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SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In September 2008, the World Bank commissioned an independent team to evaluate and assess the future role of PROFISH, the Global Program on Fisheries. The Evaluation Team found that PROFISH, since its inception in 2005, had made excellent progress in raising World Bank, bilateral donor and client country awareness of fisheries development needs, contributed fisheries and aquaculture content to global development products and assisted World Bank country/regional operations. In addition to World Bank funds, PROFISH attracted trust funds from 7 agencies and started a recovery in World Bank fisheries support following a decline that began in the late 1980s due to uncertainty over how to achieve sustainable fisheries. PROFISH helped re-establish the World Bank’s credibility in fisheries and revealed a large, pent-up demand for fisheries expertise.

The Evaluation Team concluded that fisheries can be reformed to achieve multiple objectives by (1) focusing on governance and institutions, (2) including fisheries in the mainstream development agendas and in global themes such as food security and climate change, and (3) applying the key operational tools of problem diagnosis, sequenced interventions and implementation experience and learning.

PROFISH is an innovative partnership serviced by a program team located in the World Bank’s Agricultural and Rural Development department (ARD) and with links to the Environment department (ENV). The small program team (3 senior and 2 junior/support staff) has performed at a high level but, confronted by many requests and lacking clear priorities, has tended to spread itself thinly. The Evaluation Team is convinced that PROFISH should be continued and strengthened. This report recommends how to grow PROFISH into a strategic development partnership with a clear vision, mission and strategy. A 3-5 year rolling Framework for Action is proposed, focused on the public good challenges of fisheries and aquaculture governance and a strong operational bias towards the ‘how to’ practice of achieving economic, social and environmentally sustainable fisheries and aquaculture. The Framework should be implemented by an Annual Work Plan, overseen by as proposed PROFISH Planning and Program Group chaired by the Director of ARD, and delivered by the PROFISH team with enhanced management capacity, staffing and funding.

RECOMMENDATION 1 PROFISH Framework for Action

The World Bank could achieve greater internal and external support for fisheries and aquaculture by developing more formal directions for the sectors. The Evaluation Team, therefore, recommends that the first step towards developing a formal sector policy or strategy is to charge PROFISH to design a 3-5 year rolling fisheries and aquaculture Framework for Action. The Framework should be developed using the following approach:

- **Focus the work agenda on exploring how to design and enhance sector governance**: During the transition from over-exploitation to long-term sustainability, focus on small and mixed small and large-scale coastal and inland fisheries and on sustainable aquaculture. In these fish production systems, redefine public and private sector roles in fisheries governance, while ensuring that the public good nature of fisheries is recognised. The agenda should also address the political economy of reform and the impact on financial, social and environmental benefits created in the entire value chain. To support national projects, the state of fish stocks, the supply and demand for key fish species and the structure of the value chain, including gender roles, should be assessed. The agenda for regional and national activities would contain a short, priority order list of themes to be implemented in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America.
• Prepare the policy path: Take steps to ensure that fisheries and aquaculture are well covered in Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) documents and in global agendas for the world food crisis and climate change. Fisheries reforms are path dependent and must be built on sound country and sector analyses.

• Strengthen the implementation and execution of national and regional fisheries and aquaculture projects: Start by identifying those countries and regions most suitable for exploring enhanced governance approaches, expanding political, social, institutional and economic analysis, learning from cases, and testing and adapting solutions, excluding less suitable places e.g., those that are politically unstable and unreceptive. A case file of successful and not so successful practical examples should be built to assist the World Bank to come up with specific solutions at the country level. PROFISH should also encourage rural, environment and food projects to more commonly include fisheries and aquaculture components and ensure their implementation is resourced and fully monitored. Typical projects where fisheries is the entry point may focus in the first instance on methods for reducing fishing pressure, while mitigating the initial decline in benefits, including the impact of reducing the number of fishers and other workers. In aquaculture, focus on regulatory and food safety institutions. Projects should also include capacity strengthening at individual and institutional level in client countries. Establish indicators of PROFISH performance for reporting (Rec. 6). For non-fisheries projects, the entry point could be fiscal reform, land tenure, health, education or other reforms.

• Raise more resources for fisheries and aquaculture reform: Increase the World Bank’s contribution to PROFISH to leverage resources and strengthen the convening role with other development assistance agencies and partners.

• PROFISH to continue to undertake a few well chosen global analyses: In collaboration with specialized agencies such as FAO, IFPRI, OECD, WorldFish Center, national institutions, NGOs and other World Bank units, PROFISH should undertake high quality, peer reviewed global studies. The responsibility and ownership of each global product should be made explicit.

• Develop a strategic communications program: To accelerate understanding in the World Bank, bilateral agencies, and developing countries, PROFISH needs a focused communications program with clear messages on governance options (e.g., pros and cons of rights-based management), and single incentive (e.g., wealth) versus multiple-objective (e.g., exports, food security and environment) based management in developing country fisheries

RECOMMENDATION 2 PROFISH Policy and Planning Group

In order to strengthen the governance of PROFISH and help achieve its objectives, the Evaluation Team recommends that the current PROFISH Steering Committee be replaced by a PROFISH Policy and Planning Group, with the following responsibilities, membership and modus operandi.

• The Group will be responsible to the financial supporters of PROFISH for the planning, approval and performance monitoring of the Framework for Action and the Annual Work Plans. It will also serve as a consultative forum and means to harmonize development assistance for fisheries and aquaculture as they contribute to the targets of the WSSD and the MDGs.
As a first priority, the new Group will produce a clear mission, vision and objectives for PROFISH, establish its own and PROFISH operational procedures and oversee the creation of the Framework for Action.

- The Group will be chaired by the Director of ARD, World Bank. The ENV department of the World Bank will also nominate a senior officer to the Group. The other members will be:

  o senior officers, with authority, of development assistance agencies that contribute $150k or more to the PROFISH MDTF or with proven, direct in-kind contributions of more than $150k annually to PROFISH activities.

  o one senior officer from FAO

  o up to 3 experts from client country or regional organizations in key PROFISH regions (Africa, Asia, Latin America, Pacific)

  o up to 4 members, including WWF and IUCN from non-government organizations and the private sector. The criteria for non-government organization members should include substantial on-the-ground activities in fisheries and aquaculture development and that the primary operations are not advocacy, and

  o one senior officer representing WorldFish Center.

- The Group should actively seek members from the regional development banks and other bilateral development agencies that are not yet members.

- The PROFISH Program Manager will be the Secretary to the Group. The Chair and two other members nominated by the Group should constitute an Executive Committee with a more frequent oversight role.

RECOMMENDATION 3 PROFISH Annual Work Plan

Emphasising the importance of transparency in successful partnerships, the Evaluation Team recommends that PROFISH develop and publish an Annual Work Plan which describes how the 3-5 year rolling Framework for Action implementation will be advanced for that year. The Annual Work Plan:

- Will be drafted by the PROFISH unit, using standard World Bank work budgeting formats for finances and staff resources, plus narrative;

- The target resource allocation will be: 60% client country/region work, 20% global; 15% new opportunities and 5% communications.

- Should indicate contributions to the WSSD targets and the MDGs;

- Will include performance indicators and a report of achievements against the previous year’s indicators;

- The Plan draft will be discussed with donors and partners, amended and the final approved by the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group. It should be published by the start of the World Bank financial year. The consultation process for preparing and agreeing the Plan will also serve to select the few key global and client country/region activities agreed for the year.

RECOMMENDATION 4: PROFISH Staffing and Support Groups

In order to sustain and grow its success, PROFISH will need to further develop partnerships and accelerate the implementation of fisheries and aquaculture reforms. To achieve these goals, the Evaluation Team recommends adding two additional positions to the current structure: (i) by replacing the existing Team Leader/Focal Point position with two new positions, a Program Manager and a Lead Fisheries Specialist, and (ii) adding an aquaculture specialist. In summary, the proposed new structure would be (see section 3.4.6 for full details):
**PROFISH Unit in ARD**

- Program Manager
- Lead Fisheries Specialist
- Fisheries economist
- Fisheries industry/private sector
- Aquaculture Specialist
- Junior fisheries specialist
- Administrative assistant
- Budget and Trust Fund Administrative Support

**Regional Operations officers with strong fisheries experience funded by World Bank regions or TFs:**

- Regional World Bank operations officers are needed to service fisheries and aquaculture investment and policy operations. Recommended target number by region, over the next 3-5 years, subject to budget and TF availability, are: Africa (3+), South Asia (1+), East Asia and Pacific (1+), LAC (1).

- To support multiple PROFISH activities, the Legal Department requires the services of a legal specialist with a background in fisheries and environmental law. Bilateral funding (as with France in Africa) could also be explored. Other short term sources could be from the “On Call roster” (below).

- World Bank operational staff should be given training in basic fisheries and aquaculture development approaches.

**PROFISH and ARD contract**

- To demonstrate transparency in the PROFISH partnership, including the donor Trust Funds, PROFISH and ARD should follow a clear contract of work covering budget and staff week allocations by task as occurs in World Bank regional operations departments. This would involve an annual Retrospective on Progress and Future Work Program, following standard World Bank formats.

**PROFISH Support Groups**

- PROFISH “On Call” roster of experienced specialists
- Leaders Advisory Panel
- ALLFISH
- A World Bank Fisheries and Aquaculture Thematic Group

**RECOMMENDATION 5: PROFISH Funding**

In view of the success to date of PROFISH, the continuing donor commitment and the large scope of work that is anticipated in the next phase, the Evaluation Team **recommends** that PROFISH, with the oversight of the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group, develop a funding target, strategy and plans to raise the necessary funds from different sources over the next 3-5 years. The communications strategy should be linked to fund raising. Examples of funding could include additional World Bank, DGF Second Window Facility funds, new Trust Fund sources, renewed efforts to retain existing and past donors (e.g., Japan), new sources of grant support (e.g., from foundations) and sources from thematic global funds (e.g., for the world food crisis, climate change).
RECOMMENDATION 6 PROFISH performance indicators

In order to measure results-based performance for PROFISH, the Evaluation Team recommends that the Framework for Action include:

- performance indicators that measure the application of improved governance practices, such as awareness and reputation, dissemination, early stage adoption and adaptation, full adoption and overall program quality;
- indicators of client country progress in the political will for change in sector governance, and
- professional assessments of the attributed contribution of selected PROFISH outputs to social, economic and environment impacts, as determined by the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group after a suitable lag period to show results, and while ensuring the assessments are affordable and add value.
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1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The history of human efforts towards sustainable exploitation of renewable natural resources shows a slow but gradual process whereby the initial experience of the (few) successes and failures has been instrumental in developing more holistic and effective management systems. Unlike management of forestry and water, management of capture fisheries, which deals with invisible, comparatively poorly understood and difficult to monitor marine and inland aquatic ecosystems, still needs to catch-up and emerge from largely unsuccessful science and economic based government-centric management regimes. In many World Bank client countries, even the science and economic insights are weak and not acted on by governments that lack the capacity to handle the social and political consequences of controlling fisheries exploitation.

The science and economics approaches tend to emphasise single objectives, such as biological conservation (e.g., maximum sustainable yield) or economic efficiency (e.g., maximum economic yield). Emphasising single economic or biological objectives in fisheries is usually doomed to failure, particularly in multiple technology fisheries exploited by too many vessels and people, where stakeholder objectives include reaping profits and relying on the resource for livelihood and food. These single objective models too frequently ignore the social, political, institutional and environmental determinants of effective governance of capture fisheries, and ultimately resource use sustainability. The sector’s most critical issue is how to determine more effective governance paradigms appropriate in a sector facing permanent production limits, volatile world prices and markets, and potentially massive social and unemployment issues. What institutional structures would be sufficiently robust to effectively counterbalance external political pressures, and how can the political nature of the management process be made to support more effective governance.

The fisheries sector is considered in a predicament. While human fish consumption has increased 10% over the past decade, mainly supported by strong growth of marine and inland fish culture, marine capture fish production slightly declined despite increasing harvesting efforts. Globally, the diminishing status of some 75% of marine fish stocks, reflects continuing excessive exploitation in terms of fishing efforts, net economic benefits and declining environment quality, particularly in the exclusive economic zones of developing countries. Such over-exploitation may cost the global economy tens of billions of dollars in benefits, and may affect over 150 million fishers and shore-based workers, many of whom are women, the vast majority in developing countries. Beyond declining resources, poor economic returns and related social hardships, the sector is also facing increasing concerns about its ability to satisfy future demand for protein-rich food and handle the impact of climate change.

Strong demand for fish products in the four key global markets – the EU, Japan, China and the USA – and declining catches in the developed world has led to rapid growth of global fish trade. Since 1976, its global annual value has increased by over 1000% in nominal terms and currently exceeds $86 billion. Over half of exports originate in developing countries. Most fishing activities have become marginal in financial terms; profits as a percentage of total sector value

added are predominantly generated from distribution and marketing in the main global markets, and are often captured by large international conglomerates. The consolidation of fish marketing into multi-national entities – large processors, wholesalers, restaurant and supermarket chains – has changed the relative roles of the public and private sectors in fisheries resources management. Their common interest in reliable supplies of raw material has led to parallel efforts to improve the effectiveness of fisheries management. The public sector in developed countries is increasingly using rights-based management approaches, while the private sector focuses on the sustainability of the product origin fisheries. Unfortunately only few developing countries have advanced along this approach.

In 2002, the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) considered the effective management of the natural resource base the overarching objective for economic and social development, and specified targets and approaches for the fisheries sector. This objective, the targets and approaches included several directly related to fisheries (Box 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Implementing Measures</th>
<th>Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>... by 2010 ... a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity ....</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Develop and facilitate the use of diverse approaches and tools, including the ecosystem approach, the elimination of destructive fishing practices, the establishment of marine protected areas ... including representative networks by 2012 and time/area closures for the protection of nursery grounds and periods, proper coastal land use; and watershed planning and the integration of marine and coastal areas management into key sectors</td>
<td>31 (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Achieve the Millennium Declaration target to halve by the year 2015 the proportion of the world’s people who suffer from hunger .. including by promoting food security and fighting hunger in combination with measures which address poverty..</td>
<td>38 (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not later than 2015 if possible</td>
<td>Maintain or restore (fisheries) stocks to levels that can produce the maximum sustainable yield with the aim of achieving these goals for depleted stocks on an urgent basis and where possible not later than 2015</td>
<td>30 (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underlying the fisheries challenges and the compelling reasons for addressing them is the reality that fish resources – and the marine environment in which they live - are the ultimate public goods. A healthy marine environment can better deal with the impact of climate change; rapidly increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide are already changing critical oceanic processes. Although humans mainly overexploit species at the upper levels of the food chain, substantially reducing their biomass and reproductive capacity, the impact reverberates in multiple ways to lower levels. Catching, processing and distributing fish and certain types of aquaculture have a large carbon footprint, e.g., shrimp production requires 5-10 times their weight in fuel. Hence, better governance of marine (and inland fisheries) leading to larger biomasses of key fish stocks, will increase potential future fish production, reduce the financial and energy costs to do so, and provide sustainable livelihoods for many people. It also
will reduce imbalances in the marine environment, and enhance its ability to weather future environmental shocks, including those from climate change.

1.2 Introduction

The World Bank ranked among the top global donors to the fisheries sector from 1973-2002. During the first two decades, when fisheries lending totalled an average of $400 million annually, or about 1-2% of World Bank annual lending, support focused on expanding capture and processing capacity, infrastructure and research. During the 1990s, lending volume and the number of operations substantially declined when opportunities for sustainable development dwindled, and the impact of more effective resource management paradigms was still being monitored and analysed. Lending for aquaculture accelerated, be it from a low base. Of their own volition or from implicitly following the World Bank’s lead, other development banks and bilateral donors also reduced fisheries development assistance. Following strong demand for World Bank support, notably from Asia and Africa, activities in the sector gradually increased again after 2000.

1.3 PROFISH

Following exploratory efforts in 1998-99 and three years of preparatory activities funded by Japan through the Global Trust Fund for Sustainable Fisheries, the Global Program of Fisheries (PROFISH) was created in 2005 to improve sustainable livelihoods in the fisheries sector and to make concrete progress towards meeting the WSSD’s goals in fisheries. Its work programs focused on producing a range of global goods (analysis, knowledge products, awareness and advocacy) aimed at addressing the global fisheries crisis and more effective sector governance requirements, and regional and national products designed to improve fisheries governance in target regions and specific countries. PROFISH is not an investment fund but a means to assist World Bank client countries to establish a national consensus on the design and implementation of sector strategies and plans for sustainable fisheries and mainstream these policies and plans into the national economic planning frameworks. These activities are expected to lead to an increased investment in fisheries policy reform, good governance, pro-poor fisheries strategies and other strategic national and regional investments.

PROFISH is a programming and funding partnership between key fishery sector donors, international financial institutions, developing countries, stakeholder organizations, and international agencies, located in the Sustainable Development (SDN) Network in the World Bank. It currently receives financial and in-kind support from Iceland, France, Norway, Finland, Japan (until 2006), FAO and the World Bank. The growing partnership includes FAO, IUCN, the World Bank Development Grant Facility (DGF) and the WorldFish Centre.

The present Evaluation described in this report is the result of the June 2008 annual PROFISH Steering Committee meeting approval of the Terms of Reference for the independent evaluation of the performance of PROFISH. This decision reflected the DGF requirement for independent evaluation of the past performance of World Bank Partnerships. Equally important, the Evaluation has been asked to focus on the future, with a forward assessment that aims to: better define the future role of PROFISH, its objectives and strategy to prioritise its main activities, define its institutional structure, staffing and funding and provide guidance on global understanding of sector governance as it may influence the World Bank’s future role in the sector. Terms of Reference are in Annex A.

---

3 Saving Fish and Fishers, World Bank (2004)
The Evaluation Team (Meryl Williams, Mark Wilson and Joaquim Tenreiro, Annex B) focused on three major sources of information: (i) the findings of the Quality Assessment Group (QAG) Quality-at-Entry evaluation of global partnerships; (ii) documentation of PROFISH past activities, including major global reports and country studies and progress reports and selected scientific articles (Annex C); (iii) interviews with 57 representatives of PROFISH client countries and funding partners, other donors active in the fishing sector, World Bank staff involved in PROFISH activities and World Bank managers (Annex D).

