

Mid-term Review

Project number: FIS/2012/074

Project title: Improving Community-based Fisheries Management in Pacific countries

Project leaders:

Commissioned agency: WorldFish

Collaborating agencies: Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Division of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystems (SPC, FAME)
University of Wollongong, Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security (ANCORS)
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD), Kiribati
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Solomon Islands
Fisheries Department, Vanuatu

| Countries involved | Institution | Personnel |
|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| Kiribati | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD) | Kautoa Tonganibeia |
| Solomon Islands | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) | Rosalie Masu |
| Vanuatu | Fisheries Department | Graham Nimoho |
| Pacific regional | Secretariat of the Pacific Community | Moses Amos |
| Australia | University of Wollongong, Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security (ANCORS) | Quentin Hanich |

Review team members:

Name: Professor Neil Loneragan, Murdoch University

Name: Associate Professor Kate Barclay, University of Technology, Sydney

Dates of review meetings: 22-24 September 2015

1. Methodology/approach adopted for review

The reviewers attended a two day project review meeting at the Innovation Campus , University of Wollongong from September 22 to 24, and heard presentations from team members on all the objectives, components and activities of the project. The reviewers were provided with extensive project documentation and publications and all presentations at the review in a shared DropBox folder and hard copy. Prior to the review, the reviewers had discussions with the Project Leader, Dr Neil Andrews, and the ACIAR Fisheries Program Manager, Dr Chris Barlow, to understand some of the questions that they would like

investigated during the review. People from all participating countries attended the review, except Kiribati, where flights were cancelled at the last minute because of poor weather conditions. Associate Professor Quentin Hanich presented information on the progress of the research in Kiribati. During the review, one session was dedicated to breakout discussions on three topics: Theory of Change and integration with the New Song; Potential synergies between the ACIAR PACFish project and the ACIAR Pacific Aquaculture project; and consequences of Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu for project objectives. The reviewers also talked informally with individual team members out of session and reviewed the manuscripts, reports and papers produced thus far in the project.

2. Background

This project is large and complex, operating across three countries (Kiribati, Solomons, Vanuatu) as well as on a regional level (Secretariat of the Pacific Community), involving seven organizations (WorldFish/James Cook University, ANCORS/University of Wollongong, Kiribati MFMRD, Solomon MFMR, Vanuatu Fisheries Department and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community) and a large team. It has also established linkages with NGOs in the different countries to understand the research environment. In CBRM, the project is also tackling some of the most complex questions in fisheries – how to sustainably manage multi-gear and multi-species fisheries and the livelihoods dependent on these fisheries, in data-poor fisheries, with limited human and financial capacities, across large geographical distances, and vastly different institutional and cultural contexts. Moreover, this project is required to dovetail with a related ACIAR project on aquaculture. It is no doubt very challenging to manage this project, and it was somewhat challenging for the reviewers to grasp the varied activities going on in the project and map them onto the objectives for the project. That said, the project team was in a good position to be able to build on the solid foundations of previous work by WorldFish and ANCORS, especially in the Solomon Islands and Kiribati, with established networks in those countries and in the regional organization SPC. The project was also able to capitalize on related work from other projects that was already ‘in the pipeline’ to be able to produce some outputs at the early stage and build on ideas already partially worked through.

The people of Vanuatu and the project team suffered a deep setback following the devastation of Cyclone Pam in March 2015. The project was reoriented for a while to assist with recovery following this cyclone, and is now regrouping to see which of the original objectives can be met and how the activities may be reformulated to maximise the benefits of the research by the end of the project in 2017. Another change to the original project objectives and activities has been necessitated through the development of a regional ‘New Song’ approach by the SPC in early 2015. This approach aims to raise the profile and significance of coastal fisheries in policy dialogues in the Pacific as a critical foundation to development in the region through food security and livelihoods. The New Song was adopted by the Heads of Fisheries and at the Ministerial level in 2015. Some project objectives are being refashioned to align more closely with this change to the policy landscape.

3. Review Executive Summary and Recommendations

The project team has made significant progress in a number of areas and established very good relationships with local communities. These achievements are particularly noteworthy because of the challenges the research faces in working in remote regions with limited infrastructure and difficult logistics, as highlighted by the absence of the people from Kiribati. Overall - great achievements in a complex area. The achievements cross a range of areas including: reviewing major bodies of literature; evaluating theoretical constructs for socio-ecological systems; engaging with women and using gender analysis; and progressing research within the communities of the different countries. The project builds on previous history of involvement of the team in the Solomons and Kiribati, in particular, and highlights the value of deep understanding of culture, regional organisations and NGOs in different countries. Multi-disciplinarity within the project is being handled really smoothly and productively. Because of the understanding and relationships that have been built, the project team has maximised the linkages with other research projects, funding providers and NGOs in the region.

The research in this project spans two major directions; 1) it is engaged and policy-relevant at community, sub-national/provincial, national and regional levels; and 2) it is producing world class theory and scientific publications to spread the knowledge globally and further develop the field of small scale fisheries and community based resource management, including aquaculture. Particularly noteworthy has been the development of community management plans in some locations in Kiribati very early on in the project. The project is possibly a world first in generating practical understandings in researchers, but also in communities and governments of how to bring gender understanding into fisheries and aquaculture processes.

We were impressed with the high calibre of the staff in the project teams, including country staff, and the professionalism and enthusiasm shown by staff in their presentations during the review and the joint publications provided for information. The project is building new capacity in fisheries in the Pacific by employing young people employed on the project and the partner agencies.

The reviewers were somewhat hampered in our ability to assess the achievements of the Kiribati team (Objective 2) due to weather conditions making it impossible for the team to travel to Wollongong for the review. The Kiribati team leader, Assoc. Prof. Quentin Hanich, presented on behalf of the team, and the reviewers had access to some written reports and publications on the Kiribati work. We felt relatively well informed about this work, despite the team not being able to present or discuss their work at the review meeting.

Prior to the formal start of the review, the project leader asked the reviewers to consider two specific aspects of the research: 1. The directions and objectives of the research in Vanuatu, post-Cyclone Pam; and 2 the integration of this project with the ACIAR Aquaculture project. These topics were discussed thoroughly during the breakout session on Wednesday morning and the objectives of these activities were reframed to maximise the potential benefits of the research. The Solomon Island gender work is progressing very well, both in the field and in publications. The Kiribati gender work seems to be also progressing very well in the field, but the participants have not been able to write this up yet. The economics work was touched on only briefly and one of the participants was not present at the review meeting to speak on this topic. However, the planned papers on the economics provide a good framework and direction for summarising this research.

