

***"Rehabilitation and sustainable development of
fisheries and aquaculture affected by the tsunami
in Aceh Province, Indonesia"***

(Project OSRO/INS/601/ARC)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

December 2008 - January 2009

Management Response

3 June 2009

A mid-term review of the project *Rehabilitation and sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture affected by the tsunami in Aceh Province, Indonesia* (OSRO/INS/601/ARC) was carried out in December 2008 / January 2009 to assess project progress and the quality of implementation. At the mid-point of the project, the evaluation was intended to make recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design, strategy and orientation of the project and to make detailed recommendations on the work-plan for the remainder of the project.

The Mid-Term Evaluation examined progress achieved in the period January 2007 - December 2008 and a report submitted 30 May 2009 presented the evaluation team's findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as comment on some wider lessons that were emerging from the project.

This document is the "Management Response" to the evaluation, prepared in accordance with FAO guidelines *"Responsibilities and Procedures for Management Response and Follow-up Reporting on Evaluations - July 2008"*.

The Mid Term Review report is viewed by ARC, FAO and Indonesian government partners as reflecting well the activities, progress and challenges of the project. With only a few exceptions the recommendations are accepted and the project has already taken steps to implement them.

In the following table the recommendations made in the report are considered and addressed one-by-one.

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
GENERAL							
Major Findings E.9. para 100 Project management should ensure that integration between components continues and is expanded upon.	√			Is occurring to an increasing extent during 2009.	Increase integration between components	2009	Project Coordinator & component leaders
Recommendation B para 120 Increase the input of training/education expertise to the project (e.g., with an international education/training consultant) to ensure sufficient quality to obtain the expected results.	√			Already being implemented	Contract consultant	Done in May 2009	Project Coordinator & component leaders with TCEO.
COMPONENT 1							
Recommendation C1 In order to facilitate post-project institutionalisation of the outcomes for component 1, it is recommended that the project develop and test written guidance materials, and seek to obtain or identify a legal framework for improved collaboration between the different levels of government services, more rational deployment of human resources, and other issues.		√		Work is being done to embed the project outcomes in the government system and written guidance materials can play a role in summarizing improvements and acting as a reminder. It is the actual adoption of the improvements however that is the most critical factor and which can be influenced to some degree by the project. . Legislating for improved collaboration and more rational deployment of human resources is a longer term objective as it will require parliamentary approval. This is unlikely to be achievable within the project period though the project can encourage its development through <i>inter alia</i> the Fisheries Sector Steering Committee.	Encourage DKP to prepare written materials to back up the improvements they want to see implemented in district coordination and HR. Seek the placement of this topic on the agenda of the Fisheries Sector Steering Committee.	2009-2010	Component 1

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Recommendation C2 Consider a program to train and assist the DKP staff at Province and District levels to be able to formulate an integrated fisheries management plan. This management plan would include an integrated fisheries strategic plan and an integrated fishery zonation plan.	√			Already in progress. The project's focus will be on fostering capabilities and capacities among DKP and other fisheries stakeholders to engage in the management planning process at province and district levels. The level of detail of the fisheries management and zonation plan or plans, and their status at the end of the project ,are subject to many factors, several of which are outside the control of the project.	Continue support for the development of a provincial fisheries management plan and zoning plan under the Steering Committee initiative. Continue foundation training in fisheries at both province and district level	2009-2010	Components 1 & 2
Recommendation C3 The withdrawal of project support from the complex processes it is supporting with Component 1 will need to be gradual and closely monitored in order to ensure that the processes do not die with lack of external support.	√			Agreed	Continue emphasis on this through implementation of the exit strategy	2009-2010	Component 1
COMPONENT 2							
Recommendation D1 Focus on changing the behaviour of fisheries sector stakeholders so that they are better positioned to collaborate on shared management of resources.	√			Knowledge and Attitudes are being addressed first , as a route to changing behaviour (Practices)	Continue work with the three key partners, DKP, <i>Panglima Laot</i> , Fishing Communities	2009-2010	Component 2
Recommendation D2 The MMs and the PLs should be included as participants of the training on the integrated fishery management plan, as mentioned in the Coordination and Planning Section.		√		This is difficult, as while MMs and PLs know a lot about fishing they lack key technical background to be able to benefit from formal training on fisheries management planning. They will however be included in more generalized fisheries training and “learn by doing” through their close participation in the development of the plan or plans.	Continue generalized fisheries training for MMs and PLs and closely consult them in the development of the plan.	2009-2010	Components 1 & 2

