**Box 8      FAO cross-cutting themes 2014-17**

Gender
Governance

#### **Annex 4 Questionnaires for National Project Coordinators and National Technical Officers**

##### *Mid-term Evaluation of REBYC II CTI Project (Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch Management")*

##### **Questions for National Project Coordinators**

1. The Project has had a very slow start and has at the time of the mid-term evaluation just started operations on national level. What are in your opinion the most important bottlenecks for an efficient project implementation?
2. FAO is responsible for the Project in collaboration with SEAFDEC, with National Project Coordinators in charge of national activities, supported by National Project Officers and National Working Groups and Consultative Councils on local level. What is your opinion about the efficiency and effectiveness of the institutional arrangements? Would any other arrangement suit the conditions in your country better?
3. Is the project design, in your view, optimal to address the main issues facing the trawl fisheries in your country?
4. The project emphasizes the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management? Is this concept in line with policies and strategies in your country?
5. The project also pays attention to stakeholder participation and public-private collaboration for the development of management plans for the trawl fisheries. Are there structures in place in your country for this level of participation of stakeholders?
6. Which are the main achievements so far?
7. Which is the most important outcome you expect of the project? Which components should the project focus on during the last two years of operation?
8. Would you like to draw the attention of the evaluation to any other issues?

##### *Mid-term Evaluation of the Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch*

##### **Management Project (REBYC II CTI)**

##### **Questionnaire for National Technical Officers**

1. Name, position

##### *Planning, preparation*

2. Did you or your departmental colleagues have any inputs to or were you consulted in the preparation of the project? Were you involved in the selection of pilot sites?
3. How much participation was there in the preparation of the national work plan?

##### *Bycatch as an issue*

4. Does your country have any policies or laws/regulations addressing bycatches? How? Which aspects of bycatch are addressed?

##### *Relevance of the project*

5. Is the project as formulated relevant for the bycatch problems/issues in your country? Can you rank the four project components on a scale from 1 (irrelevant) to 5 (highly relevant) in terms of importance?
6. How relevant is the project Outcome, collaboration between the public and private sector, to your country's bycatch issues?

*Efficiency and Operational and Institutional Issues*

7. The project has had an overall slow start and implementation is delayed. What is your understanding of the reasons for the delays?
8. Do you get technical and operational guidance from the Regional Coordination Unit? What about technical or scientific information from this unit or FAO?
9. How important is SEAFDEC in the implementation of the project?
10. Are there other partners on a regional level which are important?

*Stakeholder participation*

11. Is the National Working Group functional and supporting and guiding the implementation of the project? Who are the members?
12. Have the Consultative Groups for stakeholder participation, or Management Councils, been established? Are they functional? Who are the members?

*Regional dimension of the project*

13. Have you participated in any regional activities (workshop, meeting, training course)?
14. Is the project leading to enhanced regional collaboration on fisheries management?

*Effectiveness*

15. What have been the most important achievements under the project? Which components are the most challenging?
16. Will you be able to conclude the planned activities and achieve the outputs in time?
17. EAFM is regarded by the Regional Coordination Unit, FAO and SEAFDEC as an important tool to develop provincial/local trawl management plans. In your opinion is EAFM applicable for the project to achieve its outcomes/outputs?

*Gender*

18. The gender dimension is important – is the stakeholder participation gender balanced?
19. In the pilot sites, what activities do women do in the fisheries sector related to bycatch? How will the project affect them?

*Capacity Development*

20. How much has the project strengthened capacity in your country on bycatch issues?

*Bycatch for consumption (UN Principle on Right to Food, including rural employment)*

21. How will the project affect people's consumption of bycatch as food, especially the poor?
22. How will the project aim of bycatch sustainability affect employment in bycatch processing?

*Impacts*

23. Have there been any impacts so far, expected or unexpected, from the project activities?

*Sustainability*

24. Will the successes in your country be sustained into the future? Are there the necessary budget, technical skill and commitment of the stakeholders?



*Future Directions*

25. The project had a slow start and not much was achieved. In the remaining two years what components or activities should be the priorities? Which ones are not so important?
26. What can be achieved during the remaining time of the Project?