Recommendations for ACIAR

We have no concrete recommendations for ACIAR regarding this project, but some general suggestions for ACIAR's consideration.

Congratulate the project leader and team for the excellent progress they have made on both theoretical understanding and the practical applications to CBRM in the Pacific region. Document and evaluate how the project has managed to achieve such significant progress, despite major challenges of working across different countries and cultures, and in remote regions with limited infrastructure and difficult logistics. The understandings gained from this process are relevant to all ACIAR projects across its programs and countries. Consider aspects of the project that might be extended to maximise the benefits of the research and the progress that has been made.

The progress of the project on many fronts has been very impressive. The conclusions from the discussion sessions on the three topics identified at the workshop, (Theory of Change and the New Song; Vanuatu objectives post-cyclone Pam; and integration with the ACIAR Aquaculture project), and their implications for the objectives and activities in the project, should be documented briefly.

Keep funding ambitious projects like this if the team and the project fit. It pushes the field forward and it develops new leaders with the skills to tackle the complex human and ecological problems involved in small-scale fisheries. Despite the complexity inherent in this approach, the scientific literature indicates that this approach has the greatest chance of addressing sustainability for small-scale fisheries. Without such an approach it seems unlikely that these ecosystems can be maintained at the level required for continued food security and livelihoods in coastal areas in Pacific Islands countries.

Recommendations for the Project Team

We have made five specific recommendations to the Project team below that refer to Objective 3, on the Solomon Islands (Recommendations 1 to 3) and Objective 6, on the design and implementation of an impact assessment framework (Recommendations 4 and 5).

Solomon Islands

1. It is recommended that the Solomon Islands team consider engaging more with the national level for CBRM in the Solomons. We understand the project decided to focus on the Provincial level for Western Province, and had limited engagement with Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) for the FAD portion of the project because the MFMR has little presence in community-based fisheries. However, MFMR is currently developing further capacity for coastal fisheries under the World Bank funded Pacific Regional Ocean Partnerships (PROP), which has some funding for coastal fisheries that the national government would be able to access. It seems important for the knowledge gained about CBRM in this project to inform MFMR plans for the PROP funding, and also explore the potential for PROP funding to further the gains made in CBRM through this ACIAR project.

2. It is recommended that the Solomon Islands team articulate the Malaitan aspects of the project more clearly within the Objective, which specifies Western Province, and also specifies engagement with provincial government agencies. There is now a Malaitan site Fumato'o for CBRM – Radefasu in Malaita is being used for the work on non-CMT contexts for CBRM (Activities 1.5). According to discussions at the review meeting, there are now

plans to collaborate in some way with the Aquaculture project on community-based pond tilapia farming in Malaita that WorldFish is conducting under another project. It would be a good idea to include the Malaita work and clarifying how this fits within the objectives of the project. Note that it may not be feasible to collaborate with Malaitan provincial government within the scope of the current project.

3. It is recommended that the Solomon Islands team consider using the Radefasu case (Langa Langa Lagoon, Solomon Islands) for the scaling out as well as for the non-CMT CBRM case study (Activities 1.5). One of the ways the scaling issue is being approached is through testing a ‘light’ approach to CBRM. The Radefasu CBRM appears to have been “self-driven” from within the community (building on community members having been involved in previous conservation projects), and so may help illuminate how communities may generate their own CBRM in multiple locations, without requiring intensive resources from outside agencies.

Management and Evaluation Framework

4. It is recommended that the project team develop an explicit and simple Management and Evaluation (M&E) framework for reporting on this project to ACIAR and DFAT from the theoretical development that has been done by building on Ostrom’s Social-Ecological Systems framework and the CGIAR outcomes evaluation framework used in the Aquatic Agricultural Systems program. While the theoretical work is useful for making use of existing project data, embedding M&E thoroughly into the research process, and also for developing general ways of evaluating outcomes across different contexts, the project also needs to report against the specified indicators to the funding bodies. This needs to happen soon so that the M&E can be implemented for the remainder of the project.

5. It is recommended that in developing the M&E framework for this project, the project team consider how to dovetail with SPC’s need to develop M&E report cards for coastal fisheries under the New Song policy. Liaise with Moses Amos and the new SPC M&E person for this.

4. Project outputs

Determine and comment on how the project is progressing to achieving the outputs and milestones against each of the objectives. Reviewers should refer to Section 5 of the Project Document for a more complete discussion of objectives, outputs, activities and methodologies.

The **overall aim** of the project is to improve food and nutrition security, productivity and resilience of fisheries systems and community livelihoods in the Pacific region.

- Green cells = completed; **red text** = delayed; **blue text** = in preparation or planned but on schedule; [*italicized text*] = original milestones or activities prior to agreed changes
- The term 'Policy Brief' is used as a generic descriptor for outputs for broader readership – often but not always derived from journal articles

Objective 1: Critically analyse CBFM and related interventions as used in the Pacific region