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Recommendation D3 The Community Motivators should continue to be given strong backstopping from the project, calling on them for various activities, training, etc., as frequently as is practical.	√			Agreed	Call on MMs where possible to participate in activities and promote their services to other NGOs and agencies	2009-2010	Components 1 & 2 & 4
Recommendation D4 A full database of the MMs, including their skills and abilities, and full contact information, be circulated to development partners	√			Agreed – already circulated to many and an improved 'source book' is in preparation	Finalise MM 'source book' and circulate widely	Mid 2009	Component 2 & Info. & Comms section
Recommendation D5 Outcomes of this innovative activity be specifically investigated during the project final evaluation. This should be explicitly included in the Terms of Reference for that evaluation.	√			Agreed	Include in final evaluation TOR	2010	Project Coordinator
COMPONENT 3							
Recommendation E1 This component should swing the balance of its activities more towards two specific parts of its work: (i) the work on farmer organizations and behaviour change, and (ii) the work on the policy environment. This may mean reducing the emphasis on the technology transfer work on BMP aquaculture techniques with a relatively narrow sample of farmers.		√		Promotion of farmer organizations as a way of expanding and strengthening the adoption of Better Management Practices is a key focus of the 2009 programme. Nevertheless the demonstration programme, which is expanding to 1200 farmers in 2009 from 90 in 2008, is a critical step in consolidating the project work and it would not be productive to cut it back. Affecting the policy environment within the project period would be more difficult but a start has been made under Components 1 & 3 to influence future provincial and district policy and strategy for the aquaculture sector.	Continue promotion of farmer groups. Continue efforts to influence provincial and district policy and strategy for the aquaculture sector.	2009-2010	Components 1 & 3

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Recommendation E2a The component should consider the preference expressed by some fish farmers for a three-species polyculture system rather than two species as practiced by the project at present (shrimp, milk fish and seaweed)		√		It has been considered, but seaweed culture introduced in 2008 under a parallel IFC programme was not successful. The demand from farmers for income within 6-9 months and the market requirements for minimum volume were not adequately addressed.	No further action	-	-
Recommendation E2b Adaptive research should be conducted by the aquaculture facilitators to find locally appropriate seed densities and feed supply in order to achieve the most efficient extensive shrimp culture.	√			This has already been done through the several years' work carried out by collaborating agencies since the tsunami.	No further action	-	-
COMPONENT 4							
Recommendation F1 Component 4 should seek to tighten its focus to a more limited and manageable set of areas of intervention. This could, for example, mean focusing on handling of fisheries products from catch or harvest until sale by the producer, or instead focusing on the marketing chain.		√		This is already occurring during the 2009 programme, with focus on specific action plans in each of the five operating districts.	Continue focus on specific action plans in each district	2009-2010	Component 4
Recommendation F2 Improve definition how it will monitor and measure outcomes/impact of its activities.	√			Agreed	Improve definition of how outcomes/impact will be monitored and measured	2009	Component 4 & M&E section
Recommendation F3 This component, like the others, needs to maintain a clear longer-term focus on replicability, viability and sustainability, not just success with pilot sites	√			Agreed	Maintain a clear longer-term focus on replicability, viability and sustainability, not just success with pilot sites	2009-2010	Component 4

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
MONITORING & EVALUATION							
Recommendation G121 Key indicators require revision. Most of the current indicators are written with embedded targets, and as a result, the team is unable to measure progress. For example: “75% of project partners trained achieve their personal action plan targets” should be changed to: “% of trained project partners that achieve their personal action plan targets.”	√			Already implemented	Revised indicators included in Jan-Mar 2009 quarterly report tracking table	-	-
Recommendation G122 The project M&E system should report also on process indicators.	√			Some have been included in the revised indicators used since Jan-Mar 2009	Revised indicators included in Jan-Mar 2009 quarterly report tracking table	-	-
Recommendation G123 There should be more precision in the targets. In addition, these targets need to be reduced to yearly and quarterly goals	√			Included in the revised indicators used since Jan-Mar 2009	Revised indicators and targets included in Jan-Mar 2009 quarterly report tracking table	-	-
Recommendation G124(c) KAP surveys to be conducted to provide a baseline	√			Baseline KAP survey being scheduled	Implement baseline and endline KAP surveys	Jun 2009 Jan 2010	M&E section
Recommendation G124(d) Clarify available budget for activities	√			Clarified	No further action	-	-
Recommendation G124(e) Conduct a “data audit” to verify accuracy	√			Data audit on Jan-Mar 2009 indicator report being implemented	Complete data audit	May-Jun 2009	M&E section
Recommendation G124(f) Amend ongoing “Capacity Building Needs Assessment” should collect baseline KAP data of DKP staff		√		Some information that could contribute to the KAP was collected but the CPNA work was too far advanced to modify further.	DKP staff to be included in the overall KAP survey	Jun 2009	M&E section