The evaluation interviews particularly focused on the relationship between each interviewee and PROFISH, his/her use of PROFISH products and services, PROFISH relevance, operational efficiency, whether it has achieved its current objectives and the nature and effectiveness of existing partnerships (Annex E provides the interview questions). To assess the future role of PROFISH, the interviews explored needs for and the nature of future PROFISH products and the advantages of its location in the World Bank. Interviews also addressed critical governance issues, notably the use of single or multiple objectives to guide sector governance, and how to move from diagnosis to effective implementation of governance in developing countries. Interviewees commented upon PROFISH involvement in aquaculture, and sought views on what fisheries could learn from or give to other sectors, especially in terms of governance approaches.

Section 1 provides the background and introduction, Section 2 examines the past performance of PROFISH, assessing its efficiency, effectiveness, work program design, contents and implementation against its overall objectives. Using qualitative assessments reflecting the views of the entire sample of 57 interviews, this section focuses on reasons for the largely positive impact of the PROFISH program at the global, national and donor levels. It also defines the main factors that will determine future PROFISH sustainability.

Section 3 looks at the short- and medium-term future. It concludes that among a multitude of reasons, key causes for the ineffectiveness of global and national sector governance can be traced to continuing uncertainty about: (i) the proper roles of the public and private sectors in sector management and control processes, (ii) the proper objectives of sector management beyond single scientific or economic objectives and including social and environment objectives and (iii) inability of the sector to attract broad political support to overcome the many blockages to reform. World Bank commitment to the Johannesburg 2015 declaration suggests a more decisive PROFISH and World Bank role in supporting sector governance improvement. PROFISH future strategy should seek and support more effective engagement of all major stakeholders in the design and implementation of a more robust sample of national fisheries sector governance programs and learn from these diverse governance experiences. Improved scientific, economic and social governance solutions – with a proven track record, and adjusted for diverse national circumstances – should then be applied by national clients, the donor community and in the World Bank. The world needs – and the World Bank can support – a partnership and centre of excellence to demonstrate more effective fisheries sector management approaches.

---

2. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

2.1 PROFISH Relevance.

2.1.1 Rationale and context at PROFISH inception

During the 1990s, when failure of traditional sector development and governance models became increasingly obvious, the World Bank reduced its activities in marine fisheries. FAO, bilateral donors, the global research community, the fishing industry and environmentalists to varying degrees realized that to reverse the global trends of declining catches, fish stocks and benefits, major efforts were needed. Particularly, strong support would be needed to assist developing countries to develop, adopt and apply more effective sector management, and achieve more and sustainable domestic economic, social and environment benefits from the sector. In the late 1990s a small group of professionals reached consensus on the need for closer donor coordination in terms of sector analysis and funding of sector restructuring, through a network-like structure of donors, technical assistance agencies and client countries, as the first step in this process.

During its design phase from 2002 to 2005 and since its inception, the detailed overall goal and objectives of PROFISH evolved (Box 2). The most recent version (2008 Progress Report) defines as its goal: to reduce poverty and improve livelihoods in fishing communities. Its objective: strengthening fisheries sector governance in client countries to make concrete progress toward meeting WSSD objectives.

The 2006 QAG Quality-at-Entry review of Development Grants Facility (DGF)-funded Global Programs and Partnerships concluded that the program satisfied priorities of clients and other donors, related closely to the core objectives of the World Bank, and its strategy for global programs (Annex F). The majority of interviewees in the current PROFISH Evaluation expressed similar views. As the next sections of this report will show, PROFISH has successfully made initial steps on various fronts towards this initial goal and objectives.

Still, there were problems. The program goal and objectives were clearly overly ambitious, given the funding, time horizon and human resources of the program. PROFISH staff early on realized the growing discrepancy between its own human and financial capacity, and the rapidly increasing internal World Bank demand for its services and demands from the ongoing pipeline of global activities. They saw this as a necessary tension given the uncertainties surrounding the work-program, as discussed below, and the lack of alternative World Bank capacity in fisheries. This led to adoption of many relatively small activities, which proved administratively cumbersome, and at times overwhelmed the limited human resources of the program. That said, the multitude of activities did enable PROFISH to start to explore how to better address the issue of developing a more practical framework for sector governance, even though this was not stated in the formal objectives. It also revealed the extent of demand for PROFISH expertise.

The lack of prioritisation did affect the balance between global and national PROFISH activities, although PROFISH tried, when and where possible, to link the two. for example, linking the global agenda to the country/regional work for ‘rent’ studies. Yet, as country activities require some level of country buy-in. the match up often proved difficult to achieve.
In principle PROFISH had more control over its global activity work program, which it could initiate itself, using its increasingly close and effective contacts with FAO, OECD and some NGOs. Nevertheless, a clear strategy for its global agenda would better serve to highlight priorities and outcomes.

National and regional activities required specific demand from World Bank clients and were even more difficult to prioritise and plan (in terms of PROFISH staff and funding requirements). In several cases, requests were reversed as Governments fell and sector authorities changed policies and their demand for World Bank or PROFISH support. Some critical activities required more time and funding than envisioned, causing others to suffer delays.

PROFISH support for World Bank related national activities often focused on Economic and Sector Work (ESW) and/or preparation of sector investments, which in practice proved somewhat opportunistic, as it required both country funding and Task Team leader support. It proved increasingly difficult for PROFISH to pick-and-choose its activities once demand increased. Lack of a clear
strategy to prioritise and reach agreement on the scope and nature of technical and financial PROFISH support to World Bank operational staff and activities – particularly to staff who needed assistance given their often limited knowledge and experience of fisheries – created mild tensions between expectations in the operational departments of the World Bank and the increasingly stretched human resources of PROFISH.

Historically fisheries did not feature in most Country Assistance Strategies (CAS’s) – being a relatively small sector in many countries. It took some time before PROFISH could get more systematically involved in the CAS preparation and review process, and was able to propose ‘better sector governance of fisheries’ in CAS’s of those countries where the sector was important or the sector’s importance had been mistakenly judged limited. Over time, this enabled PROFISH to have some influence over the potential size of fisheries related activities in the World Bank and its own role in supporting those activities.

PROFISH needed to aggressively demonstrate its viability and relevance inside and outside the World Bank, where some managers and outside institutions initially still questioned the need for World Bank involvement in the sector. As a result most initial PROFISH activities were partly selected in an opportunistic way or imposed at short-term notice to satisfy urgent SDN. PROFISH activities supporting SDN work programs proved highly demanding and sometimes unpredictable in terms of staff time requirements.

PROFISH’s role relative to other organizations e.g. FAO, OECD, etc. and ‘branding’ PROFISH in the international market proved another issue. As discussed in the next sections, however, attitudes vis-à-vis a lead role of PROFISH and the World Bank in the global fisheries development arena changed, as some donor agencies and NGOs increasingly sought such a role by the World Bank to strengthen the fisheries agenda within their own institutions, while others particularly acknowledged the financial and practical advantages cooperation with the World Bank may bring.

In terms of objectives, as the Evaluation Team analysis will show, the future focus should move particularly towards understanding of how better governance can be defined, introduced and strengthened over time in practice. The balance between global and regional and national products needs adjustment, with global and national products that contribute to better understanding of multiple governance aspects getting priority. At the operational national level, PROFISH may better integrate specific free standing surveys, information collection, political and institutional analysis and consensus building pilot activities in selected traditional project preparation and design activities. Demand for more traditional technical support to World Bank operations may be satisfied increasingly by creating a small core team of experienced external ‘on call’ consultants, with a proven track record in the World Bank. Building this team will take special care, however, as the PROFISH experience to date is that consultants that can work to the required standard are difficult to find.

Fish resources are part of the complex marine environment, mostly in coastal zones. Fisheries management therefore plays a critical role in maintaining global bio-diversity, coastal zone management, the protection of coral reefs, and – as fish production has a large carbon footprint – climate change. As the ENV department of the World Bank has particular responsibility for and interest in these activities, PROFISH goals should reflect ENV objectives and their work-programs should be mutually supportive.
2.1.2 PROFISH relevance in relation to client countries’ priorities

The ability of client countries to plan and execute adjustment of their fisheries sector governance varies widely. Some are not up to date with global developments in governance theory and practice, have no or limited scientific capability, have poorly performing, traditional institutional structures and suffer from excessive internal and external political pressures to maintain the status-quo or expand production from already heavily exploited marine and inland fish resources. Others are more advanced, understand the critical sectoral governance issues, and appear particularly well suited and sometimes eager to test new approaches. Some countries profess to aim for more sustainable management of their marine resources, but wish to apply traditional, largely disqualified approaches, or lack sufficient funding or local institutional capacity to achieve meaningful changes. Others are more advanced and are already attempting to reach political consensus on the future nature, size and allocation of sector benefits.

In addition to the above factors, most countries are also faced with a multitude of donors, technical agencies and NGOs involved in the sector, frequently having different agendas and somewhat contradicting views and widely varying abilities to assist. In theory, most countries would benefit from having a single ‘location’ from where multiple governance issues are being monitored and analysed, and from where countries can obtain cutting edge technical support to restructure their sector governance under technical and social conditions that can widely differ and have access to funding from multiple donors. In practice, while PROFISH has made great strides in the relatively short 3-year history of the program, and on multiple fronts – notably in producing global products that have received wide and repeated attention - it is still quite far from playing a more comprehensive global role. Its potential as a one-stop location to assist national sector adjustment or to facilitate access to assistance and expertise in, for example the bilateral donors, has yet to be broadly recognized.

2.1.3 PROFISH relevance to donors, other partners.

During the last decades of the previous century FAO played a critical and predominant role in advancing the scientific and economic understanding and implementation of fisheries management, while multiple donor agencies and NGOs played often relatively modest and selective roles in the development process. FAO’s role is still critical as countries begin to adopt the normative instruments agreed. While the World Bank and regional development banks were major donors in the sector, they focused on economic development aspects, and generally played a limited role in advancing improved resource management. For this reason and because the World Bank works through governments, it was slow to get involved with new management approaches such as to co-management on which NGOs, FAO and researchers had taken the lead. Now, the World Bank has less experience with new management approaches in fisheries but it can draw on the experiences other actors as far as they are relevant to World Bank products.

A small amount of relevant fisheries governance work, especially pilot or demonstration community based management projects, was also led through

---

5 A landmark FAO achievement is the 1995 Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the subsequent International Plans of Action on key fisheries matters. Article 30 (c) of the WSSD Plan of Implementation (2002) refers, viz: Implement the 1995 Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, taking note of the special requirements of developing countries as noted in its article 5, and the relevant Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) international plans of action and technical guidelines.
Changes in this *status-quo* have come about gradually, as attitudes of donors, technical agencies and NGOs concerning a different role for the World Bank and particularly PROFISH’s role have changed considerably. This partly reflected changing priorities of donor agencies – some increased their involvement in the sector, while others reduced their exposure to fisheries during the last decade – financial realities facing the donor community, and the realization that traditional sector governance approaches were failing, while new paradigms were not yet operational. FAO’s capacity has been affected by long-term reductions in their field programs that had been a key source of their experience. Overall, the FAO fisheries and aquaculture budget has been maintained by extra-budgetary funds. Normative work has increased in response to country and international demands. While some FAO and NGOs have developed substantial programs in the sector, and play a highly constructive role supporting improvement of sector governance, others have taken a more activist route towards change, often advocating ‘magic bullet’ solutions such as widespread use of marine protected areas (MPA) and blanket elimination of subsidies. These and other remedies based on science and economics alone lacked ‘how to’ or implementation savvy and overlooked that solutions are not necessarily from within the fisheries sector. They also failed to assess the political feasibility of solutions⁶ and ignored significant blockages (Box 3 and Annex G) to implementation or referred to them simply as ‘lack of political will’.

The PROFISH team has been able to use their work and the PROFISH partnership to establish and strengthen relations with donors, technical agencies and NGOs, and create credible global and national activities from the close cooperation. They increasingly realized that the agenda for changing fisheries governance and its impact on client countries would substantially benefit from closer cooperation and support – through PROFISH - from all involved parties. This suggested a potentially more elaborate World Bank convening role and expansion of its financial support. The interviews with donor and NGO representatives also suggested that some donors welcomed a more assertive PROFISH role at the global level, as this may send a message to their own agencies that fisheries is an important development target.

---

2.2 Efficiency and Effectiveness

2.2.1 PROFISH achievements according to indicators for target results

PROFISH, as a World Bank unit and partnership, was conceived as the first phase of a long-term exercise that aimed at contributing to the global reforms of fisheries policies so that countries can obtain more benefits from capture fisheries and aquaculture and address the WSSD targets. Hence, after only three years PROFISH cannot be expected to have generated sufficient results to reach this objective.

Most of the activities undertaken are very complex and require a considerable amount of interaction with other institutions to accomplish. This is not only the case for global products (e.g. the Sunken Billions or ‘rent drain’ study, the Big Numbers project, the list of irresponsible fishing vessels), but also for some regional (e.g., West Africa fisheries management initiative) and country products (e.g., Peru, Maldives, India fisheries issues reports).

Most of the results and guidance provided by PROFISH products are either in the process of being adopted by target countries and regions or, being global, are so broad that cause-effect links cannot easily be established.

Having in mind the short time elapsed and the complexity of most of the main PROFISH products, the Evaluation Team concluded that the results achieved by PROFISH have been satisfactory and provides the following analysis of achievements against the results and indicators derived from the PROFISH logframe (Annex H provides a ready reference). Budget outcomes are also examined.

---

**Result 1: Sustainable fisheries initiatives included in national plans, in poverty reduction strategies and in key donor country aid programs**

Sustainable fisheries initiatives supported by PROFISH are included in national plans, initiatives, or poverty reduction strategies, or World Bank projects of the following countries: Peru (World Bank Development Policy Loan (DPL)), Senegal (in loan project), Gabon (in DPL), Maldives, Madagascar, India (technical assistance grant for reform), Mauritania (delayed due to political issues), Guinea-Conakry (delayed due to political issues), South Africa, Sierra Leone, Liberia and other interventions are in an initial phase (Morocco/Libya/Egypt, Seychelles, Kenya, Tanzania, Lake Victoria basin countries (project in preparation) Mozambique and Vietnam (project concept note under review), and Caspian basin. Thus, 11 countries have used PROFISH assistance and more than 8 countries or groups of countries are beginning to use PROFISH. The target indicator was 10 countries (Annex H).

Policy adjustments and technical assistance programs in sustainable fisheries management are in the process of being or are already operational only so far in Peru. The target indicator was 8 countries.

PROFISH has also commissioned a preliminary study, overseen by FAO, assessing the impact of development assistance on fisheries and aquaculture and followed up an earlier FAO study with another survey of the extent to which fisheries is included, or not, in national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). The study on the impact of development assistance found few rigorous assessments and made a series of recommendations on how to overcome this problem. PROFISH is also developing a concept note to examine the links between poverty and fisheries, called *Getting on Board: Mainstreaming Fisheries into Poverty Reduction Agendas*.

**Result 2: Consensus on pro-poor sustainable fisheries initiatives promoted and fisheries initiatives established**

Consensus on pro-poor sustainable fisheries initiatives and action plans to implement the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries was developed in the following 8 countries (8 countries was the target indicator): Peru, Maldives, Madagascar, India, Mauritania (delayed), Guinea-Conakry (delayed), South Africa and Sierra Leone. Other interventions are in an initial phase, namely Morocco/Libya/Egypt, Gabon, Seychelles, Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique and Vietnam.

PROFISH has made some progress in raising awareness of sustainable fisheries among decision makers in developing countries (target of 10 countries) through co-sponsoring regional or international events (target of more than two events per year) such as: NEPAD Summit on Fisheries; supporting the L20 meeting on sustainable fisheries, the Expert Consultation on low cost fisheries management, the Expert Consultation on Sustainable Fish Trade; various OECD meetings; various UN Law of the Sea and UN Fish Stocks meetings; the UK-China Sustainable Fisheries Dialogue and, with FAO, sponsoring a session on the ‘rent drain’ study at the 2006 and 2008 conferences of the International Institute of Fisheries Economics and Trade.

A high-level stakeholder meeting – the PROFISH Forum – was organized in 2007 during the COFI/FAO. A presentation and debate on PROFISH took place on that occasion. PROFISH also supported the FAO global conference on Small Scale

---

8 On 17 February, the World Bank Board approved a $330 million Environmental Development Policy Loan to Peru, to ‘improve environmental management in key sectors of the Peruvian economy, including mining, urban transport, fisheries and biodiversity conservation’. 
Fisheries in October 2008. This high profile event brought together national fisheries agencies, NGOs, international agencies and fisheries experts to discuss the challenges of small scale fisheries and allowed several PROFISH global products to be discussed.

PROFISH has contributed Module 13, Gender in Fisheries and Aquaculture, to the 2008 World Bank-FAO-IFAD Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook. This module is a first and it has been distributed widely by PROFISH. The Evaluation Panel was informed by the editors of the Sourcebook that PROFISH had been the most collaborative and proactive sector contributing and had done more than any other sector to date in disseminating the materials. This work translates the results of detailed development research on gender and fisheries into operational suggestions. PROFISH has also helped support detailed gender analyses of the fish supply chains in Vietnam and Nigeria.

Result 3: National and international interventions on fisheries and sustainable use of aquatic ecosystems aligned, harmonized and enhanced in selected countries and regions.

Interventions, including development assistance, on fisheries and sustainable use of aquatic ecosystems and habitats have been effectively aligned and harmonized at national level in the following countries: the eight countries of the West Africa Sub-regional Fisheries Committee (SRFC) and Sierra Leone (West Africa Regional project). The indicator target was 5 countries.

For Sub-Sahara African countries, harmonized investment proposals to be based on broad-based, consensual sector plans are now in preparation through the assistance provided, with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and with partnerships with FAO and WWF, to the meetings of the Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in Large Marine Ecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa and in West Africa through regional World Bank International Development Association (IDA) investments of common interest to groups of West African countries. The target was 4 countries. In 2005, PROFISH helped support the Fish for All Summit, conducted by the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), WorldFish Center and FAO. At the Summit, African heads of state adopted the Abuja Declaration of principles for regional cooperation and sustainable management of fisheries and the sustainable development of Africa. NEPAD also released its Action Plan for fisheries and aquaculture. PROFISH did most of the drafting for these.

Consensus on regional management of selected transboundary species is being facilitated by PROFISH through support to the African Large Marine Ecosystem projects, the first move forward being those in the Gulf of Guinea where preparation is now underway. With FAO, Phase 2 of the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project is now in preparation.

