



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations

## **Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch Management Project – GCP /RAS/269/GFF**

*Management response to the mid-term evaluation report*

## 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)

**Strategies for Trawl Fisheries By catch Management REBYC-II CTI  
(GCP/RAS/269/GFF)  
Management Response to Mid Term Evaluation  
June 2014**

## **1 Overall Response to Mid Term Evaluation**

Firstly, the Project would like to thank the Mid-term Evaluation Team for their objective approach to the evaluation and their excellent report and realistic recommendations. The MTE mission took place at a time when project progress was accelerating and this allowed the MTE team to be somewhat optimistic about the future of the project. The Project Team is grateful to the MTE team for choosing to look ahead rather than focusing solely on past issues that had affected project implementation.

The MTE rightly recognises the human resource limitations on the project resulting from the part-time inputs from the PRC, the overburdened BH and LTO, and the national partner inputs under co-financing arrangements. The Project has already taken steps to redress this issue, securing the services of a fisheries officer in FAORAP and hiring a project assistant to help with project administration. Furthermore, the Lead Technical Unit (LTU) has provided additional technical support for the benefit of the project.

Whilst, the project does not have a direct institutional strengthening component, the project team is grateful that the review recognises this shortcoming and acknowledges the important work being done to build capacity in SEAFDEC and the national partners. The Project is also grateful to the MTE team for endorsing the alignment to EAFM principles, for use in its planning frameworks.

The Overall GEF rating of MU (Marginally Unsatisfactory) is considered reasonable and is not contested by the Project. This gives the Project the opportunity to focus on improving this to MS (marginally satisfactory) or higher. The orientation provided by the MTE makes these targets realistic.

The MTE rightly recognises that trawl fisheries continue to pose a real threat to sustainable fisheries and biodiversity in SE Asia and thereby also to the livelihoods and food security of people in coastal communities. So it is encouraging that the final MTE recommendation is that a new project be formulated that will take forward the work carried out by REBYC-I and REBYC-II CTI, perhaps building on the trawl fisheries management plans currently being developed. The MTE team rightly recognises that there is a risk in that the management plans are only formulated at the end of the project. The national and local partners are already looking to secure sustainable funding to implement the EAFM trawl fisheries management plans. However, a new regional project that offers some support to plan implementation would be both timely and welcome.

Pressing social issues in the SE Asian trawl fisheries such as IUU fishing, conflicts, labour (illegal migrants) and safety on fishing boats and in processing plants are making international news with increasing frequency. These issues were generally overlooked in the original project design and also have not been flagged in the MTE report. A new project would hopefully be designed to work on these challenging issues.

## 2 Management response matrix

| Management response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the REBYC-II CTI Project   |  |  |                                   |   | July 2014                               |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Evaluation Recommendation  | Management response<br>Accepted, partially accepted<br>or rejected and comment on<br>the Recommendation  | Management plan  |                                   |   | Further funding<br>required<br>(Y or N) |
|  |  | Action to be taken   | Responsible unit                  | Timeframe                               |   |
| ES12 PAGE 9  |  |  |                                   |   |   |
| 1. Enhance quality control in the preparation of project documents with a view to having them reviewed in-depth beyond Programme and Project review Committee requirements, before becoming a management instrument, with the emphasis given to consistency and logic in the Results Framework in line with RBM principles | Accepted,  | FAO has formulated the new project cycle guidelines and FI's process is in line with these guidelines. FI also ensures that all projects are in line with the new FAO strategic framework. | FAO Fisheries Department          | Starts with formulation of new projects | Insert                                  |
| 2. Ensure that funding for core functions in a project are ensured before initiating activities  | Accepted   | Losing the co-financing for the Project Regional Coordinator is a big lesson learned for us. In future projects we ensure that this post is fully funded prior to implementation.          | FAO Fisheries Department and TCID | Starts with new projects                | Insert                                  |
| 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.  | Partially accepted. The current PRC is not available on a full time basis as he has outstanding commitments with other projects. However increased travel is possible (although the LTU and FAORAP staff are proving additional technical support. | The BH and PRC have already scheduled a budget review for August/September which will reflect in the five country and SEAFDEC work-plans.  | BH                                | Aug/Sep 2014                            | Yes                                     |