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Recommendation G124(g) Census Panglima Laot to baseline this group		√		KAP sampling design in progress but this may be the most suitable approach for the PL	Design appropriate sampling strategy for PL and consider a census	May 2009	M&E section
Recommendation G124(h) Use an Education Expert to ensure trainings are of sufficient quality	√			Consultant contracted in May 2009 See above “GENERAL – Recommendation B para 120”	Use consultant	2009	All components
Recommendation G124(i) Clarify objectives of the “Value Chain Analysis”	√			The value chain analysis work was carried out to help understand the opportunities for adding value and reducing costs for key species and products from Aceh. It was designed to help identify the priorities for pilot projects and complement the PHOs. At the same time developing the capacity of a local insitution (UNSYIAH) in value-chain methodology and their understanding of the PH sector.	Findings continue into the Action Plan work	2009-2010	Comp 4
Recommendation G124(j) Determine if “fish loss assessment” will be repeated to provide temporal data	√			An end survey will be carried out to allow measurement of progress against the indicator. The assessment would be tailored to suit each pilot-project as each has slightly different objectives. So as per the revised M&E plan, it will be less a “loss assessment” and more an "evaluation of benefits and adoption of better practices"	Carry out end survey	Dec 2009	Component 4
Recommendation G124(k) Finalize Exit Plans according to schedule	√			Implementation of exit plan in progress	Further strengthen exit plan	2009	All components

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Recommendation G124(I) Seriously consider bringing on an M&E Advisor for the next 18 months of the project		√		If budget allows, additional expert consultancy input to M&E would be useful	Consider additional expert consultancy input to M&E if budget allows,	2009-2010	Project Coordinator
EXIT STRATEGY							
Recommendation J1 Exit strategy: The coordination of handover activities with government and community stakeholders needs to be detailed as soon as possible to provide guidance to the project team and ensure ongoing stability and sustainability of the achievements.	√			In process.	Detail the coordination of handover activities with government and community stakeholders to provide guidance to the project team and ensure ongoing stability and sustainability of the achievements.	May-Jul 2009	Project Coordinator and component leaders
Recommendation J2 A thoughtful strategy for withdrawing project support gradually will be a key to achieving project objectives. The coordination of handover activities with government and community stakeholders needs focused planning.	√			In process. Planned withdrawal of project support and uptake by government and stakeholders has been integral to most of the project activities since an early stage. Two examples of progress are the formation by the Community Motivators of a Forum (Forum Pemuda Pasisir Aceh) and the official registration of a local NGO (Jaringan Pegiat Kommunitas Pasisir Aceh) set up to continue the Fisheries Co-management initiatives.	Plan the coordination of handover activities with government and community stakeholders	May-Jul 2009	Project Coordinator and component leaders
Recommendation J3 Serious planning for the 'exit' should be starting immediately.	√			In process	Further strengthen exit plan	2009	All components

OSRO/INS/601/ARC Mid Term Review - management response to recommendations							
Recommendations	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
	Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
ARC-FAO PARTNERSHIP							
Recommendation K1 The evaluation sees the current project as a pilot and recommends further investigation of this non-conventional partnering between FAO and the ARC, and perhaps with other Red Cross partners.	√			Agreed	Investigate further opportunities for partnering between FAO and the ARC, and perhaps with other Red Cross partners.	2009-2010	FAO and ARC HQ staff
Recommendation K2 FAO should take advantage of potential synergies with other ARC partners. This should also be more proactively facilitated by ARC, as requested by some partners.	√			Already taking place such as with Mercy Corps, UMCOR. Further opportunities for collaboration will be sought.	Seek further opportunities for collaboration with other ARC partners	2009-2010	All components
PRIORITY FOCUS							
PRIORITY FOCUS C141.1 In considering any additional emphasis (or resources) in implementation of the project, the priority focus should be on extending and improving Components 1 and 2.		√		The project will continue to implement the agreed work plans under the four components. Should further resources become available, their best use will be carefully evaluated in consultation with DKP and other stakeholders.	Evaluate further where emphasis should be put should additional funding be made available by ARC or other agencies.	Jun 2009	FAO/ARC