

**Secretariat of the Pacific Community**

**3rd SPC Heads of Fisheries**  
*(18–23 August 2003, Noumea, New  
Caledonia)*

**Information Paper 5**

Original: English

## **Coastal Fisheries Programme Review**

**Gillett, Preston and Associates, and Thalassa Consulting**



# *A Review of the SPC Coastal Fisheries Programme*



*Gillett, Preston and Associates  
and  
Thalassa Consulting*

*The copyright for this report rests with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.*



# A Review of the Coastal Fisheries Programme

Conducted for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community

By

Ian Cartwright  
Robert Gillett  
Esaroma Ledua  
Garry Preston

Gillett, Preston and Associates  
and  
Thalassa Consulting

July 2003

*Please note that the document has been formatted for printers with back-to-back (duplex) printing capability. Other printers may print a number of blank pages.*

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.0 THE COASTAL FISHERIES PROGRAMME MANDATE AND WORK PROGRAMME .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.0 PERFORMANCE AND SERVICE DELIVERY OF THE CFP SECTIONS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 FISHERIES TRAINING SECTION.....	10
3.1.1 <i>Performance against objectives</i> .....	11
3.1.2 <i>Overall assessment</i> .....	12
3.1.3 <i>Recommendation</i> .....	12
3.2 FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT SECTION .....	12
3.2.1 <i>Performance against objectives</i> .....	13
3.2.2 <i>Overall assessment</i> .....	14
3.2.3 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	14
3.3 AQUACULTURE SECTION.....	14
3.3.1 <i>Performance against objectives</i> .....	14
3.3.2 <i>Overall assessment</i> .....	15
3.3.3 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	16
3.4 COASTAL FISHERIES MANAGEMENT SECTION.....	16
3.4.1 <i>Performance against objectives</i> .....	17
3.4.2 <i>Overall assessment</i> .....	17
3.4.3 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	18
3.5 REEF FISHERIES OBSERVATORY SECTION .....	18
3.5.1 <i>PROCFISH</i> .....	18
3.5.2 <i>Live Reef Fish Trade Initiative</i> .....	20
3.5.3 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	20
3.6 INFORMATION SECTION.....	20
3.6.1 <i>Performance against objectives</i> .....	20
3.6.2 <i>Overall assessment</i> .....	22
3.6.3 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	22
3.7 GENERAL COMMENTS ON CFP SERVICES .....	22
<b>4.0 QUALITY OF SERVICES.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.0 APPROACHES USED TO BUILD CAPACITY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1 HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT .....	24
5.2 HRD PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY-BUILDING .....	25
<b>6.0 SUSTAINABLE OUTCOMES .....</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1 PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABLE OUTCOMES.....	25
6.2 GENDER .....	26
6.3 POVERTY ALLEVIATION.....	27
<b>7.0 TARGET GROUPS FOR THE COASTAL FISHERIES PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>8.0 PRIORITY NEEDS OF THE SECTOR .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>9.0 REVIEW OF CURRENT WORK PROGRAMME AGAINST PRIORITY NEEDS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>10.0 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPC, FFA AND USP.....</b>	<b>30</b>
10.1 THE FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY .....	30
10.2 THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC .....	31
<b>11.0 PLANNING APPROACHES IN THE CFP .....</b>	<b>32</b>
11.1 OVERALL PLANNING APPROACHES .....	32
11.2 SECTION LEVEL PLANNING.....	33

12.0 USE OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EXPERTISE .....	35
13.0 CFP ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE .....	35
14.0 REVIEW OF CFP STRATEGIC PLAN .....	37
15.0 CONCLUSIONS .....	38
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW OF THE COASTAL FISHERIES PROGRAMME .....	40
ANNEX 2: PEOPLE CONTACTED DURING THE REVIEW.....	41
ANNEX 3: PREVIOUS REVIEWS CONSIDERED IN THE PRESENT STUDY .....	44
ANNEX 4: REFERENCES .....	45
ANNEX 5: INFORMATION ON THE CFP MANDATE AND WORK PROGRAMME FROM THE CFP CORPORATE PLAN.....	46
ANNEX 6: ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT .....	47

**Cover Photo:** In July 1999 Pauliasi Vulivavalagi attended a tuna handling workshop in Suva sponsored by SPC's Coastal Fisheries Programme. He indicated to the Review Team that the workshop was quite valuable and enabled him to upgrade the quality of his tuna catch. Three years later his sons, Mosese (age 13) and Molitoni (age 11), borrowed their father's skiff for some tuna fishing at the FAD deployed off Suva by the Fisheries Department (which has received considerable FAD-related assistance from SPC over the years). The boys hooked three large yellowfin. With a bit of help from nearby boats, the fish were landed and sold as premium export quality tuna to Fiji Fish Company for US\$650. (photo: G. Southwick)

## Executive Summary of the Review of the Coastal Fisheries Programme

<b>The Review</b>	<p>Work on the review by the four consultants took place between late May and early July 2003. SPC headquarters in Noumea was visited and most of the CFP staff present were interviewed. The Review Team then visited New Caledonia, Vanuatu, Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, and Papua New Guinea and meetings were held with fisheries stakeholders. Discussions by telephone were undertaken with individuals in ten other SPC countries. Altogether, CFP issues were discussed with 101 SPC staff, fisheries officials, commercial operators, villagers, NGOs, national environment departments, regional organizations, donors, and other stakeholders.</p>
<b>Categories of Recommendations</b>	<p>This report contains three levels of advice: (1) suggestions and comments in the text, (2) highlighted recommendations at the end of most sections of the report, and (3) especially important recommendations or recommendations that represent a convergence of ideas from separate areas drawn together. This third category of major recommendations is presented here in the Executive Summary.</p>
<b>General Conclusion</b>	<p>The Coastal Fisheries Programme is generally effective in its mission to optimise the value of small-scale fisheries and aquatic resource use in Pacific Island waters. All six sections of the CFP appear to be making good progress towards meeting their established objectives.</p>
<b>Other Important Findings</b>	<p>In many countries of the region the fisheries management capacity of government fisheries agencies is low while the need for these skills is large and likely to grow. A “burning need” therefore is for more assistance related to increasing the capacity to manage fisheries.</p> <p>Another important assistance need is in the area of economic analysis. An important part of the CFP work is giving advice on fisheries development, aquaculture development, and enterprise development, but the lack of economic analytical capability negatively affects the impact of CFP efforts.</p> <p>One of the strongest messages to come from the extensive consultations undertaken in this review was that CFP’s links and communications with countries have weakened in recent years, and many of the important fishery stakeholders are only vaguely aware of the range of CFP services available to them.</p>
<b>Major Recommendation #1</b>	<p>The CFP should focus more attention on providing fisheries management assistance, including building capacity, providing advice on national strategies, mentoring, and producing technical information understandable to the level at which most management interventions are formulated and implemented. To support this increased focus, the CFP should also ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The output of PROCFISH includes practical management information.</li><li>2) The Coastal Fisheries Management Section acquires high-level expertise in the wide range of coastal management subjects.</li><li>3) The Fisheries Development Section channels more of their efforts into management-oriented activities.</li></ol>
<b>Major Recommendation #2</b>	<p>The CFP should have the capability to undertake economic assessments as part of its core services. The Programme should undertake analysis of fisheries development and aquaculture as a service to countries, as well as to filter out requests for involvement in projects that have very limited chance of viability.</p>



- Major Recommendation #3** For various reasons, CFP's links and communications with countries have weakened. The CFP needs to focus considerably more attention on establishing closer links with fisheries stakeholders and make them aware of what assistance is available.
- Major Recommendation #4** Efforts should be made to obtain funding for a full-time "hands on" manager for the CFP. Failing that, the duties of the Director of Marine Resources on the SPC Executive Team should be reduced while increasing the attention that the Director focuses on the CFP.
- Major Recommendation #5** To encourage efficient use of scarce management resources, the Coastal Fisheries Management Section should be charged with spearheading cooperation with environment agencies in this area, both on a national and regional basis.
- Major Recommendation #6** More attention should be focussed on the process of the arrangements for CFP field activities by having firm agreement in writing of the arrangements, including detailing the work to be completed, areas of responsibility, and the process of reporting, including mutually acceptable deadlines.
- Major Recommendation #7** As the Coastal Fisheries Programme has accumulated decades of experience in the fisheries sector, it should become more involved in documenting what has been learned in the development process.
- Major Recommendation #8** An information flow analysis should be undertaken in a few countries to determine if serious in-country barriers exist to the dissemination of fisheries information to important stakeholders.
- Major Recommendation #9** An analysis of the use of Internet for fisheries information distribution should be undertaken, including an identification of the types of users and types of fisheries information is for which a web-based approach is appropriate and inappropriate.
- Major Recommendation #10** The CFP should undertake a capacity needs analysis across the fisheries sector that includes but goes beyond training needs. Such an analysis should include an assessment of the degree of success of training and other forms of capacity building to date.
- Major Recommendation #11** As some of the lesser-advanced countries of the region do not have well articulated strategies for fisheries development and fisheries management, the CFP should provide to countries is advice on basic fisheries development and management strategies.
- Major Recommendation #12** As attempts at improving communication between CFP and USP do not seem to have worked, there would appear to be a need for a detailed MOU between the two organisations. The MOU should draw clear boundaries between the respective roles of SPC and USP and modes of interaction, in accordance with regional priorities for coastal fisheries and aquaculture.
- Major Recommendation #13** Assistance in post-harvest activities, and in particular meeting the exacting demands export markets, is a priority need for the region. The issue of post-harvest training and technical advisory services should be reviewed in depth.
- Major Recommendation #14** A new overarching objective for the CFP should be adopted: "National fisheries agencies, working with environmental and other interests, have a clear vision for the sustainable management and development of coastal living marine resources, and develop and implement strategies and mechanisms to achieve this vision".

## 1.0 Introduction

In May 2003 the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) contracted Gillett, Preston and Associates Incorporated and Thalassa Consulting to review the Coastal Fisheries Programme (CFP). The purpose of this document is to present the results of that review, including the programme's performance, its strategic directions and relevance to its stakeholders, its medium-term planning approaches and its organisational structure. The specific terms of reference for the review are given in Annex 1. This review is part of a multi-year programme of reviews that SPC undertakes as part of its corporate commitment to its new corporate plan to provide excellent service, emphasise results and accountability, and operate with transparency.

Work on the review began in late May 2003. SPC headquarters in Noumea was visited and most of the CFP staff present were interviewed. The Review Team then visited New Caledonia, Vanuatu, Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, and Papua New Guinea and meetings were held with fisheries stakeholders. Discussions by telephone were undertaken with individuals in ten other SPC countries. Altogether, CFP issues were discussed with 101 SPC staff, fisheries officials, commercial operators, villagers, NGOs, national environment departments, regional organizations, donors, and other stakeholders. These individuals are listed in Annex 2.

Aspects of the CFP have been reviewed in the past and the relevant results have been considered in the present review. These studies (summary details given in Annex 3) are:

- An internal review of the CFP in 1997
- An internal review of the CFP Capture Section in 1999 (Lewis 1999)
- A review of the SPC/Nelson Fisheries Officers Course in 2002 (Cartwright 2002).
- An FAO review of sea safety in the Pacific Islands in 2003 which included an evaluation of the CFP's efforts in sea safety awareness (Gillett 2003).

This report contains three levels of advice: (1) suggestions and comments in the text, (2) highlighted recommendations at the end of most sections of the report, and (3) especially important recommendations or recommendations that represent a convergence of ideas from separate areas drawn together. This third category is presented in the Executive Summary.

## 2.0 The Coastal Fisheries Programme Mandate and Work Programme

Although SPC has undertaken fisheries work since the early 1950s, a distinct entity within SPC dedicated to coastal fisheries did not emerge until the early 1980s. The initial main field activity was the promotion of bottomfishing but also included some work on beche de mer and lobster.

The role of the Coastal Fisheries Programme has evolved considerably over the years. In the last decade considerable attention has been focused on the mandate issue. Although a mid-1990s "Review of the Role of Regional Institutions in the Marine Sector" was several years in planning and was anticipated to provide direction to the CFP, the report of that review did not give much guidance on the role for SPC in coastal fisheries matters, other than to recommend that SPC and SPREP should jointly share responsibility in the sector.

During the 26<sup>th</sup> Regional Technical Meeting on Fisheries (RTMF) in 1996 a paper was presented by the SPC secretariat asking for clear direction on the Coastal Fisheries Programme. Specifically, countries were asked if the Programme should continue to seek *ad hoc* opportunities to fulfil member country requirements or establish more formal justification. The report of the 26<sup>th</sup> RTMF in 1996 states: "The meeting recommended that a review be carried out within the Fisheries Programme to identify Coastal Fisheries Programme priority areas, and in consequence develop a formally-structured Coastal Fisheries Programme."

In 1997 an internal review of the CFP was undertaken (CFP 1997). Problems of the CFP were identified and an operational philosophy, structure, and mission statement were proposed. A subsequent paper submitted to the First Heads of Fisheries Meeting in August 1999 (presumably incorporating these aspects) contained the mission statement "To provide a regional support service that assists Pacific

Islanders in identifying the status and optimizing the long-term social and economic value of small-scale fisheries and aquatic resources in the Pacific Islands waters”.

Information on the CFP's present mandate is given in the *Coastal Fisheries Programme Strategic Plan 2003-2005*. The “Mandate” section in the Plan is actually concerned with the process of establishing and refining the mandate: “SPC's governing bodies, the Conference of the Pacific Community and the Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA), provide the mandate for the Coastal Fisheries Programme and approve its key directions. These key directions are initially derived by consultation with Pacific Community member fisheries and marine resources administrations, primarily during the Heads of Fisheries Meeting.....”

The precise mandate of the CFP seems somewhat elusive but appears best described in the CFP strategic plan. That plan was adopted by the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the CRGA in November 2002: “The Committee adopted the Coastal Fisheries Programme's strategic plan as a living document - The Committee noted that these strategic plans are “living documents” that provide the basic strategic framework in which SPC programmes operate but also enable programmes to respond to emerging member needs.”

The CFP strategic plan, especially the priorities and section objectives, is taken to be the CFP mandate in the present review. Information on the priorities is given in Annex 5.

The objectives of the six sections of the CFP are given in the strategic plan as:

- Aquaculture – A regional support framework for economically, socially and environmentally sustainable aquaculture planning, research and development by Pacific Island governments and private enterprises;
- Fisheries Development – Economically-viable and environmentally sound Pacific Island fishing enterprises;
- Coastal Fisheries Management – Environmentally sound and socio-economically achievable governance of reef and lagoon fisheries by PICT fisheries administrations and coastal communities;
- Fisheries Training – Adequate human resource and technical skills capacity to manage and derive sustainable economic benefit from the fisheries sector;
- Reef Fisheries Observatory – Scientifically rigorous information on the status, exploitation levels and prospects of fisheries is used by Pacific Islanders to sustainably manage living coastal resources;
- Fisheries Information – A relevant and understandable aquatic living resource-based network of knowledge is readily available to member countries and territories.