Through several different activities, PROFISH promoted and made available decision tools for sustainable fisheries governance through knowledge dissemination and human and institutional capacity building, with particular reference to best practices for effective pro-poor actions and management of small-scale fisheries. The key products/projects (some ongoing) are: with FAO, the Sunken Billions approach to estimating losses from poor fisheries management (global study completed\(^9\)), Big Numbers approach, again with FAO,

---

\(^9\) The assessment methods of the Sunken Billions study have been challenged by S.J.Holt (Fisheries Research 2009 doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2008.12.019) who argued that more appropriate methods would lead to much higher global sustainable catches and higher estimates of the current economic losses than those in the report. Others (unpublished, pers. comms.) believe that the methods used in Sunken Billions likely have validity although they chart new territory in terms of the level of aggregation of fisheries data used.
to estimating the number of small scale fisheries dependent people (preliminary report available), Alternative Livelihoods in African Aquaculture (in progress), Development of MPA Guidelines (FAO), Mainstreaming fisheries in PRSPs (in progress) and a Policy Decision Paper on Wealth-based Fisheries Management (in progress). Other products in progress concern: fisheries management in international disputed areas and a survey of legislation on preferential access to inshore areas for small-scale fishers. An evaluation of the impact of fisheries development assistance has completed its first stage and the second and final stage are to be undertaken.

Through some of the above products and other activities, PROFISH has also contributed to and/or is contributing to a greater awareness of the status of global fisheries through the global goods produced and the support to international events. Many of these activities are in collaboration with FAO. In addition to those above are: the Small-scale Fisheries Toolkit, the Global Fisheries Web Portal, promotion of the private sector Alliance for Responsible Fisheries (ALLFISH), Estimate of Illegal Fishing in the SRFC countries (including Sierra Leone), Fish Price (updating the Fish to 2020 study on supply and demand – design phase), and the national state of fishery resources study. In addition, PROFISH has produced a number of fisheries Factsheets.

PROFISH has provided support to the dialogue between developing and developed countries on monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) of fishing activities and distant water fishing in numerous international events, several in conjunction with FAO, among which the following are highlighted: Global List of Irresponsible Fishing Vessels (under discussion), support to FAO Port State Measures, assistance to Small Islands Developing States on MCS (Indian Ocean, European Union (EU) project, Iceland), support to the OECD/FAO Workshop on Opportunities and Challenges of Fisheries Globalization, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission workshop on Rights Based Fisheries Management and contributed to the EU initiative against illegal, underreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing.

**Budget Outcomes 2005-2009**

From its inception in 2005 to the end of FY09 (June 30 2009), PROFISH will have received budget of at least $8.4 million (Table 1, Annex I). The income of PROFISH after its establishment was healthy, supporting the conclusion that their work is in strong demand and is relevant.

To add detail to the efficiency and effectiveness assessment, a sample of eight projects was examined in order to assess how the results are contributing to achieving the PROFISH purpose. For most of them, the ratings range from moderately satisfactory to satisfactory, based on a 6 point scale from highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory.

The projects with fisheries components that have been selected and examined, and their World Bank evaluations were as shown in Table 2.

Thus, of the 8 projects, all are rating in the higher part of the scale, with only one component of one project (Tanzania marine and coastal environmental management) scoring a moderately unsatisfactory rating. In the same project, however, one component was highly satisfactory.
### Table 1: PROFISH budget summary FY2005 - FY2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Grants (DGF, etc)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>424,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Budget</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>343,732</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF Multi Donor Trust Funds 1+2</td>
<td>697,852</td>
<td>333,000</td>
<td>1,922,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other World Bank Trust Funds</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>342,500</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>1,884,084</td>
<td>1,563,000</td>
<td>3,312,942</td>
<td>1,269,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,374,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Implementation Status and Results (ISR) Assessments of 8 PROFISH Supported Projects.

Ratings: HS=highly satisfactory, S=satisfactory; MS=moderately satisfactory, MU=moderately unsatisfactory, NR=not rated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project, (Number of ISR assessments)</th>
<th>Overall implementation ratings</th>
<th>Progress towards Development Objectives</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maldives environmental management (1)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua hurricane Felix emergency recovery – recovery of SS fisheries (2)</td>
<td>S-MS</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>S-MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Indian Ocean fisheries (2)</td>
<td>MS-S</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>MS-MS/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibian coast conservation and management (2)</td>
<td>S-MS</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>S-S/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon national resources management (2)</td>
<td>MS-S</td>
<td>MS-S</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania marine and coastal environmental management (1)</td>
<td>MS-MS</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>MU/MS/MS/HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen resource management and conservation (2)</td>
<td>MS-MS</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>MS-S-MS/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa marine water resources development (2)</td>
<td>MS-MS</td>
<td>MS-MS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Efficiency assessment

PROFISH is an extensive, complex and open program in the sense that, in spite of the results and objectives being predetermined, new interventions were often identified during its implementation. In such a situation, the determination of standards to assess to what degree the outputs achieved derived from efficient use of financial, human and material resources was not predetermined and could not be established by the Evaluation Team. Therefore, the conclusions on the efficiency of PROFISH are based on the nature of the different activities and how much they have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes, on the basis of Team members experience with comparable programs/projects, debates, conclusions and recommendations from the PSC annual meetings, opinions collected from the interviewees and contacts with PROFISH team members.

We provide an overall positive but nuanced conclusion on efficiency, as follows:

- The PROFISH Steering Committee (PSC) annual meetings provided supervision by donors that played a positive role in implementation. However, some PROFISH Steering Committee members felt that PROFISH could make better use of their time and knowledge. Papers were often late in arriving, thus limiting their consideration and ability to obtain briefing. The Evaluation Team concluded that this slippage is expected, given the lean structure of PROFISH and its wide mandate. Some Steering Committee members felt they were not dealing with the strategic level but were operating more at the project sign-off level.

- Additional, cost-effective PSC meetings could be held via teleconferences;

- PROFISH implementation could have benefited from using standard procedures and practices from comparable programs and projects elsewhere rather than having to develop many of its own procedures and practices. However, the Evaluation Team acknowledges that for some actions, such as for some clauses in DGF letters of agreement, PROFISH had to develop its own form because standards did not exist; and

- the PROFISH team has clearly worked efficiently as indicated by the large number of initiatives and projects it has established, even if most of them were undertaken by external institutions. The Evaluation Team noted a vast number of global, regional and country related subjects, all of which contributed in different extents to the achievement of the outcomes. On the other hand, perhaps fewer activities would have allowed a higher level of efficiency (less overload) during the implementation.

- During the three-year period, the selection of client countries and initiatives was gradually improved and adjusted to the perceived PSC priorities. This was also an element that influenced in a positive way the use of the resources and the achievement of the outcomes.

2.2.3 PROFISH staff and unit assessment

The PROFISH unit in the World Bank has developed very high credibility inside and outside the World Bank. This is impressive given that it is a small, five-person unit comprising: a Team Leader/Focal Point financed by the World Bank, who acts as manager, supported by two trust funded senior fisheries specialists and one junior (extended term consultant) trust funded fisheries specialist and an administrative assistant.\(^\text{10}\) Generally, interviewees rate PROFISH staff as highly

\(^\text{10}\) Recently, part-time administrative support has been given to PROFISH by ARD in order to help manage the Trust Funds.
However, all are stretched very thin given the current extensive list of activities in the work program of studies (Annex J) and the growing demands from World Bank regional staff for technical support. That said, individual PROFISH staff are very highly respected both inside and outside the World Bank. One major World Bank region involved in fisheries commented that the PROFISH provided ‘the best technical support out of all the World Bank anchor departments’ to the manager in question dealt with.

However, several interviewees also noted the following internal issues in the PROFISH unit:

- A clear framework for action (roadmap for future activities) needs to be established along with the appropriate setting of priorities within the current long list of work program activities. This would also increase the prospects of timely availability of staff to regions and timely completion of tasks. Both are considered issues at present.

- A professional manager is needed to handle overall work program management, staffing, fund raising, and general administration. As PROFISH has grown, its work has become more complex and the management load has become more onerous and critical to taking PROFISH successfully to its next level of development.

- Teamwork within PROFISH needs to be improved.

- To cope with such a large agenda and so few staff, staff selection should be more rigorous. This is in part due to the nature of trust funded positions. However, if Second Window DGF funding could be obtained, particularly for technical support to World Bank regional operations where demand is increasing, this could mitigate the issue in part. Practical operations experience, combined with strong sectoral knowledge is a sine qua non for PROFISH staff. This is particularly important given that many World Bank regional task managers are generalists and do not necessarily have the requisite fisheries experience to gain the trust of clients in a tough reform process.

- Procrastination and a tendency to jump from one activity to another sometimes results in inconsistent messages from certain PROFISH staff;

- Staff continuity is likely to suffer since the current Team Leader/Focal Point is due to retire in 18 months and one of the two senior trust-funded staff has come to the end of his contract. However, a new trust funded staff (from Iceland) has recently joined to handle private sector work, a new area of focus for PROFISH.

- Not enough priority is given to solutions to development problems (‘How to operationalise ideas’). Feedback from interviewees in the professional community generally suggests that the problems confronting fisheries are well known. Likewise, ideas for their solution are available, though often not sufficiently tested. The priority next phase for PROFISH will be to expand testing these ideas and come up with concrete examples of good governance and sustainable fisheries management. In this context, and taking the example of PROFOR, some feedback indicated that real traction in the forestry sector came primarily from outreach to World Bank regional operations rather than from extensive policy work.
2.3 Outcomes, impacts and sustainability

In time, the impacts of PROFISH will be judged on the social, economic and environmental consequences of its activities.\textsuperscript{11} As indicated in Section 2.2, actual impacts are not expected yet because PROFISH, which provides inputs at several levels to fisheries interventions on the ground, has only been going for 3 years. Hence, the Evaluation Team restricted its outcome and impact assessments to the outcomes that PROFISH products (outputs) have made in the earlier stages of the results chain,\textsuperscript{12} as knowledge and communication products and as support and services to fisheries projects.

2.3.1 Foreseen and unforeseen outcomes and impacts

PROFISH began with raising awareness of the importance of fisheries and highlighting successful development interventions within key institutions, particularly the World Bank. To do this, PROFISH itself had to become known. In this, so far, it has succeeded. All but one relevant World Bank officer interviewed knew PROFISH well and regarded its work highly. Several of the World Bank interviewees, however, felt that PROFISH should become even better known within the World Bank, and one interviewee knew little about the unit. PROFISH has created a strong demand for its work within the World Bank, an unforeseen outcome.

PROFISH core staff and consultants have provided credible World Bank fisheries expertise in dealings with client countries. Due to the short time elapsed, social, environmental and economic impacts on people and institutions in client countries are not yet expected as projects and fisheries management changes supported by PROFISH have not yet been implemented from the PROFISH initiated or supported work.

However, in helping World Bank country/regional desks prepare country analyses in, e.g., Peru, Vietnam, India, Senegal, Sierra Leone and the Maldives, PROFISH has progressed action along the results chain towards impacts by supporting consultations with government agencies and NGOs. When the projects under preparation are implemented, these are expected eventually to have positive economic, social and environmental impacts.

PROFISH's work and products have been discussed by the Board of Executive Directors on at least two occasions, the last being on the release of the report \textit{Sunken Billions} which provided the Board with a global estimate of the annual losses being incurred from poor fisheries management. PROFISH and the World Bank, however, are aware that such estimates alone do not lead directly to action and impacts but they can help make the economic case for the intervention.

PROFISH also participates as an observer to the internal Sector Boards for Agriculture and Rural Development and for the Environment, thus having access to a wide range of World Bank units. PROFISH has used this access to its own benefit and the benefit of the Bank, e.g., bringing fisheries access negotiations

\textsuperscript{11} ‘Impacts are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended’ (Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank 2007. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards.)

\textsuperscript{12} The ‘results chain’ is defined as ‘the causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives — beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts, and feedback. In some agencies, reach is a part of the results chain between outputs and outcome’ (Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank 2007. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards.)
lessons into discussion on developing country arrangements for agriculture land leases.

PROFISH technical and financial assistance had a positive outcome for designing country fisheries projects. Whereas the technical assistance would have been expected to be helpful, the Panel was interested to learn that financial assistance from PROFISH – typically of the order of US$50-100k – was also highly valued. This small but irreplaceable contribution was seen as a critical enabling factor.

Bilateral donor agency partners of PROFISH all reported that its global, country and regional work had been very influential in raising awareness in their own agencies of the importance of fisheries. Potential partners are awaiting more PROFISH products to stimulate more fisheries support. Some potential partners would like PROFISH to visit and present key findings to their own executives/ministers to better convince them. Several also mentioned the importance of the results of the current PROFISH Evaluation and the World Bank’s reaction to it to send the right signals.

Several partners commented that PROFISH, especially through the PROFISH Steering Committee (PSC), was starting to create a forum for better coordination of fisheries work. However, many felt that this incipient forum could be much further developed, with greater opportunity for input by the bilateral agencies.

Expert partner agencies, especially FAO, reported that the PROFISH collaboration and resulting products are highly valued and have helped give their own work greater credibility. WorldFish Center reported that PROFISH support enabled them to undertake several activities with FAO.

### 2.3.2 Factors and processes that may explain outcomes and impacts

The Evaluation Team concludes that two chief factors have contributed to the positive outcomes of PROFISH work to date. First is the selection and quality of the work produced so far by PROFISH and its partners. Second is the location of PROFISH in the World Bank.

Without both of these factors, the achievements of PROFISH would no doubt have been much diminished.

On the less positive side, factors that likely held PROFISH impact back were the small size of the PROFISH unit, lack of clear priorities leading to a long list of activities and less than full use of the PSC. The small PROFISH unit, complemented on projects by experienced consultants, manages a large number of activities and multi-donor Trust Funds. The management needs of the program thus are large and complex relative to its budget and the size of the core team.

The lack of dedicated fisheries expertise in the country and regional desks of the World Bank is both a drawback and a bonus. It limits capacity but creates extra demand for work.

### 2.3.3 The extent to which PROFISH can become sustainable

The Evaluation Team considers that the key question for the World Bank is not the sustainability of PROFISH per se but how the World Bank and PROFISH partners can develop further and sustain their fisheries and aquaculture assistance. In the short term, the Evaluation Team is convinced that PROFISH is the vehicle of choice to help achieve this and one that can be developed further.

To be sustainable, PROFISH needs a clear strategy, a focused program and resources to undertake it. The strategy would help convince the World Bank and
partners of the need to take PROFISH forward and also help to attract funds to a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). The Evaluation Team provides recommendations to achieve this in Section 3.

Beyond 5 years, some functions of PROFISH could be absorbed into mainstream World Bank work. Ongoing fisheries work would be taken up by a combination of ARD, ENV and World Bank country/regional fisheries experts or fisheries-literate Task Team Leaders, plus special thematic trust funds in a manner similar to the World Bank’s forestry operations. These themes could arise under such topics as food security and climate change. Nevertheless, the Evaluation Panel envisages an ongoing need for fisheries donor coordination as outlined in the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

PROFISH will need stable and increased funding for at least the next 3 years, and preferably for 5 years. Its current annual budget ($3.3 million in FY08) is provided by a mix of MDTF, World Bank budget and DGF funds. Partners also make in-kind contributions. The World Bank’s budget funding has been critical ‘glue’ to the PROFISH partnership.

### 2.3.4 Factors affecting PROFISH sustainability

The Evaluation Team sees great merit in broader ownership of PROFISH and, at the risk of having to accommodate a wider range of views on its direction, believes that more donor agencies and development banks should be encouraged to join PROFISH. However, the minimum membership contribution of $150k should not be lowered to achieve this and the World Bank’s critical budget contributions should be continued and increased.

In practice, a PROFISH with more partners can still prosper if a strong strategy and focused program are developed.

Financially, PROFISH and all development funds will be challenged by the world financial crisis. However, a strong case can still be made for increasing the budget through broader membership.

Long term, the most critical factor for PROFISH and the World Bank will be to see fisheries management improvements implemented and leading to political, economic and environmental sustainability. Section 3 addresses in more detail how the Evaluation Team sees the sustainability of PROFISH being secured.

### 2.4 Lessons Learned

#### 2.4.1 PROFISH operational lessons

From interviews and its own assessment of the progress and performance of PROFISH, the Evaluation Team drew the following lessons:

- **Expertise**: In-house fisheries and aquaculture expertise is essential for the World Bank to engage with client countries and expert agency partners on fisheries and aquaculture projects. PROFISH has provided a clear World Bank entry point for fisheries and, to some extent, aquaculture and has helped forge partnerships with other development assistance agencies and fisheries expert partners. Presently, PROFISH is a central (ARD) unit. To move to the next phase with greater operational engagement, the World Bank also needs central and country/regional fisheries expertise. Key country/regional desk officers also need to be fisheries ‘literate’. Similarly, given the increasingly complex legal aspects of fisheries management and sector governance, the World Bank needs in-house expertise in these matters.
• **Raising development awareness of fisheries and aquaculture:** PROFISH work and products have raised World Bank and development partner agency awareness of fisheries issues such as the current economic losses due to poor governance and some of the tools that can make fisheries more sustainable. Without PROFISH, the World Bank Executive Board would not have been briefed on sector issues. The communication campaign on the release of Sunken Billions demonstrated the importance of distributing the message. More generally, positive fisheries development messages need to be well communicated in order to overcome the current general perception that little works in fisheries development. For example, Hersuog and colleagues\(^\text{13}\) pointed out that Norwegian fisheries development assistance had actually performed ‘better than its reputation’. This is likely generally true for fisheries development.

• **Partnerships:** For its first phase, PROFISH has established sound and relevant partnerships, including with bilateral donors, early stage engagement with conservation NGOs, global development and research agencies and the private sector. In its next phase, these partnerships will need to be enlarged and deepened for PROFISH to become fully effective.

• **Location in the World Bank:** For many reasons, stakeholders interviewed were nearly unanimous in supporting PROFISH’s location in the World Bank. The work of FAO and PROFISH were seen as complementary. Any real or imagined overlap with other agencies was thought to rather provide opportunities for collaboration and, occasionally a measured amount of healthy competition.

• **PROFISH management and staffing:** With growth and complexity in the work of PROFISH comes a need for greater management capacity and administrative support. For example, time and resources are needed to manage the large number of outsourced work contracts.

