



RLEP
Rural Livelihoods Evaluation Partnership

Community Based Fisheries Management Project 2 (CBFM-2)

**Third Output To Purpose Review Report
1st – 15th December 2004
(Final Draft)**

Rural Livelihoods Evaluation Partnership,
c/o BETS,
House 10, Road 135
Gulshan 1, Dhaka.
Tel: 9861531-2

B. Blake
K.A. Toufique
A. Zahid
E. Husain
P.A. Villela
(IFAD Consultant)

Dhaka, December 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The team thanks the staff of WorldFish Centre for their support during this review.

We also acknowledge the support offered by the Department of Fisheries and NGO staff in Dhaka and in the field. For much of the review the IFAD consultant Dr Alamada-Villela was a part of the team, and contributed her ideas and perspective to this report.

As in OPR 1, we sincerely thank the men and women of the communities participating in CBFM 2 for giving their time to help inform our review process.

This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of the developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID. The correct citation for this report is:

Blake, B., Toufique K.A., Zahid A., Husain E. and Villela P.A. 2004. Third Output to Purpose Review Report. December 2004. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Rural Livelihoods Evaluation Partnership. 91p.

CBFM-2 Project address: The World Fish Centre, H – 22/B, R-7,
Block -F, Banani, Dhaka.
Tel: 8813250, 8814624 Fax: 8811151
e-mail: worldfish-bangladesh@cgiar.org

RLEP has been established by the Department For International Development (DFID) to: i) manage the project review process for all its rural livelihood projects in Bangladesh, ii) develop a RLEP communications strategy, to identify and facilitate the improvement of systems for lesson-learning and provision of information to decision-makers, iii) facilitate improvements in project monitoring with particular focus on developing project teams' capacity in livelihood outcome monitoring and evaluation and, iv) build up national consultancy capacity.

The Rural Livelihoods Evaluation Partnership is represented by a consortium of three international and two national companies led by the UK based ITAD (Information Training and Development):-



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Preamble

(i) CBFM 2 is an action research project that commenced in September 2001, following a five-year Phase 1 funded by the Ford Foundation. Both projects were designed to develop and test various models for community based resource management whilst at the same time contributing to poverty reduction strategies.

(ii) The core requirements of the OPR are given in Tables 1 (issues and recommendations, page 5), Table 2 (milestones for 2005, page 10), Table 7 (progress against the recommendations from OPR 2, page 38) and Annex 4 (the DFID OPR report form, page 51). In addition, Section 9 (page 46) summarises the policy relevance of CBFM 2 to DFID/GoB in terms of PRSP priorities.

General findings

(iii) OPR 1 and OPR 2 were largely devoted to assessing progress in terms of project process. In OPR 3 it was expected that, on the basis of OPR 2 recommendations, there would be some hard evidence on fundamental questions regarding, for example, impacts on women and the poor.

(iv) **Output 1** – design and testing of models for management. The score allocated was 3 as compared with 1/2 in the previous OPR, and 1 in OPR 1. Although there is every expectation that all approaches will be developed and tested, there remains doubt over the degree to which the impact will be satisfactorily assessed. The collection of data on the impact of fisheries management on resource levels appears to be well in hand now, but this is not true of the social data. The micro-credit study has yielded little of value on AIGA or gender impact, and the provision of CBFM 2 credit to some women with no fishery connections, plus the use of some credit for fisheries related activities (boats, water body stocking), will not make the assessment of impact any easier. The failure to address many of the issues raised in OPR 2 leads to an inevitable down-grading of the score.

(v) **Output 2** – administration and coordination systems for linking CBOs across larger fisheries/wetland systems. The PNGOs have been successful in establishing all the required layers of CBO organisation, and have exceeded the project targets in this respect. The score allocated was nevertheless 2/3 compared with 2 in OPR 2. This reflects continuing uncertainty with respect to the sustainability of the institutional arrangements post-project, a concern also raised by the Joint Secretary in the MOFL. The CBOs, PNGOs and WorldFish have all requested an extension of the project, largely on the grounds that there is not enough time for the CBOs to bed in and become independent. There was general agreement that the recently formed apex groups in particular would remain relatively untested by the end of project. The project has, as yet, failed to establish clear process documentation and other methods of monitoring and assessing the performance of the institutional arrangements.

(vi) In addition, there is a lack of clarity in the CBFM 2 team about the commitment of the PNGOs post-project. The process of transferring the project revolving funds on the basis of CBO merit is not well defined, and how this will be monitored (and by whom) is not sufficiently specified, although it is assumed DoF will undertake supervision. This could have an impact on CBO sustainability, and should

be clarified as soon as possible. The early availability of funds to the CBOs could contribute to an immediate safety net in support of the institutional arrangements set up under the project.

(vii) **Output 3** - informing and influencing policy stakeholders. The score allocated is 2/3 compared with 3 in OPR 2. This slight improvement reflects the fact that the project has produced some evidence that it has already contributed to influencing stakeholders at community, local and central government levels even in the absence of a communications strategy and the proposed attitudinal surveys. This conclusion was supported by the Joint Secretary, MOFL, who complimented the project on its awareness and media work. Full adoption of the recommendations of OPR 2 and OPR 3 should rapidly lead to a score of 2, and on evidence to date, completion of sound attitudinal surveys could even deliver a score of 1 by end of project. However, this component requires full time staff, and a serious, coherent, commitment on behalf of the project. There is currently an impression that generating good research data is, in itself, an end point. Given the Purpose, this is manifestly not the case.