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|--|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 1.1 Critically analyse lessons learned in the application of CBFM in the Pacific region and its contribution to development outcomes in the region | Lessons learned publication and associated regionally relevant policy brief for Solomon Islands | Jun 2014 [Jun 2013] | Completed. Published as: Jupiter et al. (2014) Locally-managed marine areas: multiple objectives and diverse strategies. <i>Pacific Conservation Biology</i> 20: 165-179. Cohen et al. (2014). Is community-based fisheries management realising multiple objectives? Examining evidence from the literature. <i>SPC Traditional Marine Resource Management and Knowledge Information Bulletin</i> , 34, 3-12. [policy brief] Schwarz et al. (submitted). Resilience in practice: building a participatory diagnosis and adaptive management programme for small-scale fisheries. <i>PLOS ONE</i> . Blythe et al. (in prep) Navigating transformations towards community-based resource management. For submission to <i>Governing the Coastal Commons: Communities, Resilience, and Transformation</i>. Q4 2015 | Good progress demonstrated for all of Activities 1.1. |
| | Journal publication and associated policy brief: The contribution of CBFM to fisheries and food security – | Jun 2015 [Dec 2014] | Journal article completed Cohen et al. (2015). Community-based, co-management for governing small-scale fisheries of the Pacific: A Solomon Islands' case study. In S. Jentoft, & R. Chuenpagdee (Eds.), <i>Interactive governance for small-scale fisheries; global reflections</i> : Springer. pp 39-59. | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|---|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | a Solomon Islands case study | | Policy Brief delayed | |
| | Journal paper on lessons learned in monitoring and evaluation of management plans (in collaboration with SPC and LMMA) | Jun 2016 | Ongoing Govan et al. (in prep) . Critical review of the usefulness of community-based surveys of marine resources as a tool in monitoring resource status in coral reef fisheries. | |
| | Regional analysis of the contribution of CBFM to increases in economic development and food security | Jun 2015 | Ongoing. The first publication: Bell et al. (2015). Diversifying the use of tuna to improve food security and public health in Pacific Island countries and territories. <i>Marine Policy</i> 51: 584-591. Delisle et al. (in prep) . Title TBD. A revised version of Bell et al. (2009) paper: 'Planning the use of fish for food security in the Pacific'. The data used in the 2009 paper dates back to 2005/06 and as early as 1996. The proposed output will use new Census and HIES data available for most PICTs to analyse how countries are tracking in terms of the forecasts made in Bell et al. (2009) paper. Is the gap between supply and demand for fish decreasing or widening? | |
| 1.2 Critically analyse the concept of livelihood diversification and its practical relevance to improved CBFM | Journal publication and policy brief on lessons learned in livelihood diversification published through SPC channels | Dec 2015 <i>[Dec 2014]</i> | Ongoing. Analyses completed and manuscript in prep. Will be completed by revised deadline Hellebrandt et al. (in prep) . A systematic review of livelihood diversification in fisheries and aquaculture. For PNAS. Policy Brief in preparation | Good progress demonstrated in Activities 1.2. |
| | A paper detailing a capitals and assets framework for identifying opportunities and constraints to improve CBFM in PICs | Dec 2015 <i>[Jun 2015]</i> | Completed. Blythe et al. (submitted). Situating the SES framework in critical development theory. <i>Global Environmental Change</i> . | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|
| 1.3 Conduct review of past and potential future roles of aquaculture in CBFM in Pacific islands | Journal publication and policy brief published through SPC channels | Jun 2015 [Jun 2014] | Ongoing. First publication as: Eriksson et al. (submitted). Quick fix mariculture distracts fishery management of endangered species. <i>Conservation Biology</i> . Mills et al. (in prep). Systematic review of the contribution of aquaculture to food security in the Pacific Region. Analysis delayed but in process and will be completed this year. In collaboration SPC AQ project. Policy Brief delayed | Good progress. |
| 1.4 Critically analyse the potential and actual contribution of FADs as a CBFM tool and the role of tuna in meeting food security needs of the region | Journal publication and policy brief on FADs in Solomon Islands published through SPC channels | Jun 2015 [Dec 2014] | Completed. Albert et al. (2014). The contribution of nearshore fish aggregating devices (FADs) to food security and livelihoods in Solomon Islands. <i>PLOS ONE</i> 9(12): e115386. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0115386 Albert et al. (2015). Nearshore fish aggregating devices (FADs) and food security in Solomon Islands. WorldFish AAS report. Available at (http://worldfishcenter.org/content/) Masu and Albert (2015). Nearshore fish aggregating devices for food security in Solomon Islands. SPC Fisheries Newsletter, 146, 25-31. [policy brief] | Good progress towards all work in Activities 1.4. |
| | Journal article and policy brief published through SPC channels on the future role of FAD-caught tuna in meeting food security needs | Dec 2014 | Ongoing. Journal article completed: Bell et al. (2015). Optimising the use of nearshore fish aggregating devices for food security in the Pacific Islands. <i>Marine Policy</i> 56: 98-105. Policy Brief delayed | |
| | Journal article on lessons learned in implementation of national FAD programs and their role in regional food security | Dec 2016 [Jun 2016] | Ongoing. Campbell et al. (in press). Not just a passing FAD: Insights from the use of artisanal fish aggregating devices for food security in Kiribati. <i>Ocean and Coastal Management</i> . A workshop and outputs are planned to round out this Activity. Regional nearshore FAD expert workshop being developed in collaboration with SPC – to be held in Vanuatu in June 2016. Outputs from participatory processes in workshop will be used as material for subsequent journal article. Albert et al. (in prep). Regional lessons learned in the development and implementation of nearshore FADs in the Pacific Region. Journal article in Q3 2016. | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|---|----------|---|---|
| | | | SPC (in prep). Regional lessons learned in the development and implementation of nearshore FADs in the Pacific Region. Manual or related output in Q3 2016. | |
| 1.5 Analyse the governance of marine resources in cities and other contexts where CBFM is insufficient (e.g. Tarawa and Langalanga lagoons, transboundary fisheries and for national commodity fisheries) | Journal publication and policy brief published through SPC channels | Jun 2016 | Ongoing. Sulu et al. (2015). Livelihoods and fisheries governance of fisheries in contemporary Pacific Island settings: A Solomon Islands case study. <i>PLOS ONE</i> . In press. Sukulu et al. (2016). Title TBD. Journal article on establishing and implementing the Radefasu management plan in Langalanga lagoon. Hanich et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Comparing the experience of Tarawa and Langalanga lagoons is in preparation with the assistance of Reuben Sulu from Solomon Islands and Kiribati's CBFM project officers (Ben Namakin and Tarateiti Uriam). Policy Brief to come. | Good progress for the work in Activities 1.5. |
| | Journal article on the impacts of booms and busts in BdM fisheries on community and household livelihoods | Dec 2015 | Ongoing. Journal articles to date and under development: Eriksson and Clarke (2015). Chinese market responses to overfishing of sharks and sea cucumbers. <i>Biological Conservation</i> 184:163-173. Eriksson et al. (2015). Contagious exploitation of marine resources. <i>Frontiers in Ecology and Environment</i> . In press. Eriksson et al. (in prep). Resilience and governability of Pacific Island sea cucumber fisheries. Journal article to be submitted Q4 2015. Eriksson et al. (in prep). SPC Fisheries Newsletter. Summary of BdM lessons learned from the region and elsewhere. Eriksson et al. (in prep). What happens when the fishery closes? A beche de mer case study from the Solomon Islands. To be submitted Q4 2016. | |
| | Country-specific provincial-level policy briefs on fisheries management in 'non-CBFM' contexts for fisheries managers | Dec 2016 | Ongoing Collaboration underway with CSIRO and Kiribati Ministry of Fisheries to develop alternative approaches to management with Tarawa stakeholders. Paper will follow workshop – tentatively scheduled for early 2016 following national elections. As identified during the 1 st Stakeholder workshop in Kiribati in October 2014, a major challenge in the Tarawa lagoon was the low level of understanding from community members, Island Council members and government staff | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|--|---|-----------|---|----------------|
| | | | <p>on by-laws. Brooke Campbell and Aurélie Delisle have been working with staff from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and MFMRD to produce guidelines for by-law processes (relating to coastal fisheries activities in Kiribati). A draft has been forwarded to staff at MIA for input. It is envisaged that the draft will then be reviewed by MFMRD staff and discussed with community members before release in Kiribati.</p> <p>Policy Brief Kiribati to come. Policy Brief Solomons to come. Policy Brief Vanuatu to come.</p> | |
| 1.6 Estimate the economic and food security contributions of inshore fisheries to national economies of selected countries in the Western Pacific region | Journal publication and policy brief published through SPC channels | June 2016 | <p>Ongoing. This activity will be completed using a range of papers looking at different aspects of this issue – some yet to be designed.</p> <p>Albert et al. (2015). Keeping food on the table: human responses and changing coastal fisheries in Solomon Islands. <i>PLOS ONE</i>. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone0130800.</p> <p>Delisle et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Journal article. Initial discussion with staff from FAME SPC has been conducted to collaborate on this publication. The output will be an in-depth analysis of a selected number of countries and look at a range of variables around food security and economics (trade, NCDs...). A workshop with some experts to discuss relevant questions and level of analysis would be a precursor to the study.</p> <p>Policy Brief to come.</p> | Good progress. |

