

**Project Evaluation Series**

**Terminal evaluation of project “Climate  
change adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean  
fisheries sector” (CC4FISH)**

**Project code: GCP/SLC/202/SCF  
GEF ID: 5667**

**Annex 4. Template for capturing changes brought about by the project**

To be sent by email, filled in writing and to be returned to sender.

+++++

## Description of changes brought about by the project(s)

If you had to pick three changes that were brought about by the CC4FISH and/or StewardFish project, which would they be? The question is very open, it is your individual opinion of what you consider as the most noteworthy changes that we're after. We'll collate your answers and this will help us design a more structured survey and will be used as a basis for discussion for interviews with key stakeholders. The changes can be either positive or negative, regional, or specific to a country or a category of target groups. They can also be expected or unexpected. If there are more changes than three that you'd like to report on, feel free! Equally, if you struggle to list more than one or two changes, please indicate it to us. Be honest, the point is to learn from what has worked and hasn't, not to judge.

If you would prefer to provide this information in pairs or together as the coordination unit rather than individually, it is fine too.

If we ask for the contributor(s)' name(s) here, it is so that we can follow-up with you individually afterwards, if necessary. Your name will not be associated with any change description in any subsequent steps and outputs of the evaluation.

We've prepared a table (next page) to help you reflect on the changes, and structure your description of each change. Please elaborate and provide more information than what is asked if you wish.

In relation to question 8 in the tables (evidence for the changes), you might want to keep in mind the following while answering (these are only pointers):

### CC4FISH

*If the change falls under the remit of Component 1 (Understanding and awareness of CC impacts and vulnerability) / Intermediate State (IS) 1.1<sup>1</sup>*

- i. How do you know that understanding and awareness was raised? (beyond participation in a workshop). What did the stakeholders do after the assessments and/or workshops that proves they are now ready to take action for adaptation?
- ii. What follow-up was given to the vulnerability assessments? How were the findings disseminated and used? Did some stakeholders, for example, produce newsletters afterwards? Or include information on their website?
- iii. Did fisheries authorities make reference to CC adaptation in speeches? Or organize dedicated meetings afterwards to continue talking on the topic?

*Component 2: Increasing fisherfolk, aquaculturists and coastal community resilience to CC / IS1.2<sup>2</sup>*

- i. Were some groups of actors more able to embrace adaptation technologies than others and take action for greater than adaptation?
- ii. Did the interventions of the project result in greater livelihood resilience for fisherfolks and aquaculturists? If yes, what evidence is there?

---

<sup>1</sup> Increased awareness and understanding of CC impacts and vulnerability applied to the development of sustainable fisheries livelihoods and reduced unsustainable practices.

<sup>2</sup> Actions implemented to develop resilient fisheries in the Caribbean through (i) adoption of climate-resilient technologies and practices, (ii) increased number of appropriate fisheries adaptation activities, (iii) adaptive social security and protection mechanisms accessible to vulnerable fisheries; and Increase in viable value addition opportunities.

*Component 3: Mainstreaming of CCA in multi-level fisheries governance / IS1.3<sup>3</sup>*

- i. What evidence is there that national fisheries institutions have improved their capacity to mainstream CCA in their policies and practices? Did any countries actually revise policies or strategies? Or are new ones being drafted and informed by CCA?
- ii. Do you know of specific policies or strategies where CCA is mentioned? Or of other national CCA policies that make explicit reference to the fisheries sector?
- iii. Did governments elaborate new projects/initiatives based on the acquired capacity and knowledge?
- iv. Were specific working groups (or similar) formed to take further the work of the project?

*Component 4: Project management, M&E, information dissemination and communication / IS1.4<sup>4</sup>*

- i. Have any **best practices** and/or lessons emerged from the project? How have they been used?
- ii. What has been the effect of **multi-country exchanges** organized by the project?

**Your name(s)**

**Description of change 1**

<p><b>Title for change:</b> could you give a short heading to this change (to help us when we collate the information),</p>
<p><b>Would you attribute this change to...</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the CC4Fish project only (100%)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the StewardFish project only (100%)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> both projects (indicate approximately in which proportions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CC4Fish: .....%</li> <li>• StewardFish: .....%</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level</b> (delete as appropriate):</p> <p><b>Global – Regional – Country*</b></p> <p><i>*In which country/ies? .... (delete the ones that don't apply)</i></p> <p><b>Antigua &amp; Barbuda    Dominica    Grenada    St Kitts &amp; Nevis    St Lucia    St Vincent &amp; the Grenadines</b>  <b>Trinidad &amp; Tobago    Barbados    Belize    Guyana    Jamaica</b></p>
<p><b>At which stage of the project did this change happen or become notable?</b> <i>(Indicate the year and/or event).</i></p> <p><b>What evidence for this change is there?</b> <i>(you may expend more on this under point 8)</i></p>

<sup>3</sup> Political and institutional environment is reinforced through: (i) implementation of fisheries policies evidencing consideration of EAF, CCA and DRM issues, (ii) implementation of CCA policies evidencing consideration of the fisheries sector, (iii) improvement in range of and participation in governance arrangements.

<sup>4</sup> Lessons learned and best practices identified from CC4Fish adopted within and beyond the project countries.

<p><b>1. Description of change 1:</b></p> <p>Please write as precisely and factually as you can about the change you observed. Think in terms of <b>who</b> changed (social actor) and estimated number of persons affected (if relevant), <b>what</b> practice/policy etc. changed, <b>when</b> the change occurred, and <b>where</b> the change took place? Give additional facts so an outsider can understand what this change means.</p>	
<p><b>2. This change was ...</b>      <input type="checkbox"/> Expected (i.e. planned as in the prodoc or the Theory of Change)  <input type="checkbox"/> Non-expected</p>	
<p><b>3. You consider this change to be ...</b>      <input type="checkbox"/> Positive      <input type="checkbox"/> Negative</p>	
<p><b>4. You consider this change to be most closely associated with which component of:</b></p> <p><b>- the CC4Fish project?</b> <i>Tick only one component PER PROJECT</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Component 1 (CC awareness)  <input type="checkbox"/> Component 2 (Fisherfolks and aquaculturists' resilience)  <input type="checkbox"/> Component 3 (Mainstreaming)  <input type="checkbox"/> Component 4 (Management and M&amp;E)  <input type="checkbox"/> None (this may be the case if the change happened spontaneously outside of the project influence)</p> <p><b>- the StewardFish project?</b> <i>Tick only one component PER PROJECT</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Component 1 (Organisational capacity)  <input type="checkbox"/> Component 2 (Ecosystem stewardship)  <input type="checkbox"/> Component 3 (Securing livelihoods)  <input type="checkbox"/> Component 4 (Participatory M&amp;E, communication)  <input type="checkbox"/> None (this may be the case if the change happened spontaneously outside of the project influence)</p> <p><i>NB: the component headings are just short-hands for easy reference.</i></p>	
<p><b>5. You consider this change to be, in the longer term...:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very significant    <input type="checkbox"/> Significant    <input type="checkbox"/> Mildly significant      <input type="checkbox"/> Not significant</p> <p><i>Change can be significant if it reflects a new practice, a break-through from old habits, something that is important to a certain stakeholder group, something that is an important step towards your programme long-term goal, number of persons affected, etc.</i></p>	
<p><b>6. To what extent do you consider that the project was responsible for this change?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This change would not have happened without the project's intervention  <input type="checkbox"/> The change was mainly triggered by the project, but other factors were also at play  <input type="checkbox"/> The project had a minor role in bringing about the change (indirect influence)  <input type="checkbox"/> This change would have happened, even without the project's intervention</p> <p>Feel free to elaborate in the space below if you wish.</p>	
<p><b>7. What evidence in support of this statement would you cite?</b></p> <p>Please describe what makes you think that <u>the project(s) was/were instrumental</u> to the change: how do you know that this change was the result (partially, totally, directly, indirectly, intentionally, unintentionally) of the project(s)? Describe in a few sentences what was done by whom, when and where. Be as factual as possible. Do mention other actors and factors also contributed to the change if needed. Add any links to, or references of documents and other sources that can serve as evidence of the project contribution. Please refer to the questions listed in the introduction if necessary.</p>	
<p><b>8. Confidentiality</b></p>	

- This outcome is not confidential and can be used for publishing outside the project(s)
- This outcome is not confidential but the actors in this outcome should be anonymised when publishing the outcome outside the project(s).
- This outcome is confidential: it contains information that can pose a risk to individuals or organisations, and cannot be published outside the project(s).

**To be repeated for change 2, change 3...**

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.