Significant recent changes in the work programme include the addition of the Aquaculture Section, the evolution of the Integrated Coastal Fisheries Management Project into the Reef Fisheries Observatory, and the demise of the Post-Harvest section.

### **3.0 Performance and Service Delivery of the CFP Sections**

This part of the report reviews the performance of the CFP over the last five years, against stated objectives. For most programmes, the objectives of CFP strategic plan adopted by CRGA in 2002 are not the same as those used during the last five years. The Review Team has addressed this by using the objectives that have guided the activities of each section during this period, and these are stated at the start of each section review. It should be noted that the Review Team was somewhat handicapped in evaluating performance by the lack of a definitive list of activities for most sections.

#### **3.1 Fisheries Training Section**

The objectives of the Fisheries Training Section are: (1) Coordination of fisheries training, (2) Fisheries training planning, and (3) Implementation of training activities

### 3.1.1 Performance against objectives

Coordination of fisheries training - The Fisheries Training Section (FTS) communicates with a regional network of fisheries providers using the special interest publication *Fisheries Education and Training Information Bulletin* and has also established a training directory database. The training directory provides a comprehensive listing of fisheries training opportunities in the region and internationally. The FTS is active in the Association of Pacific Islands Maritime Training Institutions and Maritime Authorities (APIMTIMA), which provides input into the development of certification structures for Pacific Island crews.

The bulletin has been well received by training providers, and with the database, provides an effective means of exchanging information and publicising availability, timing and outcomes of fisheries training between around 600 contacts within the region. The extent of coverage of the private sector by the bulletin was difficult to determine. APIMTIMA provides a useful vehicle for the FTS to collaborate in, and gain acceptance for courses such as pre-sea training and other base-level certificates of competency. This prevents duplication and increases the cost-effectiveness and outputs of regional fishing training institutions.

Fisheries training planning - The FTS has assisted Pacific Island countries with the planning and implementation of national training programmes in the fisheries sector. These include assistance to local training institutions in Vanuatu, Fiji, Tonga, FSM and Kiribati for pre-sea safety and fishing skills, and to Vanuatu, Tonga and Solomon Islands for seaweed farming.

In a number of instances, there has been a very useful flow-on effect from the design and running of a particular course in one country and then using, and as necessary adapting, the training materials and experience in others (e.g. the pre-sea safety and fishing skills course). In some cases, local expertise is used to build capacity in training institutions, as was in the case in 1999, when an I-Kiribati tutor was used to run a pre-sea training course at the Fisheries and Maritime Institute (FMI) of FSM, and in so doing train FMI staff to run subsequent courses. This methodology provides for continuity and is also cost-effective.

The FTS has developed a wide range of training resource materials, both for use in stand-alone situations, and for incorporation into training workshops. The resources include videos, trainer's reference materials, training guides, manuals and posters.

Very positive feedback was received from a number of countries on the quality and applicability of these training materials. The ability of SPC material to graphically illustrate a concept of training or transfer knowledge by a video was seen as having been fundamental to getting the point across in many situations, particularly in communities or with the artisanal sector where experience with more formal learning scenarios is minimal.

FTS activities in the area of assisting countries with human resource planning have been relatively limited, with few requests received. Training strategies have been developed for Palau, the Solomon Islands and Nauru, in relation to the commercial fishing sector. No requests for assistance in human resource development (HRD) planning were received from national fisheries administrations in the last five years.

The work carried out in Solomon Islands in 2002 for the national fishing company, Soltai, was particularly effective. A number of the needs identified (including HACCP, vessel engineering and sea safety) have been subsequently met and the skills are being used by Soltai staff to support the company in its endeavours to remain viable under difficult economic and operating conditions.

Implementation of training activities - The FTS has worked with both training institutions and using its own resources to develop and deliver fisheries courses and workshops in accordance with regional priorities. For the public/artisanal sectors, the most significant of these has been the Nelson/SPC Fisheries Officers' Training course, and for the private sector, a wide range of courses and workshops including those based on post harvest processing, and technical and managerial skills training for commercial fishing enterprises, including women.

The SPC Nelson Fisheries Officers Course has trained around 10 to 14 fisheries officers annually, or a total of 275 since 1979. While this is the only major FTS public sector intervention, it forms a major part of the Section's work programme. A review of the course (Cartwright 2002) drew the conclusion that it had generally met the needs of the sector and had achieved a number of positive impacts, including the number of Pacific islander participants now in prominent positions in the region, a high level of retention of participants in fisheries agencies, the establishment of the Course as a training benchmark, and increased numbers of women in fisheries departments.

Training courses for the private sector have been generally successful. Enterprise management training and training in vessel operation management have made significant contributions to the effective operation of private sector fishing businesses. Positive feedback on tuna processing and handling and HACCP courses (some conducted by FTS staff) was received from both Government and private sector. The 1999 tuna handling and loining course in Fiji improved fish quality and value, according to comments from the Fisheries Department, major fish buyers and fishermen (see caption for cover photograph, page iv). One week after the workshop a fish processing company achieved a 5 per cent greater yield from its filleting operation, and is continuing to derive benefits from the course. Similar courses in Samoa appear to have diversified the marketing of tunas, as demand for loins has increased.

### **3.1.2 Overall assessment**

Over the last five years, in keeping with a 1996 RTMF recommendation, almost all of the efforts of the FTS being targeted at private-sector oriented activities. These have included including seafood quality management (including HACCP), safety at sea, enterprise management, and fishing vessel skippers, marine engineers and deckhands training.

Based on Review Team interviews with countries, there is a perception that the work of the FTS is generally relevant to, and appreciated by both the private sector and fisheries administrations. No negative feedback from countries on the programme and its outcomes over the last five years were received.

The increasing focus on the private sector and principally small-scale commercial fishing operators and industrial fisheries enterprises has generally resulted in an increase in, and retention of, positive training outcomes in support of sustainable economic development. When asked, no countries expressed difficulties with the FTS arranging and providing training to the private sector, although it was stressed that it was important fisheries agencies be kept abreast of any in-country activities by SPC.

There is a widely held perception that fisheries agency staff are generally well trained, but that the results of their training are all too frequently not translated into effective outcomes. While there may be some truth to this perception, there remains a need to maintain a balance with respect to identifying and pro-actively meeting training and awareness needs in the non-commercial fisheries sector, including Government. This is particularly so in the vital area of coastal living marine resource management.

Overall, it is the opinion of the Review Team that the Fisheries Training Section has been effective in meeting its objectives. It has provided appropriate and technically sound training interventions in a timely manner.

### **3.1.3 Recommendation**

- The coordination and promotion of training initiatives to build capacity in coastal living resource management (with the Coastal Fisheries Management Section) should become a specific activity of the Fisheries Training Section.

## **3.2 Fisheries Development Section**

The overall objective of the Fisheries Development Section (FDS) that has guided its work during the last five years has been to "provide practical field support, hands on training, advisory services and

increasingly, studies on development options, infrastructure and training needs, particularly in relation to the development of viable, environmentally sustainable domestic tuna fisheries and FAD technology”.

A previous internal review of the FDS was completed in 2000 (Lewis, 2000), in response to issues regarding requests for services from the section, as well as its orientation. Many of the recommendations of that review, particularly in terms of project management, have been implemented.

### 3.2.1 Performance against objectives

**Transfer of technical skills** - The FDS has focused on the use of in-country staff attachments to develop fishing and fish handling skills, with an emphasis on longlining and all aspects of vessel management.

These attachments have been targeted at both the public and private sectors, with generally more effective results from the latter. In countries where little tuna longlining activity has occurred, the interventions have, as one private sector operator in Tonga expressed it; “flattened the learning curve”. Workshops and technical assistance provided during attachments have generally been useful and cost effective, providing inputs into all aspects of the catching, handling and processing operation.

There has been less success with government fishing ventures where problems have occurred with countries not adequately supporting interventions, or where assistance has been requested with non-viable projects. In one country, two visits by a Fisheries Development Officer were effectively wasted due to vessels and equipment not being prepared. Some projects, particularly where little thought is given to economic reality, are doomed to fail. Working on these interventions is demoralizing for CFP staff and the outcomes tend to have little or no lasting impact. Further, supporting projects that are likely to fail may tend to send a mixed message to stakeholders in terms of the long-term future of projects. Up-front economic analysis<sup>1</sup> would help to highlight non-viable projects and assist with decision making as to whether or not to support a “difficult” request for assistance.

The FDS has assisted 15 countries over the last five years with FAD programmes. Activities include with the design and implementation of FAD programmes, including construction and deployment, assistance with sourcing and specifying materials and follow-up monitoring, particularly for the artisanal/small scale sector. FAD programmes have increased inshore fisheries production and provide tangible evidence of activity by fisheries departments. Sustainability of these interventions is an issue (i.e. who pays for replacement) but the recent FDS activities are assisting to address this. These include long term cost/benefit analysis and the development of cheaper FAD designs. In Vanuatu, it was claimed that new FAD designs resulting from SPC initiatives have reduced total costs of deployment by over 60%.

**Production of reports, manuals and other technical material** - The FDS has produced a wide range of high-quality technical reports and manuals, brochures and other publications on subjects including: gear and vessel trials, fishing methods and the environmental impacts of fishing. It has taken considerable time to complete some of these publications, and particularly the longline manual, which has been four years in preparation. These publications are considered by stakeholders to provide a useful record in terms of the technology and techniques used, and have are widely used as resource documents when considering development options. Assessment of uptake is difficult, but could be improved with greater information flow in country between government and the private sector (see Section 3.6.2).

**Advice on fisheries development options and planning** - The FDS has provided advice on tuna fisheries management and development plans (with FFA) to 7 countries over the last five years. Advice has also been provided on vessel parameters and selection, and other development issues. One regional study (Gillett, 2003) found that the national plans have been shown to have had beneficial effects on domestic industry development, including:

- Transparency in the process of government decision making affecting the tuna industry
- Stability in policies affecting the tuna industry
- Establishment of government/industry consultative mechanisms.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this report “economic analysis is taken to mean the appraisal/evaluation of an activity with the objective of identifying all relevant social and financial costs and benefits associated with the activity over its expected duration.

In addition, useful and frank advice has assisted governments considering means of developing a tuna industry, with the Review Team seeing evidence of this advice influencing fisheries development decisions in Niue and Nauru. In the opinion of Cook Islands “FFA/SPC advice to government has been vital to control and direct the burgeoning tuna industry”. At times, the Section has been criticized for providing technical advice on industrial-scale tuna developments, and development policy advice (usually the role of FFA). Deciding on whether or not there is grounds for the latter criticism is complicated by the ambiguity associated by the much-used term “policy”. For instance, it is not clear at which point advice on choices of development strategy becomes policy advice. Section 10.1 dealing with the relationship between FFA and SPC explores this issue further.

A useful outcome is illustrated in the picture on the front cover of this report. In this instance, a combination of SPC assistance with harvesting (FAD fishing techniques) and post harvest processing (fish handling to export standards) resulted in very real benefits to a community-level fisher, who then passed on this knowledge.

### 3.2.2 Overall assessment

Much of the commercial fishing activity in the region has been driven by the private sector and it is difficult to separate out the impacts of the FDS on fisheries development from that which has been self generated by industry. However, the Review Team concludes that the work of the FDS is technically competent and generally effective. From interviews, there is a strong view from many fishery agencies that the outputs of the section are vital to the development of the domestic industry. This perception is less strong where there is a functioning private sector in fisheries, possibly because knowledge of FDS (and SPC in general) services is limited. Based on feedback, delays in reporting, which have been addressed to some extent, and the style in which advice has been provided on occasions could be improved. Apart from these points, no substantive negative feedback was received from stakeholders or countries.

The Review Team noted that the relationship between the private sector and Government in a number of countries could be improved, in terms of working together to achieve common development goals. One effective mechanism to achieve this would be for the FDS to help establish or strengthen fishermen’s associations, thereby creating effective stakeholder groups that could directly advise government on key constraints, as well as incentives that would promote domestic fishing industry development.

### 3.2.3 Recommendations

The Fisheries Development Section should:

- Place more emphasis on assisting countries to formulate realistic overall development strategies (harvesting, processing and with FFA, marketing), which incorporate FDS interventions, and less on “catch more fish” approaches.
- Enhance the establishment and operation of fishermen’s associations as a constituency to promote the responsiveness and relevancy of government fisheries agencies.
- Increase the level of services in the area of (a) economic analysis to evaluate requests, and (b) economic evaluations of proposed fisheries developments (with FFA) as a service to countries.
- Produce more information about the development process in the fisheries sector. This would include lessons-learned in fisheries development in the region and highlighting why attempts to build domestic fishing ventures have been more successful in some instances than in others.

## 3.3 Aquaculture Section

The objective of the Aquaculture Section is to promote sustainable forms of aquaculture through a service of regional coordination and technical assistance.

### 3.3.1 Performance against objectives

**Promotion of aquaculture:** The SPC Aquaculture website states that aquaculture “has had a chequered history in the Pacific with many initiatives that had not borne fruit.... Now it appears that the tide has turned... New, viable industries are beginning to be established and are returning

substantial economic and social benefits". It was within this context that the "kick-off" regional aquaculture workshop was held in March 2002, resulting SPC Aquaculture Action Plan.

The Section has undertaken a consultative and relatively precautionary role in aquaculture promotion with activities based on the Action Plan. In particular, the Plan places an emphasis on the social, economic and environment factors which will assist in tempering unrealistic expectations with the very real challenges facing aquaculture development. As the Aquaculture Adviser put it, one of his major roles is to "dispel the myths of aquaculture".

**Regional Coordination:** The 2002 workshop and Action Plan have established a strong regional focus to the activities of the Section. General agreement has been reached at a regional level on aquaculture development constraints and capacity building and other aquaculture needs in the region, as well as the key commodities (e.g. corals, clams and pearls). This will assist in focusing the work of the section and provides clear and structured opportunities for donor intervention.

The aquaculture section has established meaningful links with international and regional organisations such as NACA, FAO and ICLARM as well as USP. These links will enable a valuable exchange of information and provide "lessons learned" from aquaculture, as well as facilitating training and technical assistance.

Attachments within region and inter-region study visits to successful aquaculture operations have been effective at generating information and experience exchange between countries. The regional attachments have been targeted towards capacity building, and include the placement of Tongan and Fijian Fisheries Officers with pearl farms in Cook Islands. Although these and other attached personnel have been enthusiastic about the attachments, it is too early to provide meaningful comment on outcomes in terms of viable aquaculture developments.