Objective 2. Design and implement CBFM in Kiribati communities in collaboration with Island Councils and national agencies.

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|--|---|--|---|----------------|
| 2.1 Conduct participatory diagnosis of the most appropriate entry points for management and governance responses | Publish situation analysis and CBFM rollout plan produced | Dec 2014 for sites 1 & 2 Jun 2015 for site 3 <i>[Apr 2014]</i> | Completed. After consulting with the respective sub-national governments, communities have been agreed on the islands of North Tarawa and Butaritari. Instead of being implemented in 1 community in 3 islands, the project is currently being rolled out in 5 communities in North Tarawa and Butaritari. The participatory diagnosis phase was conducted in those 5 communities. Further interest has been expressed by other communities and these will be reviewed as resources dictate. The report detailing the situation analysis has been submitted to the Executive Committee for feedback and comments before being released. Delisle et al. (2015). Participatory Diagnosis for North Tarawa and Butaritari island communities in the Republic of Kiribati. WorldFish, Penang, Malaysia. Project Report: 2015. Submitted. | Good progress. |
| 2.2 Convene a stakeholder meeting to agree a model for CBFM implementation in Kiribati | A stakeholder meeting designs and agrees to a model for CBFM implementation in Kiribati | Dec 2014 | Completed. A CBFM Stakeholder meeting attended by community representatives from our 5 CBFM pilot sites, government staff from a number of Ministries and NGOs was convened during Kiribati Fisheries Awareness week from 27-30 October 2014 to discuss 'what CBFM is' in Kiribati. Feedback from participants suggested to make this an annual event to share early lessons. Discussion with the Ministry of Fisheries of Kiribati are under way to co-host the second CBFM Stakeholder workshop by the end of 2015. Dates need to be finalised in collaboration with MFMRD and community representatives to take into account the timing of Kiribati's national elections. The meeting could be delayed to early 2016 based on Stakeholders' input. | Good progress. |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | Publish a situational analysis of coastal fisheries in Kiribati within the broader development context as a Working Paper and then as a journal article | Dec 2015 | <p>Ongoing. A report summarising the information gathered during the participatory diagnosis phase in the 5 pilot communities has been submitted (see also output 2.1). Additional outputs completed or planned are:</p> <p>Project initiatives highlighted as: <i>Uriam, T. and Delisle, A. (2014) Community-Based Fisheries Management Project in Kiribati: the first steps. SPC Fisheries Newsletter.</i> http://www.spc.int/DigitalLibrary/Doc/FAME/InfoBull/FishNews/144/FishNews144_22_Delisle.pdf</p> <p>Campbell and Delisle (in prep). Strengthening coastal fisheries governance: What role for community-based fisheries management in Kiribati? Journal article.</p> <p>Author et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Working Paper. Additional activity underway in South Tarawa to survey the contribution of fisheries to local diets. Survey of 60 households in Betio was completed in July 2015. Data entry is now underway, Working paper is planned for late 2015, with subsequent briefing paper planned for 2016.</p> <p>Namakin. Title TBD. MFMRD Fisheries Newsletter articles.</p> <p>Uriam. Title TBD. MFMRD Fisheries Newsletter articles.</p> <p>Namakin and Uriam (or vice versa). Title TBD. ACIAR PaRTNER magazine article</p> <p>Due to a number of planned trips in our 5 pilot communities for the rest of 2015, the publication of the journal article and the working paper will be delayed. Discussion has taken place with staff from Fisheries Division at MFMRD to collaborate on those outputs especially from staff that have joined the CBFM team throughout the implementation of CBFM in our 5 pilot communities.</p> | |
| | Publish DVDs and community-targeted brochures on CBFM in Kiribati context | Jun 2016 | <p>Ongoing. Following discussion with SPC, the available community information sheets are being translated as a collaborative exercise between the 2 I-Kiribati CBFM staff and staff from Fisheries Division.</p> <p>SPC. Outputs submitted – 19 have been completed thus far and are being printed. Several examples are included as hardcopies.</p> | The DVD idea has been replaced with University of Wollongong making an online video (MOOC). |
| 2.3 Work with at least three communities to develop | Inshore resource management plans are formally agreed to by three | Jul 2015 - Site 1 & 2 Dec 2015 for Site 3 | <p>Ongoing. Plans finalized as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tanimaiaki (Butaritari Island) agreed on 30 May 2015 2. Kuma (Butaritari Island) agreed on 6 June 2015 | Outstanding progress to have gone from zero CBFM to having a management plan agreed in 2 communities and close to agreed in 3 more. |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|
| management plans and implement adaptive management of their resources | communities and agreed management rules are implemented by the communities | <i>[Dec 2014]</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tabonibara (North Tarawa) is ongoing; visited sited between 23-29 August to complete its CBFM plan. Bikati (Butaritari Island) has proposed 2-9 October to finalise its CBFM plan Buariki (North Tarawa) has invited the team to come during the week of October 19th to facilitate the completion of its CBFM plan. | |
