

**Project Evaluation Series**

**Terminal evaluation of  
Global Sustainable Fisheries Management  
and Biodiversity Conservation in the  
Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction**

**ABNJ Tuna Project**

**Project code: GCP/GLO/365/GFF  
GEF ID: 4581**

**Annex 3. Case study: Certificate IV Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance**

# Contents

<b>1. Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Description of the CEFC</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Findings: CD Framework	3
2.2 RLP: supporting technical capacities	5
2.3 RLP: supporting functional capacities	5
<b>3. Other findings</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Relevance	7
3.2 Effectiveness	7
3.3 Efficiency	7
3.4 Impact	8

# 1. Background

1. The ABNJ Tuna project decided to support the Certificate IV Fisheries, Enforcement and Compliance, as an activity under the Output 2.1.3. "Ten G77 National Fisheries offices effectively implement and enforce national and regional MCS measures through training in a new competency-based certification program by 160 national fisheries staff from IOTC/WCPFC regions".
2. The Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance (CFEC) is an accredited course, through University of South Pacific (USP), and was developed to teach the general skills and knowledge required by Monitoring, Compliance and Surveillance (MCS) Officers at the entry-level.
3. In 2011 the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) the idea of the need to reinforce FFA members to improve compliance was growing. In October 2012 a formal training-needs analysis identified the demand for an accredited foundation course for all MCS personnel that provided an introductory overview to MCS activities and the general skills and underpinning knowledge required to undertake a career in MCS.
4. In 2013 FFA started to develop an initial qualification on MCS, to complement the ad-hoc training that the agency and other organizations in the area were doing. FFA began to create the program and looked for the University of South Pacific (USP) to provide the academic credibility and certification. However, USP didn't have the capacities required at the beginning for this training and FFA provided the trainers among its staff or identifying consultants. In 2014 the first CEFC was launched. It was delivered by FFA and Ministry for Primary Industries of New Zealand (MPI) staff with a couple of consultants plus observation and validation by the University of the South Pacific (USP).
5. The CFEC has been delivered through USP since 2014 and has over 120 students graduate across the four cohorts that have been run in this time.
6. This accredited course was coming to reinforce ad-hoc sessions that FFA regularly does and to promote and persuade Governments to pay more attention to MCS officers in terms of career options and to build professional.
7. In October 2015, the second cohort was the last year the CEFC was delivered as four weeks face to face. This session was co-funded by the Global Environment Facility(GEF)/FAO Tuna Project, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand via MPI and the Australia Fisheries Management Authority. The Tuna Project funded all the 16 participants of this cohort. In August 2015, a Letter Of Agreement (LoA) was signed between FAO and FFA for a total amount of US\$ 401,350 to cover the participation of 14 people to the CEFC. According to the reports, total expenses amounted to approximately USD 163,305.88 from a budget of USD 200,000.
8. In November 2016 the format of the training changed. This year was the first that the course was delivered as 12 months online and one week face to face. Through a second LoA, FAO funded 19 students from enrolment to the CEFC (LoA- FAO-FFA November 2016. Amendment 2017 non-cost extension). And, the World Bank funded 20 students.

9. In April 2017, the third cohort was mainly funded by the World Bank, which financed 38 students; however, only 26 students graduated.
10. The last cohort was in June 2018 with funding from the Sweden International Development Agency that funded 26 Students, and World Bank funded 12.
11. The attendees to this training come from all FFA member countries, and have different backgrounds, despite that the most of the participant are fisheries officers from governments, there are also policemen, and RFMO and fisheries observer.

## 2. Description of the CEFC

12. The Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance qualification provides the technical and practical skills and knowledge expected of competent MCS Officers. The programme covers curricula that comply with standards of competency related to demonstrating an understanding of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) Fishery, MCS concepts and legal frameworks. This programme also helps students to apply MCS tools to effective fisheries management and contribute to effective MCS activities as well as operational planning and coordination. Also, students will be able to contribute to regional cooperation's in MCS activities and Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) requirements.
13. To be admitted to the Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance programme, a person shall have: Pass in Year 12 or equivalent with two years field experience; and, Met the mature student criteria with relevant work experience.
14. Since 2016, the length of the program is one year, part-time, with 1-week face-to-face part. The program has four courses with a cost of Fiji 500\$ each, a total of about US\$ 1000 the four modules.