| Management response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the REBYC-II CTI Project   |   |   |                          |                                 | July 2014  |
|--|---|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation Recommendation  | Management response<br>Accepted, partially accepted<br>or rejected and comment on<br>the Recommendation | Management plan   |                          |                                 | Further funding<br>required<br>(Y or N)  |
|  |   | Action to be taken  | Responsible unit         | Timeframe                       |  |
| ES12 PAGE 9  |   |   |                          |                                 |  |
| 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 | Accepted  | Project Assistant (50% of his time), hired July 1 <sup>st</sup> 2014 for an initial period of half year in 2014.  | FAORAP and TCID          | 1 <sup>st</sup> July 14 onwards | The assistant is hired with the project fund for operation for late 2014. RAP may consult with TCI in case GEF agency fee is required for the year 2015. |
| 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.  | Accepted  | FIRO and FAORAP technical officers will provide more support for the project.   | FIRO and FAORAP          | 1 <sup>st</sup> May 14 onwards  | Yes the backstopping missions would need additional financial resources if the GEF agency fee is not enough to cover the missions.                       |
| 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 the plans are of quality, inclusive of all parties and shared at national level as a model for other sites.  | Accepted. This has been a weakness in the project to date.  | Increased technical support from FAORAP, PRC, LTU and Project technical staff planned for all countries during the EAFM management plans, (or equivalent) development processes.<br><br>Regional workshop to review plan status will be held in early 2015. | The project team and LTO | July – Dec 14                   | No   |

| Management response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the REBYC-II CTI Project   |  |  |                       |                 | July 2014  |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Evaluation Recommendation  | Management response<br>Accepted, partially accepted<br>or rejected and comment on<br>the Recommendation  | Management plan  |                       |                 | Further funding<br>required<br>(Y or N)  |
|  |  | Action to be taken   | Responsible unit      | Timeframe       |  |
| ES12 PAGE 9  |  |  |                       |                 |  |
| 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 analysed to understand the potential impacts of bycatch reduction on different groups, and incorporate in fisheries management planning. | Accepted. Previously, national partners had focused more on technical and biological issues and not focused so much on understanding stakeholder issues,                                     | <p>A FIRO socio-economist attended the regional planning workshop to develop national plans for 2014-2015.</p> <p>All national work-plans now have a 'human well-being' component that is aimed to focus minds on socio-economic issues. Several of the plans include socio-economic studies of the stakeholders involved in trawl fisheries. Technical support from a FIRO socio-economist will continue.</p> | The project team      | June 14 onwards | Yes, the backstopping missions to the partner countries would need additional financial resources if the GEF agency fee is not enough to cover these missions. |
| 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.  | Accepted. To date the Project has not made the most of opportunities for engagement with the private sector and NGOs. A stronger and proactive engagement with key partners is now required. | <p>Discussions held with Sustainable Fisheries Partnership in June 2014 and there is strong possibility of collaboration at the REBYC project field site in Kien Giang, Vietnam.</p> <p>Increased level of engagement with the Thai Fishmeal Round-table group and its members.</p>  | The project (LTO/RFU) | June – Dec 2014 | No   |

| Management response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the REBYC-II CTI Project  |   |  |                                   |                | July 2014                               |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|
| Evaluation Recommendation   | Management response<br>Accepted, partially accepted<br>or rejected and comment on<br>the Recommendation | Management plan  |                                   |                | Further funding<br>required<br>(Y or N) |
|   |   | Action to be taken   | Responsible unit                  | Timeframe      |   |
| ES12 PAGE 9   |   |  |                                   |                |   |
| 9. Review the priorities proposed by the MTE (Section 7.1), base the work planning for the remaining project period on these, and to seek PSC endorsement of a strictly prioritised work plan | Accepted.   | Section 7.1 of the MTE was presented and discussed at the regional planning workshop to develop national plans for 2014-2015. National work-plans now reflect MTE priorities. The PSC endorsed the work-plans in May 2014. However, the proposed low priority for work associated with BRDs was discussed in depth at regional workshops, and three countries; Vietnam, Thailand and PNG would like to continue this type work in their work plans for 2014-2015 as a way of demonstrating the benefits of improved trawl selectivity to the fisheries sector. | The project (RFU/LTO/BH)          | May 14 onwards | No                                      |
| 10. In consultation with FIRO and the RFU, extend the project up to the end of 2015 (by 3 months) to allow for the completion of crucial activities.  | Accepted  | The no-cost extension is also supported by the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PSC meeting held in Ho Chi Minh City on 29 May 2014. The extension will be proposed together with the planned budget revision in August/September 2014.   | The GEF Unit and the project, RAP |                | No                                      |

| Management response to the Mid-Term Evaluation of the REBYC-II CTI Project  |   |                    |                  |           | July 2014                               |
|---|---|--------------------|------------------|-----------|---|
| Evaluation Recommendation   | Management response<br>Accepted, partially accepted<br>or rejected and comment on<br>the Recommendation | Management plan    |                  |           | Further funding<br>required<br>(Y or N) |
|   |   | Action to be taken | Responsible unit | Timeframe |   |
| ES12 PAGE 9   |   |                    |                  |           |   |
| 11. Initiate as early as possible and in consultation with the RFU, FAORAP and PSC, the formulation of a follow-up project with the aim of synthesizing the results from REBYC and REBYC-II CTI and implementing the fisheries management plans and the institutional and legal changes proposed. | Accepted  |                    | FIRO             | June 2015 |   |