### 2.4.2 Development lessons from PROFISH related to development assistance agencies social and economic goals

PROFISH is only in the early stages of delivering development lessons, but still the Evaluation Team felt that some were beginning to emerge. At this stage, the lessons are chiefly for development agencies and they follow from the conclusions above on PROFISH itself. The Panel concluded that:

- **World Bank leadership:** Development assistance agencies take a lead from the World Bank. Lacking a clear path forward for fisheries development, the World Bank reduced its presence in fisheries and lost its fisheries expertise and therefore access to promising developments, including in testing and promoting new fisheries governance approaches. Likewise, many of the bilateral and other multi-lateral development assistance agencies, such as the regional development banks, also reduced or eliminated their assistance to fisheries and aquaculture, thereby doubly weakening help to the sector at a critical time.

- **Sector policies and strategies:** A symptom of the World Bank’s withdrawal from fisheries and aquaculture is that it lacks sector policies and strategies: In the absence of a formal strategy or policy on fisheries and aquaculture, the sectors have suffered additional drift in World Bank

priorities, especially in relation to other sectors with better defined directions such as forestry and water. The World Bank’s fisheries policy vacuum, combined with a low fisheries profile in many client countries has resulted in fisheries being absent from many Country Assistance Strategies (CASs). The Evaluation Team, however, does note the creation of the fisheries scene setting documents developed by PROFISH, namely “Saving Fish and Fishers” (2004) and “Turning the Tide” (2005), which begin the process of exploring fisheries and aquaculture directions. The World Bank should now be considering the next steps down the path to a fisheries and aquaculture strategy.

- **Aquaculture**: Aquaculture should be made a more substantial part of the package of ‘fish’ related efforts by PROFISH as the two sectors intersect, not least in the supply of food to markets. This expansion of the PROFISH mandate was strongly supported by nearly all stakeholders, especially those dealing with Africa and Asia. However, the Evaluation Team cautions that PROFISH must ensure that it supports sustainable aquaculture that benefits poorer segments of society and does not damage the environment, as foreshadowed in the PROFISH report “Changing the Face of the Waters” (2007). Support for high value and/or carnivorous species is not recommended except in certain circumstances. For example high value filter/deposit feeding bivalves and holothurians, e.g., giant clams, pearl oysters, sea cucumbers, can be cultured by small scale farmers on remote islands.

- **Fisheries and aquaculture in development**: These sectors are relevant to many development themes. In many countries, experience shows that fisheries or aquaculture alone will not garner significant development attention in their own right. Therefore, the sectors will need to link themselves with critical development issues such as the world food crisis, food security, climate change, poverty alleviation, biodiversity and gender.

### 2.4.3 The one-two-three of ‘how to’ reform fisheries

At its inception interview, the Evaluation Team was asked to challenge the perception that fisheries is the only rural sector which demonstrated a fundamental uncertainty over what to do, and how to do it. This ‘how to’ dilemma occurs despite strong agreement on the critical issues in the sector and to a lesser extent the desired outcomes. While the Evaluation Team acknowledges that reforming fisheries to achieve better multiple objectives is challenging, we point out that lessons learned clearly show successful reform is attainable.

First, we caution against looking for a single blueprint or magic bullet solution or reform and suggest, instead, ‘how to’ tools that are essentially processes able to be tailored to each case. Reforming fisheries means dealing with institutional development and thus governance should be the main focus. In client countries and in development agencies, a pre-condition to reform is to get fisheries on the development agenda and recognize the political economy of reform.

Challenges occur in three critical areas: (i) how to effectively handle the political nature of the sector governance decision making process, notably prior to and during sector reform; (ii) disagreement among stakeholders and professionals about the relative importance of the separate, but closely related elements of the ‘triple’ bottom line (economic, environmental and social performance of the sector); and (iii) the sequencing of a sector restructuring process. The relative importance of the components of the triple bottom line ultimately need to be determined by the key stakeholders involved – after having considered the impact of potential alternatives.
The main ‘how to’ or operational tools address these challenges. They are: effective, place based problem analysis (diagnosis), sequencing of interventions, implementation experience drawn from within and outside the fisheries sector and a learning approach.

In a nutshell, the ‘one-two-three’ of how to reform fisheries is:

1. Make governance and institutions the main focus
2. Include fisheries and aquaculture in the mainstream development agenda, and
3. Apply the key operational tools of problem diagnosis, sequenced interventions, implementation experience and learning.

1. **Focus on governance and institutions:** At this stage of development of fisheries and aquaculture, the World Bank and other development agencies should be focusing their work on reforming and strengthening governance of fisheries and aquaculture. Good governance is a means, though not an end, to fisheries reform. Addressing fisheries governance essentially means careful engagement with institutions, especially existing institutions. Bilateral development assistance agencies that have stayed the course on fisheries, such as NORAD and DFID, have considerable experience in assistance to fisheries governance reforms. FAO has led normative and technical assistance in governance. NGOs and research agencies such as WorldFish have experience of certain governance forms, such as community based and comanagement. PROFISH and the World Bank roles will need to complement, draw from and extend the experience of these partners. PROFISH could create a bridge to get the partners’ fisheries governance knowledge applied, tested and scaled up in World Bank sector products. PROFISH can help develop joint World Bank and donor governance programs in key countries, and link fisheries governance to wider World Bank agendas such as governance and anti-corruption and the World Bank Institute’s governance studies.

2. **Fisheries must be included in the mainstream development agenda:** To get the attention needed to trigger assistance, fisheries need to be included in national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) and Country Assistance Strategies (CAS). Over the last two decades in the World Bank, agriculture faced the same struggle for recognition and eventually succeeded. Fisheries are usually low in client country priorities and will rarely feature as a country priority in their own right. Multiple entry points are possible, however, for fisheries and aquaculture components in loans and technical assistance. World Bank country staff, client country fisheries managers and donors need to engage fisheries in the bigger development issues. Once fisheries is on the development assistance agenda, however, new national policy and legal arrangements may still be needed before loans and other assistance can progress.

Once agreed, reforms may still not be implemented as planned. PROFISH is encouraged to continue to help client countries understand the political economy of reforms and prepare to overcome blockages. For many fisheries interventions, decisions are ultimately in the hands of governments, albeit with varying amounts of stakeholder drive and engagement. Through working with World Bank and donor partners, PROFISH has learned valuable lessons concerning the political, economic and social drivers, inertia and blockages to reform. These lessons should be harnessed and expanded.

---

14 The Evaluation Team supports Hersoug’s view that fisheries do not operate in an ‘institutional vacuum’, and ‘piecemeal engineering’ is preferred rather than ‘grand design’ (Hersoug, B. 2007. Evolution of Fisheries Development Assistance, PROFISH Forum).
Engagement in development issues is a two way street. The World Bank and other development agencies should routinely have fisheries included in mainstream development themes such as governance and corruption, climate change, rural development and poverty. Excellent, though still modest, examples of where this has happened is the fisheries and aquaculture module in the World Bank-FAO-IFAD Gender Sourcebook for Agriculture, and the fisheries chapters in high profile World Bank publications such as “Global Issues for Global Citizens” and “Environment Matters”.

In some cases, PROFISH will need to challenge prevailing narratives that exclude fisheries and aquaculture as positive interventions. For example, the Evaluation Team was informed that fish were not seen as part of the solution in the World Bank’s Global Food Crisis Response Program due to the apparently unbridgeable global supply-demand gap. Yet, local reality can be quite different. For example, aquaculture has made tilapia and Chinese carps affordable fish for poor people in Bangladesh.15

Development agencies, including the World Bank and other PROFISH partners have strong poverty eradication agendas and yet fisheries, and to a lesser extent aquaculture, present real challenges to this agenda. Fisheries development is noted to have made few inroads into eradicating poverty in the sector.16 A large part of this failure may have come from misdiagnosis of fisheries-poverty links17 and overlooking the rational economic reasons for the persistence of small scale fisheries.18 The ‘how to’ approach the Evaluation Team suggests should go some way to overcoming this problem. Thus, fisheries should also be included in the poverty eradication agenda but with clearer diagnoses of the sources of poverty in the sector.

3. Operational or ‘How to’ tools

- **Problem diagnosis**: Each case is different and needs its own analysis and estimate of potential gains and transition costs. A country (or similar), and not just a sector, analysis is needed as fisheries are nested in wider social and ecological systems, and local systems are nested in broader geographic areas.19 A checklist of items that should be in the diagnosis is emerging; it includes the traditional estimates of the financial, biological and employment losses under current management and potential gains under alternative future scenarios, an assessment of current and future governance of the fisheries, and the changing status of the resources, workforce and social structure, supply chain and markets. While making a whole-of-supply chain analysis, the gender and other social dimensions


16 NORAD 2009. Ibid.

17 This results in confusion of the quite different reasons for poverty in fisheries, each needing different interventions. In one case, the concept of marginalization wherein ‘they are fishermen because they are poor’ occurs where fisheries act as a social safety net and solutions lie mainly outside the sector, e.g., in viable alternative or diversified livelihoods. A second case, ‘they are poor because they are fishermen’, requires solutions within the fisheries to render them more productive, profitable and equitable. (Bene, C. 2003. When fishery rhymes with poverty: a first step beyond the old paradigm on poverty in small-scale fisheries. World Development 31:949-975.)


should be fully included as these lead to a much clearer picture.\textsuperscript{20} The diagnosis should include a political assessment of critical future decisions and institutional arrangements as part of a scenario analysis of the sequencing of implementation.

The diagnosis helps focus attention on specific place based needs and possible solutions.\textsuperscript{21} NORAD’s successive evaluations of Norwegian fisheries projects over 50 years have indicated the importance of a good understanding of the actual fisheries situation to achieving positive development outcomes.\textsuperscript{22}

- **Sequenced interventions:** Improving sector governance is a complex process involving legal, financial, institutional, leadership and decentralization aspects on top of the more traditional adjustment of fleets, infrastructure, MCS, research, product quality control and marketing. Getting the sequencing of different reform elements right is critical, and will require in-depth understanding of the local situation and political environment based on a good diagnosis. For example, a country seeking to gain greater value from its fisheries resources may need to upgrade its landing ports to control product quality as well as monitor landings.

- **Implementation experience and learning:** Diagnosis and proposed reforms are only the preludes to action. Priority should be given to action, especially testing, piloting, reviewing and fine-tuning development interventions on the basis of experience. The ultimate and interim results of the reforms must also be measured to inform the learning process and to transparently monitor progress against the agreed and objectives of the triple bottom line - economic, social and environmental.

Many development agencies, including the World Bank, are now systematically pilot testing and adjusting interventions. PROFISH is using this approach with co-management in Senegal fisheries. The Evaluation Team is strongly in favor of making this approach core to PROFISH. As a central unit in a global lead development agency, the World Bank, PROFISH is ideally placed to apply rigorous experimental and research methods to possible development interventions. In the health sector, this is now referred to as ‘implementation science’.\textsuperscript{23}

The challenges of fisheries development and the changing world within which fisheries operate require that fisheries governance institutions, client countries and development agencies become learning institutions. Countries are repositories of a wealth of lessons on how to reform and one of the challenges is to tap into this wealth. Sectors from which lessons can


\textsuperscript{21} For example, broad diagnoses of three different small scale fisheries indicated different priorities for management in each, namely: building local custodial institutions to limit fishing (Solomon Islands beche de mer); protecting and rebuilding remnant lake fish stocks and diversified rural livelihoods during low water regimes (Lake Chilwa, Malawi); and improving the capacity of fisheries governance in multiple use land and water management (Tonle Sap, Cambodia) (Andrew, N. et al. 2007. Diagnosis and management of small scale fisheries in developing countries. *Fish and Fisheries* 8:227-240).


be learned include other natural renewable resources such as forests, land and water, rural development, and management of non-renewable resources such as minerals and energy. In addition, fisheries reform can learn from reforms in education, health, tax, etc. Reflexively, the fisheries sector can teach lessons to other sectors.

Across regions, considerable scope exists for cross-country learning, perhaps now best exemplified by the peer-to-peer approaches used within the OECD. Lessons can be learned from failures and partial successes, if cultural barriers to learning from experience can be broken down.

2.5 Conclusions on Performance Assessment

Relevance: The Evaluation Team concluded that the design of PROFISH was relevant from inception and agreed with the 2006 QAG Quality-at-Entry assessment that the PROFISH program was relevant to the priorities of clients and donors, related to the core objectives of the World Bank and the World Bank’s strategy for global programs. Through the work program developed, PROFISH has further developed its relevance to client countries, the World Bank, donors and other partners. PROFISH has produced relevant global fisheries products and met country and regional demands for services. In the absence of strong priority setting, however, PROFISH’s responsiveness has led the program to be spread too thin.

Efficiency and Effectiveness: On the basis of the analysis of performance against the indicators for the 3 results specified in 2005 PROFISH logframe, the qualitative efficiency assessment and the sample of Implementation Status and Results assessments, the Evaluation Team concluded that PROFISH’s performance has been at above satisfactory, though not yet at the highly satisfactory level. This performance is particularly worthy of merit because the PROFISH team has been small and the demand for its services larger than expected.

Substantial progress has been made towards the ambitious PROFISH goal and objectives. PROFISH has contributed to raising awareness of fisheries management good practices and effective fisheries management tools and to upgrading legal and regulatory frameworks to support sustainable and equitable use of fisheries resources. The World Bank, GEF and other donors are beginning to allocate greater financial resources to meet the investment and recurrent costs of fisheries management and control in developing countries and at regional level. Through PROFISH, more donor interventions are being aligned and harmonized in support of national strategies for sustainable fisheries.

Outcomes, Impacts and Sustainability: The Evaluation Team concluded that PROFISH has successfully revived World Bank awareness of and interest in the fisheries sector. This awareness is leading to more client country, World Bank country/ regional and donor partner fisheries activities but much more is still needed. Social, economic and environment impact due to PROFISH activities is not yet measurable as many of the practices and approaches proposed are yet to be implemented. The outcomes of PROFISH work have been successful because of well-chosen activities, the quality of the outputs and because PROFISH is located in the World Bank. However, the outcomes were hampered by lack of clear priorities, few staff relative to the number of activities and the need for strengthened management and governance as the program grew.

Overall, the Evaluation Panel concluded that PROFISH is the current and medium term (5 years at least) program of choice for supporting development assistance to sustainable fisheries. Further, PROFISH could be sustained in an enhanced form through attracting more bilateral donors and development banks to join.
Lessons learned: PROFISH demonstrated that locating strong, credible fisheries experts in the World Bank unleashed an internal and external demand for fisheries projects and began to raise awareness of the sector. The program should create a platform for action, testing fisheries and aquaculture governance reforms through pilot tests and experiments leading to improved approaches. Aquaculture should also be included in PROFISH.
3. FORWARD ASSESSMENT: REFORMING FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE

3.1 A clear vision and objectives for PROFISH

The early achievements of PROFISH are well recognized and widely acclaimed. Even so, the Evaluation Team concluded that PROFISH would benefit from a clear statement of purpose and direction that readily communicates its role and intentions to internal and external audiences and helps define the work program. On the basis of stakeholder feedback and the Panel's own deliberations, a draft for discussion is presented for PROFISH to consider and develop further (Box 4).

**BOX 4: Draft Vision, Mission and Objectives**

The *vision* of PROFISH is a world with sustainable, equitable fisheries and aquaculture, nourishing people and supported by a healthy environment.

The *mission* of PROFISH is to lead and support the World Bank, other donors and client countries in developing effective approaches for restructuring fisheries, restoring fisheries resources, developing sustainable aquaculture and rebuilding aquatic habitats.

The *objectives* of PROFISH are to provide products, services and tools to:

- Improve the effectiveness of fisheries and aquaculture sector governance
  
  Fisheries governance is subject to huge challenges in conserving and managing the exploitation of commons resources. PROFISH will operate as a catalyst in exploring governance methods through analysis of critical issues, testing of management approaches, notably in small-and mixed small and large scale fisheries and aquaculture, and providing support to reforms in fisheries and aquaculture management.

- Help client countries make concrete progress towards meeting the WSSD’s goals in fisheries
  
  To restore fisheries resources and aquatic environment, ambitious global targets were set by the 2002 WSSD International Plan of Action. As part of the goals of improved sectoral governance, PROFISH will help focus client countries, the World Bank group, other development banks, bilateral donors, intergovernmental and non-governmental expert fisheries partners on developing and implementing actions to meet the WSSD targets.

- Improve sustainable livelihoods in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors
  
  Fisheries currently are fully or partly supporting too many people, many of them poor women, men and children working in long fish supply chains. In working to improve fisheries governance, PROFISH will collaborate with other experts in other sectors to ensure that restructuring considers all those in the supply chain and that fishing effort reductions occur in a fair and equitable manner. In aquaculture, livelihoods are at risk from environment, fish health and trade conditions. PROFISH can assist client countries and the World Bank build capacity to better manage these risks.

- Elevate the profile of fisheries and aquaculture on critical global agendas
  
  Fish and livelihoods are rarely high on global agendas. PROFISH will advocate for recognition of the fisheries and aquaculture issues on global agendas, especially food security, climate change and poverty.
3.2 Relevance and future demand for PROFISH services and products

Section 2.1 described the context within which PROFISH was designed and how its relevance to client countries and development agencies continued to evolve during implementation. In this forward assessment, the future demands for PROFISH products and services are addressed, drawing on the expressed views of interviewees. Different types of stakeholders had different present and future demands covering: global sector analysis, arranging funding from the World Bank and others, assisting World Bank regional/country desks in preparing projects and raising public awareness, including educating World Bank and others of the problems facing fisheries and the benefits from solving them. At the time of the interviews, the consequences of the global financial crisis and its likely impacts on trade and demand for fish and on the use of the fisheries welfare safety net were not yet signalled.

3.2.1 Client countries

The Evaluation Team was, unfortunately, unable to contact and interview several key client country officers familiar with World Bank fisheries work due to intervening political events and personnel changes in several countries. However, the interviews achieved were rich and useful.

Fisheries departments in client countries want the World Bank to help them increase the economic value of their fisheries, and provide more assistance to better control the sector. This can involve support preparing basic diagnostic studies on the sector covering fish stocks, industrial capacities, labor profiles, economic, environmental and social issues, reduction of the fleet and role of public and private sectors to provide the basic rationale for government policy formulation and decision making.

Countries also want technical recommendations on sectoral transparency, the role of aquaculture and, specific to the country, advice on sub-sectors, e.g., anchoveta and tuna in the case of Peru. PROFISH helped in the training of staff and diffusion of ideas is also requested, along with long term investment support as the World Bank operations go through subsequent phases, e.g., DPLs II and III etc.

At the outset, they seek World Bank help getting the fisheries sector included in World Bank operations. Client country finance and planning ministries are more likely to seek advice on what to do in fisheries and aquaculture if the World Bank has in-house fisheries and aquaculture expertise. Fisheries expertise will only be relevant, however, when readily available to the World Bank’s operational units that directly interact with the client country finance ministries.