Code	Course Title	Fees (FJD)
CEFC41	Introduction to Fisheries, Governance & legal Frameworks	\$500
CEFC42	Introduction to Fisheries Management	\$500
CEFC43	Operational Planning & Enforcement Processes	\$500
CEFC44	MCS Role and Monitoring Tools	\$500

### 2.1 Findings: CD Framework

15. FAO's Corporate Strategy on Capacity Development introduced a new CD framework that is based on the enhancement of Technical and Functional capacities, which are prerequisites to achieving the three Global Goals of FAO Members, across three dimensions: individual, organizational and the enabling environment.
16. This Framework is the guide of the case study, how the functional and technical capacities were implemented across the three dimensions of Capacity Development: enabling environment, organizations and individuals.
17. The CEFC was addressed to reinforce individuals. Therefore there have been some limitations to analyse the organisational dimension. There is an assumption that the increase in participants capacities will contribute to strengthening organizational capacities.

The results are summarized in the figure below.

**Figure 1: Synthesis of the case study CD framework**

	<b>Individual Dimension</b>	<b>Organizational dimension</b>	<b>Enabling Environment</b>
<b>Technical capacities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased knowledge to support SDG 14: enhance understanding and, therefore, applicability of the different legal and policy framework related to ABNJ issues</li> <li>• Enhanced awareness of the linkages among the different sector involved in ocean governance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased knowledge to support SDG 14: enhance understanding and, therefore, applicability of the different legal and policy.</li> <li>• Participants able to support some changes regarding ocean or seas management in their countries, institutions or organizations because of and after the RLP, very limited however.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to SGD 14.</li> <li>• Aligned FAO's SO4.</li> </ul>
<b>Functional Capacities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited support to the policy and normative work: development of the policy briefs and Communities of practice.</li> <li>• Increased communication among peers in different countries and positions: 77% of the survey respondents have stayed in touch with other participants and share information and documents; Increased and reinforced individual and institutional networking.</li> <li>• 35% of the participants work now in their country delegation.</li> <li>• RLP has been highly useful to improve the participants ABNJ leadership skills that they apply in their daily work.</li> <li>• Participants more aware of the complexity of the ABNJ governance and management, and all different stakeholders involved, and try to linkages among them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution of the BBNJ process: improvement in the richness of the negotiation between ICG 2 and ICG3; countries have stronger and better capacity to participate in international and regional processes for management and coordination of ABNJ activities.</li> <li>• Improvement of the papers, proposal, text, and materials elaborated by the participants' organizations.</li> <li>• Improved collaboration among the countries and institutions of the participants.</li> </ul>	

## 2.2 RLP: supporting technical capacities

18. In the CD Framework, "Technical capacities" refer to capacities that Member Countries need to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Technical capacities correspond to FAO's main areas of work, which are prioritized in its Strategic Objectives. In a sense, the RLP has contributed to SDG 14 "Life below water": conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development"; and is aligned to the FAO's Strategic Objective 4 "make agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and more sustainable" and two cross-cutting themes of the Strategic Framework: Governance and climate change **(individual, organizational and enabling environment dimensions)**.