*Other matters*

27. Are there other issues you wish to alert us about?

## Annex 5 List of stakeholders interviewed

Name	Position
<b>FAO</b>	
Petri Suuronen	Project Lead Technical Officer, FIRO
Frank Chopin	Senior Fishery Industry Officer, FIRO
Indroyono Soesilo	Director, Fisheries and Aquaculture Resource Use and Conservation Division, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
Susanna Siar	Fishery Industry Officer, FIRO
Barbara Cooney	Senior Programme Officer, GEF Coordination Unit
Blaise Kuemlangan	PTF member, Chief, Development Law Service
Karine Eckstein	PTF member, Associate Legal Officer
Janne Fogelgren	Project Coordination Officer, FIDF
Chris Dirkmaat	Executive Officer, GEF Coordination Unit
Jeffrey Griffin	Environment Officer, Investment Centre
Vili Fuavao	Deputy Regional Representative, RAP
Rick Gregory	Project Regional Coordinator
Simon Funge-Smith	Senior Fishery Officer, RAP
Robert Lee	Fishery Industry Officer, RAP
Weimin Miao	Aquaculture Officer, RAP
Daniele Salvini	Senior Field Programme Officer, RAP
Chongguang Liao	Budget Holder and Field Programme Officer, RAP
Nawarat Chalermkao	Assistant Representative- Programme, Thai Affairs Section, RAP
Rudolf Hermes	Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme Coordinator
Rajendra Aryal	Representative, FAO-Philippines
Aristeo Portugal	Assistant Representative-Programme, FAO-Philippines
Jong Ha Bae	Representative, FAO-Viet Nam
Nguyen Song Ha	Assistant Representative, Programme, FAO-Viet Nam
<b>SEAFDEC</b>	
Chumnarn Pongsri	Secretary-General
Isara Chanrachkij	Project Technical Advisor
<b>Thailand</b>	
Mala Supongpan	NTO, Department of Fisheries
Chintana Nettasan	Law consultant
Suchat Sangchan	NPC, Director of Central Gulf Marine Fisheries Research and Development Center, Department of Fisheries
Piyachoke Sinanun	Fisheries Biologist
Pat Triratuna	Fisheries Biologist, Fisheries Foreign Affairs
<b>The Philippines</b>	
Jonathan O. Dickson	NPC, Chief, Capture Fisheries Division, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Department of Agriculture, Republic of the Philippines
Rafael Ramiscal	NTO, Capture Fisheries Division, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Department of Agriculture, Republic of the Philippines
Juan Albaladejo	Director, Regional Fisheries Office No. VIII
Renato C. Diocton	Assistant Professor, Head, Research & Development & Extension Services, Samar State University, College of Fisheries & Marine Sciences
Marcos Sabido	Technical Working Group (TWG) member, and Guide/Interpreter
Angelica Realino	Fisheries Division Chief-Designate, and TWG member
Elena Sevilla	Council Member, Barangay
Marcelo Camarines Jr.	President, Long-line Fishermen's Association
Napoleon Lamarca	TWG member, Project Technical Staff, BFAR Central Office
Edwin Catarro	Shrimp trawl operator
Apolinario Cattaros, Jr	Shrimp trawl owner
Juan Meniano, Jr.	TWG member, Agricultural Technologist and PAFC-Coordinator
Simon Conejas	Agricultural Technologist, Local Government Unit, Catbalogan City
Ronnie Romero	Researcher, NFRDI
Dionisio Balili	TWG member, PFARMC Chairman, and Member, National Anti-poverty Commission

Apolinario Cataros, Jr.	TWG member, President, Commercial Fishing Boat Operator
Maridel Bulawit	TWG member, Small-scale trawl operator/fish trader
Norberto Berida	TWG member, BFAR-RFTC Training Center Director
Esteban Conchas	TWG member, PAFC Chairman
<b>Viet Nam</b>	
Dao Hong Due	General Director, Department of Capture Fisheries and Resource Exploitation (DECAFIREF), Fisheries Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
Pham Viet Anh	NTO, DECAFIREF
Nguyen Than Thang	Chief, Fisheries Exploitation Division
Nguyen Thi Bich Ngoc	Chief Accountant, DECAFIREF
Nguyen Hoai Hain	Fisheries Resources Division, DECAFIREF
Nguyen Ba Thong	Consultant, data collection
Nguyen Viet Thanh	Consultant
Mr. Trung	Fisheries Information Center
Nguyen Thanh Binh	Interpreter
Quang Trong Thao	Vice-Director, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD), Kien Giang Province
Duong Xuan Trung	Vice-Director, Sub-DECAFIREF
Le Van Tinh	Chief, Planning and Finance Division, DARD, Kien Giang
Le Quang Da	Vice-Chief, Agriculture Division, DARD, Kien Giang
Pham Ngoc Tuan	Vice-Director, DECAFIREF
Mr. Tieng	Vice-Director, Tac Can Port Authority, Kien Giang
Do Van Hung	Chief, Personnel Division, DARD, Kien Giang
Le Van Dep	Chief, Planning Division, DARD, Kien Giang
Mr. Cao	Fishing boat owner, Kien Giang
<b>SFP</b>	
Duncan Leadbitter	
<b>IFFO</b>	
Andrew Jackson	
<b>Survey Respondents</b>	
Nguyen Thi Trang Nhung	Deputy Director, Viet Nam Fisheries Administration, Department of Science, Technology and International Cooperation
Jonathan O. Dickson	Chief, Capture Fisheries Division, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Department of Agriculture, Republic of the Philippines
Ian Liviko	Manager - TRL Lobster/Prawns, Fisheries Management Unit National Fisheries Authority – Papua New Guinea
Mr. Endroyono	NPC, Sub-Directorate of Fishing Gear Design and Appraisal, Directorate General of Capture Fisheries, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia
Imron Rosyidi	NTO, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia
Suchat Sangchan	NPC, Director of Central Gulf Marine Fisheries Research and Development Center, Department of Fisheries

