

Project Evaluation Series
[18/2023](#)

Terminal evaluation of the project “Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System”

Project codes: GCP/SFS/480/LDF and
GCP/SFS/480/SCF
GEF ID: 5113

Management response

Terminal evaluation of the project "Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System" - Management response **07/2024**

Evaluation recommendation	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><i>To FAO:</i></p> <p>FAO country offices should have greater involvement in regional projects in which the Sub-regional FAO office is the Budget Holder. This would ensure smooth transition of responsibility for project partnerships from the Sub-regional FAO office to the FAO country offices, given that this is likely to happen after end of regional projects.</p>	Accepted	<p>This would be an FAO sub-regional to FAO national office arrangement. The national FAO offices were regularly informed on the project and its activities were synergized with national FAO projects. Country office colleagues were also involved in technical missions and procurement actions of the BCC that needed support from the FAO. The budget available for involvement of the FAO country offices limited their further involvement. Countries involved in the project would also be encouraged to initiate national FAO-office engagement.</p>	FAO, BCC and recipient countries of the project.		Yes
<p>Recommendation 2.</p> <p><i>To FAO Sub-regional Office and BCC:</i></p> <p>The FAO Sub-regional Office and the BCC should liaise with the Governments of Angola and Namibia about what support they could provide to the two governments in their quest for further financial assistance for continuing and expanding the project activities. This would increase the likelihood for sustainability of project activities after end of the project. For example, Angola sees great benefit for expanding activities to other small-scale fishing communities.</p>	Accepted	<p>Government officials have been involved with implementation of project activities from the start of the project, as a means to ensure sustainability after the end of the project. The BCC did not prepare an exit strategy for the project. The FAO has discussed and prepared national initiatives with the countries and GEF for Angola, Namibia in consideration also of this FAO/BCC project implemented. Project implementation frameworks were prepared for preparatory phases (PPG) with the GEF.</p>	FAO, project recipient countries.		Yes

Terminal evaluation of the project “Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System” - Management response					07/2024
Evaluation recommendation	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 3.</p> <p><i>To FAO and BCC:</i></p> <p>When there are delays in project start or during implementation and a “no-cost extension” is necessary, project activities and outputs need to be carefully re-prioritised without having negative impact on funding for project activities.</p>	Accepted	FAO and BCC supported countries in re-prioritizing project activities and outputs once a no-cost extension is granted, in coordination and collaboration with other projects that were implementing related projects. FAO also provided extensive support in this during the re-design of the project.	FAO, BCC.		No
<p>Recommendation 4.</p> <p><i>To BCC and FAO:</i></p> <p>Key project positions should not be scrapped or left vacant at the expense of efficient project management and implementation. For example, the scrapping of the Financial and Admin, and the Climate Change experts, and the non-replacement of the Communication Officer had negative impact on the project.</p>	Accepted	At the inception stage of the project; the HR budget and positions were revised after careful consideration and consultations based on the budget/salary expectations based on qualifications needed for positions and specific needs in the countries. The position of communication officer could not be refilled based on limited time frame available for project and budget available, without interfering with project implementation activities.	FAO, BCC.		No
<p>Recommendation 5.</p> <p><i>To BCC and FAO:</i></p> <p>The use of a global budget as was the case for Namibia and South Africa sharing the SCCF budget component should be avoided. The allocations for each country should be agreed at the beginning of a project to improve efficiency and avoid misunderstandings.</p>	Accepted	Allocation of regional project budget to be considered /shared (according to distribution of activities) at inception of project.	FAO, BCC.		No

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy