

Project Evaluation Series

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

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

Annex 3. Evaluation matrix

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rome, 2021

The following table presents the main evaluation questions and sub-questions. Additionally, the Evaluation Team had developed questions per each project component. A more detailed version of the Evaluation Matrix is available for consultation upon request, in Excel format.

Questions derived from Results framework	Relevant documents	Key informants
Relevance (rating required)		
10 Congruence. Are the project results and achievements congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies; environmental priorities and the FAO Country Programming Frameworks in the six project countries?	GEF strategy documents FAO Country Programme Framework FAO EAF and CCRF documents	FAO regional office (child projects)
11 Changing context Has there been any change in the relevance of the project since its design , such as new national policies, plans or programs that affect the relevance of the project objectives and goals? If yes, are there any changes that need to be made to the project to make it more relevant?	National fisheries policy and legislation	Child project coordinator
12 Key issues in fisheries management. Have the project results and achievements addressed key issues that constrain or facilitate sustainable fisheries management - as perceived by a broad range of fishery scientists, economists and sociologists; and by stakeholders on the ground targeted in the "child projects"?	See also the technical Evaluation Questions	GPP coordinator, Child project coordinators and technical staff
Effectiveness - achievement of project results (rating required)		
13 Outcomes and objective. To what extent have the project outcomes and its objective to <i>"Enhance multi-state cooperation and catalyse investments to foster sustainable fisheries, restore and protect coastal habitats, and reduce pollution of coasts and large marine ecosystems"</i> been achieved to date, and how effective was the project in achieving them? (The MTE can regard this question to the extent possible, considering project's progress to date.)	PIRs; Project and programme communications and publications	GPP coordinator; Child project coordinators and technical officers
14 (Component 1) coordination and adaptive management		
a. Has the project been able to, through strengthened coordination and adaptive management for the Coastal Fisheries Initiative, establish the institutional structures and methodological tools required for the efficient implementation, monitoring an evaluation of the CFI Program in general and the Global Partnership Project in particular?	Reports by GCU to GSC PIRs Workshop reports	GPP coordinator and admin officer Representative staff from all implementing and partner agencies; Lead administrative staff from all child projects
b. How effective has these been? See also Q1 and 2		
15 (Component 2) Promotion of Policy Influence and Catalytic Role: Have knowledge management and outreach strategies, aimed at improving the broad sharing of information and knowledge among coastal fisheries as well as explicitly extending the communication outside of the CFI's geographic scope been implemented? (see also Q6 and Q9)	annual workshops; progress reports; knowledge and communications strategy	GPP Coordinator; leaders/coordinators of all subsidiary projects; GPP LTO; GPP communications officers

Questions derived from Results framework	Relevant documents	Key informants
16 (Component 3) Fisheries Performance assessment		
a. Has a Fisheries Performance Assessment Instrument been developed and established?	FPAT website and FAO e-learning portal; Background scientific literature on fisheries and sustainability assessment	GPP LTO GPP coordinator; Coordinators of child projects
b. To what extent has the project, to date, provided technical support for the wide adoption of the Instrument, allowing for an effective coverage of the environmental, social and economic impacts of coastal fisheries?	As above + Other international organisations and fora promoting sustainable fisheries	As above + LTO for each child project Leaders of other sustainable fishery initiatives globally
c. How have the CFI partners, academic and research networks been involved in this process?	workshop reports	LTO, CFI partners, leading fishery scientists globally (global reference group)
d. Is there any evidence as yet that the instrument has, or will, contribute to more sustainable coastal fisheries?	CFI workshop report; Project PIRs	Child project coordinators and or technical officers and local partners
17. Effectiveness of partnership arrangements: this project is a partnership between the donor (GEF), FAO, UNDP, the World Bank, the WWF, Conservation International, UNEP, and the University of Washington (USA), as well the governments of the six project countries.	CFI framework document; GPP project document	Representatives of implementing partners
a. Are these partnerships operating successfully to date in the project countries as well as at the global level?	Joint outputs and publications	Above plus: Partner representatives in project countries or regions
b. What are the strengths and challenges of the project's partnerships?		Above plus: Partner representatives in project countries or regions
18. Unintended results. Are there any unintended results to date?	Media	GPP and child project coordinators
19. Likelihood of impact Are there any <i>barriers or other risks</i> that may prevent future progress towards and the eventual achievement of the objectives of this project (with a view of the goals of the Coastal Fisheries Initiative as a whole)?	Fisheries management literature and guidance Sustainability literature	GPP coordinator, LTO Child project coordinators and technical advisors; Global reference group (!)
Efficiency (rating required)		
20 To what extent has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and management been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation? How satisfactory is the project's expenditure rate to date?	Project implementation plans and budgets	GPP Coordinator and admin officer Child project coordinators and/or admin officers
21 Building on previous initiative.		
a. To what extent has the project built on existing agreements, initiatives, etc., and avoid duplication of similar activities of other groups?	Programme Framework and project documents; Global fisheries sustainability assessment, promotion initiatives and frameworks	Global reference group, or the constituency of relevant scientists and fisheries managers, including FAO fisheries scientists

Questions derived from Results framework	Relevant documents	Key informants
b. What steps has the project taken to maximize synergies and eliminate overlaps between its own "child" projects?	Global workshop reports	GPP coordinator
Sustainability (rating required)		
22. Exit strategy Does the project include provisions to sustain its results and benefits (i.e. an exit strategy) and are these provisions being implemented?	Project documents; global stakeholders	child project leaders; global reference group or equivalent.
23. Risks What are the key risks that may affect the sustainability of the project results and benefits (i.e. financial, socio-economic, institutional and governance, and environmental)?	Project documents	GPP; child project leaders; global reference group or equivalent
Factors affecting progress (rating required)		
24 Project design		
a. Is the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes?	project documents, TOC and results framework	GPP coordinator; Child project leaders; Technical officers and advisors
b. Is the logic coherent and clear and are the theories of change of the "child" projects aligned to the overall goals of the programme?	project documents, TOC and results framework	GPP coordinator, LTO
c. To what extent are the project's objectives and components clear, practical and feasible within the timeframe?	project documents, TOC and results framework	GPP coordinator, LTO
d. Did the project identify capacity needs , especially at the regional, national institutional and local levels, as appropriate?	project documents, TOC and results framework; inception workshop report	GPP coordinator; Child project leaders; Technical officers and advisors
25 Project execution and management		
a. Partners To what extent did the project execution partners (particularly at the global level) effectively discharge their roles and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?	GSC minutes; PIRs	GPP coordinator; representatives of partners
b. What have been the main challenges in relation to the management and administration of the project and what changes are needed to improve delivery in the second half of the project?	GSC minutes	GPP coordinator; representatives of partners
26 Financial management and co-financing		
a. What have been the challenges related to the financial management of the project	Annual action plans and budgets	GPP coordinator, GPP administrator, project administrators
b. to what extent has the pledged co-financing been delivered?	Programme budget; Annual action plans and budgets	GPP coordinator, GPP administrator, project administrators
27 Project oversight, Implementing Agency role		
a. To what extent has FAO delivered on project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation, approval and start-up, oversight and supervision?	Workshop reports, project documents	Partner representatives
b. In particular, how effective have been the Global Reference Group, the Global Steering Committee and the Global Coordination Unit?	Minutes of GCU; GSC; GRG	Representatives of Global Reference Group, the Global Steering

Questions derived from Results framework	Relevant documents	Key informants
		Committee and the Global Coordination Unit
28 Partnerships and stakeholder engagement		
a. What has the nature and extent of involvement of the main project partners	project documents; workshop reports	GPP coordinator; representatives of partners
b. What has the nature and extent of involvement of other stakeholders' involvement and associated challenges and outcomes.	project documents; workshop reports; PIRs	GPP coordinator; GRG members; child project leaders
c. What has been the effect of their involvement/non-involvement on the project results?	workshop reports, PIRs	GPP coordinator; child project leaders
29 Communication and knowledge management (see also Q6)		
a. How effective has the project been in consolidating, communicating and promoting its key messages and results to partners, stakeholders and a general audience?	Programme publications, websites, tools, meeting reports	Global Reference Group; partner representatives; child project leaders
b. How can this be improved?		Communications officer; partner representatives; GRG
c. What knowledge activities and products have been utilized in this project.	programme publications; workshop reports	GPP coordinator, Child project leaders and local partners
30. M&E design and implementation (see also Q 1&2)		
a. Is the M&E plan practical and sufficient?	Programme document; project document; TOC; M&E plan if available	GPP coordinator, child project leaders; GPP and project admin officers
b. Does the M&E system operate as per the M&E plan?	Programme document; project document; TOC; M&E plan if available	GPP coordinator, child project leaders; GPP and project admin officers
c. Has the project been monitored effectively and efficiently?	Programme document; project document; TOC; M&E plan if available	GPP coordinator, child project leaders; local partners; GPP and project admin officers
Cross-cutting dimensions		
31 Gender and minority groups)		
a. To what extent were gender considerations taken into account in designing and implementing the project (i.e. did the project conduct a gender analysis, as planned)?	programme and project documents; workshop reports; gender strategy	GPP coordinator and programme partners
b. Were women able to gain equal benefits from the project's activities?	PIRs, Workshops	local partners
c. Overall, what is the progress on gender-responsiveness measures?	PIRs, Workshops	
32 Environmental and social safeguards. To what extent were environmental and social concerns, including considering the effects of the project on the most vulnerable local populations, been taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the project?	NA to Global project?	NA to Global project?

Questions derived from Results framework	Relevant documents	Key informants
Technical Evaluation Questions		
Overfishing. Is overfishing (in terms of effort or capacity) of the community/target stock a problem at child project sites or areas?	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
Bycatch. Is indiscriminate catching of bycatch species, or juveniles a problem in the focus fisheries?	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
Destructive gear Does the fishing gear being used negatively affect the wider environment (eg damage to substrate, accidental catch etc)	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
Equity Are there social, economic or equity issues in the prosecution of the child projects fisheries or in the value chain?	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
MPA displacement Is the possible impact of marine protected area designation in terms of displacing possibly damaging fishery effort to other areas, or the short term negative socio-economic impacts of MPA designation being taken into account in the child projects.	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
Understanding and prioritising the issues. Are fishers, fish processors government officers and other stakeholders aware of these problems and keen to find collaborative solutions?	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
Baseline assessment. Have these issues been explored or analysed during project and programme inception (eg through a baseline governance analysis?)	Child project documents; previous fishery assessments	Child project leaders and technical advisors
Programme level response. What is the programme, and the GPP doing to help address these issues?		
Fisheries Performance Assessment		
a. Timely application of FPAI. Will the FPAT be ready in time to help address these issues within the programme timeframe, and if not what other actions is GPP taking to facilitate child projects to address these issues.	FPAI website and e-learning portal; annual workshop reports	FPAT development partners; LTO; Child project leaders and technical advisors
b. Child project stakeholder engagement in FPAI development. Is the FPAT being informed by experience in tackling these issues on the ground rather than vice versa.?	FPAI website and e-learning portal; annual workshop reports	FPAT development partners; Child project leaders and technical advisors
c. Milestones for sustainable fishery management. Has the programme considered defining in simple terms the key features of a sustainable fishery management system which would serve as targets or milestones for the child project target fisheries?	FPAI website and e-learning portal; annual workshop reports	GPP leader, LTO; FPAT development partners;
d. Coordination. What will be the relationship between the FPAT and other similar tools such as MSC, Fishery improvement plans (FIPs). Does it complement or improve on other fisheries performance assessment instruments such as the MSC assessment framework?	FPAI website and e-learning portal; annual workshop reports	GPP leader, LTO; FPAT development partners; GRG or equivalent
Knowledge product strengthening. To what degree have new knowledge products enhanced,	FPAI website and e-learning portal; annual workshop reports	Implementing partners; child project technical advisors. GRG

Questions derived from Results framework	Relevant documents	Key informants
complemented or replaced previous products, such as EAF toolkit and Guidance for small scale fisheries?		

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.