## Annex 6 Project Scoring Matrix

A. Background information														
Project Title:		Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch Management Project (REBYX-II CTI)												
Project Symbol:		GCP/RAS/269/GFF												
Projec Start Date (EOD) (dd/mm/yy)		31/10/2011												
Project NTE (at time of TORs) (dd/mm/yy)		31/10/2015												
Project LTO		Mr. Petri Suuronen, FIRO, FI												
Project Budget (DWH budget at time of TORs):		USD	GEF USD 3 million (co-financing USD 8 million)											
Type of Project:		TCD	x		Emergency									
Type of Evaluation:		Separate		Joint				Programme						
Timing of Evaluation:		Mid-Term	x	Final				Ex-post						
Mission dates in the country (dd/mm/yy)		From:	11/02/2014		30/04/2014									
B. Assessment of the project - Questions and issues that require scoring are intended to read as "assess the degree to which...."														
Item No	Question/Issue					Item included			Scoring*					
						Yes	No	NA/NR	1	2	3	4	5	6
	I. Project Relevance to:													
1	National/regional development priorities, programmes, needs of the population					x							x	
2	FAO Country Programming Framework					x							x	
3	FAO Global Goals, MDGs, Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results (list relevant and score)					x								x
3.1	Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner												x	
4	FAO Core Functions (list relevant and score)													
4.1	Assemble, analyze, monitor and improve access to data and information, in areas related to FAO’s mandate												x	
4.2	Facilitate and support countries in the development and implementation of normative and standard-setting instruments, such as international agreements, codes of conduct, technical standards and others													x
4.3	Advise and support capacity development at country and regional level to prepare, implement, monitor and evaluate evidence-based policies, investments and programmes												x	

4.4	Advise and support activities that assemble, disseminate and improve the uptake of knowledge, technologies and good practices in the areas of FAO's mandate								X	
5	<b>Clarity, robustness and realism of the Theory of Change</b>	X						X		
6	<b>Quality and realism of project design</b>							X		
6.1	Quality of the Logical Framework - validity of indicators, assumptions and risks							X		
6.2	Approach and methodology - stakeholder and beneficiaries identification and analysis							X		
6.3	Duration						X			
6.4	Institutional set-up and management arrangements								X	
	<b>II. Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes</b>									
7	<b>Outputs</b>									
7.1	Extent to which the expected outputs have been produced	X					X			
7.2	Quality of produced outputs								X	
7.3	Timeliness of produced outputs	X					X			
8	<b>Outcomes</b>	X								
8.1	Actual or potential achievement of outcomes	X						X		
9	<b>Feed-back loop for normative - knowledge products</b>									
9.1	Use by the project	X						X		
9.2	Actual or potential contribution	X						X		
	<b>III. Efficiency and Effectiveness of Project Implementation Process</b>									
10	<b>Management and implementation</b>									
10.1	Quality, realism and focus of workplan	X						X		
10.2	Assessment of delivery, causes and consequences of delays and of any remedial measure taken	X						X		
10.3	Monitoring and feed-back loop into improvement management and operations	X						X		
10.4	Staff management	X							X	
10.5	Development and implementation of an exit strategy	X					X			
11	<b>Institutional set-up</b>									
11.1	Admin. and technical support by FAO HQ, regional, sub-reg. and country office	X							X	
11.2	Institutional set-up, internal review processes, coordination and steering bodies	X						X		
11.3	Input and support by the Government/s and resource partners	X						X		
12	<b>Assessment of financial resource management</b>									