| | Community workshops and network meetings held with Provincial stakeholders including other communities to share lessons | Jun 2015 and June 2016 | <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>A meeting with the Island Council and Unimwane Association (council of Elders) was undertaken in May 2015 in Butaritari Island to provide update on project progress. Identical meetings with those institutions were conducted early August 2015 in North Tarawa (delays were experienced at the request of the Mayor of North Tarawa following the death of the Island clerk and a councillor in one of our pilot site).</p> <p>The CBFM team continues to take any opportunities to present updates on the project during official meetings from those institutions.</p> <p>Following the completion of our pilot sites' CBFM plans, community members suggested that they would start the process of informing neighbouring villages through meetings between village chiefs, island Council and Unimwane Association.</p> | Good progress on the remainder of Activities 2.3. |
| | Three-country journal paper that critically reviews lessons in, engaging with communities, developing management plans and monitoring their implementation | Jun 2016 | <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Author et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Journal article. This article will likely slip to later in 2016.</p> | |
| | Three-country journal article that reviews fisheries outcomes from | Jun 2016 | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Cohen et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Journal article. This article will likely slip to later in 2016.</p> | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | serial periodic harvesting (a common management strategy in CBFM) | | | |
| | National policy brief on CBFM produced | May 2017 | Not due yet. The experience and lessons learned during the project will provide material for a Brief on CBFM in Kiribati to be produced between members of the Kiribati CBFM team and national government partners. Policy Brief to come | |
| 2.4 Design and conduct questionnaires on the gendered dimensions of CBFM in the wider livelihood context. | Community workshops and meetings held to report back results of gender analyses | Jun 2015 <i>[Dec 2014]</i> | By the milestone measure this has been completed but is an ongoing process. A workshop on CGIAR AAS Program benchmarking tools including gender tools was conducted in Honiara in 2014 prior to a benchmarking exercise undertaken in Malaita under FIS/2010/056. FIS/2012/074 activity leaders attended the workshop and have since adapted data collection methodologies for new geographies. Gender-differentiated information on marine resource use has been collected in Kiribati have been reported during Island Council meetings in Butaritari (May 2015) and North Tarawa (August 2015) and during community meetings throughout the year (Meeting in Buariki will take place in October 2015). The information was presented to staff of Fisheries Division at MFMRD in June 2015 and will be presented during the meeting with the Permanent Secretary and her executive committee during the presentation of the report mentioned in activity 2.1. In collaboration with CSRIO, maps representing the gender-differentiated resource use of the environment at the community level will be produced in 2016. | Good progress. |
| | Three-country journal article published on gender in fisheries in Kiribati, Solomon Is and Vanuatu | Jun 2016 <i>[Dec 2015]</i> | Questionnaires have been finalised and shared with the three country teams to use for data collection. Data collection complete in Solomon Islands. Data is set to start in Kiribati in 2015. Aurélie Delisle and staff from Solomon Islands attended a “Gender-transformative approaches” workshop in Honiara in August 2015 and have held discussion on lessons learned from the data collection on gender norms in Solomon Islands. This information is helping sort out the logistics for data collection in Kiribati. Four additional people will need to be recruited for data collection to be effective in Kiribati. | It is not clear whether a 3 country paper will be possible because interruptions due to Cyclone Pam mean the gender work in Vanuatu has not yet started and may not be able to be completed within the remainder of the project. The team is revising the Vanuatu objectives and activities, including the gender work, to submit to ACIAR for approval. |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|---|----------|--|----------------|
| | | | Discussion need to be held with MFMRD. To coordinate this effort so that data collection can take place by the end of 2015. Delays in the recruitment of staff will result in delay in the data collection process. Data collection in Vanuatu will be dependent on the priorities of the country and the recruitment of 4 additional people for the purpose of data collection. Delisle et al. (in prep) Title TBD. Journal article. | |
| 2.5 Aligned with existing national policy and structures design and implement a provincial level support network for communities undertaking CBFM | Network established and policy brief produced | Jun 2016 | Ongoing. Critical rapport building of key relationships with and between different national agencies is ongoing, ongoing especially with the members of the North Tarawa and Butaritari Island Councils, MFMRD, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Updates on the progress of the CBFM project are given to these agencies on a regular basis Policy Brief to come | Good progress. |
| | Locally relevant community targeted information is produced and available through MFMRD | Jun 2016 | Ongoing. The CBFM team is closely working with the 5 pilot communities to seek their inputs on locally relevant information which will be further developed with the assistance of MFMRD later this year. Output to come | |