Country visits by the Aquaculture Advisor have been very effective in workshop follow-up and to assist with formulating national strategies for aquaculture development, within the regional framework. The feedback from countries visited and interviewed were generally very positive concerning the current approach to aquaculture development.

Links with the SPC-based ICLARM project provide the Section with ready access to regionally relevant applied research that is targeted at answering questions that will be of benefit to all PICTs. e.g. protocols for the release of beche de mer (sandfish) to optimize survival. ICLARM is also identifying products which would be best suited to the region by using a bio-economist (AusAID funded) to determine which products have the best chances of financial success.

**Technical Assistance:** The Section is working towards being a "one stop shop" for aquaculture information needs in the region, and is tackling this through a variety of approaches:

- A web site, which includes information on Pacific aquaculture issues, marketing, and announcements on training, employment etc. The degree to which technicians in fisheries departments are able to access the internet may constrain the effectiveness of this medium in some countries (see Section 3.6.2 on the need for an evaluation of Internet use)
- In-country training workshops, including a train-the-trainer seaweed workshop in the Solomon Islands in November 2002 and the giant clam hatchery training in Tuvalu in March 2003.
- An emphasis on practical, hands-on aquaculture assistance, assisted by the recent recruitment of an Extension Agent
- Use of local consultants to assist with capacity building through training and the establishment of aquaculture strategies. An additional benefit of this is to increase the experience and capability of local consultants, who have a good chance of remaining in the region.

A number of the above interventions will rely on adequate in-country support, since the capacity of a single extension officer to assist will be limited. In the case of the Solomon Islands seaweed workshop, interviews during the present review indicate that the government officers trained under the Section have no budget to work with and, without such support, it is likely no significant impact will occur.

### 3.3.2 Overall assessment

The regional meeting to identify priorities and regional approaches, combined with programming visits and in-country seminars provided in conjunction with the visits have provided a strong base for the Section's



activities. The meeting was evaluated by participants according to progress made towards 12 objectives criteria; the consensus was that either “some progress” or “a lot of progress” was made on all items. The support for the Section from countries is further evidence that this consultative approach, combined with effective communication and rapid response times, is working. Initial moves to establish additional aquaculture ventures through capacity building using regional consultants, attachments and training courses appear to be appropriate.

Given the long history of failure of aquaculture products, there is a need for an increased consideration of the economic viability of prospective aquaculture operations, even at village level. This parallels a similar need identified in Section 3.2 for economic evaluations of fisheries development activities. In focusing extension efforts on encouraging people to grow things (e.g. extension efforts to teach villagers how to grow tilapia), there is a danger of insufficient attention to the determinants of viability, including costs and marketing arrangements. With more commercial ventures such as pearls, hard lessons have been learned in French Polynesia and Cook Islands in terms of supply, demand and pricing, and these experiences are useful for informing prospective developments in other PICTs. As a service to the region, the Aquaculture Section could provide economic scrutiny to individual aquaculture projects and national aquaculture strategies, as well as examining the underlying economics: investment climate, taxation, business conditions, subsidies, etc. This will assist in building national capacity for aquaculture assessment, reduce the possibility of CFP encouraging non-viable activity, and tend to improve the success rate of aquaculture projects. It will also avoid the situation of CFP being a promoter of aquaculture at all costs, rather than promoting aquaculture when it makes economic sense. There may continue to be political or donor pressure to take up aquaculture projects that do not appear economically viable - in such cases, an independent SPC-driven appraisal would at least allow an informed debate of the project's costs and benefits.

Many stakeholders raised their concerns on how little information there is on current aquaculture activities when compared to what is going on in the region. The Aquaculture Section has recognised this and is taking action. For example after visiting Micronesia, an article documenting aquaculture activity in the Marshall Islands, FSM, and Palau was produced for the SPC Fisheries Newsletter #100 (July Sept 2002). To make further progress (and to reduce reinventing the wheel) two activities would be of considerable value: (1) compiling an annotated bibliography of aquaculture in the Pacific, and (2) the production of lessons-learned papers should be considered. Given the lack of basic skills in aquaculture and the current high level of interest, this is an important area to be addressed.

Overall, it is the opinion of the Review Team that the interventions of the Aquaculture Section have been effective in against meeting the objectives but could be improved to address important areas such economics.

### 3.3.3 Recommendations:

- Economic evaluations should be part of the “toolbox” of the aquaculture section and this should be greater than occasionally employing a consultant economist.
- The Aquaculture Section should work closely with member countries to document past and current aquaculture activities and experiences in the region.

## 3.4 Coastal Fisheries Management Section

The objective that has guided the Coastal Fisheries Management Section (under the title of Community Fisheries Section) for most of the five-year period covered by the review is to “Promote the participation of coastal fishing communities, particularly women, in the management of subsistence and artisanal fisheries and allow them to benefit from regional and national fisheries assessment management, and development activities”.

The term "**fisheries management**" is sometimes the source of confusion in the fisheries sector as is often interpreted to mean very different things to various people. This ranges from the fairly complex definition of fisheries management given in some international fisheries agreements to the *de facto* definition used in some countries of "all that a government fishery agency does". The definition of "interventions in a fishery in pursuit of specific established objectives" is simple and conveys the importance of clearly defined objectives in the management process. It is therefore used in this report.

### 3.4.1 Performance against objectives

The major activities of the section to promote the participation of coastal communities in management have been the community work by the Community Fisheries Adviser in American Samoa, the Marshall Islands, and Fiji. The March 2003 Regional Policy meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management was also a key activity. Country visits have been recently made by the Community Fisheries Officer to assess potential for CBM and provide gender input into tuna management plans.

The various stakeholders in the section's major target countries generally have a favourable impression of the outcomes of the in-country work:

- The head of the fisheries agencies in the Marshall Islands indicates the target communities have a sense of more responsibility over their inshore resources.
- In American Samoa eight out of the 36 villages in the territory now have some form of community-based management as a direct result of the work of the Section. According to government fisheries officials, the reserves established with assistance from the Section are causing a positive change in attitude of the residents.
- In Fiji the work of the Section helped promote a change in attitude from development to management. In addition, subsequent to the in-country work, a marine reserve was established in Tavualevu and Nadroga officials requested training in the management of marine reserves.
- The tangible outcomes of the work on assessing CBM potential are less evident but this may be due to the foundation nature of the activity.
- It is likely that the gender analysis done in conjunction with formulation of tuna management plans for various countries has resulted in greater awareness of gender issues by tuna managers, but it is difficult to determine if management interventions have been modified as a result of the new awareness.

### 3.4.2 Overall assessment

Numerous stakeholders throughout the region offered their opinions of the strengths and weaknesses of the Section. Several common elements emerged in these discussions. Frequently-expressed perceptions of Section strengths were the use of previously-trained people as consultants in other countries and the promotion by the section of a management concept that is tried/tested/proven. Common perceptions of weaknesses included the "toolbox" being largely limited to promotion of the Samoan community-based management model and that the work of the Section favours a small number of countries.

The Section has considerable experience and technical competence in community management affairs, but less so in the new and broader area of coastal fisheries management. In countries where the Section has carried out significant activities, it appears that the work has had a reasonably good impact. The timeliness of work (response to requests, reporting) appears satisfactory, but using the model employed by the project (initial visits, multiple follow-up visits), results in only a few countries being able to benefit each year from the major activity of establishing community management programmes. To some degree, the regional coastal management workshop in March 2003 enabled non-target countries to benefit from the Section.

Overall, the Section has made good progress in promoting the participation of coastal fishing communities in the management of small-scale fisheries in American Samoa, Marshall Islands, and Fiji.

The process of relating past performance of the Section to recommendations for the future is affected by the recently enlarged role of the Section. A change of objectives was approved by CRGA in November 2002 which transformed the Community Fisheries Section into the Coastal Fisheries Management Section with the objective of promoting "environmentally sound and socio-economically achievable governance of reef and lagoon fisheries". Considerable effort has been focused on accommodating the expanded mandate, including a regional meeting in Nadi and a subsequent tour of the region. The resulting report, "Strategic Plan for Fisheries Management and Sustainable Coastal Fisheries in Pacific Islands" is largely oriented to revising the activities and outputs of the newly-formed Fisheries Management Section to ensure that these accurately reflect the perceived needs of member countries and territories. Because this closely parallels the efforts of the present CFP review, comments on the draft strategic plan may be more instructive than making separate recommendations.

### 3.4.3 Recommendations

With respect to the future of the Coastal Fisheries Management Section, the Review Team is largely in agreement with the recommendations of the draft strategic plan<sup>2</sup>. Certain subjects may, however, benefit from additional consideration. These include:

- Six goals are presented in the plan, all of which seem reasonable. It should be noted that another goal, establishing realistic fisheries management objectives and assessing what information is needed to support obtaining those objectives, appears to be required *before* the proposed collecting/analysing of data.
- A considerable amount of coastal resource management at community level is being undertaken by government environment agencies and NGOs. To encourage efficient use of scarce management resources, the Coastal Fisheries Management Section should be charged with spearheading cooperation in this area, both on a national and regional basis.
- The lack of success enjoyed by the many past human resource development planning efforts in fisheries agencies should be considered when promoting additional HRD planning work.
- The need for the Section to provide legal services to the region should be reconsidered. Enhancing an established legal division at FFA may result in greater efficiency (see Section 9.0).
- If the Reef Fisheries Observatory is unable to address the need to adapt the results of its rigorous scientific research to produce practical management guidelines (Section 3.5.1), then this critically important function should be performed by the Coastal Fisheries Management Section.

## 3.5 Reef Fisheries Observatory Section

From Coastal Fisheries Programme Strategic Plan 2003-2005, the overall objective of the Reef Fisheries Observatory is “Scientifically rigorous information on the status, exploitation levels and prospects of fisheries *is used*<sup>3</sup> by Pacific Islanders to sustainably manage living coastal resources”. Although it is recognized that there are several components of the Observatory, in the limited time available the Review focused on PROCFISH and the Live Reef Fish Trade Initiative.

### 3.5.1 PROCFISH

PROCFISH (coastal) is the major activity of the Reef Fisheries Observatory. The objective of this project, as stated in project documentation is “to promote the sustainability of lagoon and reef fisheries in the Pacific Islands. More precisely, this involves providing the basic information needed to adopt more appropriate management measures, plans and regulations”. As this five-year project is in its early implementation stage, measuring progress towards attainment of objectives may be premature at this time. On the other hand, at this early point it is timely and important to scrutinize the project from conceptual and practical perspectives - to make sure that the planned activities support both stated objectives and address actual needs of countries.

Based on in-country consultations and the Review Team’s experience, three broad statements can be made:

1. The high calibre of staff, their dedication, progress to date and the substantial resources of the project suggest that the present stated objectives of PROCFISH are likely to be achieved.
2. It would be possible to obtain additional benefits from the PROCFISH work if changes are made in how the fieldwork is carried out and in relationship to national counterparts.
3. Unless objectives are modified or changes made in the outputs, it is quite possible that the wealth of high-quality information likely to be generated by the project could have little relevance to the short and medium-term fisheries management needs in many of the target countries.

With regards to #2 above, it is acknowledged that PROCFISH team members have made considerable efforts to assure good relationships with officials and counterparts government fisheries agencies. Because of the newness of the activity during the period of original discussions of arrangements for

---

<sup>2</sup> Draft number 3, June 2003

<sup>3</sup> Emphasis supplied, see later text.

fieldwork, the original thinking of the two parties (PROCFISH staff, government officials) on obligations and expectations concerning the field work seem to have subsequently diverged. In some of the target countries there is the perception on the part of senior fisheries officials that the PROCFISH team is “Dashing in and dashing out with little understanding by local staff of what is happening” and “our role is only to provide logistical support to PROCFISH”. There is also some sentiment that the assigned counterparts feel their role is somewhat token in nature. In the PROCFISH team’s earnest quest for maximizing the productivity of time spent in-country, it appears that substantially more attention should be focused on communicating (and constantly reinforcing) the objectives/outputs of the programme to the full range of government and other stakeholders. Secondly, if the project is expected to have an impact on developing national capacity, it is essential that the counterparts be drawn more fully into the work, including field activity planning and data analysis.

Statement #3 represents one of the more significant problems encountered in the Review Team’s examination of the CFP. To address the issue, it is necessary to go beyond an assessment of project activities and requires examination of the validity of project design. In short, the high quality comparative assessments, rigorous scientific information, and acclaimed publications that PROCFISH may result in few medium-term practical benefits to the target countries, many of which may have invested considerable energy in the project. Such a situation, if allowed to continue, may compromise the ability to attain the longer-term benefits for which the project was designed.

The basic difficulty appears to be that that outputs of PROCFISH appear to be somewhat different to what many of the countries of the region require or have requested in the past to improve the management of coastal fisheries resources. There is a real need for advice which based on solid data and methodologies such as that from PROCFISH and other research. The advice, however, should be in a form which is understandable and easy-to-use. Examples of this are simple guidelines and “rules of thumb”. This impression comes from in-country discussions during the present review, statements recorded in regional meetings, and the opinion of the Review Team. Consider:

- The 1996 Regional Technical Meeting on Fisheries contained a recommendation expressing the need to take advances in the ecology of reef organisms and produce a practical handbook of coastal fishery management options.
- The record of the First Heads of Fisheries Meeting in 1999 stated “The meeting urged the Programme not to let its activities be driven by a desire to become a “centre of excellence” in reef fisheries science, but to keep its sights firmly fixed on the practicalities of fulfilling the needs of member countries, particularly in supporting local fisheries managers and management action.”
- A statement by the WorldFish Center at the PROCFISH Advisory Committee in Nadi in October 2002 addresses a key concern: “PROCFISH assumes that political will exists for decision makers to develop science into policy; this would not be acceptable to the Worldfish Center nowadays. An explicit process to carry this through must be in place.”

There does not appear much doubt that the difficulty described above exists. A PROCFISH submission to the present Review states: “the project has a gap in terms of translating project language into an understandable message that is useable in-country and by fishery managers”. The problem appears to be a difference in opinion over who or what fills the gap.

In some CFP documentation there are indications that the Coastal Fisheries Management Section will bridge the gap, however this appears unlikely for several reasons: the present and likely future skills in that section and direction that the programme will probably take, as per the recent “Strategic Plan for Fisheries Management and Sustainable Coastal Fisheries in Pacific Islands”. More importantly, the issue of efficient use of expertise should be considered; it appears that the staff of PROCFISH could, without too much of a departure from existing plans, go the extra distance and produce basic management guidelines on important species and fisheries<sup>4</sup>. With some re-engineering, it may be possible to have “the best of both worlds”: the scientifically rigorous outputs as desired by the donor and the basic management information as needed by the countries. The strategy for approaching the donor to accommodate this departure from the original project design is probably best known to SPC management; the contribution of the Review is to point out the critical need for such a change. Discussions with EU officials associated with the project indicate that such a change in outputs is not out of range of possibility.