3.2.2 World Bank, International Finance Corporation and Global Environment Facility

Among the 31 World Bank, International Finance Corporation (IFC) and Global Environmental Facility (GEF) Secretariat staff interviewed in depth, specific requests and suggestions for PROFISH support varied with the responsibilities of the interviewee. In general, most thought that PROFISH should highlight the big fisheries issues for World Bank attention and get fisheries into the high profile and mainstream World Bank programs such as those on governance, corruption and climate change.

In ARD, officers wanted PROFISH to contribute cutting edge technical content into broad World Bank rural development products and sought guidance on what the
World Bank should be doing and advising on fisheries. Markets and regulatory issues should also become a focus for PROFISH.

In ENV, officers saw fisheries as an entry point to better ecosystem management and wanted guidance on tackling the enormous problem of the dependence of small scale fisheries on fragile and overexploited ecosystems such as coral reefs.

In the regional and country desks of the World Bank, requests for PROFISH services were much more operational. The requests ranged from advice on the best operational approaches, clarification of the public and private sector roles in fisheries and aquaculture, especially veterinary services, on-the-spot expertise when engaging with knowledgeable stakeholders, to co-financing for project development and solid analytical work on legal aspects of fisheries.

IFC and GEF requests stressed the need for a sound set of tested development approaches for fisheries and aquaculture. In the case of GEF, these approaches are needed in relation to the environment and in the case of IFC also in relation to viable private sector investments.

The International Finance Corporation (IFC) Agribusiness division currently lacks expertise in fisheries and aquaculture and yet it needs the expertise to judge the quality and feasibility of large fisheries and aquaculture projects submitted. To overcome its past experience of the sectors as risky, especially from poor government regulations and a poor environment record, it needs a sound set of tried and tested development approaches to build its loans around. At present, IFC has reduced its risk by curtailing its activities to mainly fish processing and shrimp aquaculture.

The Global Environment Facility (GEF), which is supporting certain PROFISH activities in Africa, and receiving services from PROFISH, seeks greater capacity in PROFISH to speed up project development and help meet GEF’s own tight timelines for project development and implementation. GEF also seeks support for its fisheries private sector engagement, especially with respect to discussions with private sector banks that fund the world’s overcapitalized fishing fleets. GEF also looks to PROFISH to use its World Bank convening power to gain access to client country finance ministers, other senior officials and national clients, as the client country environment ministry links of GEF are not as strong as those of the World Bank. GEF considers that this access to senior government officials and agencies is also vital in solving the governance of shared stocks within shared ecosystems. Finally, GEF wishes PROFISH to extend its efforts to helping the environment projects achieve better sustainable livelihood outcomes to support conservation, and to extend its work to the open ocean challenges for marine conservation, especially on seamounts accessible to fishing.

### 3.2.3 Donors, OECD, OECD Countries and other Development Banks

The 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness stressed harmonization of donor actions. Most bilateral development agencies look to the World Bank for leadership and a sense of direction in development assistance, although they also have their own sectoral, social and environment policies.

In fisheries, the donors, OECD and OECD countries fisheries agencies want the World Bank to help influence developing countries by engaging their governments in fisheries reform. The World Bank could lead a paradigm shift and help get people out of fishing. The World Bank could also do more to raise the awareness of client countries of the importance of stronger fisheries management so that they can engage more meaningfully in regional fisheries management organizations. The OECD envisages further collaboration with PROFISH on policy
coherence between developed and developing countries over joint managed fisheries and fish trade.

To succeed in such a bold direction, the World Bank will need to help raise the profile of fisheries with development assistance agencies, communities and OECD parliaments and PROFISH would need to create a strong fisheries donor forum for harmonizing assistance.

The development banks and bilateral donors offered to co-finance more economic studies in fisheries, e.g., economics of rebuilding fish stocks, as a mechanism for communication and exchange of ideas.

3.2.4 Other partners, including research, development and conservation NGOs, private sector

FAO wants the World Bank to continue to use its leverage on governments, such as in providing country level support for fisheries development assistance and preparing countries for financing in fisheries. It welcomes continued technical cooperation with PROFISH, with a focus on economics, social development, political analysis, fish stock assessment by country and aquaculture.

Conservation NGOs believe that the World Bank should focus on the unpopular issue of reducing fishing capacity, including steps to stop subsidies for fisheries and tackle how to address equity in distribution of the shrinking resources. PROFISH should assist the World Bank to direct more attention to land based sources of pollution in its terrestrial programs and examine the role of healthy ecosystems as carbon sinks.

Research organizations such as WorldFish are concerned that more be done to understand vulnerability of fishing dependent communities and the practical options for the people in them.

This group of partners wants PROFISH to continue and expand its work of putting fisheries on the political agenda. It has mixed views as to whether PROFISH should also cover aquaculture and inland fisheries.

The private sector representatives want assurances that their voices will be heard. The developed country industry wants priority given to rights based management approaches. They would also appreciate more links to the World Bank and IFC experience in other sectors such as small and medium sized enterprises, storage, refrigeration, port facilities and development financing. PROFISH and ALLFISH could be conduits for this access.

3.3 Building on lessons learned: work program scope and detail

The World Bank and other development assistance agencies are seeking a new set of tools, beyond traditional economics and biology, with which to frame the critical institutional dimensions for restructuring overexploited fisheries and for assisting the sustainable development of aquaculture. In the main, the search for these tools should be considered separately within the scope for marine fisheries and inland fisheries and aquaculture. Section 3.4.3 described the Evaluation Team’s conclusions on current approaches.

3.3.1 Scope for Marine Fisheries

PROFISH’s focus on marine capture fisheries in its initial phase was strongly supported as essential to develop the credibility which PROFISH needed to gain funding support and professional acceptance. Moving forward, there is strong support for refining the marine capture fisheries focus to how to relieve the
pressure on coastal fish stocks by controlling fishing at critical times and places, reducing the number of people depending on fishing full or part time, helping people find or create viable alternative livelihoods and helping client countries, coastal communities and the larger scale private sector sort out competing uses of fisheries resources. Although some insights can be obtained from approaches in other sectors (e.g., forestry, rural, mining), property rights issues and fishing community development approaches were also considered to be specific enough to warrant a sectoral approach with specific sectoral skills. The fisheries approach will need to take industry structure into account, including the scale of types of production units, the supply chain and the public/private sector roles.

In most marine fisheries, the problem of fisheries overexploitation is immense, however, and has resulted from the past and continuing build up of all forms of fishing effort caused by more fishers, using more numerous and powerful fishing gear in more environments. The problem cannot be reversed overnight by single solutions applied in all situations. The overexploitation issue has typically been treated as a problem for the fisheries catch sector but in reality its effects are embedded deeply in the economies and societies and connected to other actors in the supply chain and to local and distant market drivers. Efforts to reduce fishing pressure, whether by regulations on gear, licences, vessels or closed seasons have only partially succeeded in many developing country fisheries. Efforts to remove vessels and fishers altogether from the sector have also commonly fallen short of needs. The problem of overfishing is thus being addressed in a number of ways from trying to control the fishing done by fishers to controlling over-capacity in fleets and fishing gears (e.g., the FAO International Plan of Action on Fishing Capacity).

PROFISH should make governance that is effective in reducing fishing pressure its main focal area. It should explore different possible entry points with governments, communities and special interest groups for enabling the process of fisheries restructuring and of determining the end result. Social and economic sector entry points such as health, income, credit, gender and education programs may offer possibilities. Measures will be needed to soften the impact throughout the supply chain of moving people out of fishing, and reducing the fish catch in the short-term. The size and nature of incentives to engage in different jobs and reduce the risks of such occupational changes, should be balanced against the urgency of resource rebuilding. In place-based fisheries situational analyses, thorough gender analyses should be included in order to fully understand the types of fishing, supply chain roles and opportunities presented in the sector. In addition, the fisheries sector budgets should not be expected to pay the full adjustment costs as the fisheries resources, which are public goods and long have been overexploited to provide public and private benefits.

Balancing regional and country fisheries support is a difficult problem for marine fisheries. Country initiatives are essential but can be undermined by factors in the region, such as uncontrolled fishing on shared stocks and developed countries exporting of unwanted fishing vessels to distant fisheries. Interviewees were not in agreement on this point, with some interviewees considering the ongoing regional approach in West Africa as a model and other commenting that this example has also highlighted the need to maintain a strong country focus since investment programs are still heavily country-based, particularly in the World Bank. The Evaluation Team believes that this is not an ‘either/or’ question but rather an ‘and/but’ issue that needs balance between the regional and country approaches.

3.3.2 Scope for Aquaculture and Inland Fisheries

The Evaluation Panel heard strong support for PROFISH to become more actively involved in aquaculture and inland fisheries. The reality is that about half of all
fish products entering the food market already come from aquaculture and, in certain countries/regions, such as Lake Victoria and the Mekong Region, inland fisheries play a large role.

The types of sustainable aquaculture the Evaluation Team believes PROFISH should focus on should be small-scale, local, environmentally sustainable systems with good commercial and food security potential. Larger scale enterprises are more the domain of IFC, for which PROFISH could also provide support if funded to do so. In the case of small-scale operations, markets are likely to be more local and/or the benefits more likely to stay local if the markets are distant. There is a large interest in aquaculture in Asia (East and South) and Africa, where major challenges still exist on governance, environmental sustainability, value chains, bio-safety, food safety and quality standards. Feedback emphasized that if PROFISH becomes involved in sustainable aquaculture, the emphasis should be on sustainable technology in the face of intensification. Caution should be exercised where feeding regimes depend on fish meal. Restocking of natural fish stocks, under appropriate bio-safety conditions, should also be considered. On small-scale inland fisheries, issues of governance and effort reduction are similar to marine fisheries, but usually on a different scale. Inland fisheries have the distinct advantage that certain resources can be rebuilt in part by stocking of hatchery reared juveniles. Hence, while more brainstorming is required in order to develop a clear strategic approach, the likelihood of positive outcomes from more effective governance of inland fisheries is potentially higher. In both aquaculture and inland fisheries, gender roles should be understood in the supply chains and opportunities supported from women and minority groups.

The overall outcome was very clear, namely to include aquaculture as a separate but parallel activity within PROFISH. Likewise inland fisheries should be folded under PROFISH's existing operational umbrella and specific PROFISH priorities explored. Subject to additional resources and before embarking fully into these new fields, PROFISH should decide its strategy and focus in aquaculture and inland fisheries.

### 3.3.3 Scope for Fisheries and Aquaculture in Global Themes – Climate Change and Food Security

Among the many global themes relevant to fisheries and aquaculture, the Evaluation Team considers that climate change and the world food crisis should be given priority.

In the case of climate change, the World Bank is currently preparing the 2010 World Development Report with the theme of Climate Change. Both in terms of mitigation (reducing emissions from the sector and examining carbon sequestration capacity in fisheries and aquaculture ecosystems) and adaptation to climate changes (temperature, salinity, ocean currents, ocean chemistry, salinity change, regime shifts), the sectors have a great deal at stake. If they are not given due treatment in the World Development Report, a major opportunity for development action will be missed.

Likewise, the World Bank Global Food Crisis Response Program should be convinced to include fisheries and aquaculture components.

### 3.3.4 Fisheries Needs a World Bank Framework for Action

During the Evaluation, strong support was expressed for a clear statement of PROFISH's strategic goals but little appetite was shown for an approach based on the traditional, voluminous sector policy papers or even policy notes. Knowledge per se was not considered a key constraint in the sector or for recovering fish
stocks, rather what is needed are more networks of the informed to implement, test and adapt solutions in more settings. Consequently, a consensus developed around preparing a Framework for Action, ideally in a simple matrix e.g., like the format of a logframe. This would draw on the extensive analytical and, to a lesser extent, operational experience of PROFISH’s first phase, supplemented by relevant global experience for PROFISH partners.

The World Bank Framework for Action in fisheries and aquaculture would take the following approach:

- Focus the work agenda on a few items in designated fisheries types and regions.
- Prepare the policy path for fisheries, recognizing the current positioning of fisheries and the possible fisheries and other relevant sector and thematic pathways forward.
- Strengthen the implementation and execution of fisheries and aquaculture projects and clarify the multiple governance objectives sought, especially taking note of the challenges of trying to simultaneously satisfy the ‘triple bottom line’ of social, economic and environmental objectives.
- For aquaculture, support equitable and environmentally sustainable developments that increase the supply of fish and/or provide opportunities for small scale operators.
- Create more resources for fisheries and aquaculture reform by strengthening the World Bank convening role and developing a coordinated/umbrella approach to operational support and co-financing.
- Communications: Although PROFISH has helped raise the World Bank and donor awareness of fisheries, much more is still needed.

RECOMMENDATION 1 PROFISH Framework for Action

The World Bank could achieve greater internal and external support for fisheries and aquaculture by developing more formal directions for the sectors. The Evaluation Team, therefore, recommends that the first step towards developing a formal sector policy or strategy is to charge PROFISH to design a 3-5 year rolling fisheries and aquaculture Framework for Action. The Framework should be developed using the following approach:

- **Focus the work agenda on exploring how to design and enhance sector governance:** During the transition from over-exploitation to long-term sustainability, focus on small and mixed small and large-scale coastal and inland fisheries and on sustainable aquaculture. In these fish production systems, redefine public and private sector roles in fisheries governance, while ensuring that the public good nature of fisheries is recognised. The agenda should also address the political economy of reform and the impact on financial, social and environmental benefits created in the entire value chain. To support national projects, the state of fish stocks, the supply and demand for key fish species and the structure of the value chain, including gender roles, should be assessed. The agenda for regional and national activities would contain a short, priority order list of themes to be implemented in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America.
- **Prepare the policy path:** Take steps to ensure that fisheries and aquaculture are well covered in Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) documents and in global agendas for the world food crisis and climate change. Fisheries reforms are path dependent and must be built on sound country and sector analyses.
• **Strengthen the implementation and execution of national and regional fisheries and aquaculture projects**: Start by identifying those countries and regions most suitable for exploring enhanced governance approaches, expanding political, social, institutional and economic analysis, learning from cases, and testing and adapting solutions, excluding less suitable places e.g., those that are politically unstable and unreceptive. A case file of successful and not so successful practical examples should be built to assist the World Bank to come up with specific solutions at the country level. PROFISH should also encourage rural, environment and food projects to more commonly include fisheries and aquaculture components and ensure their implementation is resourced and fully monitored. Typical projects where fisheries is the entry point may focus in the first instance on methods for reducing fishing pressure, while mitigating the initial decline in benefits, including the impact of reducing the number of fishers and other workers. In aquaculture, focus on regulatory and food safety institutions. Projects should also include capacity strengthening at individual and institutional level in client countries. Establish indicators of PROFISH performance for reporting (Rec. 6). For non-fisheries projects, the entry point could be fiscal reform, land tenure, health, education or other reforms.

• **Raise more resources for fisheries and aquaculture reform**: Increase the World Bank’s contribution to PROFISH to leverage resources and strengthen the convening role with other development assistance agencies and partners.

• **PROFISH to continue to undertake a few well chosen global analyses**: In collaboration with specialized agencies such as FAO, IFPRI, OECD, WorldFish Center, national institutions, NGOs and other World Bank units, PROFISH should undertake high quality, peer reviewed global studies. The responsibility and ownership of each global product should be made explicit.

• **Develop a strategic communications program**: To accelerate understanding in the World Bank, bilateral agencies, and developing countries, PROFISH needs a focused communications program with clear messages on governance options (e.g., pros and cons of rights-based management), and single incentive (e.g., wealth) versus multiple-objective (e.g., exports, food security and environment) based management in developing country fisheries.

### 3.4 Institutional framework

#### 3.4.1 Locating PROFISH in the World Bank:

The value of locating PROFISH in the World Bank (World Bank) was consistently reaffirmed throughout the interviews (Section 2.4.1). As described in Section 2.1.1, this is a significant shift in views from the early days of the PROFISH concept. The World Bank has considerable comparative advantage when it comes to promoting the fisheries agenda globally. Other United Nations agencies, such as FAO, and also bilateral donors do not have the same leverage as the World Bank with decision makers in developing countries nor are they as well equipped to deal with tough policy agendas. In this respect, the World Bank has a proven track record of advising Governments as they strive to make important decisions in areas such as fisheries governance and priority investments. Furthermore, the World Bank’s global convening power and capacity to promote coordinated, integrated approaches with other members of the donor and NGO community at
the country level, is proven. PROFISH also benefits from the experiences and cross-sectoral learning from similar World Bank-led initiatives, inter alia, in forestry, water, energy, land, mining and the environment. Likewise, being in the World Bank requires PROFISH to take a more holistic approach to development at the client country level. Rather than a stand-alone sector, fisheries needs to be viewed as an integral part of a more complex, multi-sectoral, overarching political agenda. Fisheries management cannot be considered in isolation from other governance issues, institutional and legal arrangements, economic conditions, and political realities. This integrated approach is well established at the sectoral level throughout World Bank business processes. The multiple legal aspects of national and international fisheries sector governance equally suggests the need for support from the World Bank’s Legal department.

PROFISH, in turn, has had a highly positive effect on the World Bank’s re-engagement in fisheries and has provided an important context for discussion and partnership through its studies and operational support to World Bank regional operations. A key ingredient has been the challenge of creating awareness of fisheries in the minds of World Bank country directors. This involves striving to ensure that key strategy documents such as CAS, PRSP and also core policy operations such as DPL, reflect the importance of sound fisheries resource management on reducing poverty, creating wealth, adding value and ensuring environmental and social sustainability.

3.4.2 Governance of PROFISH

The PROFISH Steering Committee (PSC), which formally meets once a year, received very positive feedback during interviews and is seen as an important forum bringing donors and creating an opportunity to harmonize their fisheries agendas (refer to Section 2.3.2 regarding making better use of the PSC). The PSC comprises a balance of UN agencies, bilateral donors, NGOs and the World Bank. However, at present, developing countries and fishers, especially small scale fishers, are not adequately represented. Other anomalies exist in that FAO which is a key global player in fisheries and also a contractor to PROFISH, is a member, while IUCN (also a contractor) is not an official member of the PSC. Membership requires a contribution of $150k to the multi-donor trust fund and there is interest from additional bilateral agencies to become members. However, some of the latter interviewed reported they lack support from their respective ministries, who do not recognize the priority of fisheries in their development programs. In this context, there were multiple requests for PROFISH and senior World Bank Management to make presentations in front of the respective parliamentary committees, highlighting the importance and potential value of sustainable fisheries to developing countries.

