

Evaluation of Fisheries for Food Security Program MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Initiative Summary

Initiative Name	Fisheries for Food Security Program (the Program)		
AidWorks initiative number	INJ589		
Commencement date	19 November 2010	Completion date	November 2015
Total Australian \$	9,578,105		
Total other \$	N/A		
Delivery organisation(s)	Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystems (FAME) Division		
Implementing partner(s)	Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)		
Country/Region	Pacific		
Primary sector	Fisheries		
Initiative objective/s	To engage with and support a sustainable, well governed, effective and efficient regional organisation [SPC FAME] that works towards improving food security in Pacific Island Countries and Territories through: lifting fisheries productivity, improving rural livelihoods and building community resilience from the sustainable management of fisheries.		
Initiative Description	<p>The Program enhances SPC FAME's core capabilities and targeted project priorities. The Programs seven components are aligned to SPC FAME's Strategic Plan and support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scientific data and advice for the large scale oceanic tuna resources, artisanal resources (of high importance to food security) and deepwater snapper (a niche industry in a limited number of countries); • planning and technical support for aquarium fisheries (a niche industry in a limited number of countries) and mariculture and aquaculture (with some growth opportunities across the region); and • export assistance for marine products. 		

Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Objective:

a) to assess the Program's progress to date against DFAT's evaluation criteria (including ratings), and to recommend changes to strengthen performance in the second half of the planned Program. This assessment should include consideration of the Program's mid-term impacts, design, management and implementation issues, and any contract variations necessary to give effect to recommended changes.

b) to identify options and make recommendations on future directions of support to SPC FAME.

Evaluation Completion Date: 10 January 2014

Evaluation Team: Bruce Chapman (Team Leader), Joe Stanley (independent consultant) and Brianna Page (DFAT Evaluation Manager)

DFAT's response to the evaluation report

- DFAT found the quality of the report to be of a very high standard. The report was comprehensive and well written. The author willingly participated in the peer-review and incorporated many of the comments and suggestions that were made during the process.
- Overall, DFAT's response to the findings and recommendations is that they are reasonable, well connected to evidence, and achievable for the Program to implement.
- This Program will continue for the length of its term (November 2015), and then on recommendation from the mid-term review, DFAT will consider shifting its approach to core funding, rather than project funding, to enable SPC FAME to demonstrate stronger strategic management of all available resources.

DFAT's response to the specific recommendations made in the report

Recommendation	Response	Actions	Responsibility
1. That there should be an explicit focus on Program/Component objectives and outcomes in the annual planning process	Partially Agree Our funding is relatively seamless with SPC FAME's core business, which is a positive. But we do agree that linking funding to outcomes is sensible.	SPC FAME to explicitly plan for the PFFSP objectives during annual work planning processes	SPC FAME
2. That FAME review the M&E framework to ensure that it is useful as a management tool through: a) Reviewing component outcome statements and performance measures to ensure that they are relevant (in light of progress to date and increased flexibility under the Australian Government funding envelope) and follow a consistent approach; b) Reviewing data relating to performance indicators as part of the annual work planning process; c) Developing a slimmed down version of the M&E matrix that focuses on outcomes and indicators at Program Component level.	Agree The M&E is historically not SPC FAME's strength. There need to be useful indicators that are linked to measurable, accessible data so that we can better describe the good work being done by SPC FAME.	DFAT to work with SPC FAME to re-work the high-level food security objectives and to create a useful M&E Framework. DFAT will reconsider funding reallocations for the programs M&E.	DFAT with SPC FAME and SPC Corporate

<p>3. That FAME reviews the budget allocations for the term of the Program and discusses with DFAT changes that may be appropriate to improve delivery or reflect changing priorities.</p>	<p>Agree DFAT is happy to make contract amendments to reflect changing priorities or needs to ensure that the money is being spent in the most effective way possible.</p>	<p>SPC FAME to consult with DFAT section if there are changing priorities which require a contract amendment.</p>	<p>SPC FAME</p>
<p>4. That emphasis be placed on economic and social viability of development activities, in addition to technical considerations.</p>	<p>Agree This should already be in place as it was part of the design. The Review has rightly identified this shortcoming.</p>	<p>SPC FAME to re-visit concept notes and ensure that all socio-economic activities outlined were undertaken and/or reported on, and take steps to improve incorporation of economic and social viability issues in both design and M&E.</p>	<p>SPC FAME</p>
<p>5. That emphasis be placed on compatibility and accessibility across databases, and on data aspects of coastal/artisanal fisheries</p>	<p>Agree The review found a degree of uncertainty existed among beneficiaries (fishery authority officials) about the relationship between different initiatives relating to data; their coverage, role and purpose, capacity for data sharing and compatibility.</p>	<p>SPC FAME to ensure that the database initiatives are clear to the recipients and the most effective and efficient approaches are being taken, including in respect of data compatibility.</p>	<p>SPC FAME</p>

<p>6. That FAME regularly reviews gender disaggregated data on participation of women in its activities and takes appropriate steps to increase the participation of women.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>The formal emphasis on gender so far has been lacking, and more effort needs to be placed in both collecting gender disaggregated data and then <i>using</i> it. We note, however, that gender issues have been addressed in a number of fisheries activities, but in an ad hoc way.</p>	<p>SPC FAME to increase the amount of gender disaggregated data collected, and then use this data to actively ensure women receive equal benefit from the program.</p>	<p>SPC FAME</p>
<p>7. That DFAT consider future support in the form of core funding to support SPC FAME core services, subject to appropriate in-house project management and Monitoring and Evaluation systems.</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p> <p>DFAT feels that increased core funding to the FAME division of SPC would increase their flexibility to adapt to emerging priorities, whilst maintaining sound core services. DFAT feels, and the mid-term review supports, that many of the projects supported in this Program should be considered as core services, and funded as such.</p>	<p>DFAT to consider this at the end of the Program, subject to funding availability.</p>	<p>DFAT</p>
<p>8. That DFAT and FAME should take note of the thematic areas raised by SPC members through the review process.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Several interesting themes regarding the future pressures on food security were raised during the review interviews. These will be useful to consider for future assistance, subject to funding availability.</p>	<p>DFAT and FAME to take note of the issues raised and incorporate them into future design processes, noting that DFAT has a mandate to progress resource, environment and food security issues within the region.</p>	<p>DFAT and SPC FAME</p>