## 2.3 RLP: supporting functional capacities

19. The FAO CD Framework sustains that four Functional capacities enable countries and (sub)regions to plan, lead, manage and support change initiatives to ensure that technical know-how is embodied in local systems and processes in a sustainable way:

a) Policy and Normative: capacities to formulate and implement policies and lead policy reform;

20. The CEFC is focused on MCS officers, technical staff with no function or role in formulating or lead policy reform. However, 76% of the respondents said that is very true that as a result of his/her participation in the CEFC he/she has promoted and supported changes in processes or priorities regarding MCS activities in his/her organisation. From FFA, the people interviewed said that there had been an improvement of enforcement and compliance with the legal framework of the region. The CEFC has contributed to it, but it is not possible to know to what extent, and probably it would depend on the country **(organisational dimension)**.

b) Knowledge: capacities to access, generate, manage and exchange information and knowledge;

21. According to the survey, more than 50% of the participants in CEFC were experienced MCS officers, 36% with between 5 and 10 years of experience and 15 more than ten years. Despite their experience, the CEFC has supposed a significant improvement of the global and regional framework on MCS (60%), and for another 37%, the improvement has been a lot **(individual dimension)**. The table below is the answer matrix of the question on how useful was the CEFC in contributing to individuals capacities.

In general, how useful was the CEFC programme in contributing to your capacity?	Highly useful	Not very useful	Somewhat useful	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
Broadening my knowledge of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) Fisheries;	98%	0,00%	0%	2%	51	4
Improving my knowledge and understanding on MCS concepts and international, regional and national legal frameworks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) fisheries;	96%	0,00%	2%	2%	49	3,98

In general, how useful was the CEFC programme in contributing to your capacity?	Highly useful	Not very useful	Somewhat useful	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
Increasing my knowledge on monitoring system to identify track IUU fishing;	84%	0,00%	14%	2%	51	3,86
Improving my skills and knowledge required to adopt and apply good governance procedures and practices when undertaking Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) activities.	96%	0,00%	2%	2%	49	3,98
Plan and carry out a safe and well-coordinated vessel boarding and inspection activity;	92%	0,00%	6%	2%	51	3,94

22. For 82% of the respondents, the CEFC contributed in a very important way to improve collaboration among countries, and also among international organizations on IUU and other Tuna fisheries issues. This is also has been identified by the people interviewed **(organizational dimension)**.

23. People interviewed have noted that in the past years the level of engagement of the countries in the region on MCS discussions and implementation has been improved. However, the direct link with this training cannot be proved, there is a significant contribution. FFA claims that they are now receiving better and higher quality reports **(organizational dimension)**.

c) Partnering: capacities to engage in networks, alliances and partnerships;

24. One of the intended results noticed by the people interviewed and the comments to the survey is that because of the CEFC, collaboration among countries has been improved and MCS officers have created an informal network among CEFC participants and colleagues. As an example, 54% of the respondents said that the number of Fisheries related MCS regional cooperation activities have increased after CEFC **(individual and organizational dimension)**.

d) Implementation: management capacities to implement and deliver programmes and projects, from planning to monitoring and evaluation;

25. In general, the CEFC content has well targeted the training needs of the attendants, and almost all of them use the knowledge acquired in their daily work **(individual dimension)**. Officers feel more confident to do their job. If before they were avoiding some of the tasks, now 61% of the respondents have the perception that the number of Fisheries related boarding and inspection activities have increased in their countries after CEFC. However, this evaluation could not find the actual statistics of it, as there is not a compiled database for the region, but for each country.

26. Regarding the number of IUU activities, there is not either compiled date, but the perception of the IUU detected is more heterogeneous, and again it will depend of the country: for 27% of the respondents the number of IUU activities detected has increased, for 31% is lower, for 20% remain the same and a 10% don't know.