On the PSC, comments and recommendations from interviews included:

- The PSC should have a greater role in reviewing PROFISH’s performance against objectives and should be more accountable for the PROFISH priorities, particularly the balance between global studies and the operational support to regions. This is currently the sole responsibility of World Bank management and the Focal Point. Initially the World Bank Directors of ARD and ENV were to be jointly responsible, however in practice the Team Leader/Focal Point reports to ARD.

- Senior Officials from participating agencies need to attend in order to raise the profile of the PSC and PROFISH. In the case of World Bank, this would include the Directors of ARD and ENV, and when possible the VP of Sustainable Development.
• The PSC, as a routine, should hold a closed meeting, i.e., without the unit staff present, before the main PSC to enable any governance and performance matters to be aired.

• In the day following the formal PSC meeting, donor members should meet together to discuss their fisheries and aquaculture programs and explore avenues for greater coordination.

• PSC documents should be circulated well in advance of the meetings to allow senior government officials sufficient time to participate in, and be briefed on, the agenda.

• All PSC documents should be ‘decision ready’ and clearly indicate the PSC decisions and action needed. Currently, certain documents lack clarity on what is required of the PSC, e.g., the late-delivered ALLFISH agenda paper at the February 2009 meeting required PSC decisions that were not spelt out. Such practices do not allow PSC to function properly as a decision making body.

• The PSC could benefit from studying the functioning of ESMAP (Energy Assistance Management) to determine how to increase the participation of senior management from the World Bank and other SC members. In this context, increasing the scale of total funding is considered not only important but highly appropriate.

• At present, the ASEAN and African Union representatives are the only ones representing developing country interests, although offers to the Organization of American States and ICSF were declined. Some interviewees felt that at least one more developing country person should be added to the PSC.

The Evaluation Team considered the suggestions and made its own analysis of the options for enhancing the governance of PROFISH. The Team concluded that the World Bank should elevate its convening role in PROFISH by providing the Chair of the main governing body. In suggesting this change, the Evaluation Team hastens to stress that this view is not in any way intended to imply that the current and past PSC chairs have done anything but exemplary jobs. Rather, we note that the World Bank is the main funder of PROFISH, makes extensive use of its services and, through it, seeks collaboration with other agencies in fisheries projects (see partner roles below). A Director-level World Bank officer, preferably the Director of ARD, would elevate the status of the governing body and signal a high level of interest in the functions of the fisheries program. As PROFISH’s role develops, the interest the World Bank shows will both provide leadership to fisheries and aquaculture development and increase the attention directed at fisheries and aquaculture by client countries, development assistance and specialist agencies. Bilateral development assistance agencies are entrusting funds to the World Bank and, in return, the World Bank should be expected to provide high level leadership that brings relevant broad knowledge to fisheries and aquaculture development. At present, the World Bank takes a minor role in the PSC, thus underplaying the opportunity to bring greater development insights and convening power to the work of PROFISH.

3.4.3 Donors and potential donors
As noted above, the PSC gets high marks on bringing donors together in an attempt to harmonize their agendas in fisheries. Likewise the PROFISH unit is viewed overall as an effective, professional unit. Among the bilateral donor community, some are very active in the sector, e.g., Department for International Development (United Kingdom), AFD (France), Iceland and New Zealand and clearly value the work and products of PROFISH, some of which are prepared with considerable help from contractors such as FAO. Within this group, there is
excellent communication with the Team Leader/Focal Point and selected PROFISH staff. A second group of bilateral donors and potential donors, however, suffer from a lack of political support for fisheries from their own governments. They are, as a result, frustrated by their inability to participate more fully in the PSC and on joint activities with PROFISH or even to co-finance with the World Bank in regions where their own development programs may actually operate in other sectors. Some in this group requested help to raise awareness in their own political institutions. A third group of countries are either uncommitted or still need further convincing, including Japan that supported the precursors of PROFISH, AusAID (Australia), the European Union and USAID. PROFISH should plan the best strategy for also including regional development banks. The banks are circulated the key documents but only the African Development Bank has shown interest.

3.4.4 Partners

PROFISH partners of all types consider the relationship to be healthy, dynamic, evolving and growing.

In its preeminent UN role in fisheries and aquaculture, FAO is the major partner at the technical level and has an excellent working relationship with PROFISH on the PSC Board and through the work program. Indeed, FAO was instrumental in fostering the creation of PROFISH out of the former Forum for Sustainable Fisheries. FAO now also sees PROFISH as an important opportunity for business, via its role as valued expert contractor. GEF has worked closely and effectively with PROFISH and currently supports African work and is interested in the private sector links. A few bilateral donors stand out as being particularly active in support of the PROFISH agenda, namely, Iceland, New Zealand and Norway and, in areas such as alternative livelihoods, USAID and also WWF have collaborated very closely with PROFISH. For WorldFish Center, the PROFISH partnership creates opportunities to direct their research to practical applications appropriate to their poverty reduction mission.

A key partnership which still needs further nurturing is with World Bank regional country directors who are responsible for managing overall World Bank agendas at the country level. They decide on priorities for investment and most importantly, they lead discussions on broad based policy issues, including governance, institutional and regulatory reform. This will be an increasingly important partnership as PROFISH moves more deeply into operational cross support within the World Bank.

With respect to NGO partners, the Evaluation Team considers that strict criteria should be developed regarding membership of NGOs. Only NGOs with substantive on-the-ground fisheries and aquaculture activities should be invited to participate, the total number should be capped and no organizations that are primarily concerned with advocacy should be included. WWF is already an observer at the PSC and IUCN should also be invited to join as it represents over a thousand conservation agencies and government departments.

---

RECOMMENDATION 2 PROFISH Policy and Planning Group

In order to strengthen the governance of PROFISH and help achieve its objectives, the Evaluation Team recommends that the current PROFISH Steering Committee be replaced by a PROFISH Policy and Planning Group, with the following responsibilities, membership and modus operandi:

- The Group will be responsible to the financial supporters of PROFISH for the planning, approval and performance monitoring of the Framework for Action and the Annual Work Plans. It will also serve as a consultative
As a first priority, the new Group will produce a clear mission, vision and objectives for PROFISH, establish operational procedures for its own business and for the conduct of PROFISH business and oversee the creation of the Framework for Action.

- The Group will be chaired by the Director of ARD, World Bank. The ENV department of the World Bank will also nominate a senior officer to the Group. The other members will be:
  - senior officers, with authority, of development assistance agencies that contribute $150k or more to the PROFISH MDTF or with proven, direct in-kind contributions of more than $150k annually to PROFISH activities.
  - one senior officer from FAO
  - up to 3 experts from client country or regional organizations in key PROFISH regions (Africa, Asia, Latin America, Pacific)
  - up to 4 members, including WWF and IUCN from non-government organizations and the private sector. The criteria for non-government organization members should include substantial on-the-ground activities in fisheries and aquaculture development and that the primary operations are not advocacy, and
  - one senior officer representing WorldFish Center.
- The PROFISH Program Manager will be the Secretary to the Group. The Chair and two other members nominated by the Group should constitute an Executive Committee with a more frequent oversight role.

### 3.4.5 PROFISH Annual Work Program

To implement the 3-5 year Framework for Action (Rec. 1), the Evaluation Team recommends that PROFISH should adopt the practice of preparing an Annual Work Program. In designing the first Annual Work Program, consider the following principles and priorities:

- Simplify the agenda according to the priority tasks in the Framework for Action.
- Focus on bringing ideas into practice, i.e. pilot initiatives to give practical and measurable tests of evolving theoretical concepts for a limited number of countries and projects to increase the chances for success and replication.
- On global and methodological studies, consult with the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group on a list of no more than 2-3 main outputs per year.
- Bring more development thinking into the analytical agenda, and do not look only through a fisheries prism e.g. when considering rights-based approaches and political economics.
- Actively and dynamically support the World Development Report on climate change and initiatives on the world food crisis
- Shift the overall balance towards more cross support to World Bank regions/countries. In this context maintain an unallocated portion of the
total budget (10-15% at the beginning of the FY) to be able to respond to unanticipated demand for operational support.

- Over the next 1-2 years allocate 5+% of the budget to raising awareness of fisheries issues in (a) the donor community, thereby stimulating additional core funding and (b) client countries to generate policy change and potential investment opportunities, e.g., August 2009 African Heads and Ministers Meeting as follow up to NEPAD Fish for All African Summit in 2005.

- Continue support to private sector initiatives such as ALLFISH the secretariat for which will be housed in the International Coalition of Fisheries Associations (ICFA) and other work contracted to FAO and others, and is currently being supported by GEF. An important objective of this initiative will be to involve small and large actors in the sector.

- Work with FAO to find ways to encourage countries to develop more transparent reports on the status of fisheries resources

---

**RECOMMENDATION 3 PROFISH Annual Work Plan**

Emphasising the importance of transparency in successful partnerships, the Evaluation Team **recommends** that PROFISH develop and publish an Annual Work Plan which describes how the 3-5 year rolling Framework for Action implementation will be advanced for that year. The Annual Work Plan:

- Will be drafted by the PROFISH unit, using standard World Bank work budgeting formats for finances and staff resources, plus narrative;

- The target resource allocation will be: 60% client country/region work, 20% global; 15% new opportunities and 5% communications.

- Should indicate contributions to the WSSD targets and the MDGs;

- Will include performance indicators and a report of achievements against the previous year’s indicators;

- The Plan draft will be discussed with donors and partners, amended and the final approved by the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group. It should be published by the start of the World Bank financial year. The consultation process for preparing and agreeing the Plan will also serve to select the few key global and client country/region activities agreed for the year.

---

**3.4.6 PROFISH unit staffing and support groups**

Interviewees in general considered that the role of capture fisheries and aquaculture in the World Bank development agenda over the next 3-5 years is likely to increase and, so too will the demand for staff with relevant skills and knowledge. There was also fairly uniform agreement on the types of skills needed and also the need to balance these staff between PROFISH in ARD and sector departments in the regions. Regardless of location in the World Bank or source of funding, all these staff should be members of a Fisheries Thematic Group, along the lines of the existing, successful Land, Water or Transport groups. The Senior Fisheries Specialist in PROFISH (below) would lead this thematic group and would be responsible for arranging regular meetings (3-4 times per year), setting agendas, and soliciting feedback prior to the AGM of the SC.

The current structure of PROFISH – a focal point in the Agriculture and Rural Development (ARD) department in the World Bank linked to several trust funds – has created a useful early platform. In the World Bank, the next phase of
PROFISH should have its own program coordination, funding and research functions stationed in ARD and its critical mass in the World Bank regions linked to outside agencies. The Evaluation Team envisages that PROFISH will have enhanced management, greater clarity of purpose and greater focus in activities. To achieve this, a modified institutional structure is proposed.

A further matter that the Evaluation Team was asked to consider was the Iceland proposal for a Reform Unit in PROFISH (Terms of Reference 18h, Annex A). This proposal was made by the Foreign Minister of Iceland to the World Bank President in 2008. The Team commends Iceland for its initiative in bringing this need to the attention of the World Bank President and notes that the Minister’s letter is another good example of the awareness-raising power of the PROFISH partnership.

The Team feels that the Reform Unit proposal is covered in the present Evaluation Report recommendations in two ways. First, the Framework for Action Recommendation 2) and ‘how to’ conclusions strongly recommend a focus on governance and reforming fisheries institutions. Second, the enhanced staff complement (Recommendation 4) contains strengthened PROFISH staff and operational capacity in an integrated way to permit the World Bank and PROFISH to have more significant impacts on fisheries reforms. To establish a separate Reform Unit runs the risk of overlap of tasks and fragmentation of the PROFISH team.

**RECOMMENDATION 4: PROFISH Staffing and Support Groups**

In order to sustain its success to date, PROFISH will need to further develop partnerships and accelerate the implementation and impact of fisheries and aquaculture reforms. In order to achieve these goals, the Evaluation Team **recommends** adding two additional positions to the current structure: (i) by replacing the existing Team Leader/Focal Point position with two new positions, a Program Manager and a Lead Fisheries Specialist, and (ii) adding an aquaculture specialist. The proposed new structure would be as follows:

**PROFISH Unit in ARD**

- **Program Manager:** This position would be World Bank/ARD funded. It would provide strong managerial skills, be responsible for funding, donor coordination, personnel management including nurturing teamwork, monitoring outsourced work (e.g. to FAO, IUCN), public relations, links to PSC, prioritizing PROFISH tasks and individual staff member’s work plans. Given the upcoming retirement of the current Team Leader/Focal Point, the selection process for the Program Manager should begin immediately after the February 2009 PSC meeting in Rome.

- **Lead Fisheries Specialist:** This position would be World Bank/ARD funded. This person would be responsible for the overall technical and strategic direction of PROFISH and, jointly with the Program Manager, the selection of new staff. S/he would also coordinate the fisheries thematic group activities. In order to attract highly qualified applicants, and given the level of responsibility expected, this position should be graded at the same level as other ARD Sector Advisers.

- **Fisheries economist:** This position would be trust funded and requires expertise in macro economic policy and governance. PROFISH should seek to continue the current arrangements with the New Zealand Government.

- **Fisheries industry/private sector:** This position (now on board at PROFISH) would be trust funded and requires private sector and commercial expertise and would be responsible for supporting initiatives such as
ALLFISH. Arrangements are under way with the Government of Iceland to support such a position.

- **Aquaculture Specialist**: This position could be funded by World Bank/ARD or a new (future) trust fund. The special focus of the work would require a regulatory and policy specialist with good links to global institutions, and would be supported by the “On-Call” roster of technical specialists (below). Preferably, this position should be located in a World Bank regional department (preferably East Asia) to ensure strong links to operations, however with the administrative flexibility to work across regions on demand.

- **Junior fisheries specialist**: This position would be World Bank funded as an Extended Term Consultant (ETC), as at present.

- **Administrative assistant**: This position should remain World Bank funded and is essential to the support of PROFISH.

- **Budget and Trust Fund Administrative Support**: This position would be shared with other ARD units, as currently planned.

**Regional Operations officers with strong fisheries experience funded by World Bank regions or TFs:**

- Regional World Bank operations officers are needed to service fisheries and aquaculture investment and policy operations. Recommended target number by region, over the next 3-5 years, subject to budget and TF availability, are: Africa (3+), South Asia (1+), East Asia and Pacific (1+), LAC (1).

- To support multiple PROFISH activities, the Legal Department requires the services of a legal specialist with a background in fisheries and environmental law. Bilateral funding (as with France in Africa) could also be explored. Other short term sources could be from the “On Call roster” (below).

- World Bank operational staff should be given training in basic fisheries and aquaculture development approaches.

**PROFISH and ARD contract**

- To demonstrate transparency in the PROFISH partnership, including the donor Trust Funds, PROFISH and ARD should follow a clear contract of work covering budget and staff week allocations by task as occurs in World Bank regional operations departments. This would involve an annual Retrospective on Progress and Future Work Program, following standard World Bank formats.

**PROFISH Support Groups**

- **PROFISH “On Call” roster of experienced specialists**: A roster of external technical specialists should be called upon by PROFISH or the World Bank regions to form an external team of experts who understand and would participate regularly in World Bank operations in specific regions. Ideally, to ensure their availability at short notice, a retainer mechanism should be used, particularly for support to the regions. The regions, not PROFISH, would be responsible. Bilateral donors also may provide experts.

- **Leaders Advisory Panel**: PROFISH should replace the current Forum with a high level Advisory Panel that will include high profile, highly respected leaders and thinkers with knowledge and ideas relevant to progressing the fisheries and aquaculture reforms. The Group could include top FAO specialists, famous authors, other sector related VIPs. This group would be
selected to cover global or regional themes and play key roles in supporting and promoting these agendas and PROFISH’s program overall.

- **ALLFISH:** A time frame should be established for this important private sector based network to become a separately managed activity with close linkages and coordination through PROFISH.

- **A Fisheries Thematic Group**, coordinated by the Lead Fisheries Specialist, should meet regularly to discuss areas of mutual interest in fisheries and aquaculture. World Bank-wide, all relevant staff working on fisheries and aquaculture sector issues and operations would be included, especially PROFISH, regional operations, and other interested staff in ARD and ENV.

### 3.4.7 Funding

Increasing the sources and levels of funding will be crucial to PROFISH’s long term impact and success. Trust funds, DGF, GEF and World Bank resources have been essential to the operation and success of this first phase of PROFISH. Looking forward, and assuming the increasing demand for PROFISH products and services is to be met, an increase in overall funding will be required. This will again place a high premium on PROFISH management spending time on fund raising and budget justification. Consequently, high priority must be given to finding a replacement for the retiring Team Leader/Focal Point so as to make a seamless transition at this critical stage.

Examples of such funding could include:

- Additional World Bank (ARD) budget for the two new positions of Program Manager and Aquaculture Specialist. World Bank commitment sends a very strong signal to donors and potential donors and will leverage new funds.

- DGF Second Window Facility to meet increasing demand from World Bank regions

- New Trust Fund sources, e.g. France and Australia. In addition, through the afore-mentioned awareness campaign in potential donor capitals, increase PSC membership and/or additional TF resources to the existing multi-donor facility. An important element in this regard would be to secure 3-5 year commitments to ensure continuity of programming and technical support.

- Continue efforts to convince Japan to re-engage.

- Search for new sources of grant support similar to GEF’s assistance to African and ALLFISH initiatives. Examples include foundations.

- Recognize the long term potential value to the PROFISH agenda of significantly strengthening the important role of fisheries and aquaculture in the Climate Change WDR and the Food Crisis Agenda. There may also be an additional benefit in that, in the short term, these World Bank initiatives have extra sources financing.

### RECOMMENDATION 5: PROFISH Funding

In view of the success to date of PROFISH, the continuing donor commitment and the large scope of work that is anticipated in the next phase, the Evaluation Team **recommends** that PROFISH, with the oversight of the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group, develop a funding target, strategy and plans to raise the necessary funds from different sources over the next 3-5 years. The communications strategy should be linked to fund raising. Examples of funding
could include additional World Bank, DGF Second Window Facility funds, new Trust Fund sources, renewed efforts to retain existing and past donors (e.g., Japan), new sources of grant support (e.g., from foundations) and sources from thematic global funds (e.g., for the world food crisis, climate change).