12.1	Adequacy and realism of budget allocations to achieve intended results	x					x			
12.2	Adequacy and realism of Budget Revisions in matching implem. needs and prj objectives	x					x			
12.3	Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation and in relation to work-plans	x					x			
	<b>IV. Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles</b>									
13	<b>Gender equality</b>									
13.1	Extent to which gender issues were reflected in prj objectives, design and identif. of beneficiaries	x					x			
13.2	Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in project implementation and management	x					x			
13.3	Extent to which gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative	x					x			
14	<b>Extent and quality of Project/Programme Work on Capacity Development at</b>									
14.1	individual	x					x			
14.2	organizational/institutional	x					x			
14.3	enabling environment	x					x			
14	<b>Analysis of the adoption of the Human-Rights Based Approach</b>	x					x			
15	<b>Design, implementation and effects on results and sustainability of partnerships and alliances</b>	x					x			
16	<b>Analysis of how environmental impacts were taken into consideration and addressed</b>	x							x	
17	<b>Extent of compliance with the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards (emergency projects)</b>			x						
	<b>V. Impact</b>									
18	<b>Actual/potential impact on people</b>	x					x			
19	<b>Actual/potential impact on institutions</b>	x					x			
20	<b>Contribution to FAO SOs and Organizational Outcomes</b>	x							x	
21	<b>Contribution to FAO Core Functions</b>	x							x	
	<b>VI. Sustainability</b>									
22	<b>Technical, economic and social</b>	x					x			
23	<b>Institutional uptake and mainstreaming of newly acquired capacities</b>	x					x			
24	<b>Diffusion among beneficiaries</b>	x					x			
	<b>VII. Overall project performance</b>									
	<b>VIII. Recommendations(not for scoring)</b>									
1	Enhance quality control in the preparation of project documents with a view of having them reviewed in-depth beyond Programme Review Committee requirements, before becoming a management instrument for projects, with emphasis	FAOFisheries Department								

	given to consistency and logic in the Results Framework in line with RBM principles	
2	Ensure that funding for core functions in a project are ensured before initiating activities	FAO FI and TCID
3	Undertake a budget revision to secure funding for full-time services of the PRC to the project for the remainder of its duration and allocate sufficient funds for increased travel by the PRC to the countries and for capacity-strengthening activities in them	BH
4	Ensure that BH functions are adequately resourced with time, cost-recovery mechanisms and the funds available from the project's GEF agency fee, which could be used to support a project assistant. FAORAP is also urged to recruit such a project assistant to be based in FAORAP and with full access to FAO systems	FAORAP and TCID
5	Continue to provide technical support and backstopping to the project, or the necessary resources for it, to ensure that momentum in implementation is maintained and that the main outputs are achieved by the project's end	FIRO and FAORAP technical officers
6	Furnish in-depth and longer-term technical training and facilitation of stakeholder engagement at site-level to the stakeholders for EAFM-based management plan development in order to better ensure that plans are of quality, inclusive of all parties and shared at national level as a model for other sites	Project Team and LTO
7	The project should urgently assess in-depth to what extent socio-economic, including gender, data-gathering has been initiated in each of the countries, and take action to ensure that adequate and relevant data is gathered and analyzed to understand the potential impacts of bycatch reduction on different groups, and incorporate in fisheries management planning	Project Team
8	Explore the possibility of having the project's partner organizations, e.g. regional/international NGOs, regional initiatives and industry organizations, adopt outputs of the project, or parts of them, suited to these partners, to enable the project to focus on its areas of strength	Project
9	Review the priorities proposed by the MTE, base the work planning for the remaining project period on these, and to seek PSC endorsement of a strictly prioritised work plan	Project
10	In consultation with FIRO and the RFU, extend the project up to the end of 2015 (3 months) to allow for the completion of crucial activities	GEF Unit and Project
11	Initiate as early as possible and in consultation with the REFU, FAORAP and PSC, the formulation of a follow-up project with the aim of synthesizing the results from REBY and REBYC-II CTI and implementing fisheries management plans and the institutional and legal changes proposed	FIRO
	<b>IX. Lessons learned (not for scoring)</b>	

Scoring\* 1 very poor; 2 poor; 3 inadequate; 4 adequate; 5 good; 6 excellent