---

<sup>4</sup> These are not country specific management plans, but rather regionally focussed information upon which national management plans could be based.

### 3.5.2 Live Reef Fish Trade Initiative

The other major component of the Reef Fisheries Observatory is the Live Reef Trade Initiative. This subsection, which started in the year 2000, has funding for the different phases by ADB and by the MacArthur Foundation); the associated objectives are:

- Live Reef Foodfish, ADB component: “to assist Pacific Islanders to address problems resulting from the economically and environmentally unsustainable practices in live reef export fisheries”
- Live Reef Foodfish, MacArthur Foundation component: “to fund and support the required capacity within SPC to address the issues and concerns requested by Pacific Island countries with regard to the live reef foodfish trade.

The list of in-country activities by the Live Reef Trade Initiative is impressive. Nine countries have had requests serviced, some involved multiple visits. A major regional workshop was successfully conducted. There is little doubt that both of the above objectives are being accomplished.

Feedback on capacity building from the countries has been favourable, with the effectiveness of the field work and attachments being specifically mentioned. Follow-up on specific assignments suggests that the work in Fiji has resulted in the national fisheries officer now having some degree of competence of dealing with the increasing amount of interest in the live fish trade.

With respect to improvements, some additional attention should be focussed on reporting. Officials in some countries indicated that they have waited for extended periods for submission or finalization of reports. Although this may reflect on project efficiency, part of the delay could have arisen out of a misunderstanding over the process of reporting (“who is waiting for who’s comments”). In any case, it is suggested that to avoid a repetition of past difficulties that there be a firm agreement in writing as to the written products to be produced, deadlines, and any arrangements for commenting.

### 3.5.3 Recommendations:

- Using the knowledge accumulated in the course of its rigorous scientific work, the Reef Fisheries Observatory should produce practical management information, such basic management guidelines on important species and fisheries.
- More attention should be focussed on the process of reporting, including having firm agreement in writing of the arrangements.

## 3.6 Information Section

According to the 1999–2003 SPC Corporate Plan, the objective of the Information Section is to “Promote information transfer in countries and territories through dissemination of current fishery information and maintenance of technical networks”.

### 3.6.1 Performance against objectives

As given in Information Paper 1 presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Heads of Fisheries Meeting, the section has two strategies for achieving the objectives: (1) Provision of information on a regular or on-demand basis to fisheries experts, development officers, extension agents, planners, management personnel, and other individuals involved in fisheries development and management on a national regional or international level, and (2) Information-related assistance to national fisheries services. These two strategies appear to be a logical division of efforts to achieve the objectives.

The breadth of information regularly provided to the region by the Information Section is quite good:

- SPC Fisheries Newsletter
- Information bulletins for the 10 special interest groups
- SPC Fisheries Address Book
- Coastal Fisheries Programme news website

Most stakeholders interviewed in the Review were familiar with the information produced by the section. In fact, outside of government fisheries agencies this information is probably the best known product of the

Coastal Fisheries Programme; many individuals in the private sector know little of the CFP besides the various publications.

Stakeholders throughout the region offered their opinions of the strengths and weaknesses of the Section. Several common elements emerged in these discussions. Frequently-expressed perceptions of Section strengths were the variety of the publications and efforts taken to obtain topics of interest for the newsletter. Few weaknesses were noted in the stakeholder comments. One French-speaking respondent, although commenting favourably on the quality of publications, mentioned the fact that French versions usually take longer to be issued.

The above comments largely echo the sentiments of the Review Team on the high quality of information from the Section. The only substantive additions are:

- The variety and focus of the major publications seems quite appropriate: the newsletter for recent events and information across the region, with the more detailed and technical information in the information bulletins.
- The Review Team feels that the audience for publications has matured to the point where less SPC/CFP “propaganda” and fewer “good news” stories are now required, with the style changing to realities of fisheries development and management. Portraying the impact and lessons-learned from past SPC/CFP interventions “warts and all”, would also be appropriate.
- Although not strictly an SPC problem, the high quality publications of the Section may have reduced impact as much of the in-country distribution may depend to some extent on poor or non-existent national distribution channels of the government fisheries agencies.
- Timeliness of SPC publications appears to be a semi-intractable problem that has plagued SPC for over a quarter-century (Section 4.0). Although some difficulties remain with getting time-sensitive fisheries information to the various clients, the Section has made remarkable progress since, for example, the period when the Fisheries Newsletter was years behind (e.g. advertising an up-coming meeting that had taken place a year earlier).

The major network activity is the promotion of special interest groups (SIGs). These have been established in ten areas (beche de mer, trochus, pearl oyster, etc.). Nine of these appear to be active at present. There appears to be positive outcomes from establishing the SIGs - most experienced fisheries professionals working in the region either know of, or belong to, one or more special interest group, and seem to derive benefits, mainly from the associated information bulletins. Several individuals feel that membership in the special interest groups is significant enough to list this on their curriculum vitae. Less-experienced professionals do not seem to be nearly as aware of the SIGs or of benefits of being a member. This seems to be ironic, as those individuals are most in need of establishing professional contacts and gaining exposure to recent developments in the region.

Another network-promoting activity that should not be underestimated is the SPC Fisheries Address Book. Although it requires a substantial amount of effort on the part of the Section to keep the 1300 addresses current, the book has evolved into an indispensable tool for establishing and maintaining professional communication in the fisheries field in the Pacific Islands region. Some additional potential exists for using the address book to promote additional contact, especially breaking down the communication barrier between fisheries/environment agencies (sections 3.4 and 7.0).

In addition to these regional information activities, the Section also responds to requests. These include:

- Requests from individuals for literature on specific subjects, sometimes in association with the Pacific Islands Marine Resources Information System (PIMRIS)
- Requests from countries for particular products: fish posters, pamphlets on national fisheries laws, etc.
- Training attachments: in the past few years, fisheries officers from Vanuatu, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Tonga, Samoa, Papua New Guinea (2), Cook Islands, Fiji have had attachments through the Section.

According to stakeholder interviews, the responses to requests are quite professional, complete, and timely. The Review Team is of a similar opinion, based on both follow up with stakeholders and being users themselves of the services. The only major comment to be made concerns the fact that many individuals from government and private sector were not aware of the services of the Section that they could potentially benefit from, especially that concerning acquiring information on specific subjects.

### 3.6.2 Overall assessment

The Review Team's assessment is that the Section has made significant progress in achieving the objectives, in both information production and promotion of networks.

The Review Team has become aware of information flow problems unrelated to the present or past performance of the Section. That is, relevant stakeholders may actually not be receiving the information intended for them. This points to the need for periodic evaluation of the target audience and whether information is getting to those clients.

The review has identified a major bottleneck as the in-country information flow between the fisheries agencies and other stakeholders. Although not suggesting that the Information Section take over this role of in-country information dissemination, there is a need to do an analysis in a few countries of in-country information flow. This is likely to be instructive to those countries, as well as being useful to the Information Section. It is especially important in this evaluation to look at appropriate mechanisms for getting relevant information to stakeholders in remote locations and those at the community level.

There is the occasional suggestion that the CFP make greater use of the Internet in distribution information. Alternatively, there is a substantial body of opinion that most fisheries stakeholders in the region do not have regular Internet access. An important future activity of the Information Section would be to carry out an analysis of the use of Internet for fisheries information distribution, including an identification of the types of users and types of information for which such a scheme is appropriate and inappropriate.

These additional activities are not cost free. Consideration should be given to reallocating funds from activities which may be more peripheral to the objective of providing information to important stakeholders. In this regard, the fairly expensive activity of producing high-quality colour fish posters should be scrutinized. Alternatively, there is the view that the expensive activity of mailing out thousands of hard copies of publications which can be distributed faster and cheaper through the Internet should be considered for re-allocation.

### 3.6.3 Recommendations

The Review Team makes the following recommendations for the Information Section:

- There should be greater publicity of the services of the Information Section to a wide range of fisheries stakeholders and more efforts should be made to include less experienced professionals in the special interest groups.
- Fewer SPC "good news" stories are now required in the Information Section publications, with the style changing to realities of fisheries development and management.
- An information flow analysis should be undertaken in a few countries to determine if serious barriers exist to the dissemination of fisheries information to important stakeholders.
- An analysis of the use of Internet for fisheries information distribution should be undertaken.

## 3.7 General Comments on CFP services

One of the strongest messages to come from the extensive consultations undertaken in this review of the CFP was that many of the important fishery stakeholders are only vaguely aware of CFP and have little knowledge of the services that are available. In fact, some of the review interviews were not really obtaining perceptions from clients, but rather explaining to potential clients what the CFP is and what services it can provide. This indicates that the CFP needs to focus considerably more attention on making those that are eligible for CFP services aware of what assistance is available.

There also is the impression that CFP may be growing out of touch with an important category of client, the senior fisheries officers of the region. In discussions, those individuals often compare their relationship with CFP to that with the FFA, which they feel is quite close. Part of this is undoubtedly due to the infrequency of SPC fisheries meetings, something which is beyond the control of the CFP. It should be pointed out, however, that FFA seems to give more priority to activities which strengthen dialogue with senior fisheries officers. As an example, in reviewing the travel of CFP staff over the past five years, the

Review Team noted that there were cases of sending two CFP staff to a single meeting in another part of the world. While there may have been sound reasons for doing this, the FFA often funds a Pacific Island fisheries official to attend such meeting along with a single FFA staff member.

Related to the issue of being in touch with countries, the degree to which the CFP is directed by countries in terms of priorities is not clear. Interventions during RTMF and HoF meetings are mostly related to votes of thanks for assistance provided, or requests for additional work. Other than where specific workshops have been held (Aquaculture and Coastal Fisheries Management) little specific strategic direction has been provided to the CFP in the past (see also Section 11.0 on planning).

## 4.0 Quality of Services

In the discussions of the performance of the six sections of the CFP, several patterns concerning the quality of the services have emerged. Many of these concern the quality, appropriateness, and timeliness of the services and the interactions with the stakeholders.

Almost without exception, the services from CFP are very high in quality. Few, if any, negative comments were received from the broad range of stakeholders on this subject.

The appropriateness of services provided (“the right medicine”) is generally good. The only problems that seem to occur, are those activities carried out by CFP at the insistence of requesting governments, which may be classified as having only marginal chances of success. Multiple trips to promote longlining from the same unsuitable vessel is an example of an inappropriate service; it was done to satisfy an official government request but had little possibility of resulting in a viable operation.

The timeliness of CFP assistance is another important issue. The programme is good on responding to requests. Certain popular services may take some time to provide, as countries must “wait in a queue” but this is understandable and no reflection of poor quality stakeholder servicing. CFP (and SPC in general) has characteristically been very good in timeliness of correspondence, especially relative to other regional organizations.

The timeliness of reporting is different. Although generally good, two types of difficulties exist:

- The occasional long time lag associated with getting a report back to a country after a mission
- Misunderstanding over the process of reporting and commenting on report drafts (“who is waiting for who’s comments”), with the result of some degree of frustration on the part of both the reporting officer and the client.

CFP staff have done an outstanding job in their relationship with stakeholders. The perception is that, in carrying out the various duties, the staff have a good mixture of cultural sensitivity, professionalism, and productivity. Where difficulties arise, it is often because of the desire to accomplish a large degree of work during short period of in-country field activity. This can result in an appearance of “dashing in and out” of country – an issue raised by a number of stakeholders.

In the quest to improve the quality of CFP services, some thought should be given to the feasibility of out-posting of staff to non-Noumea locations. Although the CFP seems uncomfortable with this model, apparently for administrative reasons, the SPC successfully maintains an effective sub-regional plant protection unit in Pohnpei to service Micronesia. Other factors to consider are:

- The communication situation between SPC/Noumea and officers in the field has changed remarkably for the better since the period in the 1980s when CFP’s Training Section was based in Suva.
- Many international development agencies are successful at managing out-posted staff
- Some of the lesser developed countries of the region deserve to have the benefits of CFP staff based in their country; it is somewhat ironic that CFP services are most accessible in New Caledonia, one of the countries of the region that has the most alternatives to CFP assistance.

Although the delivery of services by CFP is considered to be of good quality, there is some potential for improving the few weak areas:



- The incidents of inappropriate services could be reduced by a preliminary economic analysis of requests for services (sections 3.2.3, 3.3.3, and 9.0)
- At least some of the reporting delays and misunderstandings could be resolved by a firm agreement in writing between CFP and the client detailing the work to be completed and the process of reporting, including mutually acceptable deadlines.

## 5.0 Approaches Used to Build Capacity

### 5.1 Human resource development

All sections of the CFP have implemented implicit or explicit HRD strategies to support individual capacity building in Pacific Island Countries, under the following major strategies:

**Training courses; national, regional (Pacific) and Australia and New Zealand- training practitioners and trainers** Courses and workshops have provided the backbone of capacity building efforts, focusing on key non-government interest groups (e.g. the private sector), in addition to fisheries departments. By selecting priority topics and using highly qualified individuals, usually with extensive industry or field experience, CFP training courses have been generally very effective. Particular success has been achieved with courses in HACCP/fish processing and small business enterprises for the private sector. Within the government sector, the Nelson course has also maintained a sound track record. Weaknesses have occurred in public sector interventions, where training tends to be somewhat ad-hoc and recipients of training may not be in the position or have the motivation to take advantage of training. Selection of participants has also been a key issue. Some attendees have been selected by their fishery agencies on a “rotational” basis, rather than on the likelihood of obtaining direct personal and institutional benefits from training. This issue was found to be particularly relevant in the case of regional courses where there may only be one place per country and that place is taken up by a disinterested/poorly motivated/inappropriate individual, who is unwilling or unable to share the benefits of training with others. Regional training can however provide a wider perspective, establish networks and allow for an exchange of ideas between countries

**Capacity building attachments to SPC and where useful development models exist** All sections of the CFP have used attachments of one form or another. The IS has had 10 attachments from nine countries in recent years, and SPC staff consider that this is a valuable way of providing capacity building through exposure to the work of the Marine Resources Division while working on a specific project, such as the production of a poster/leaflet. Attachments have been targeted toward individuals, allowing them to develop specific technical skills and awareness of the work of SPC with minimum time out of country. Links with SPC established during the visit are usually maintained over time and form a valuable two way conduit for information.

Attachments where useful development models exist have been used successfully in a number of areas, primarily under the coordination of the Training Section. These include attachments in aquaculture (pearl farming), the delivery of training, and community based fisheries management.