3.5 Indicators to measure the progress of PROFISH

Measures of the success of PROFISH differ for different stakeholders (and ‘shareholders’). As indicated in Section 2.3 above, the ultimate measures of success will be in the impacts on the ground, impacts such as resource rents from restored fish stocks, distribution of the wealth and benefits from fisheries, the health of fish stocks and aquatic ecosystems. To achieve impact on the ground, however, the products and services of PROFISH are only one set of inputs, often to the intermediate stages of an impact pathway. First they must be used, often adapted to specific local conditions, and merged with other inputs to create outcomes leading to impact. To understand the likely pathways to impact, PROFISH and partners should undertake participatory impact pathways analyses for selected projects.

In the absence of project or activity impact pathway mapping, the Evaluation Team restricted itself to suggesting measures of the proximate success of PROFISH work. The list is organized according to stages in the results chain and benefited greatly from suggestions from several interviewees. Most of these measures are straightforward to make, and for some a routine monitoring system can be established to record the measures.

Table 3: Suggested Indicators of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Awareness and Reputation</th>
<th>In World Bank, awareness of PROFISH products and services, at successive organisational and functional levels from Executive Board to country desks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Dissemination IT measures | - PROFISH webpage hits; document downloads  
- Press coverage of PROFISH products  
- number and relevance of outlets taking up stories  
Professional credibility and quality of PROFISH products measured by  
- peer reviewers, reviews in journals, conferences, etc |
| Donor partner coordination   | - Number of donors, partners coordinating assistance, policies, due to PROFISH support |
| 3. Early Stage Adoption and Adaption | Number of countries reforming fisheries policies as a result of PROFISH support  
Number, size and quality of World Bank pilot or demonstration projects attributable (in full or part) to PROFISH facilitation |

---

Number, size and quality of donor pilot or demonstration projects attributable (in full or part) to PROFISH facilitation

Number of country/regional projects that emulate PROFISH global products, e.g., rent drain studies

Number of World Bank donor projects/activities considered as a result of PROFISH facilitation, but not followed through

Number of countries adopting PROFISH best-practice tools

4. Full Adoption

Number and size of World Bank loans that can be traced to PROFISH facilitation or assistance

Number and size of donor projects that can be traced to PROFISH facilitation or assistance

5. Impacts

After a suitable time lag, the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group should commission selected ex-post impact assessments for relevant outputs, subject to being able to assess impacts and attribute credit.

6. Overall Program quality

Quality of portfolio of projects as assessed by periodic evaluation

Value delivered to different stakeholders (client countries, fishers and fish workers, development assistance agencies, researchers, NGOs in conservation and development) as assessed by a structured survey

Direct and simple sources of verification will not be available for many of the above indicators and so some form of study or professional survey will be needed. The importance of PROFISH and the impact estimates will warrant such an investment.

**RECOMMENDATION 6 PROFISH performance indicators**

In order to measure results-based performance for PROFISH, the Evaluation Team recommends that the Framework for Action include:

- performance indicators that measure the application of improved governance practices, such as awareness and reputation, dissemination, early stage adoption and adaptation, full adoption and overall program quality;

- indicators of client country progress in the political will for change in sector governance, and

- professional assessments of the attributed contribution of selected PROFISH outputs to social, economic and environment impacts, as determined by the PROFISH Policy and Planning Group after a suitable lag period to show results, and while ensuring the assessments are affordable and add value.

### 3.6 Risks

#### 3.6.1 Risks to the World Bank

PROFISH, working with World Bank officers, has made considerable progress in certain World Bank regions/countries to raise the profile and reduce the risks of involvement in fisheries activities. Global studies (e.g. *Sunken Billions*), policy operations (Peru Development Policy Loan), pilot testing of fisheries management
and governance options (Senegal co-management), major regional initiatives (West Africa), and sequenced policy through to investment approaches (India) have all contributed to reducing the perception that the sector is too risky for country directors to include in their work programs. At the same time, World Bank officers are increasingly aware that fisheries resources are part of a complex of public goods of the potential wealth creation in small scale fisher communities, and the need for sustainable approaches to all forms of natural resources extraction.

Political will to carry out necessary reforms and changes to sustainable management systems remains an important blockage, especially as fisheries reform needs support beyond the fisheries departments, e.g., in the Ministries of Finance and also at the local community level. However, this is true of many sectors in which the World Bank operates. PROFISH can mitigate some of these risks by raising awareness of decision makers, using specific data and experiences derived from other countries in similar stages of development or from other sectors within the country. As mentioned previously, an important starting point within the World Bank would be to ensure that key country and multi-sectoral strategy documents (e.g. CAS) include an analysis of, and recommendations for, the fisheries sector. This not only will create awareness in World Bank country directors, but will also raise the profile of the sector in the World Bank’s dialogue with government where many of the issues are common throughout the economy, e.g. governance, property rights, institutional weakness.

3.6.2 Risks Facing PROFISH

The lack of an effective World Bank global work program on fisheries is a major constraint to the sector as a whole, and not just for World Bank initiatives like PROFISH. Other sectors, most notably water, but also to some extent Forestry, have developed a global consensus on generic work programs, albeit with considerable effort and time involved. PROFISH can help in this respect through its donor/partner coordination mechanisms to bring such a work program to fruition. In the meantime, interviewees urge PROFISH to test various mechanisms on how to implement reforms, not only in governance and property rights, but also in sustainable eco-friendly management systems. This is considered a priority activity and will, to a certain extent, determine whether PROFISH will be judged as successful or not. However, the special complexities in fisheries and aquaculture, e.g., resource assessment challenges, shared resource management, high levels of trade, will create additional challenges to PROFISH in finding successful interventions.

3.6.3 Risks Facing Partners

Partners’ risk is not increased by working with PROFISH. On the contrary, the ability of PROFISH to bring together such a wide range of parties to discuss areas of common interest in the fisheries sector reduces individual partner’s exposure to risk. That said, the blockages to change are formidable in all countries and entities involved in this sector (Box 3). Likewise, discussions of the respective roles of the public and private sectors highlight the challenges to reform. Partners also face the usual reputational risks of each being seen by its constituents to have compromised on principles when organizations with disparate aims, e.g., environment versus peoples’ livelihood, cooperate to bring about long term benefits.

Despite the risks to those agencies that support fisheries reform, the Evaluation Team believes that the risks are manageable.
Annex A: Objectives of the Evaluation and Forward Assessment

Extracts from the Scope of Services and Terms of Reference: Evaluation and assessment of future role of PROFISH.

B. Purpose, Scope of the Independent Evaluation and Strategic Assessment of Future Role

12. The exercise aims to address three closely related but separate tasks:

(a) To ensure that PROFISH activities meet the fiduciary requirements of the PROFISH Trust Funds and the Development Grant Facility (DGF).

(b) To carry out a strategic assessment of PROFISH, including its future role, its funding, governance, possible redefinition of its core activities and exit strategy as may be required.

(c) To assess the nature and value of the key PROFISH global, regional and country level products, taking into account: the WSSD’s goals in fisheries, other relevant goals for fisheries and for the broader natural resources agenda, and the need for measurable indicators of progress.

D. Objectives of the Evaluation and Forward Assessment

17. The evaluation of the past performance of PROFISH would have the following specific objectives. It would:

(a) Assess the performance of PROFISH against objectives, annual plans and taking into consideration (i) assumptions made during the design and establishment of PROFISH; (ii) assumptions made in preparation of the annual work programs and (ii) factors that have positively and negatively impacted on the results;

(b) Analyze what lessons from these experiences should be applied in the design of the future role of PROFISH.

18. The objectives of the forward assessment will be as follows:

(a) Demand. Assess and define future demand for PROFISH activities from client countries, bilateral donors and multilateral organizations, notably the World Bank;

(b) Comparative advantage. Identify the comparative advantage of PROFISH and the potential focus of PROFISH activities within a World Bank context, and deliver a clear vision, based on comparative advantage, for the future program to enable it to develop and implement its future sector strategy. Such PROFISH mission and vision, may include long term (5+year) strategies, that may be directly linked to World Bank strategies, and short to medium term (1-5 year) objectives.

© Objectives. Review whether the role and main objectives of PROFISH, as currently defined, are still fully relevant and define how they should be adjusted;

(d) Indicators. Suggest associated key progress indicators for the PROFISH program. These indicators should be specific enough to evaluate/prioritize future PROFISH work programs and projects.

(e) Best practices. Seek and synthesize ‘expert’ opinions from across the globe about the effectiveness of tools, approaches and partnerships currently applied to effectively manage sectors and pursue sustainable development agendas, including, but not limited to forestry and fisheries;

(f) Scope and prioritization of activities. Assess the nature of future PROFISH ‘products’ including those related to aquaculture, and define demand for such activities for which demand appears most pressing, and the implications the use
of such products would have in terms of likely effectiveness, risks, costs and human resources.

(i) Assess whether aquaculture should be an integral part of the PROFISH work program, or how the demand for aquaculture ‘products’ can be integrated into World Bank activities;

(ii) Recommend on priority and non-priority PROFISH activities with particular reference to the global goods agenda.

(iii) Define PROFISH future role in supporting marine and inland fish culture;

(g) Governance. Discuss the “Governance Arrangements for PROFISH” and to which extent they are adequate and appropriate for PROFISH to reach its goals and objectives, and for the organizing of the Program and recommend upon the most desirable future shape of PROFISH, in terms membership, governance, objectives, administrative structure, funding and staffing, with specific recommendations for:

(i) the role and responsibilities of the Steering Committee; (ii) management structure and responsibilities; and (iii) systems and processes to manage; (iv) PROFISH finances, (v) information and knowledge, (vi) staff, (vii) client and stakeholder relations and communication, and (viii) program performance indicators.

(h) Reform Unit. Give particular consideration to options for integrating the Icelandic “Reform Unit” proposal into future management arrangements and to the links between PROFISH and the new All-Fish initiative;

(i) Work Program alignment. Evaluate the planned work program for alignment to the revised approach which will specifically identify which activities are to be continued and those to be discontinued;

(j) Risks. Assess the major factors that will influence future PROFISH effectiveness and results in the future, and how risks can be effectively managed.
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While Secretary for Fisheries, Dr Tenreiro worked to build up fisheries institutions, promote the development of the fisheries sector, both the industrial and small scale fisheries (artisanal and semi-industrial) in marine and inland fisheries. He was responsible for preparing development and management strategies, policies and plans and negotiating and setting up of fishing joint ventures with government participation. He initiated fisheries administration (control) and research for small scale fisheries development promotion bodies and fisheries development funding.
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Mark Wilson retired from the World Bank at the end of 2006 after over 30 years of operations experience in agriculture and rural development work in Latin America, South and East Asia, the Middle East and North Africa, and Eastern Europe. His last position was Sector Director, Rural Development and Natural Resources Management in the World Bank's East Asia and the Pacific Region. He is currently a consultant on development issues.
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<td>Client Country</td>
<td>Adviser to the Vice Minister of Production (Alfonso Miranda) in the Government of Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mohamed Sheriff</td>
<td>Client Country</td>
<td>Sierra Leone, Fisheries Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Nolting</td>
<td>Potential Donor</td>
<td>GTZ (Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Jarchau</td>
<td>Potential Donor</td>
<td>GTZ (Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Lent</td>
<td>Potential Donor/Partner</td>
<td>NMFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Cox</td>
<td>Potential Donor</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl-Christian Schmidt</td>
<td>Potential Partner</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Terkel</td>
<td>Potential Donor/Partner</td>
<td>DFO, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Organization/Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Ridgway</td>
<td>Potential Donor/Partner</td>
<td>DFO, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Volk</td>
<td>Potential Donor/Partner</td>
<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Duda</td>
<td>Potential Partner</td>
<td>GEFSec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Fox</td>
<td>Potential Partner</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gloefelt-Tarp</td>
<td>Potential Partner</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Crothers</td>
<td>PROFISH Steering Committee chair</td>
<td>New Zealand Government, PSC chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolfo Brizzi</td>
<td>World Bank Manager, SA anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Townsend</td>
<td>World Bank Senior Economist, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Winter</td>
<td>World Bank Social Sciences (Africa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Ragasa</td>
<td>World Bank Gender Team, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cees De Haan</td>
<td>World Bank Retired Bank Staff - Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Di Leva</td>
<td>World Bank Chief Counsel (legal VP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Delgado</td>
<td>World Bank Adviser, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eija Pehu</td>
<td>World Bank Gender Team Leader, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerhard Dieterle</td>
<td>World Bank Forestry Team Leader, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Milne</td>
<td>World Bank TTL, SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fraser-Stewart</td>
<td>World Bank TTL, Accra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lamb</td>
<td>World Bank Senior Agribusiness Specialist, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Virdin</td>
<td>World Bank Director, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marea Hatziolos</td>
<td>World Bank Senior ENV Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjory-Anne Bromhead</td>
<td>World Bank Manager, Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Cackler</td>
<td>World Bank Manager, ARD anchor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrice Talla</td>
<td>World Bank Counsel, Legal Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Purcell</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Senior Partnership Specialist, ARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renan Poveda</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Senior ENV Specialist, LAC in Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Maber</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Sector Operations Officer, MENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Evans</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Director, ENV anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Vincent</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Fisheries Specialist, TTL, AFTEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Chemerinski</td>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>Director, Agribusiness Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Braedt</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Task Manager, East Asia and Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves Prevost</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>ENV, formerly Task Team Leader of West Africa fisheries initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Tilyae</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Operations Manager, Latin America and Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidvard Gronnevet</td>
<td>World Bank, PROFISH</td>
<td>Fisheries Specialist, ARD Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Arbuckle</td>
<td>World Bank, PROFISH</td>
<td>Senior Fisheries Specialist, ARD anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Kelleher</td>
<td>World Bank, PROFISH</td>
<td>Fisheries Team Leader, PROFISH leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brainstorming Meeting: B. Best (USAID), S. Nakatsuka (Japan), M. Hatziolis (WB), L. Msellati (WB), Vishwanie Maharaj (WWF-US), Kieran Kelleher, M. Arbuckle, L. Gronnvet (PROFISH), + Review Panel

TTL=Task Team Leader
Annex E: PROFISH Evaluation: List of Interview Questions

Preamble:
PROFISH is the World Bank’s partnership with intergovernmental and international non-governmental agencies for fisheries development. Established in 2005, it is presently being evaluated and we would welcome your views and experiences with PROFISH and suggestions for its future directions.

1. What use have you made of PROFISH products and services or what is your role in PROFISH? How long have you been associated with PROFISH work?

2. From your experience:
   a. What is the relevance of PROFISH to your work?
   b. How do you find the operations of PROFISH – efficient, effective, timely, etc?
   c. If a partner in PROFISH, how have you found the partnership – participatory, responsive, level of communication, governance arrangements, etc?

3. Our Evaluation Team has been charged with making a ‘forward assessment’ of PROFISH. We’d be very interested in your views on the future needs for PROFISH in your work or more generally. At present, PROFISH work consists of Global, Regional and Country level studies/assessments, and awareness raising activities. Specifically:
   a. What would your future needs from PROFISH be? What should the program be doing differently and how? E.g., what new work should they be doing, what should they be doing more of, less of, or stopping altogether?
   b. For you, how would you measure or know when PROFISH is doing a good job and achieving its objectives?
   c. What are the advantages of having PROFISH led by the World Bank? Why not FAO, for example?
   d. We’ve heard that fisheries, especially coastal fisheries, have a fundamental conflict in trying to simultaneously satisfy economic, social and environmental objectives. So, how do developing countries move from diagnosis to treatment of this problem? What can actually be done?
   e. Should PROFISH be doing more on aquaculture, and inland capture fisheries?
   f. What can other sectors and rural development domains teach fisheries?

4. Anything else you would like to bring to our attention on PROFISH and its performance or potential?

SUGGESTIONS TO THE TASK TEAM

15. In line with the comments made above, the panel suggests that the task team consider the following points:

(a) Consider deleting some of the current activities in order to better align the program with the Bank’s administrative capacity to manage the activities and with the available resources;

(b) Devote more resources and attention to the global advocacy component or, conversely, focus more attention on improving the capacity of individual countries to manage their own fisheries. In its response the task team expressed some reservations about this recommendation since they do not consider the Bank’s core strength to be in the broader area of global advocacy and anyway, the topic is populated by numerous, often competing, NGOs and several UN agencies. Since the DGF component is being managed by other organizations, the panel still believes there is merit in strengthening political interventions (as opposed to technical) by PROFISH (not necessarily the Bank);

© Even though there is no doubt the program will take more than three years to achieve the stated objectives, it would be desirable to develop an exit strategy that will in due course permit the Bank to turn over the program’s management to another agency, recognizing of course that the sheer magnitude and importance of the fishery sector to many developing country economies might suggest that the Bank give serious consideration to giving this sector greater weight in its investment priorities over the long-term;

(d) Make strategic communications with partners (internal and external) involved in PROFISH financed analytical work a key part of the program. Advocacy campaigns at country and global level will be a key part of such communication; and

(e) Make sure that the concept note for each country/global activity under PROFISH specifies the expected results/outcomes and describe the baseline situation. This is essential to monitor, evaluate and communicate results.
Annex G: Blockages to Fisheries Reform

The following analysis of blockages to fisheries reform were prepared by an expert group during the Bellagio Conference on Sustaining Global Fisheries, February 20-25 2007, Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Conference Center, Bellagio, Italy and are also presented in: “Positioning Marine Fisheries in a Changing World”, Meryl Williams, Lori Ridgeway, Quentin Grafton and Dale Squires, IIFET Vietnam 2008. paper 484. Lori Ridgeway took the lead on drafting this following section.

BLOCKAGES TO THE TRANSITION TO RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES

There is broad understanding of the normative frameworks for more effective fisheries management, e.g., the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement. Governments have also committed themselves through a wide range of international agreements and resolutions to acting on these frameworks, and many of these obligations have properly found their way into national norms. There are many examples of effective fisheries reforms, but also many cases where reform has not been sufficient or successful. Why has there not been more progress in putting the recommended measures in place to respect obligations undertaken?

While the critical elements of good governance are generally understood, lack of implementation may come down to four key blockages:

Inability or unwillingness to deal with short term political and social costs and their distribution

This is most often -- fairly or unfairly -- accused as “lack of political will”. Governments, are inherently risk averse by the nature of the political cycle, as are stakeholders (whose livelihoods may be at stake), unless faced with either clear evidence of benefits of reform, or an undeniable crisis where the costs of not making change become extremely explicit. In fact, reforms often are not undertaken until the issue becomes one of economic crisis, rather than simply known or projected environmental consequences (OECD, pending 2009).