Objective 3. Design and implement CBFM in Western Province of Solomon Islands in collaboration with provincial government and national agencies

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|---|------------------------|--|--|
| 3.1 Conduct participatory planning with Provincial government to build capacity for Provincial support to CBFM implementation | Policy brief targeting Provincial government on CBFM | Jun 2014 | Completed. Participatory planning was achieved through field visits to Western province communities by a team of WorldFish staff and provincial agriculture and fisheries officers. WorldFish (Dr Greg Bennett) served on the Provincial Fisheries Advisory Committee. The output for this activity was the draft ordinance for the Provincial government which awaits approval by the Executive. Western Province Fisheries Ordinance | Good progress. |
| 3.2 Work with at least three communities to develop management plans and implement adaptive management of their resources | Written management plans are endorsed by communities | Dec 2015 [Dec 2014] | Ongoing. Management plan reviewed and revised for Leona and Paramatta communities. Initial participatory action planning conducted in Santupaele communities – management plan formation delayed due to (unrelated) village conflict – now scheduled for October 2015. Community meeting to design marine resource management plan conducted in Fumato'o and in Radefasu – to be finalised into management plans later in 2015. | Good progress on Activities 2.3. Note that 2 communities are in Western Province and 2 are in Malaita Province. |
| | Community workshops and network meetings held with Provincial stakeholders including other communities to share lessons | Jun 2015 and Jun 2016 | Completed by the milestone measure but an ongoing activity. We continue to look for opportunities to bring together and strengthen the <i>Western Province CBRM working group</i> . A second meeting of the network was hosted by partners in March 2015. A workshop for community managers from Leona/Paramatta is scheduled for 2015 to undertake participatory analysis of data on management performance. We provide monthly (where possible) updates to Provincial government in one on one meetings, and Greg Bennett is included as a member on the Provincial Fisheries Advisory Council | |
| 3.3 Design and conduct questionnaires on fisheries outcomes and | Data report produced to contribute to Objective 1 publications | Dec 2015 [Dec 2014] | Ongoing. Under the ACIAR project (FIS/2012/056) data collection on fisheries impacts of CBFM was conducted in December 2013. Data collection conducted in Leona/Paramatta communities in December 2014. Data collection scheduled for Santupaele in September 2015. | Good progress. |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|--|---|------------------------|--|--|
| economic benefits of CBFM | Community workshops held to communicate results | Jun 2016 [Apr 2015] | Ongoing. Preliminary results from Leona/Paramatta reported back during review of management plan (Dec 2015). An intern (youth member from the community) was employed to work with data (January-April). Participatory analysis with intern, and a group of youth and committee members scheduled for August 2015. | |
| 3.4 Design and conduct questionnaires on the gendered dimensions of CBFM in wider livelihood context. | Results are presented back to the community | Jun 2015 [Dec 2014] | Ongoing but delayed. Data from both Malaita and Western Provinces have been analysed and written up as: Cohen et al. (submitted). Understanding adaptive capacity and capacity to innovate in social-ecological systems; applying a gender lens. <i>AMBIO</i> . Cohen et al. (in prep). Second paper, title TBD. Article planned to extend analysis. Journal article. Malaita report-back completed as AAS (2015) Community Information for Malaita Hub. AAS 4 pp. Western province community report-back planned for Q4 2015. | Excellent progress, considering how difficult it is usually to achieve progress on gendered understandings of fisheries internationally. The AAS program in WorldFish implemented in Solomon Islands has enabled this level of progress. Capacities developed by the Solomon Islands team can be transferred to the other country teams. |
| 3.5 Aligned with existing national policy and structures (NPOA, SILMMA) convene stakeholders to design and implement a provincial level support network for communities undertaking CBFM | Policy document prepared for Provincial Government on CBFM | Dec 2015 | Ongoing. WorldFish staff continue to be a part of dialogue concerning policy and structures (e.g., including regular attendance of SILMMA and NCC meetings). This will ensure our future networking efforts are capitalising on and fitting with existing efforts. Output to come | Good progress in Western Province for all work in Activities 3.5. Note no apparent engagement with national policy on CBFM within this project. We understand WorldFish is involved with a provincial support network in Malaita, but it was not clear whether this was being used to support the aims of this project with the two CBFM sites in Malaita for this project (Fumato'o, Radevasu). |
| | A provincial level network is endorsed by the Provincial government | Oct 2016 | Completed. Establishment of an information exchange and coordination network of CBRM practitioners (2014). A second meeting of the network was hosted by partners, with WorldFish participation, in March 2015. We will continue to identify and pursue opportunities to build this network, with partners. | |
| | Up to date locally relevant community targeted information is produced and available through Provincial Fisheries | Dec 2015 | Ongoing. In dialogue with the communities where WorldFish currently support CBFM, we continue to identify information required by communities to support their management efforts. The information materials we produce in future activities will respond to these needs. Provincial government staff were included in the multi-stakeholder symposium on community-based resource | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|------------|--|----------|---|----------|
| | and related network offices | | management in Western Province. As a result of this knowledge and awareness of CBFM within the provincial government was increased. Output to come | |
| | CBFM support by Provincial officers in the target Province is costed for the Province for their use in budget negotiations | Dec 2016 | Ongoing. Activities to build capacity in the provincial government for planning and CBFM support will continue in 2016. While provincial fisheries and environment staff are committed to supporting CBFM, their limited human and financial capacity presents an ongoing challenge. We are in regular contact with the Provincial government regarding CBFM and in an effort to understand their current and required financial capacity | |

Objective 4. Design and implement CBFM in Vanuatu coastal communities in collaboration with national NGOs and agencies

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | | Comments |
|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| 4.1 Conduct participatory diagnosis of the most appropriate entry points for management and governance responses | Situation analysis and CBFM rollout plan produced as a report | Dec 2015 <i>[Jun 2014]</i> | Ongoing. Diagnosis and review for report completed but completion of report will be delayed. Report will not include any post-cyclone analyses. Raubani et al. (in prep). Scoping report title TBD. On track for completion in 2015. Author et al. (in prep). Journal article on Vanuatu's experience with CBFM. | The Activities under Objective 4 need to be re-drafted to account for the disruption caused by Cyclone Pam. The team discussed the changes that need to be made during the review meeting. They will submit a revised draft to ACIAR for approval. Kate Barclay sat in on that discussion and it seemed the team would be able to achieve most of the activities, if in a revised form. It was unclear whether the gender work (4.3), that requires external technical assistance, would be possible. |
| 4.2 Convene a stakeholder meeting to agree a model for CBFM implementation in Vanuatu | A stakeholder meeting designs and agrees to a model for CBFM implementation in Vanuatu | Dec 2014 | Ongoing. Pre-cyclone consultation completed but planned stakeholder meeting for 2015 now deferred. This activity may evolve into a post-cyclone fisheries stakeholder meeting, but final plans need to be determined on advice from Vanuatu Fisheries Department and SPC. | |
| | Model is published as part of a critical review of Vanuatu's long experience in CBFM | Jun 2015 | Deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |
| 4.3 Design & conduct questionnaires on the gendered dimensions of CBFM in the wider livelihood context. | Results are presented back to the community | Jun 2015 <i>[Dec 2014]</i> | Deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |
| 4.4 Work with at least three communities to develop management plans and implement adaptive | Inshore resource management plans formally agreed to by three communities and rules are implemented by the communities | Dec 2015 | Four communities agreed in Maselkynes, north Santo and Aniwa. Scoping and community engagement completed. Activities now deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|
| management of their resources | Community workshops and network meetings held with Provincial stakeholders including other communities to share lessons | Dec 2015 | Deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |
| | Produce DVDs and community targeted brochures on CBFM | Dec 2015 | Deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |
| 4.5 Aligned with existing national policy and structures design and implement a provincial level support network for communities undertaking CBFM | Network structure agreed to with Fisheries Department and code of operations (constitution) agreed to by stakeholders | Jun 2016 | Deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |
| | Locally relevant community targeted information is produced and available through Fisheries Department | Dec 2016 | Deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Plans to be revisited at the end of 2015. | |

Objective 5. Enhance understanding and mechanisms to accelerate scaling-out of CBFM in the Pacific region