One key determinant of success of SPC attachments is the fact that they are generally planned with a specific objective and outcome in mind, particularly in terms of personal and national benefits once an individual returns from SPC.

**Field attachments by CFP staff and counter parting** As discussed in Section 3.2 on the (Development Section, attachments by CFP staff to provide field support and hands-on training have been extensively used by the FDS and have been a powerful intervention in terms of the direct transfer of technology in a number of related fields. These interventions allow for a high level of adaptation to the capacity building needs of a particular country. Similar approaches have been taken with CMS and PROCFISH activities. In PROCFISH only limited capacity building has occurred, since time spent in countries apparently allows for little more than a tight schedule of sampling and field work, with little time for developing the skills of Pacific island staff.

**Use of multi-media (publications, videos, web-based information)** This form of capacity building is extensively used by the CFP as outlined in other parts of this report. Information to support training and awareness raising has been particularly valuable and has had a large multiplier effect on capacity building when used by training institutions or during field and other workshops. A noteworthy example of this has been the success of the SPC Sea Safety initiatives, which seem to have contributed to noticeable improvements in sea safety in several Pacific Island countries.

From discussions with stakeholders in countries, there appear to be a number of gaps in the production and dissemination of information from Fisheries Departments to Stakeholders. This issue is discussed in Section 3.6.2 above.

## 5.2 HRD Planning and institutional capacity-building

In most fisheries agencies, HRD plans are in place under the general provisions of the public service and responsibility for their implementation frequently lies beyond the fisheries sector. The extent to which HRD planning, including the limited assistance provided by SPC (see Section 5.2) has resulted in fisheries departments maximising staff training, development and utilisation is questionable.

The CFP has not played a significant role in institutional capacity-building in terms of systems, policies and procedures. This review encourages the CFP to work with countries in taking a more strategic, planned approach to coastal fisheries management and development. In so doing, it is important that CFP provide advice on, and consider how best to assist with the institutional capacity-building needed to support such an approach.

Overall, CFP approaches to capacity building have been appropriate, although there has been limited assessment of the overall impacts of these interventions over time. This is due in part to the absence of a comprehensive approach to capacity building in the fisheries sector by countries. The Review Team suggests that consideration be given to undertaking a capacity needs analysis focused on fisheries agencies and the private sector. The objectives of the analysis could be to: 1) establish a benchmark of current capacity and 2) identify critical capacity building needs (including training) to support the effective management and development of coastal fisheries. The results of the analysis would be helpful in coordinating in-country capacity building efforts across the CFP programme, and provide a basis for the assessment of the outcomes of such interventions.

## 6.0 Sustainable outcomes

### 6.1 Planning for sustainable outcomes

A number of strategies to achieve sustainable outcomes across the range of CFP activities have been utilised. These include:

- Capacity building, with an emphasis on training (Section 5.0)
- Choosing target groups and individuals that have the ability, position and motivation to internalise assistance and continue to use and build on skills/knowledge/advice provided. Increased attention to the private sector has been successful in this regard.
- Aligning activities to meet national development priorities, so that there is interest/commitment in continuing with activity.
- The Aquaculture and Coastal Fisheries Management Sections have recently aligned their activities more closely with country priorities; other Sections suffer somewhat from the infrequency of HoF meetings and as a result may be less aligned with national priorities.
- Planning projects so they are sufficiently resourced and of adequate duration to promote sustainable outcomes (e.g. allowing for second-phase projects such as those planned for the FAD and PROCFISH projects)
- Use of an MOU to gain a commitment from Government to support SPC interventions through the provision of equipment and other contributions, as well as a counterpart. This approach is used effectively by the Fisheries Development Section.

Much of the work of the CFP has been initiated by countries in the form of requests for assistance. Dealing with requests to assist with high-risk (in terms of sustainability) projects has been a key issue, and one which raises the fundamental incompatibility of reacting uncritically to country requests with achieving sustainable outcomes. A proportion of country requests to CFP for assistance (as high as 30%) have been effectively “filtered out” through informal discussions between the Director of the Marine Resources Division and country representatives. More up-front and transparent economic analysis using simple benefit/cost analysis, combined with estimates of social impacts and prospects for sustainability, would help to filter projects and improve impacts.

A process of keeping official and fisheries contacts in the loop while initiating direct technical discussions between stakeholders (CRGA 27 decision) to formulate technical assistance is seen as a means of generating more sustainable projects. While the process has been agreed, and from in-country comments to the Review Team apparently supported, it has not been implemented widely. In at least two instances, CFP Sections have worked with the private sector to develop projects (e.g. HACCP and vertical longlining) to an advanced stage, only to have fisheries departments withdraw support and force withdrawal of the initiative. In these cases, both government entities were kept fully apprised of the development of the projects.

There is a feeling among some CFP staff that some activities of the CFP have been repetitive and should be part of the regular work of fishery agencies. Repeat visits may not be contributing to capacity building, and may actually be counter-productive. In one instance, a single country has been assisted with FAD deployment four times in six years and still does not have the equipment or confidence to deploy FADs without SPC assistance. This appears to be a case of using the CFP as a purely a service, rather than as a tool to build in-country capacity.

In summary, most, if not all CFP assistance include some form of planning for sustainability. However, since there is little formal follow up on in-country outcomes by the CFP, the degree to which this planning is successful is rarely, if ever measured. Wherever practical, arrangements to make interventions sustainable should be made specific at the time of formulating assistance and followed up in the future, possibly under the new CFP objective suggested in Section 14.0. As part of this process, SPC should build a record of CFP assistance and its impacts for each country.

## **6.2 Gender**

Women's Fisheries Development was initially a stand-alone section of the coastal fisheries programme. Over time, there has been a shift towards a gender-balanced approach within communities and women in fisheries issues have been subsumed within the Coastal Fisheries Management Section. Gender remains a major component of work of the Section – especially because of women's intergenerational view of conservation.

Under the CFMS, work has focused on national baseline studies and follow-up workshops, during which some of the issues from the studies were addressed – e.g. the Niue women's invertebrate fisheries study and the kai (freshwater mussel) study for Fiji.

Input has been provided by the CFP on the gender issues related to the tuna management and development plans. This was provided as a part of a FORSEC/FFA/SPC collaboration, which has resulted in greater awareness of gender issues by tuna managers, but it is difficult to determine if management interventions have been modified as a result of the new awareness. Other interventions by the CFP dealing with gender issues include:

- Women in fisheries enterprise training.
- Encouraging women participants on the Fisheries Officers Course, to assist with gender balance in fisheries administrations.
- A focus on gender aspects within aquaculture development, noting that as a new industry, aquaculture does not have the cultural restrictions sometimes associated with capture fisheries.
- Gender approaches to training courses – checking for gender considerations e.g. equal opportunity for applications, accommodation arrangements and the delivery of material suitable for women.
- Women in Fisheries Information Bulletin

From country discussions, uptake of specific gender initiatives has been somewhat limited, mostly as a result of gender not being of the highest priority, and the number of competing requirements for scarce resources. Baseline data on women in fisheries and some of the follow up actions are now being used to assist with inshore fisheries management (e.g. Niue). In some instances there appears to be a lack of understanding of what CFP can offer in terms of gender-based initiatives, a relatively common finding for other Sections within the CFP

In conclusion, the Review Team considers that there is an appropriate emphasis on gender issues within the CFP, based on evidence that the issue is being addressed at a number of levels.

### **6.3 Poverty alleviation**

Coastal fisheries resources are of fundamental importance to poverty alleviation in the Pacific Islands. They contribute to food security by providing a highly nutritious protein supplement to the diets of many rural households Gillett et al (2001) noted that most of the Pacific Island countries exceed by a large margin the world average per capita fishery product consumption rate of 13kg, and that estimates for Kiribati indicate that it has the highest rate of fish consumption in the world. Almost all of this fish is taken from relatively vulnerable (in terms sustainability) coastal waters.

Coastal fisheries also form the basis for an economic activity that is accessible to the poorest segments in Pacific Island countries. Artisanal fishing has the potential to generate additional family income, making it an excellent vehicle to reduce rural poverty.

Increasing fishing pressure is tending to cause overexploitation of the coastal fisheries resources, which in turn, contributes to the decrease in quality of life that many communities in Pacific Island countries are experiencing, especially those close to urban areas. The CFP seeks to help countries achieve a balance between the need to develop coastal fisheries and the requirement to manage fishing activities in such a way that poverty alleviation benefits will be available for future generations.

Specific examples of the way in which the CFP contributes to poverty alleviation include:

- The development of sustainable management arrangements for coastal fisheries, particularly relating to community based initiatives;
- Assistance to small scale fishers to expand into tuna fisheries through the use of FAD related programmes and small boat tuna catching techniques, including vertical longlining;
- Village level aquaculture programmes (e.g. for prawns and tilapia) aimed at providing supplemental income and providing extension support to communities; and
- A continued focus on role of women in fisheries as a group that are an important provider of family food, including fish and shellfish.

Overall, the CFP makes a substantial and responsible contribution to poverty alleviation, primarily by working with communities and through an increasing focus on small-scale fishers and the generation of sustainable benefits at village level.

## **7.0 Target Groups for the Coastal Fisheries Programme**

The target groups for the CFP have traditionally been government fishery agencies and small-scale fishers. With new initiatives, new target groups and program emphases have arisen in the last few years. These presently include private sector fishing companies, coastal communities, and women.

Two major issues relating to CFP target groups are:

- The degree to which target groups outside government are able to access CFP services
- The inclusion of government environment agencies and NGOs concerned with coastal resource management as CFP target groups.

A decision of the 1997 CRGA/Conference allowed enterprises to informally approach the SPC Marine Resources Division to ascertain if certain assistance would be appropriate and, if so, develop a proposal

for formal submission through the official channels. It appears that this represents a sensible approach; it addresses concerns by the private sector that they are being excluded from the process while maintaining the legitimate coordinating role of the official SPC contact.

Although this scheme seems quite favourable, there is a difficulty over the fact that the most articulate/informed companies are the ones most likely to participate in the process of formulating a request to SPC, while many companies (perhaps those most needing external assistance) are unaware of the opportunities or unable to frame requests for assistance in an appropriate manner. This relates to the need to give more publicity to CFP services (Section 3.7) and/or agreement to disseminate the findings from work with one company to others. There is also the question of CFP providing assistance to large fishery firms - whether it is appropriate for SPC to furnish what could be considered a subsidy to a profitable company, especially in view of SPC's poverty-reduction emphasis. Some form of SPC policy on this issue should be developed, which may include the concept of cost-recovery.

The other major issue dealing with CFP target groups is the issue of considering government environment agencies and environmentally-oriented NGOs as legitimate target groups of the CFP. On one hand, the fisheries officials of the region (as portrayed by the report of the Coastal Fisheries Management Section's recent regional tour report) do not appear to consider this especially important. On the other hand, the reality is that a considerable amount of coastal resource management at community level is now being undertaken by government environment agencies and NGOs. Considering the funding situation, this involvement is likely to increase. In addition, as inshore fisheries become more fully-exploited and the activities of government fishery agencies become more management/conservation oriented, the objectives and activities of fisheries agencies and environment agencies are likely to converge. To encourage efficient use of scarce management resources, the CFP should spearhead fisheries/environment cooperation and having the environment sector as a CFP target group could assist in this process. An example of this is suggested in the recent coastal fisheries strategic plan document in which it is proposed that resource management training be undertaken for two participants from each country: one from a fisheries agency and the other from an environmental agency.

## 8.0 Priority Needs of the Sector

The terms of reference for this review indicate that priority needs of the sector should be summarized, making specific reference to the needs expressed at regional technical meetings. From an examination of the reports of recent technical meetings, it is evident that "priority needs" are not especially well articulated by the meetings. In fact, Recommendation 13 of the 26<sup>th</sup> RTMF in 1996 states that a review should be carried out to identify priority areas for the CFP. In the various technical meetings held recently, some substantial needs are mentioned or alluded to. Common themes include:

- Additional masterfishermen
- Post harvest work
- Assistance associated with FADs
- Management assistance: capacity building in resource management, practical management advice, legislation drafting, and interventions to halt the reduction in catches of inshore marine species

Alternatively, the priority needs which have emerged from stakeholder consultations and analysis during present review are:

- Economic evaluations of development activities, including those associated with fishing enterprise development and aquaculture.
- Increased level of coastal fisheries management capacity and an expansion of SPC's delivery of practical fisheries management advice
- National strategies for fisheries development and fisheries management, into which SPC interventions would be integrated

Based on analysis by the Review Team, some comment should be made on the above lists. An examination shows that they are actually perceived gaps in the present CFP work programme, rather than basic needs of the sector. It also should be noted, as mentioned by King et al. (2003), that it is important to make the distinction between needs and wants and prioritize those needs relating to the most pressing problems.

It is not disputed that the masterfishermen (now called Fisheries Development Officers) are presently popular with the countries, especially for services dealing with medium-scale tuna longlining and FADs. As this review of the CFP is forward looking, likely future developments should also be considered. Most experience observers of the fisheries situation in the region feel that the era of increasing fishing activities and constantly expanding fish catches is over. The recent regional coastal fisheries management review sponsored by SPC and the Commonwealth Secretariat stressed the need for government fishery agencies to change their focus from development to conservation. CFP's masterfishermen could have a role in this process.

There has been some expression of the need for legislative advice, with the idea that revising fisheries legislation is important for improving coastal fisheries management. While not disagreeing with the need, some consideration should be given to how to best address the need.

Some of the lesser advanced countries of the region do not have well articulated strategies for fisheries development and fisheries management. At the same time, the CFP often assumes that the assistance requested by countries nicely fills a gap in a logical/appropriate strategy and it is not the role of the CFP to question this. The reality is that at least some of the CFP assistance is actually a one-off activity that does not contribute to a process and is not pursued in the future: it dies with completion of the SPC intervention. In this type of situation, an important need for some countries is advice on basic fisheries development and management strategies.

The need for post-harvest work is often mentioned. Although this perception seems valid, it should be noted that post-harvest activities embrace several very different disciplines, including fish handling, marketing, economics, and food technology research.

The suggestion for economic evaluations of development activities should be considered in light of the past record of fisheries development activities. Tiller (1997) noted "For more than 20 years flawed activities have undermined donor and recipient confidence in fisheries developments and consumed vast quantities of scarce development capital. Even the most tenacious donor is now nervous about fisheries development proposals." Economic evaluations of development schemes (including both requests to CFP and those to be financed by other sources) could have a very positive effect by identifying those projects "doomed to failure" and thereby improving the record of fisheries and aquaculture development activities. This could also be an important mechanism for CFP to avoid involvement with projects that have very limited chance of viability (Section 6.1).