The costs of adjustment are borne by governments, fishers and their communities in the short term, and the benefits of effective change are more uncertain and generally longer term -- perhaps outside the planning horizons or current priorities of either governments and/or stakeholders.

This issue has many aspects. For example, the issue may be a lack of understanding or transparency about the opportunity costs of operating in a short-term framework and foregoing longer-term sustainability. There may be a lack of predictability of the impacts of changed management and tools, especially in a complex environment – whether that in environmental, resource or socioeconomic domains. There may be issues around the distribution of costs and benefits, including disagreement on who should bear the costs and reap the benefits, related also to the power distribution of those affected and their influence of the political and management systems. There may be uncertainty about the ability to appropriate the benefits of reforms for fishers, communities and even nations while the existence of costs may be fairly certain. There may even be unknown impediments outside the fisheries system itself, for which solutions would be difficult pre-conditions to changes in fisheries management, which can range from seemingly unrelated issues to the need to make costly legislative changes that would enable reform. Other priorities that are perceived as more urgent or important may delay or block policy attention. Not all issues make it through the ‘thin policy pipe’. And finally, there may be a lack of capacity or mechanisms to offset the costs of adjustment where necessary through such
mechanisms as compensation, meaning that short term costs become difficult or impossible to manage.

Often a lack of strong and explicit political guidance has led to confusion among change-managers of the tolerance levels for change, which further favours cautious approaches.

As concerns by the public grow relative to the more traditional private ones, costs are often localized and real, whereas benefits, especially those of a public nature, are increasingly non-market, diffuse, and enjoyed by those who do not bear the costs (e.g., see Balmford and Whitten 2003 for an interesting discussion of paying for tropical forest conservation). Those bearing the costs may have greater difficulty bearing the risks of adjustment because of fewer alternative employment and income sources and irreversibilities and sunk costs due to the vintage of human and physical capital. The indirect or opportunity costs are especially important.

**Disagreement on how to best achieve long term sustainability and efficiency in the use of resources**

_Well understood directions for reform are still under challenge as the best way forward._ This, combined with the challenges of managing change, inhibits reform. In some cases the use of some forms of rights-based approaches has even been forbidden by law.

There are many examples of reformed and viable fisheries across many countries. It may be that the easiest reforms have been undertaken, as some characteristics of stocks and fleets are more amenable to rights-based approaches than others. Continued disagreement on best approaches lies in part, on lack of information on _how different well-understood principles and tools such as property-like approaches can be adapted to meet the diverse needs of different fisheries_ (especially small scale and artisanal, and high seas), and economic and social/cultural contexts that have different tolerances for distributional outcomes of rights based approaches (Ridgeway and Schmidt in press). In the case of many fisheries, especially small-scale fisheries in developing countries, fishers use and access rights are not formally protected and hence the small-scale operators and the workers for large scale operators are particularly vulnerable to changes in the _status quo_, regardless of how meagre their current benefits from the fishery. Although generally not well organized and represented, they and their advocates will disagree with changes that will surely disadvantage their stake.

With small-scale and artisanal fisheries, the lack of scientific knowledge and infrastructure coupled with management, enforcement, compliance infrastructure precludes often promoted options such as ITQs and yet insufficient is known about the best ways to manage and the best forms of rights-based management. Promising approaches such as hybridizing group/common property rights and traditional forms of management with more modern forms from the state in the face of expanding markets and migration and population growth and technical change (Cinner and Aswami 2007) have yet to be more fully developed.

One of the most dynamic of governance debates at the current time is the emerging _“conservation” agenda_, spawned in part by broader views of the health of oceans and protection of biodiversity and the role of fisheries within that. As commonly framed in an adversarial way, it diverts attention, energy and scarce resources from win-win solutions building a coherent system of fisheries within oceans governance that meets the coincident needs of both fisheries and their communities and the wider public, to more simplistic solutions skewing outcomes to favour only ecosystem services, or approaches to rebuilding fisheries that are seen as imposing unnecessary losses in livelihoods.
Part of the issue is the distrust in some quarters of the ability of the fishing sector to govern itself - which is rooted in past and ongoing management failures (such as cod in the past and currently, tunas) - especially in relation to protection of non-target species and habitats, and the slow pace of reform itself. This is challenging accountabilities, and is leading to competition for capture of societal priorities and decision-making. A related issue is the conflict between those who envision -- especially for high seas and trans-boundary fisheries -- a global top-down governance/oversight system to enforce accountabilities for conservation, versus governance systems based on incentives among key users which is hampering buy in to governance models such as regional fisheries management organizations in the high seas (Ridgeway and Rice in press).

Part of the issue relates to disagreement on the tolerable weights of conservation/preservation versus sustainable use, which is a subset of a broader "best use" debates regarding oceans. This -- and other disputes on tools and reform options -- affects views on the appropriateness of tools that will be chosen for sustaining oceans and its resources, the legitimacy of advice to decision-makers and of who is making the decisions, and is challenging the perceived legitimacy of stakeholders themselves. This results in both intra- and intergovernmental governance challenges.

A related issue leading to disagreements over management options is what constitutes a sufficiently "precautionary approach" in light of often weak information and knowledge (science). The increased prominence of ecosystem-based management has heightened these debates especially given different interpretations of the concept within governments and among stakeholders, such as the burden of proof of sustainability and the role of prior environmental assessment, or choices among blunt tools such as moratoria, no-take zones or MPAs “versus” (rather than “in conjunction with”) tighter and enforced controls on fishing. Furthermore, projections of imminent and broad fisheries collapse -- around which there is not agreement -- has led to differences in view on gradualist versus big-bang approaches, as well, which hampers decision-making in the absence of well-defined political preferences.

**Communications and knowledge gaps with respect to providing policy makers with sufficient information to make decisions**

Good governance is information-hungry, and decision-making needs to be evidence-based. Good governance also relies on buy-in to the information that is being used to make decisions. This relates to science regarding fisheries and their ecosystems, as well as economic and social information. It is generally accepted that the information base on which decisions are being made is often weak, which hampers buy-in to the benefits of, and basis for, regime shifts.

This challenge is two-fold. First is better communicating that which is known -- and the quality of that information -- in a way that is relevant to managers and other decision-makers, and validated by stakeholders.

Second it relates to filling critical information and knowledge gaps, including better integration of information from research, traditional and customary knowledge, industry and stakeholder observations and research, and monitoring and assessment (based on robust monitoring frameworks).

Needed information relates also to the understanding of the context in which decisions are being made, rigorous analysis of the implications (benefits and risks) of different options, confidence intervals around predicted outcomes and analysis of the effectiveness of best practice regimes, as a tool in adaptation. It also thus relates to the design and implementation of monitoring and assessment systems.
The need to address and manage the change process with a broadened policy toolkit

Fisheries and the communities they serve are nested within a broader political, economic and social system, including players and tool kits. Successful management of transitions requires playing to strengths in this system. And at the very minimum such systems need to be mutually supportive and ensuring that economic, social and environmental incentives are aligned.

Generally fisheries Ministers -- and certainly fisheries managers, given their mandate --, do not always have direct access to the various tools needed to manage the economic and social aspects of transitions to new fisheries regimes. Such tools could be economic diversification, rural development, land and coastal reform, financial intermediation, social safety nets or compensation. Nor do they necessarily have the convening power to ensure the tools are brought by others to the aid of fisheries adjustment.

The issue of managing change is a whole-of-government issue, not less in fisheries than in other major structural adjustments. Moreover, the solutions lie in enabling the strengths of different orders of government, industry and of non-government agencies, and in the case of developing states, donors. This places a high premium on political, institutional and administrative leadership as a precondition for successful change management. The breadth of the overall toolkit can be easily overlooked in the risks assessment of changes to fisheries regimes.
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Annex H: Performance Reference: PROFISH concept Note 2005 and Logframe

Effectiveness compares the outputs against the purpose of a project/program – to what extent was the **purpose** achieved or can it be expected to be achieved through the outputs that have been produced plus the identified external factors? It asks the question whether any other external factors have either positively or negatively influenced the degree to which the purpose was achieved.

The objectives of PROFISH are defined as follows:

The PROFISH Concept Note (January 2005), gave the **Overall Objective** (or goal):

Sustainable livelihoods in the fisheries sector and in coastal rural communities improved and to concrete progress towards meeting the WSSD objectives.

The **Strategic objectives** (or purpose):

(i) Fisheries sector governance strengthened by improving the quality and better align the interventions made by both public and private sector donors;

(ii) assisting countries and regions to establish roadmaps to achieve effective sector governance;

(iii) using improved fisheries management tools.

**Target groups at the level of the strategic objective were:**

Primary target group ... senior decision and policy makers in those developing countries which demonstrate the political will for improved sector governance, and where fisheries can make a significant contribution to poverty reduction.

In addition, PROFISH may work with countries that have significant fish resources but still lack the political commitment to improve sector governance by contribution to the regular policy discussions of these countries with the World Bank. Finally, PROFISH would aim to inform decision makers in the World Bank about the potential for and impact of enhanced sector governance of the fishing sector in selected countries for which they are responsible.

The secondary target group is composed of the major stakeholders in the fisheries sector in developing countries, with particular reference to the representatives of the small-scale fishers.

Priorities were described as:

PROFISH will concentrate its efforts in accordance with priorities and criteria to be developed by its Executive Steering Committee ... It is expected that **Sub-Saharan African countries will receive priority in the medium term.** However, other developing countries are also likely to be priority targets.”

As derived from the PROFISH logframe, the expected **results** and the correspondent **indicators** are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable fisheries initiatives included in national plans, in poverty reduction strategies and in key donor country aid programs;</th>
<th>Sustainable fisheries initiatives to be included in national plans and poverty reduction strategies of ten countries in three regions as a result of Sector Strategy Notes, policy analyses and consensus-building supported by PROFISH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least five country-level investment, policy adjustments and technical assistance programs in sustainable fisheries management operational as a result of the Strategy Notes and associated plans. These investment programs would be supported by the World Bank, GEF and other donors and would assist those countries meet the fisheries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National and regional consensus promoted on pro-poor sustainable fisheries initiatives and priority activities to implement the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries;

Consensus on pro-poor sustainable fisheries initiatives and action plans to implement the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries to be developed in eight countries.

Awareness of management for sustainable fisheries targeted to decision makers promoted in at least ten developing countries through co-sponsoring of up-to two regional or international events per years.

A high-level stakeholder meeting to be organized at least once every two years to present the broad vision for interventions in the sector, to review the results of the analyses and investments supported by the program, and to address emerging policy or program implementation issues.

At least one publication prepared summarizing the vision, experience and lessons of PROFISH with respect to sector assistance. This report should also define the status and progress of interventions towards achieving this vision by the World Bank and other donor.

National and international interventions on fisheries and sustainable use of aquatic ecosystems aligned, harmonized and enhanced in selected countries and regions.

Interventions, including international assistance, on fisheries and sustainable use of aquatic ecosystems and habitats effectively aligned and harmonized at national level in five countries. Harmonized investment proposals to be based on broad-based sector plan consensus in preparation (pipeline) for four countries.

Two regional fisheries organizations facilitated in reaching consensus on regional management of selected transboundary species.

Development of decision tools for sustainable fisheries governance to be enhanced and made available thorough knowledge dissemination and human and institutional capacity building, with particular reference to best practices for effective pro-poor actions and management of small-scale fisheries.

Contribute to a greater awareness on the status of global fisheries, and support the dialogue between developing and developed countries on monitoring and surveillance of fishing activities and distant water fishing.

Assuming the outputs have been produced at a satisfactory degree, did the potential risks (at this level) allow the achievement of PROFISH purpose? We cannot know as they are not indicated in the Concept Note. However, there are some “critical assumptions” indicated in the “Summary logframe” although these seem to be related exclusively to country specific products:

- Broad national **consensus** achieved on a roadmap to **sustainable fisheries**;
- Effective sustainable fisheries toolkits delivered to target countries;
- Acceptable progress in human and **institutional capacity building** achieved;
• Political will and impetus towards sustainable fisheries maintained.

In principle, the degree of achievement of the purpose can be determined through the indicators at its level. Although no indicators have been included in the PROFISH Concept Note, they have been identified in the original matrix (or, as it has been designated, “Summary logframe for the country-specific component”). As purpose indicators are normally common to the different components, they can in principle be considered:

• Best practice and effective fisheries management tools (e.g. marine protected areas) are introduced (Means of verification: Transparency in licensing).

• Legal and regulatory framework upgraded to support sustainable and equitable use of fisheries resources. (Means of verification: Reports of broad-based/ participatory national advisory committees; Annual reports of ministries; Reports from regional fisheries bodies and FAO).

• Sufficient financial resources are allocated to meet the investment and recurrent costs of fisheries management and control. (Means of verification: National budget allocations and expenditures; Annual reports of ministries).

• Donor interventions are aligned and harmonized in support of a national strategy for sustainable fisheries. (Means of verification: PROFISH independent evaluations).
## Annex I: PROFISH Budget FY2005 to FY2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (some values approximate)</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGF (PROFISH)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGF (ALLFISH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO CP</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries AID</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries ENV</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable costs AID</td>
<td>88,732</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable costs ENV</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PROFISH Multi-Donor TFs 1+2     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Iceland (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) | 333,000| 333,000| 334,000|        |        |
| Iceland (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) | 100,000|        |        |        |        |
| United Kingdom (DFID)           |        |        |        | 1,588,400 |        |
| France (AFD)                    | 264,852 |        |        |        |        |

| Other WB Trust Funds            |        |        |        |        |        |
| Norway/Finland (JFSSD)          | 200,000| 142,000| 150,000| 150,000| 150,000|
| Norway/Finland (TFESSD) ENV personel | 200,000| 200,000| 200,000|        |        |
| Norway/Finland (TFESSD) ARD personel | 200,000| 150,000| 150,000| 50,000  |        |
| Japan PHRD (est)                | 60,000 |        |        |        |        |
| Japan CTF (est)                 | 50,000 |        |        |        |        |

| Investment income               |        |        |        |        | 105,642 |

| In kind contributions (notional values) |        |        |        |        |        |
| New Zealand (Ministry of Fisheries)    | 150,000| 150,000| 150,000| 150,000| 150,000|
| Iceland (Min. Foreign Aff.)            |        |        |        |        |        |
| FAO                                   | 120,000| 150,000| 150,000| 150,000| 150,000|
| WorldFish                             |        |        |        |        | 25,000  |

| TOTAL                               | 345,908| 1,884,084| 1,563,000| 3,312,942| 1,285,000|
| Grand Total all years               |        |        |        |        | 8,374,023|
Annex J: PROFISH Activity List FY2009-01-15

Table 12. Summary of PROFISH FY09 proposed budget by activity ($'000), from: PROFISH Work Program 2009 presented to PROFISH Steering Committee, 24-25 June 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Execution</th>
<th>Trust Funds</th>
<th>In-kind*</th>
<th>DGF</th>
<th>BB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Products sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rent Drain</td>
<td>WB/ FAO</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Numbers</td>
<td>WB/IUCN/WF C/FAO</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale fisheries toolkit</td>
<td>FAO/ WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish to 2030 (global supply &amp; demand) – new activity</td>
<td>WB/ FAO/ IFPRI</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Fish Stocks</td>
<td>WB/FAO</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Law Best Practices</td>
<td>IUCN/ WB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Guidelines sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming PRSP ESW</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy of Reform</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change and Fisheries</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Awareness &amp; Advocacy sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Oceans</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFISH Forum</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Small Scale Fisheries Conference</td>
<td>FAO/WB/IUCN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>(FY08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COFI</td>
<td>WB/ FAO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IIFET developing country participation</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>from FY08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seafood Summit</td>
<td>WB/ IFCFA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other agencies (OECD)</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building and communication</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global List of Irresponsible Fishing Vessels</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Policy Development sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Tropical Tuna Fisheries Commission</td>
<td>PROFISH / LAC Region</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island Countries</td>
<td>PROFISH / EAP Region</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>PROFISH / LAC Region</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green-print for African Aquaculture (with FAO/ WFC)</td>
<td>PROFISH / Africa Region</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Project Development sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa Regional Fisheries Project</td>
<td>PROFISH / Africa Region</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project 2</td>
<td>PROFISH / Africa Region</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Triangle Initiative</td>
<td>PROFISH / ENV/ EAP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>PROFISH / MENA Region</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Execution</td>
<td>Trust Funds</td>
<td>In-kind*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspian Region / Iran</td>
<td>PROFISH / MENA Region</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Country Policy Development sub-total</strong></td>
<td>(all staff travel costs)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>PROFISH / EAP Region</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>PROFISH / SA Region</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>PROFISH / MENA Region</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>PROFISH / MENA Region</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Country Project Development sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru (incl. 30k from CP)</td>
<td>PROFISH / LAC Region</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>PROFISH / SA Region</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>PROFISH / SA Region</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>PROFISH / Africa Region</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>PROFISH / EAP Region</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Oversight sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen (upon request)</td>
<td>PROFISH / MENA Region</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>PROFISH / Africa Region</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Governance and administration sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>210 80 340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent evaluation of PROFISH</td>
<td>PSC/ Focal Point/ Partners</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFISH Reform Unit</td>
<td>to be determined by PSC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLFISH governance</td>
<td>PROFISH / Africa Region</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of PROFISH</td>
<td>PROFISH</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total by source</strong></td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>260 670 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Global Total</strong></td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex K: Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARD</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development (department of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>World Bank internal budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Country Assistance Strategy (of a client country and the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFI</td>
<td>Committee on Fisheries (of FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGF</td>
<td>Development Grants Facility (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPL</td>
<td>Development Policy Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>Environment (department of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMAP</td>
<td>Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESW</td>
<td>economic and sector work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>extended term consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (of the World Bank Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICFA</td>
<td>International Coalition of Fisheries Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>International Development Association (of the World Bank Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation (of the World Bank Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International finance institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>Implementation Status and Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>World Conservation Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUU</td>
<td>illegal, unreported and unregulated (fishing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>monitoring, control and surveillance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDTF            multi-donor trust fund  
NEPAD           New Partnership for African Development  
NGO             non-government organization  
OECD            Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development  
PSC             PROFISH Steering Committee  
QAG             Quality Analysis Group (within the World Bank Office of the Managing Director of Operations)  
PRSP            Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (of a client country)  
RFMO            regional fisheries management organization  
SDN             Sustainable Development (Network of the World Bank)  
SRFC            West Africa Sub-regional Fisheries Committee  
TF              Trust Fund  
WSSD            World Summit on Sustainable Development