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|---|---|------------------------|--|---|
| 5.1 Conduct social network research in CBFM networks | Journal articles based on social network analyses published for the region | Jun 2015 | Completed. Journal articles already published complete this activity as part of a revised set of outputs for this Objective, as agreed with ACIAR FIS. Other already in preparation will add to the compilation. Evans et al. (2015). Understanding leadership in the sustainability sciences. <i>Ecology and Society</i> , 20: 50. Case et al. (2015). Rethinking environmental leadership: the social construction of leaders and leadership in discourses of ecological crisis, development and conservation. <i>Leadership</i> . Early access. Cohen and Steenbergen (2015). Social dimensions of local fisheries co-management in the Coral Triangle. <i>Environmental Conservation</i> 42: 278-288. Cohen et al. (submitted) The Landscape of Leadership in Conservation and Development. <i>Environmental Research Letters</i> . Blythe et al. (in prep). Building governance capacity through social networks. Journal article by Q4 2015 Blythe et al. (in prep). Title TBD – lessons learned from working through networks (drawing on experience with MPPD, SILMMA, NCC, CTI). Journal article by Q4 2016 | Good progress. |
| 5.2 Support SPC to develop regional Theory of Change for scaling out CBFM | DFAT Noumea CBRM workshop completed and SPC policy brief published with regional Theory of Change | Jun 2015 | Ongoing. But delayed. Participation in Noumea workshop completed (Sulu, Cohen, Schwarz, Delisle, Campbell, and Andrew). The workshop produced a 'New Song' for coastal fisheries in the region which was subsequently endorsed by HoF. SPC (in prep). Policy Brief with graphical summary of the ToC from the SPC document in preparation in collaboration with SPC. | This Activity has already been somewhat revised since the advent of the New Song regional approach to coastal fisheries launched early in 2015. Discussion on Theories of Change and scaling out CBRM held as part of the review meeting resulted in a plan to redraft some of these activities, and Activity 6.1 further, to submit to ACIAR for approval. This is to further align the activities of the project with the aim of helping develop the New Song as regional policy. |
| | Journal article and associated policy brief and presentation to Heads of Fisheries forum on promoting sustainable fisheries through | Jun 2017 [Jun 2016] | Not due yet Author et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Journal article. SPC (in prep). Title TBD. Policy Brief. New post-doc co-funded by James Cook University Centre of Excellence (Dr Andrew Song) has been recruited to help address broader regional-scale governance issues and with particular reference to the New Song and Pacific regionalism. He starts in Q4 2015. | |

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | Status Report | Comments |
|--|---|-------------------------------|--|----------------|
| | CBFM and progress in implementation of SPC 'New Song' | | | |
| 5.3 Identify and use a range of communication channels such as websites and theatre to facilitate information exchange | Website and associated database integrated with existing sites to facilitate information exchange | Dec 2015 <i>[May 2014]</i> | Ongoing. A beta version of a Pacific coastal fisheries atlas has been coded to be used as a portal to other websites (e.g. LMMA, SPC and ReefBase Pacific). Final plans and website development will be determined after further discussion with partners. | Good progress. |
| | Alternative communication channels tested and evaluated | Jun 2016 | Ongoing. See country-specific outputs (e.g. Activity 2.2.3) | |

Objective 6. Design and implement an impact assessment programme to evaluate progress against AusAID and ACIAR indicators

| Activities | Output/milestone | Due date | | Comments |
|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 6.1 Hold PIAP workshops in Tarawa, Gizo and Port Vila to guide project design and impact assessment | Theories of change developed and published as a three-country Working paper | Dec 2015 <i>[Dec 2014]</i> | Ongoing. Solomons completed. Kiribati to be completed in 2016 following collaborative workshop. Stakeholder engagement and collaboration underway with Kiribati Ministry of Fisheries. Following consultations with Secretary, workshop will be scheduled after NZ funded Acting Director of Fisheries commences in late August 2015. Theory of change for Kiribati will address community, lagoon and national critical pathways and contexts. Paper will follow workshop – tentatively early 2016 following national elections. Vanuatu deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. Hanich et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Journal article. | See above for Activity 5.2. |
| 6.2 Establish economic, social and ecological baselines at local, regional and national scales based on CBFM sites | National policy brief on CBFM baseline produced for each country | Dec 2015 <i>[Dec 2014]</i> | Not yet due but delayed milestone in anticipation of delays in development of Theories of Change. The project is developing a regional M&E protocol that spans countries to tracks program outcomes. A regional Policy Brief will be published rather than a country-by-country one. Author et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Policy Brief. | Good progress on the framework for this. More work needed on adapting that framework to the specific reporting requirements of this project, and adapting it to be useful for M&E for initiatives under the New Song. Brief documentation on how this might be achieved would be valuable. |
| | Three-country journal paper on lessons from implementation of <i>ex ante</i> impact assessment programme | Apr 2017 <i>[Dec 2016]</i> | Not yet due. Ongoing evaluation of community engagement is feeding into planning and development of this output. A journal paper is under development drawing from the development of the regional M&E protocol (point above). Eriksson et al. (in prep). Title TBD. Journal article. | As above. |
| 6.3 Design a participatory impact assessment programme incorporating indicators of change at local, provincial and national scales and work with | Responsible agencies have incorporated indicators into their national M and E Programs | Jun 2015 | Ongoing. Vanuatu deferred as a consequence of Tropical Cyclone Pam. The project is developing a regional M&E protocol (point above). As part of its implementation, training workshops with partners are being considered. This will be evaluated in late 2015 as the M&E protocol is finalised. | As above. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| responsible agencies to incorporate into their national M and E programs. | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

5. Project Evaluation

In completing the following table, the reviewers are requested to synthesise the information listed in the Project Outputs table (Section 4); quantitative evidence from reviews, reports, etc; as well as qualitative information from interviews, case studies and the like. The first four questions (Group A) relate to the specific outcomes of the project. The next six (Group B) concern best practice and longer term impact. The final two (Group C) are specifically for ACIAR's learning processes.

As this is a mid-term review, many of the comments below will be of a preliminary nature. Scoring may be as much or more related to the trajectory of the project than as against the achievements to date.

The scoring for Groups A and B is defined as follows:

| Satisfactory | Less than satisfactory |
|---|---|
| 6 Exceptional quality Equal to or greater than 90%. Beyond normal project expectations; an example of a project team delivering significantly more than anticipated at the time of project design. | 2 Less than adequate quality Project did not deliver on several areas of core expectations. Reviewers consider that, given the circumstances of the project, outputs and outcomes should have been at a higher level. |
| 5 High quality 80-89% performance. Overall very good work, with virtually all outputs achieved, although possibly some minor gaps that could have been closed. Strong, positive cooperation across the entire project team. | 1 Poor quality Unacceptable performance, even after consideration of all mitigating factors. |
| 4 Good quality 65-79%. Performance quite good. Project team has delivered on the majority of the activities, with valid justifications for those not achieved. | |
| 3 Adequate quality 50-64%. Some areas of core expectations probably not achieved, although factors, external or outside of the control of the project team, may have been responsible. | |

| A – Specific outcomes of the project | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| A1 – Skills and knowledge change | Guidance: Evaluate the extent to which the project is increasing knowledge and skills of project staff and collaborating communities, through their participation in the project and the training elements. | |
| | Results Statement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This seems to be occurring in each of the three countries in communities. Project staff have really good knowledge and skills. | Score: 5 |