Lastly, but very importantly, there are considerable indications that assistance related to the management of coastal fisheries will be the "burning need" for the foreseeable future. This contention is supported by knowledgeable stakeholders, the recent coastal fisheries management review, and the present review of the CFP.

## **9.0 Review of Current Work Programme Against Priority Needs**

Some of the gaps in the work programme mentioned in Section 8.0 above seem to justify an adjustment in strategic or operational aspects of the CFP. On the other hand, there may be non-CFP alternatives to the other needs.

With respect to the perceived need for more masterfishermen activity, this must be reconciled with the contention that government fishery agencies should change their focus from development to management/conservation. It seems that the two concepts could both be accommodated by masterfishermen to channelling more of their efforts into management-oriented activities, including work associated with FADs, and activities which improve the value of the catch, such as fish handling, rather than efforts to increase fish production. In fact, the masterfishermen themselves in recent documentation (SPC 2003) point to the progressively more saturated fisheries of the region, the requirement for management, and the need for using the FAD as a management tool.

The expressed need for assistance with coastal resource management legislation should be carefully considered with respect to the CFP work programme. In the recent past countries of the region have received assistance dealing with fisheries legislation from a variety of sources, including FFA, FAO, and ADB. Most Pacific Island countries continue to be eligible for legal support from these agencies. The

issue of the CFP providing legal advice should be considered in light of these alternate sources, especially FFA's Legal Services Unit. Although the FFA is primarily involved in tuna issues, FFA undertakes work on national fisheries laws which characteristically encompasses all types of fisheries including those of coastal areas. Regardless of institutional mandate, FFA's work on the basic fisheries laws does have substantial bearing on coastal legal issues. With this in mind, it would seem logical to enhance FFA's ability to provide a full range of assistance in fisheries legislation, rather than have two separate fisheries legislation sections in the two regional organizations covering fisheries.

With respect to the need for economic evaluations of development activities, it should be noted that it is especially difficult to obtain information on the economics of small-scale tuna fisheries. In the 1980s the assistance provided to the Pacific Island countries by the FFA included support for the analysis of the economics of small-scale fishing. In the early 1990s, when the FFA changed its focus of operations to concentrate almost entirely on the tuna fisheries, the organization virtually ceased its involvement in the analysis of small-scale coastal fisheries and the task was not taken up by SPC or any other regional organisation. This is ironic considering that the important CFP activities of fisheries development, aquaculture development, and enterprise development are inherently associated with assessing economic/financial feasibility. This is recognized by the present CFP strategic plan in which the stated sub-sector objectives in aquaculture and fisheries development make specific reference to "economically sustainable" and "economically viable", respectively. The CFP should therefore have the capability to undertake economic assessments as part of its core services, rather than attempt to "make the problem go away" by occasionally employing a consultant economist.

One of the most important needs of the region in coastal fisheries will be several forms of assistance related to management. This includes building capacity, advice on national strategies, mentoring, and technical information understandable to the level at which most management interventions are formulated and implemented. The present Coastal Fisheries Management Section has arisen from the former Community Fisheries Section. Despite the name change, the expertise within the section appears largely focused on community fisheries. High-level management expertise is required, and this should be on the same level for coastal fisheries as that which FFA has for pelagic fisheries. Especially important is bridging the gap between scientific information and management advice.

Assistance with post-harvest activities, and in particular help in meeting the exacting demands export markets, is a priority need for the region. Currently, this need is being addressed by the CFP (Training and Fisheries Development Sections) and USP. From discussions and observations, it is clear that current efforts are not fully meeting the needs of the sector and that there are tensions between the CFP and USP over the supply of services (see next section). The Review Team suggests that the issue of post-harvest services be reviewed in detail and that the results be discussed by CFP, USP and other stakeholders, and included in the proposed MOU between CFP and USP.

## **10.0 Relationship between SPC, FFA and USP**

### **10.1 The Forum Fisheries Agency**

The CFP and FFA have closely related areas of interest in the following areas:

- Tuna fisheries development, with an emphasis on tuna longlining and including the economic analysis of small to medium scale fishing operations.
- The development aspects of national tuna fisheries management plans, and specifically those relating to harvesting, processing and gender.

An MOU between FFA and SPC is in existence and clarifies their respective roles for donors, PIC administrations and clients. The current MOU is more focused on OFP and tuna, may need re-visiting in light of increasing interaction in the area of fisheries development. A regular colloquium is held between the two organisations, and is a useful activity, allowing discussion to be focused on relationships and responsibilities rather than project specifics. Comment was received by the Review Team that the Colloquium has become less focused and more irregular than in the past. To be effective, these issues require addressing.

The following are specific aspects of the relationship between SPC and FFA.

**Development options:** SPC has greater field knowledge of the small and medium scale tuna longline fishery and some cost/income data relating to harvesting operations. FFA maintains marketing data, including tuna prices and provides advice on overall development policy.

**Sharing information and liaison:** In general FFA has greater contact with fisheries agencies than SPC, which has more contact with fishers and commercial companies. A more regular exchange of information between FFA and SPC would improve liaison between these institutions and both public and private stakeholders in the fishery.

**Complementary project formulation:** FFA and SPC have had a history of collaboration on joint projects, including the GEF International Waters project on Oceanic Fisheries Management. An upcoming EU project based on the development of tuna fisheries in the Pacific ACP countries (DEVFISH), recognizes the respective strengths of FFA and SPC and if approved will fund complementary programmes in each institution.

**Legal drafting requirements for CBM activities:** It has been suggested that SPC should obtain the capacity to provide advice on CBM-based legislation, including by-laws. Careful consideration will be need to see if such assistance would be better placed with (or at least managed by) FFA. FFA already has extensive knowledge of fisheries acts and legislation in the region, almost all of which combine offshore and coastal fisheries issues. Under an FFA based legal advice scenario, CFMS could provide technical input into the process, as is frequently the case with fisheries and legal specialist working on other large fisheries capacity and institutional building projects in the region.

**Advice on development policy issues:** FFA sees policy advice on medium to large scale commercial fisheries development options (which are frequently related to advice on property rights, limited entry regulations, use of joint ventures etc), as clearly laying within its mandate. SPC often provides advice on development strategies, which is considered to amount to policy advice. This causes some minor friction between the organisations at times. The proposed DEVFISH project will assist with better defining the respective roles of FFA and SPC.

FFA's view is that relationships with SPC generally work well. It has been suggested that some input from SPC (CFP) can tend to be overly prescriptive and may be phrased more as instructions than suggestions. FFA also feels that advice is occasionally provided in areas where the CFP does not have competence. SPC's view on the status of their relationship with FFA is also positive. There is general agreement on the need to clarify relationships in the area of technical versus policy responsibilities.

There appears to be more a problem with undercover than overcover ("more gaps than overlap") in some areas of the SPC/FFA mandates. These include aquaculture development policy, technical advice on industrial fisheries development and economics of small scale fishing and post-harvest operations.

In summary, the Review Team considers the relationship between SPC and FFA as healthy, with good lines of communication in place. There is however scope to review the current MOU and use the colloquium and other opportunities to discuss how best to meet shortfalls in the fisheries development needs of the region.

## 10.2 The University of the South Pacific

The CFP and USP have closely related areas of interest in the following areas:

- Fisheries training and education
- Post harvest training and HACCP related advisory services
- Other technical and research programmes including aquaculture and community fisheries

The following are specific aspects of the relationship between SPC and USP.

**Provision of fisheries training:** Under informal regional agreements, USP has a role<sup>5</sup> to provide education and training services in the aquaculture and post harvest sectors. As a university, the USP is required to provide an academic approach to fisheries education and research, albeit it with an applied focus. Individual USP staff are keen to run short, vocational courses on applied fisheries topics, but this activity appears at times to be in conflict with the core business of the University. SPC is a trainer of "last

---

<sup>5</sup> Some SPC countries are not part of USP - PNG and the French territories have own universities.



resort” and also coordinates the funding of a range of training activities using appropriate resources within the region, including SPC.

**Funding:** SPC is frequently able to attract a wide range donor interest in fisheries related training courses, including those for post harvest. USP is not normally funded to run short course training or provide technical assistance. These services are generally run either through donor funding (e.g. CSPOD) or on a cost recovery basis, restricting the ability of USP to expand services to the fisheries sector. At times there is competition between the agencies for funding in similar areas of endeavour.

**Post graduate research in coastal fisheries:** There is potential to increase numbers of PIC students researching issues relevant to the issues facing coastal fisheries management and development. SPC could provide supervisory services and occasional lectures for PIC students – this would be of particular value in building local capacity.

**“Lead agency” issues:** Probably the major issue for the SPC/USP relationship is the USP view that they are the CROP lead agency for post-harvest aspects of fisheries and training/education in aquaculture. As a result, there is an expectation that they will receive preference for regional consultancies/training in these areas. SPC, as the regional coordinating agency for country requests in these areas tends to attract donor funding and then select the best individuals and organisations to respond to these requests.

From discussions with SPC and other stakeholders, there is a perception that USP, while legitimately eager to take a greater role in fisheries, is somewhat out of touch with the region and does not have the networks or processes to act as an independent “lead agency”. There is also an issue with respect to a lack of appropriate background and experience in some areas at USP, which impacts on its competitiveness to attract funding and win fee paid work ahead of other service providers.

USP, for its part, recognizes that mixed messages have been given to the fisheries sector in terms of applied fisheries training, education and research. However, in accordance with recommendations from a recent external review of MSP, as a CROP agency USP wishes to assume a more central role in fisheries research and education, but is limited by donor and other support. There is some disappointment that SPC has not chosen to take advantage of its seat on the MSP Advisory Board as an opportunity to provide input into the USP fisheries programmes.

In summary, the relationship between SPC and USP in the area of fisheries is a matter of some concern. SPC and USP both have legitimate roles and both have a long-term future in the region, with a number of areas of common or overlapping interest. Attempts at improving communication do not seem to have worked and there would appear to be a need for a detailed MOU between the two organisations. The MOU should draw clear boundaries between the respective roles of SPC and USP and modes of interaction, in accordance with regional priorities for coastal fisheries and aquaculture.

## 11.0 Planning approaches in the CFP

### 11.1 Overall planning approaches

As a regional research, support and advisory programme, the CFP bases key planning decisions on the direction provided by its member countries. Unlike FFA, which receives generally direction from heads of fisheries agencies, SPC puts forward work programmes and related ideas to HoF for comment, for onward transmission and final decision at CRGA. There is little or no national fisheries expertise at CRGA and the degree to which this process directs the alignment between country priorities and the SPC work programme is unclear. Regional workshops, meetings, and country visits also feed into the SPC planning process.

Planning in the CFP has been a mixture of:

- longer-term, programmed activities, including those tied to major donor projects, such as the three-year AusAID sponsored Aquaculture programme; and
- relatively ad-hoc gap-filling responses to country needs in coastal fisheries e.g. assistance with a ciguatera outbreak or a priority training need.

The balance between these two approaches is estimated by CFP management to be of the order of 80% against programmed projects and 20% short-term gap-filling interventions. Much of the 80% is responsive in the sense that the work usually stems from short-notice country initiated requests for assistance.

The degree to which sections have been able to plan activities based on regional priorities has frequently been restricted by the ability to attract donor funds. Ideally, regional priorities would be donor priorities although this has not always been the case. Some project-based activities will remain rather more “donor driven” than others, with up-front planning and relative rigid and planned funding and work schedules, including the EU PROCFISH project

The gradual, but consistent change over the last 3-5 years towards an emphasis on programme rather than project funding by key donors (Australia, New Zealand and France) has allowed for greater flexibility in planning and mobility of resources within the Secretariat, through three year funding cycles. With this planning flexibility also come obligations to donors in terms of quality assurance and the effective implementation of results-based performance appraisal. CFP planning strategies have also undergone change under the adoption of a results-based approach and the submission of a new CFP Strategic Plan 2003-2005 to CRGA in 2002.

Corporate planning in a formal sense is a relatively new process to most sections, although the SPC initiated, output-based reporting format has provided a useful transition, and appears to have worked well. Informal feedback from AusAID, one of CFP’s major donors indicates that they are very satisfied with planning processes within SPC in general, including that of the CFP.

During field visits and interviews, almost all HoF and other senior fisheries officials seemed relatively unaware of the SPC planning process. In fact, as discussed elsewhere, the degree to which countries as “stakeholders ...feel that it (the CFP Strategic Plan) is as much their plan as much as SPC’s, and that it is a blueprint for them to work in partnership with us to address their most important needs” (SPC, 2003) is somewhat questionable. A number of countries feel that they have “lost touch” with SPC as an organisation due largely to the infrequent meetings, particularly in comparison with FFA.

Given the comments received from countries during the review, it is apparent that SPC should work on forging a closer relationship with national administrations in terms of planning processes (see also Section 3.7).

## 11.2 Section level planning

At Section level, there does not seem to be a uniform approach to medium term (1-3 year) planning. Most sections are request-driven, based on service areas established under regional priorities. Planning consists of allowing for an approximate number of technical assistance interventions, in addition to meeting planned outputs from longer term projects (e.g. PROCFISH, and the FAD programme). The programme’s new planning and reporting process has led to relatively detailed six month planning cycle, in addition to the establishment of an annual workplan.

During discussions with countries, it was noted that there were a number of comments concerning the desirability of SPC looking across the region and increasingly planning activities (based on country priorities) more in advance. These activities (e.g. training courses, workshops, opportunities for attachments) could be advertised and built into stakeholder planning processes at the national level. The Review Team considers that this would be a logical approach, as long as sufficient “slack” was maintained for the occasional urgent need for assistance at short notice. More advanced planning and promotion of activities would also raise the awareness of CFP programmes and related opportunities, and assist with the development of national strategies for coastal fisheries management, in which the assistance would fit. Currently, the Review Team feel that a number of interventions, while planned at the SPC level, do not fit within a national vision for fisheries, and their sustainability and impact suffers accordingly.

Good examples of a more strategic approach to planning and gaining a sense of partnership exist in the Aquaculture Section. The Aquaculture regional workshop and programming visits including a wrap up seminar by the Aquaculture adviser has left a number of countries with the feeling that they are aware of what the Aquaculture Section had on offer, and how they could benefit from those services. Equally importantly, the countries felt that the Section has an accurate overview of in-country circumstances and priorities. The Coastal Fisheries Management section has also undertaken a regional workshop and review of coastal fisheries management needs.

It is too early to comment on the degree to which the new Corporate Planning process is effective with respect to the CFP work program. Overall however, the Review Team considers that planning processes used to date have been broadly effective in terms of scheduling the work and direction of the CFP. For the future, it is suggested that the following should be considered:

- Developing a closer relationship with national fisheries agencies so that they become more engaged in, and feel ownership of the CFP planning process and resulting workplans.
- Promoting advance planning processes in countries to reduce ad-hoc activities and encourage a more strategic approach to fisheries management and development planning by stakeholders at national level.