### **3. Other findings**

#### **3.1 Relevance**

27. Relevance in supporting MCS needs of the FFA member countries: It was concluded that CEFC4 is highly relevant to the MCS needs of the FFA member states. Although there has been considerable variation in the proportion of graduates from different countries, analysis of the participant numbers show that nearly all member countries have benefited from it. Some member countries such as Fiji have shown a great recognition of the relevance of the programme and have put forward a large number of their staff for training. Fiji has provided 50% of the total participants from Cohorts 1 to 5. Most of the member countries with small MCS operations have also had relatively high proportions of their staff trained. The uptake of places on CEFC from some of the members with MCS employment has not been proportionally as high.
28. According to secondary sources, while some senior staff do not fully recognise the relevance of CEFC, for some countries, the CEFC is crucial. However, until now all participants rely on international funding, none of the countries in the region has yet paid the training for their staff.
29. The CEFC is the first program in the world of this nature. And this is one of the main reason to have been chosen by the Tuna project. The logic was to support the consolidation and further development of the training and with the experience and the lessons learned replicate the certificate in other regions of the world. The CEFC has modules that are pertinent at the global level and others that are regionalized and should be adapted to the legal framework of other regions. There was an FAO consultant in charge of this process, but he was unable to continue it.
30. The CEFC is also relevant to the needs of individuals working in MCS in the Pacific. As collected in the survey and other secondary data, the CEFC is highly relevant to develop and reinforce MCS capacities and skills of individuals that work in related activities, even for those with more than ten years of experience. 90% of the respondents feel more confident working with fisheries MCS activities after the training.

#### **3.2 Effectiveness**

31. The CEFC4 is effective in assuring that participants have acquired the intended knowledge skills and attitude from the course. Being a formal Certificate from an academic institution (USP) the participants are evaluated against a set of competency standards measurably. Currently, FFA staff in conjunction with New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industry and the Australian Fisheries Management Authority are responsible for the face-to-face assessment process for CEFC4, and people that don't meet the standards don't graduate. Therefore, the CEFC4 is also effective as in providing participants with background knowledge on topics such as governance, legal frameworks and fisheries management, with a strong emphasis on the practical application of this knowledge.

#### **3.3 Efficiency**

32. According to the learning review of CEFC 2018: "Putting a monetary cost on the CEFC4 programme is not straightforward since it is made up of various elements, some of which

vary enormously in depending on the country of origin of the participant. For an individual to undertake the four online components (CEFC41, CEFC42, CEFC43 and CEFC44) the current fees are Fiji\$535 per course or a total of Fiji\$2140, which at current exchange rates is equivalent to US\$250/course and a total programme cost of US\$1000. In addition to these fees, there are considerable costs associated with conducting the Assessment week in Suva. In addition to flying non-Fiji based participants and the FFA tutors to Suva they all require accommodation and daily subsistence allowances for the duration of the assessment. Trying to accurately quantify the overall costs per participant for the assessment week proved very difficult. However, a very approximate figure of US\$3000/participant was reached for one of the recent assessment weeks. In the recommendations at the end of the Activity Report for the 2015 CEFC4 training programme, it was stated that 'after the initial three years of scholarship awards, students will be expected to pay for their own studies or be sponsored by their departments'. From the findings of this review, it appears that this is not going to eventuate and for the foreseeable future FFA will continue to find funding to support individuals from Members countries".

### 3.4 Impact

33. Based on primary and secondary sources of information, it is not possible to make any definitive assessment of the level of the direct impact of CEFC4 on Pacific fisheries. Attributing cause and effect between an individual training programme and large-scale changes in MCS across the Pacific is not possible given the complicated and indirect relationship between these variables. However, given the recognised importance of human resource capacity in implementing effective MCS in the regions, and the demonstrated effectiveness of the CEFC4 programme, one can assume that the CEFC4 is having a positive impact on Pacific fisheries. The ongoing need to support the Member countries in developing the capacity of their staff to address the issues related to illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing (IUU), and thus safeguard the long-term sustainability and economic benefits of the tuna fishing industry, cannot be overstated.
34. The importance of this training has been recently recognized during the Special 112th Forum Fisheries Committee Meeting (SFFC112) in October 2019, the FFC, the governing body of the FFA, formally agreed on the relevance of the CEFC, and included in the following statement:

The Committee:

- i. **Supported** the development of Diploma in MCS and the development of Diploma in Advanced Investigation and Prosecution skills for Fisheries Officers;
- ii. **Supported** the contextualization and delivery of a Certificate III or IV in leadership and management for officers managing small teams;
- iii. **Supported** work being done to secure the accreditation of PIRFO Observer courses.