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| | | |
| A2 – Institutional and group practice change | <p>Guidance: <i>Are the collaborating R&D institutions and development agencies changing their understanding and approach to community management of near-shore fisheries in the areas where the project is being implemented?</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes for SPC coastal fisheries and aquaculture. • Yes if the Kiribati and Vanuatu project staff become ongoing government staff as planned. • Difficulties beyond the control of the project in Vanuatu with Cyclone Pam. • In the SI case the project staff is WorldFish staff, not government. It seems as if the Western Province fisheries officers are changing understanding and approach. The Fisheries Ordinance in Western Province has changed. Possibly MFMR has changed to do with FADs. | Score: 5 |
| A3 – Communication / extension / dissemination processes and strategies | <p>Guidance: <i>Are the communication and extension activities and strategies appropriate for the content of the project? Are they promoting practice change? Will they form enduring information sources? What could be done better?</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy briefs and SPC information bulletin publications are appropriate communications, but most are not yet ready so were not reviewed. • Communication through SPC information sheet translations are good. Other communication strategies including video and brochures are yet to be produced. | Score: 5 |
| A4 – Publications, scientific outputs | <p>Guidance: <i>Assess the scientific, technical and extension outputs in terms of their number, quality, distribution and potential contribution to other scientific projects or activities (noting that the project is only at the mid-way point of a four-year schedule).</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scientific publications for the regional and SI components are excellent in number and quality (where WorldFish had a head start due to ongoing work). The scientific publications for the other two countries are a little further behind, but demonstrate solid progress, which can build in the remainder of the project. • World leading potential contribution to similar work globally in terms of conceiving fisheries and aquaculture within social and development contexts, and in terms of generating and using gendered understandings in coastal resource management. | Score: 6 |
| B – Best practice and longer term impact | | |
| B5 – Appropriateness / relevance | <p>Guidance: <i>Is this project an appropriate contribution for Australia to be making to Pacific fisheries at this point of time? Discussion should assess if the content of the project continues to be relevant to the specific development context in which it is being implemented (here we are specifically looking to relevance to the “New Song for Pacific Fisheries”).</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, coastal fisheries are crucially important for food security and livelihoods for most Pacific Islanders and the capacity of coastal ecosystems to provide these services is already under pressure in some areas, and the | Score: 6 |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>problem will increase as populations and market pressures increase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project can potentially be very helpful for realizing the aims of the New Song, in terms of evidence-based ideas about how CBRM can be supported. | |
| B6 - Effectiveness | <p>Guidance: <i>To what extent is the project delivering on its aim to improve food and nutrition security, productivity and resilience of fisheries systems and community livelihoods in the Pacific region.</i> <i>Are we achieving the outcomes (changes in learning, behaviour or conditions) that we said we would achieve? Assess the extent to which identified (or new) risks to progress and outcomes are being managed, and with what impacts or consequences.</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The behaviour to change is that of the communities, market actors, and government actors. The team are engaging thoroughly with communities, sub-national governments, national governments and SPC. There is already some evidence of changes in practice (management plans, Fisheries Ordinance). More evidence is to be expected further along. Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu was a significant risk to progress, however, discussions during the review meeting show that most or all of the original Vanuatu objectives may be achieved in a slightly revised form and schedule. | <p>Score: 5</p> |
| B7 - Efficiency | <p>Guidance: <i>Assess whether outputs are being delivered within the stated timeframes and whether these are providing value for money; the budget is being spent as expected; the inputs are adequate to achieve the initiative's objectives; the different parts of the management system are working well. In summary, and most importantly, is this project value for money?</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This all looks fine. Some activities are ahead of schedule and some behind, on the whole it seems to be on track. The things that are behind are so for a good reason and seem recoverable within the project. The project is very complex and involves multiple teams of people in different locations. Coordination and management seems good considering this. | <p>Score: 5</p> |
| B8 – M&E | <p>Guidance: <i>Assess the extent to which monitoring and evaluation is providing useful information which is being used for management learning and accountability.</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E framework is still at a conceptual level and has not yet been concretely designed for this project or implemented yet. After discussion with ACIAR and DFAT on this, the team committed to addressing this in the short term. | <p>Score: NA</p> |
| B9 – Legacy / sustainability | <p>Guidance: <i>Assess the extent to which the processes are owned by and provide strengthened capacity of local partners. Assess the extent to which benefits are likely to endure after the project ceases? Are there any positive or negative environmental impacts associated with project activities?</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> | <p>Score:</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This seems to be exemplary in terms of engaging with communities, government and SPC. It is also skilling up in country staff. The project benefits look at this stage like enduring after the project ceases. Project activities have minimal negative environmental impacts, only those of travel. If the project improves sustainable use of coastal resources via CBRM it will have a significant positive environmental impact. | 5 |
| B10 – Gender equity | <p>Guidance: <i>Assess the extent to which the project integrates gender-sensitive practice into the overall approach to working with communities.</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is world leading in terms of developing skills in data collection, community engagement, and analysis regarding gender relations in coastal resource use and decision-making. | Score: 6 |
| C – ACIAR Learning | | |
| C11 – Lessons learnt | <p>Guidance: <i>The intention is to capture experiences and learning which are not dealt with elsewhere in the review and which should be brought to the attention of the ACIAR Fisheries Program. It could cover, for instance, difficulties with capacity building, complex or changing institutional arrangements which impact on delivery of outcomes, personnel arrangements, difficulties in managing projects remotely, infrastructure inadequacies inhibiting project implementation, risk management, impacts of uncontrollable events, etc.</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is achieving remarkable success in building a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary research team that is making impact on evaluating theoretical constructs and their practical applications to CBRM, particularly coastal fisheries from communities to national and regional forums. Lessons learnt from managing and running the project would be valuable for the ACIAR fisheries program and other ACIAR programs. | |
| C12 – Follow-up | <p>Guidance: <i>Advise ACIAR on what, if any, additional or follow-up activities and support are desirable to ensure the most appropriate activities and project management for the remainder of the project. Any comments about the possible on-going relevance of this stream of work to Pacific fisheries development after the termination date of the project are welcomed.</i></p> <p>Results Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The New Song policy approach reflects a growing understanding that small-scale fisheries must be understood and managed within the broader development context. This includes community-based management in collaboration with sub-national, national and regional governmental organizations. This stream of work is thus clearly relevant for Pacific fisheries development beyond the end of this project. | |

Signature:



Name: Neil Loneragan

Designation: Professor of Marine Ecology and Fisheries, Academy of Environmental and Conservation Sciences, School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University

Date: 2nd November, 2015

Signature:



Name: Kate Barclay

Designation: Associate Professor, School of International Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Technology Sydney

Date: 2nd November, 2015

Appendixes (as required)

- (i) Publications
- (ii) List of persons contacted by review team