## 12.0 Use of Internal and External Expertise

The Review has been directed to examine the programme's use of internal and external expertise and comment on the effectiveness of the current mix<sup>6</sup>. In mid-April the professional staff of the programme consisted of 19 people<sup>7</sup>. Most of the CFP sections make occasional use of consultants. An important issue is the appropriate balance between the two types of personnel. Some of the advantages and disadvantages given in the table below provide the main consideration influencing that balance.

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Full time staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stability and continuity</li> <li>• Support to the organisation</li> <li>• Contributes to building institutional momentum</li> <li>• CFP has more control</li> <li>• Loyalty to SPC</li> <li>• Countries and individual staff can culture relationships and a common understanding of key issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be more expensive</li> <li>• Can be less output driven</li> <li>• Can be more focused on SPC headquarters than on the priorities of countries</li> <li>• Difficult to terminate</li> <li>• Reduces flexibility to alter work programme</li> <li>• Inefficiencies from staff trying to extend/ prolong projects in order to protect their jobs</li> </ul>
Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can spend all time in the countries</li> <li>• Can provide better per dollar value in terms of outputs</li> <li>• Easier to balance supply of expertise with demand of countries – do not need to support during periods of weak demand</li> <li>• Wider range of skills available</li> <li>• For some important skills, not enough work or too much work for full-time staff</li> <li>• Could be a mechanism for employing more Pacific Islanders at SPC</li> <li>• Hiring the best available specialized expertise can be better than hiring generalists to do passable work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CFP has less control</li> <li>• Significant time can be spent in identifying and recruiting</li> <li>• Specialized skills required to administer consultants effectively</li> <li>• Possibility that consultants will be an easy mechanism for CFP full-time staff to carry out their work, rather than an alternative to full-time staff</li> <li>• Difficult to consolidate work over a long-period into a durable publication</li> <li>• Advice may be biased towards obtaining further consultancy assignments</li> </ul>

In any regional service organization the amount of time and energy that go into office activities not related to delivering the work programme is substantial and the CFP is no different. The challenge for CFP is to reduce to an appropriate level the non-productive inwardly focused activity. It is difficult to make many generalizations on this issue; the proper balance between staff and consultants necessarily depend on the nature of the project. What can be stated, however, is that some jobs are inherently field-oriented and the CFP should make greater use of consultants for types of work that take place largely in the countries. The reality is that it is unreasonable to expect full-time staff to spend most time away from their home bases in Noumea and any individuals charged to do so would tend to gravitate homeward, reducing impact at the country level. As an example, the past CFP post-harvest project produced most of the valued outputs in-country, but most time of the full-time staff was actually spent in Noumea<sup>8</sup>.

In general, it is suggested that in the design of CFP projects that have a large field work component, more consideration should be given to using consultants.

## 13.0 CFP Organizational Structure

A thorough analysis of the structure of the CFP was not possible during the short period of the present review. The five person-days spent at SPC headquarters were insufficient to scrutinize the present arrangements to the point of being able to recommend an optimum arrangement. What was possible in

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that two of the three authors of this report are full-time consultants. Although this allows some insight from a consultant's perspective, there is possibility that this may bias the objectivity of the assessment.

<sup>7</sup> This does not include the staff of the WorldFish Center sea cucumber project

<sup>8</sup> This is not meant to reflect staff performance but rather project design.

the limited time was to identify problems in the present organizational structure and suggest changes to overcome or reduce these difficulties.

There is presently much interest in the organizational structure of the CFP. The terms of reference for this review specifically indicate that this be examined. During interviews with CFP staff, subjects related to the structure were often raised. Although such organizational issues may be thought to be of concern largely internal to SPC and CFP staff, it is interesting that the countries of the region have commented on the organizational structure of the CFP: Recommendation One at the 1996 Regional Technical Meeting on Fisheries mentions the need for increased collaboration between the different sections that make up the Coastal Fisheries Programme.

Information relating to organizational structure problems of the CFP includes:

- The 1997 internal review of the CFP identified the major problems, one of which was a tendency towards fragmentation in the six sections. It stated "Constant oversight or dialogue and active planning is needed to counteract tendency towards fragmentation".
- Interviews with the section heads during this review indicate that the major organizational problems relate to a lack of collaboration between sections and the lack of a full-time coordinator for the CFP.
- Observations during the present review indicate a loss of efficiency due to the sub-optimal level of communication and cooperation between the sections and several difficulties related to low level of active hands-on management in the CFP.

Some comments should be made on the difficulties listed above. The past review, comments of present CFP staff, and present review indicate two types of difficulties: that which is related to interaction between the sections and that which is related to the lack of a full-time manager. At least part of the section non-interaction problem (or a constraint to addressing the issue) could be due to the other problem of not having a full-time manager.

Based on observations and interviews in the present review, there appear actually be two problems relating to management of CFP:

- The lack of a dedicated manager. SPC's Director of Marine Resources Director has to split his time between the duties of being on the SPC Executive Team, coordinating the Marine Resources Division, and managing the CFP. Insufficient time is dedicated to CFP management.
- The "hands-off" management style. It is ironic that the required "constant oversight" of the 1997 internal review appears to be a loose arrangement in which the Director of Marine Resources provides an earnest helping hand when requested by the section heads and others. Although the freedom associated with this management style seems to be popular with the staff, it does not appear to address the recognized tendency towards fragmentation, associated inefficiencies, or the occasional need to "crack the whip".

In dealing with institutional organization difficulties there may be a tendency to address the issue by re-organising the various sections ("if in doubt, re-organise"). In fact, the SPC produced a paper on restructuring the Marine Resources Division for its 1998 regional fisheries meeting to address perceived difficulties. However, as stated by a staff member of the CFP "the problem is about communication and management, not structure". Structural changes therefore do not appear to be the solution.

The ideal situation would be to obtain funding for a full-time manager of the CFP who would have an active hands-on management style. However, as pointed out in documentation presented to regional fisheries meetings, the prospects of obtaining funding for such a position are bleak. In this predicament, the options and required action are best known to senior SPC management, but from the perspective of the Review Team, it appears that a temporary measure would be to reduce the duties of the Director of Marine Resources on the SPC Executive Team while increasing the attention that the Director focuses on the CFP.

Changes leading to more appropriate arrangements for the management of the CFP would help address the lack of communication between the sections, but additional measures seem warranted. Possibilities could include the requirements for sections to jointly prepare project proposals or to report on inter-section cooperation in their regular progress reports.

Another issue related to the organizational structure of the CFP is the cross-sectional/programme support services. This consists of the Information Section and to a lesser degree the Training Section. The Review Team believes that the Information Section provides an appropriate mix of support services to the other sections and specific initiatives of the section. Similarly, the Training Section provides a valuable coordination and “gap-filling” service. While there has been suggestion that the role of the Training Section could be absorbed into the activities of other sections, it is the opinion of the Review Team that such a move would be less effective than current arrangements.

A review of the various databases maintained in the CFP, indicates there are no major associated organizational issues, other than that of confidentiality. CFP staff point out that it is necessary to have the same types of contributor-agreed levels of access and confidentiality as that for the Oceanic Fisheries Programme databases. This is important as (1) for some countries the distinction between the various components of SPC fisheries activities may be blurred, and (2) as the CFP assumes the role of a repository for member-country coastal fisheries survey information, such a uniform confidentiality policy is important for building trust.

## 14.0 Review of CFP Strategic Plan

This section provides specific suggestions and recommendations for changes to the CFP 2003-2005 Strategic Plan in light of the findings of this Review, noting that the Plan has been designed as a “living document” and can accommodate such change. Overall, the Review Team considers that the Plan provides an effective statement of the issues facing coastal fisheries identifies priority needs and lays out strategies for meeting these needs. More should be done by CFP to engage countries in sharing the regional vision and objectives for coastal fisheries contained in the Plan. The Review Team suggests that this would be best achieved by establishing closer links with countries and assisting them to develop corresponding national visions and strategies for their own coastal fisheries.

The only other general comment on the Plan relates to the emphasis on using outputs rather than **outcomes** with performance indicators to measure progress towards meeting objectives. The Plan seems somewhat “inward looking” in places and oriented towards measuring the performance of CFP staff in terms of the quality and quantity of the Programme’s activities. In the end, what really matters is how well **countries** perform as a result of CFP assistance in achieving the objective of sustainable coastal fisheries.

One way of addressing these two comments may be to establish a new, overarching objective for the CFP, which could be worded along the lines of:

*National fisheries agencies, working with environmental and other interests, have a clear vision for the sustainable management and development of coastal living marine resources, and develop and implement strategies and mechanisms to achieve this vision.*

If the outputs, activities and performance indicators were carefully designed, this section of the plan would draw together the outcomes of the six CFP Sections, as well as assisting countries to obtain a strategic view of their coastal fisheries. It would also assist the CFP to maintain an overview of its past and planned interventions in each country, and their actual and predicted impacts.

A few specific comments follow; the sub-headings used below correspond to sections in the Strategic Plan.

**Pacific Context and Challenges:** This review has suggested one of the greatest challenges facing coastal fisheries development, including small-medium scale tuna ventures, is economic viability. Greater attentions should be given to this issue, to match the “economically sustainable” statement that is made in connection with aquaculture in this section.

**Priorities:** It is recommended that an additional priority be added: “*Improving the record of fisheries and aquaculture activities in the region by encouraging/providing economic scrutiny to proposed developments*”.

**Objective 1 (Aquaculture):** i) Amend the following activity to reflect the added priority on assessment, by inserting the words in bold: “*Advice and assistance to Pacific Government departments and private sector operators to assess the **socio-economic and technical** viability of aquaculture proposals and national aquaculture strategies, in response to requests*” ii) Increase emphasis on need for information flow and

'lessons learned' within the region by adding the activity "*Communication of past and current news on aquaculture activities*" to Output 1.2.

**Objective 2 (Coastal Fisheries Development):** Under Output 2.1, include two new activities: i) "*Promotion of fishers associations*" and ii) "*Promotion of fisheries management through such mechanisms as FADs*". Under the activity listed in Output 2.3 add the words in bold: "...*national commercial fishery development **strategies and plans***", to reflect a greater emphasis on providing CFP assistance within a holistic national strategy, rather than as ad-hoc, gap filling interventions.

**Objective 3 (Coastal Fisheries Management):** The Review Team assumes that the recent SPC/CFTC regional coastal fisheries management review will guide the modification of this section in the CFP Strategic Plan. In considering these modifications it is suggested that reference be made to the comments and recommendations provided in Section 3.4.3 of this review. Particular attention is drawn to the recommendation that the CFM section should spearhead cooperation between fisheries and environmental interest groups, at national and regional (SPREP) levels and between both government and ENGO groups.

**Objective 4 (Training):** Given the increasing need for effective coastal fisheries management and the lack of capacity in fisheries management in fisheries agencies, it is recommended that an additional activity be added under Output 4.1, "*Training for fisheries agencies in fisheries management*". Also under output 4.1, while some guidance on training needs has been provided by HoF and other avenues, it is suggested that the activity "*Regional analysis of capacity in fisheries management and development*" be added. Demand for Output 4.2 dealing with the development of strategic plans for HRD has been low and requires re-evaluation in terms of need and likely impact.

**Objective 5 (Reef Observatory):** Under Output 5.2, and in recognition of the need expressed by countries to begin to address management issues, add the activity: "*Development of basic management guidelines and management strategies for species and fisheries of importance or under threat*".

**Objective 6 (Fisheries Information):** To better understand issues relating to the accessibility and flow of information to end users, it is suggested that the following activities be added to Output 6.1: i) "*Case studies on fisheries information flow*" ii) Internet utility analysis.

**Partnerships and Resources:** The MOU with FFA should be reviewed and updated as necessary. The negotiation of an MOU and the establishment of a colloquium process with USP should be investigated as a priority. Specific mention of the emerging relationship with environmental agencies, and in particular SPREP, should be made.

## 15.0 Conclusions

The important conclusions of the Review are:

- The Coastal Fisheries Programme is generally effective in its mission to optimise the value of small-scale fisheries and aquatic resource use in Pacific Island waters. All six sections of the CFP appear to be making good progress towards meeting their established objectives.
- There is concern over the gap between PROCFISH's outputs and the needs of the countries. This represents one of the more significant problems encountered in the Review.
- In many countries of the region the fisheries management capacity of government fisheries agencies is low while the need for these skills is large and likely to grow. A "burning need" therefore is for more assistance related to increasing the capacity to manage fisheries.
- Another important assistance need is in the area of economic analysis. An important part of the CFP work is giving advice on fisheries development, aquaculture development, and enterprise development, but the lack of economic analytical capability negatively affects the impact of CFP efforts.
- One of the strongest messages to come from the extensive consultations undertaken in this review was that CFP's links and communications with countries have weakened in recent years, and many of the important fishery stakeholders are only vaguely aware of the range of CFP services available to them.

- The confusion over the process of reporting and responsibilities for in-country work detracts from the Programme's characteristically high quality work.
- The appropriateness of services provided is generally good. The main problems that seem to occur are those activities carried out by CFP at the insistence of requesting governments which maybe be classified as having only marginal chances of success.
- As inshore fisheries become more fully-exploited and the activities of government fishery agencies become more management/conservation oriented, the objectives and activities of fisheries agencies and environment agencies are likely to converge. Increased cooperation between the agencies in these two sectors would bring increased efficiencies and help achieve a common focus.
- The relationship between SPC and USP in the area of fisheries is a matter of some concern. SPC and USP both have legitimate roles and both have a long-term future in the region, with a number of areas of common or overlapping interest.
- The past review, comments of present CFP staff, and present review indicate two types of difficulties related to institutional structure: that which is related to interaction between the sections and that which is related to the lack of a full-time "hands-on" manager. However, as stated by a staff member of the CFP "the problem is about communication and management, not structure".
- The CFP strategic plan provides an effective statement of the issues facing coastal fisheries identifies priority needs and lays out strategies for meeting these needs. More could be done by CFP to engage countries in sharing the regional vision and objectives for coastal fisheries contained in the Plan, including adopting a new over-arching objective.



## Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Review of the Coastal Fisheries Programme

1. Summarise the current and immediate past (five years) mandate and work programme of the programme, based on an analysis of relevant documents (e.g. strategic plans, project documents, budgets, annual reports and six-monthly reports).
2. Review the programme's performance over the last five years against stated objectives. Base this review on an analysis of programme documents and reports, internal and external research reports, stakeholder surveys, field work and other appropriate means. Review the programme's *outputs* (that is the results that the programme is largely responsible for) and, very importantly, *outcomes* of programme activities (Has the programme made a difference to its clients? Is there evidence of impact?) During country consultations, review evidence of programme outputs being passed on to intended ultimate beneficiaries (e.g. fishers).
3. Solicit feedback from stakeholders on how the quality of services could be further improved in terms of timeliness, quality of technical contents and appropriateness, and distil responses into specific recommendations.
4. Review the approaches used to supplement and build capacity in member states, with specific regard to the production and dissemination of information, and to human resource development.
5. Consider the extent to which the programme plans for and achieves sustainable outcomes, to which it integrates gender issues into its work programme and to which its work contributes to poverty alleviation.
6. Summarise priority needs in the sector, as expressed, for example, at regional technical meetings and in recent research and solicited directly from stakeholders.
7. Review current programme priorities and work programme against the review findings and suggest any appropriate adjustments at the strategic or operational levels. Highlight current gaps in programme activities that could provide opportunities for new SPC initiatives and those areas where the level of service could possibly be reduced – taking into account also the roles that other organisations at regional (e.g. USP) and national levels may play in the Pacific.
8. Comment specifically on the relationship between the programme and FFA: current status and possible future developments.
9. Comment on the appropriateness of the programme's target groups (e.g. government fisheries agencies, government environment agencies, private sector, communities and fishers) and any associated issues.
10. Review the current approach or approaches to medium-term programme planning (one to three years). Analyse and document good practice examples and discuss whether they could be introduced programme-wide.
11. Review the programme's use of internal and external expertise and comment on the effectiveness of the current mix
12. Review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the organisational structure, with particular regard to the programme's sections, their linkages to each other and to other programmes of the Marine Resources Division, and the organisation of cross-sectional/programme support services and facilities (e.g. the Information Section and various databases maintained within the division). Make recommendations for improvement if appropriate.
13. Review the Strategic Plan of the Coastal Fisheries Programme against the team's findings and make specific recommendations for possible future revisions.

## Annex 2: People Contacted During the Review

### People met at SPC

#### SPC management

- Richard Mann
- Tim Adams

#### Aquaculture

- Ben Ponia

#### Coastal Fisheries Management

- Ueta Fa'asili
- Aliti Vunisea

#### Fisheries Development

- Lindsay Chapman
- Steve Beverly

#### Fisheries Information

- Jean-Paul Gaudechoux
- Aymeric Desurmont

#### Fisheries Training

- Michel Blanc
- Teriihauroa Luciani

#### Reef Fisheries Observatory

- Pierre Labrosse
- Being Yeeting
- Kim Friedman
- Mecki Kronen
- Franck Magron
- Laurent Vigliola

#### Other:

- Warwick Nash, SPC/Worldfish project

### People met in New Caledonia

#### Direction des Ressources Naturelles:

- Richard Farman, Directeur adjoint

#### Private sector:

- Francois Guaitella, Fleet Captain, Navimon
- Christian Nau, Vessel Operations Manager, Navimon
- Claude Favy, President, Pecheries de Nouvelle Caledonie

#### Other:

- Christian Blanchard, Directeur, Ecole des Metiers de la Mer

### People met in Vanuatu

#### Department of Fisheries:

- Moses Amos, Director
- Robert Jimmy
- William Naviti
- Graham Nimoho
- Kalo Paloa
- Wesley Obed

#### Others:

- James Batty, Executive Director, Equity Investment Bank
- Augustin Pheu, Managing Director, La Touque a Poissons
- Lindsay Cook, Fisherman
- Dale Thompson Senior Veterinary Officer, Vanuatu Quarantine and Inspection Service
- Geoge Buurgu Director, Department of Cooperatives
- John Friam, President, Shefa Fishermen's Association

### People met in Fiji

#### Fisheries Department:

- Maciu Lagibalavu, Director Fisheries
- Malakai Tuiloa, Deputy Director Fisheries
- Aisake Batibasaga, Principal Research Officer
- Stanley Qalovaki, Research Officer – Resource Inventory Survey
- Seru Batibasaga, Research Officer

#### Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry:

- Laiakini Tiko, Deputy Secretary

#### University of the South Pacific

- Satya Nand Lal, Research Fellow in Aquaculture
- Tony Chamberlin, Post Harvest Specialist
- Alec Forbes, Shrimp Aquaculture Specialist
- Cameron Haynes, Director, Marine Studies Programme

- Nathan Evans, Lecturer – Ocean Law and Policy
- Captain Jone, Marine Studies Programme
- Randy Thaman, Professor of Geography

Others:

- Bill Aalbersberg, Representative of Fiji Local Marine Management Area and Director Institute of Applied Science, University of the South Pacific
- Graham Southwick, Fiji Fish
- Robbie Stone, Ocean Trader
- Aliti Susau – Worldwide Fund for Nature
- Pauliasi Koroi Vulivavalagi – Suva small-scale tuna fisherman [SPC course participant]
- Cedric Schuster – Environment consultant and recent reviewer of SPREP/GEF International Waters Project
- Guido Carrara, Rural Development Adviser, Delegation of the European Commission for the Pacific, Suva, Fiji

**People met in Tonga**

Ministry of Fisheries:

- Manase Felemi, Secretary for Fisheries
- 'Antimoni Petelo, Principal Fisheries Officer, Extension, Management and Surveillance
- 'Ulungamanu Fa'anunu, Principal Fisheries Officer, Aquaculture Research
- Sione Matoto – PhD candidate
- Tevita Latu - Senior Fisheries Officer

Tonga/AusAID Fisheries Project:

- Marc Wilson, Team Leader
- Gerry Russo, Masterfisher

Others:

- Bill Holden, fishing vessel operator, 'Alatini Fisheries
- Lenny Niits, fishing vessel operator, Maritime Projects Tonga

- Paul Mead, Vava'u fisher and former SPC master fisher
- 'Akau'ola, Governor of Vava'u and former Secretary for Fisheries
- Palaki Asipeli, Acting Director of Environment, Ministry of Lands, Survey, and Environment
- Dick Joe Avock, Manager, Walt Smith International

**People met in Samoa**

Fisheries Division :

- Tanielu Su'a, Director/Head of Samoa Fisheries
- Atonio Mulipola, Principal Fisheries Officer
- Peter Watt, Commercial Fisheries Extension Adviser

Others:

- Lim Levy, Tradewinds Fishing Company
- Sue Miller, IUCN Samoa Marine Protected Areas Project
- Andrew Wright, GEF International Waters Project
- Lui Bell, Principal Marine Conservation Officer, Division of Environment and Conservation

**People met in Papua New Guinea**

National Fisheries Authority:

- Molean Chapau, Managing Director
- Priscilla Kaumi, Public Relations/Information Officer
- John Kasu, Principal, National Fisheries College, Kavieng

Others :

- Maurice Brownjohn, Chairman, PNG Fishing Industry Association, Port Moresby
- Hugh Walton, Team Leader, AusAID National Fisheries College Strengthening Project, Kavieng
- Eugene Schultz, Chairman, New Ireland Commercial Fishers Association, Kavieng

- Jeff Kinch, Community and Artisanal Fisheries Advisor, Conservation International, Alotau

**People contacted in Niue:**

- Brendon Lameiki Pasisi, Principal Fisheries Officer, Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
- Sioneheke Leolahi, GEF International Waters Country Coordinator and former Principal Fisheries Officer [met in Tonga]

**People contacted in Tuvalu**

- Malaki Tihala, Deputy Director of Fisheries
- Nikolasi Apinelu, Fisheries Research and Development Officer
- Satalaka Petaia, General Manager, National Fishing Corporation of Tuvalu

**People contacted in the Solomon Islands**

- Albert Wata, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
- George Boape, Principal Licensing Officer
- Michel Lam, Marine Aquarium Council

**People contacted in Guam**

- Gerry Davis, Chief, Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources

**People contacted in Tokelau**

- Mose Pelasio, Senior Policy Advisory Officer, Natural Resources and Environment Unit, Office of the Council of Faipule

**People contacted in French Polynesia**

- Bruno Ugolini, Chef de service, Service de la pêche

**People contacted in American Samoa**

- Ray Tulafono, Director, Department of Marine and Wildlife Resources

**People contacted in the Marshall Islands**

- Danny Wase, Director, Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority

**People contacted in the Cook Islands**

- Navy Epati, Secretary of Marine Resources, Ministry of Marine Resources

**People contacted in Wallis and Futuna**

- Daniel Tahimili, Responsable du Service Pêche, Service de l'Économie Rurale et de la Pêche

**People Contacted in Nauru**

- Anton Jimwereiy, CEO, Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority
- Peter Jacobs, Research and Development Manager, Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority

**Others:**

- Sinna Sinnappurajar, Country Programme Manager, AusAID Pacific Branch, Canberra

### **Annex 3: Previous Reviews Considered in the Present Study**

Aspects of the CFP have been review in the past and the relevant results have been considered in the present review. These studies are:

The 1997 internal review of the CFP was, according to the report, the first review of the CFP that has not been developed with one particular donor's priorities in mind. It identified the major problems of the Programme: a tendency towards fragmentation in the six sections, dependency on the funding priorities of aid donors, difficulty in building a long-term directed work programme, and losing contact with member country clients.

An internal review of the CFP Capture Section (Lewis 1999) was undertaken in June 1999. The report of the review made 33 recommendations. These included the subjects of length of field assignments, formalization of SPC and host country responsibilities, filling the gap in post-harvest expertise, increasing the section's travel budget, rapid reporting of results of assignments, continued production of technical manuals, cooperation with FFA, finalization of a sea safety policy, and a change for the name of the section and for titles of staff.

In late 2002 SPC commissioned a review of the SPC/Nelson Fisheries Officers Course (Cartwright 2002). It concluded that the course has had a positive impact on the fisheries of the region. The review supported the continuation of the course, with the strong recommendation that the current development and fishing emphasis in fisheries officer training be more balanced with basic fisheries management and development skills.

In early 2003 FAO conducted a review of sea safety in the Pacific Islands (Gillett, 2003) which included an evaluation of the CFP's efforts in sea safety awareness. The report stated: "Sea safety awareness work seems to have contributed to noticeable improvements in sea safety in several Pacific Island countries and it is likely that the SPC efforts were a major part of this progress. The success of past SPC awareness work together with the on-going requirements suggest that SPC/CFP efforts in this subject should continue". The report made five suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the awareness work.

## Annex 4: References

- Cartwright, I. (2002). SPC/Nelson Fisheries Officers Course Review. Thalassa Consulting.
- CFP (1997). Coastal Fisheries Programme Review. SPC, Noumea.
- Gillett, R. (2001). The Contribution of Fisheries to the Economies of Pacific Island Countries; A report prepared for the Asian Development Bank, the Forum Fisheries Agency and the World Bank. Asian Development Bank, Manila. 217 pages.
- Gillett, R. (2003). Domestic Tuna Industry Development in the Pacific Islands: The Current Situation and Considerations for Future Development Assistance. Forum Fisheries Agency, Honiara, 198 pages.
- Gillett, R. (2003). Aspects of Sea Safety in the Fisheries of Selected Pacific Island Countries. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 72 pages.
- King, M., U.Fa'asili, S.Fakahau, and A.Vunisea (2003). Strategic Plan for Fisheries Management and Sustainable Coastal Fisheries in the Pacific Islands. Draft No.3.
- Lewis, A. (1990). Capture Section Internal Review and Recommendations.
- SPC (2003). Evolution of Fisheries Development. Annex 23 *In: Papers for the SPC Regional Policy Meeting on Coastal Fisheries Management*. Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Noumea.
- Tiller, S. (1997). The Republic of the Marshall Islands: from Rents to Profits. *In: Zachary, D., C. Sterling, and L. Karolat (1997). Towards a Prosperous Pacific: Building a Sustainable Tuna Industry in the Pacific Islands*. Maui Pacific Center.

## **Annex 5: Information on the CFP Mandate and Work Programme from the CFP Corporate Plan**

The CFP strategic plan, especially the priorities and section objectives, is taken to be the CFP mandate in the present review. The priorities, present section objectives, and general areas of the work programme from the "Coastal Fisheries Programme Strategic Plan 2003–2005" are:

- Establishment of a greater share of the value of Pacific Islands regional tuna landings by Pacific Island enterprises;
- Building an effective regional network that helps national experts in the aquaculture field to draw on each others' experiences and capabilities;
- Helping governments set in place reef fisheries co-management systems that take into account the role of community resource-stewardship, as appropriate to each island or culture;
- Producing "national status, and sustainable prospects" reports on reef fisheries for Pacific Island policy planners
- Ensuring that the "supply" from existing providers of fisheries training and information is matched with the "demand" from the Pacific Island fisheries sector, and trying to identify and fill the gaps where there is no existing or cost-effective provider for essential local training and information.

The objectives and general areas of the work programme for the six sections of the CFP are given in the plan as:

- Aquaculture – A regional support framework for economically, socially and environmentally sustainable aquaculture planning, research and development by Pacific Island governments and private enterprises;
- Fisheries Development – Economically-viable and environmentally sound Pacific Island fishing enterprises;
- Coastal Fisheries Management – Environmentally sound and socio-economically achievable governance of reef and lagoon fisheries by PICT fisheries administrations and coastal communities;
- Fisheries Training – Adequate human resource and technical skills capacity to manage and derive sustainable economic benefit from the fisheries sector;
- Reef Fisheries Observatory – Scientifically rigorous information on the status, exploitation levels and prospects of fisheries is used by Pacific Islanders to sustainably manage living coastal resources;
- Fisheries Information – A relevant and understandable aquatic living resource-based network of knowledge is readily available to member countries and territories.

## Annex 6: Acronyms Used in this Report

ADB	Asian Development Bank
APIMTIMA	Association of Pacific Islands Maritime Training Institutions and Maritime Authorities
AS	Aquaculture Section of the Coastal Fisheries Programme
CFMS	Coastal Fisheries Management Section of the Coastal Fisheries Programme
CFP	Coastal Fisheries Programme
ComSec	Commonwealth Secretariat
CRGA	Committee of Governments and Administrations
ENGO	Environmental non-government organisation
EU	European Union
FAD	Fish aggregating device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FDS	Fisheries Development Section of the Coastal Fisheries Programme
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FMI	Fisheries and Maritime Institute of FSM
ForSec	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
HRD	Human resources development
ICLARM	International Center for Living Aquatic Resource Management
IS	Information Section of the Coastal Fisheries Programme
MOU	Memorandum of understanding
NACA	Network of Aquaculture Centers in Asia
NGO	Non-government organisation
PIMRIS	Pacific Islands Marine Resources Information System
PNG	Papua New Guinea
RFO	Reef Fisheries Observatory
RTMF	SPC Regional Technical Meeting on Fisheries
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TS	Training Section of the Coastal Fisheries Programme
USP	The University of the South Pacific