Overall Progress

(viii) The overall Outputs score allocated was an averaged 2.7 (3+2.5+2.5), a decline from OPR 2 (1.5+2+3). The different distribution of points reflects an improved chance of success in influencing key stakeholders, and lingering doubts over the testing and assessment of the institutional mechanisms and impact. The Purpose score remains at 3. The ability of the project to deliver the Purpose will depend to an extent on the outcome of recommendations for modifying the wording. It is considered that, even with full delivery on all three Outputs, achieving a new and operational policy formulation process is beyond the reach of any single project. Delivery of a new approach to influencing policy formulation is, however, within the reach of a programmatic approach bringing together all relevant projects. Linkages and partnerships between projects, and between institutions are thus critical. At this time, the institutional climate is favourable for such an approach, and with the imminent arrival of the PRSP, the timing is also potentially auspicious.

Specific Issues

(ix) In general, the OPR team found that there had been good progress on the implementation of core field activities through the PNGOs. The relationship between the PNGOs themselves, and between the PNGOs and Department of Fisheries/local government officers was encouraging. The NGOs have been successful in extending the primary community groups to clusters and, in some cases forming potentially influential apex bodies. The CBOs visited during the review mission were unanimous in their view that fisheries production had increased, all had accumulated savings (to varying degrees) and some had plans for entrepreneurial developments using the accumulated funds. The CBO networking process has been fully implemented.

(x) The philosophy of the project is simple in principle if not in realisation. Research should generate evidence of benefits, and this evidence should be used to influence policy in favour of pro-poor participatory management approaches. The key word is evidence. The project has so far failed to deliver sufficient evidence of social benefits and is yet to take a strategic approach to influencing policy (e.g. the recommended macro-economic tradeoffs case study has still not been attempted). The fisheries programme has produced data suggesting an overall increase in production across all water bodies of some 41%, with an increase of 57% in flood plains. The reality of production increases is independently confirmed by the MACH project (USAID). The issue of attribution of increases remains to be fully resolved. It

is vital that WorldFish takes a firm hold on these issues of evidence generation and attribution, integrating the social and fisheries science data sets.

(xi) To achieve this, WorldFish has to closely monitor progress against the milestones provided in this report, and to employ external specialists where needed. One reason for the lack of progress on key issues since OPR 2 was the loss of key staff, including the project leader. Some of the new staff are still in the process of getting to grips with the project, but the decision to appoint a senior Project Scientist with an overview remit is welcome, and will hopefully help to keep the necessary focus. Further close monitoring will be essential and it is hoped that DFID will play a role in this, aided by the proposed milestones and schedule (Table 2, page 10).

(xii) The review attempted to assess the project as currently framed, in the context of the DFIDB CAP and future policy, and asked two questions:

- If reducing poverty and closing the gender gap are primary targets of future DFID programmes is community based fisheries management an appropriate front line vehicle?
- If advocacy, participatory governance and policy influence are also primary targets of future programmes, can community based approaches to resource management contribute significantly (as well as benefiting)?

(xiii) It was concluded that CBFM is not, in general, a vehicle of choice for Women and Girls First (closing the gender gap). The CBFM approach as an entry point to poverty reduction should yield major positive outcomes, but these are yet to be clearly demonstrated, and there is the shadow of some possible negative impact in the background. On the other hand, the relevance of CBFM to the target of participatory governance is significant. Community empowerment, linkages, positive use of local power relations and routine inclusion of local government officers, contribute to the potential for change.

(xiv) The question of chicken and egg arises. Should bottom-up mobilisation for community management be supported, or should support to broad-based governance improvement come first, to lay a fertile base for CBM? The answer is in some ways simple - both are needed. The resource base cannot wait to be managed, and the poor cannot wait to rise above poverty. Perhaps the answer lies partly in the venerable concept of integrated rural development. If large-scale budgetary support programmes can be tailored to deliver widespread empowerment of the poor and women through appropriate community based management, funded and managed at the local government level, the process of improving governance could be made directly and immediately relevant to the policy target groups (see Sections 2 and 9).

Overall Conclusion

(xv) Progress since OPR 2 has in general been disappointing. However, there is nothing that cannot be resolved by rapid and expert application of the WorldFish team, (supported by external expertise as required). The strength of the NGOs is both a blessing and a concern. The former for keeping the project moving in the last year, and the latter for being an essential element that will find exit strategies difficult. The proposed option to discontinue the CBFM 1 sites as soon as possible, and monitor the result over the next 18 months or so, offers an excellent opportunity to answer the question – does CBFM actually work?

(xvi) The post-review response of WorldFish to the issues raised in this report have been swift and comprehensive (actions taken by the end of January 2005):

- A Communications Officer/Media Focal Point has been appointed
- A part-time Gender Focal Point has been engaged
- The poverty assessment study will be completed by the end of March 2005
- The macro-economics trade-offs study has been agreed, and external experts have been approached
- An AIGA study will be undertaken in April-May 2005
- A approach has been agreed with MRAG to integrate socio-economic and bio-physical data

This progress should be born in mind when reading this report

Table 1 Summary of Issues and Recommendations Against the Logical Framework

LOGFRAME	ISSUES	RECOMMENDATIONS	PAGE
<p>Purpose A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</p>	<p><u>Current Version</u>: A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</p> <p><u>OPR 2 recommendation</u>: that CBFM 2 should <u>contribute to</u> a process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management being agreed and operational</p> <p>But - The actual <u>process</u> of policy formulation is very much a national government issue which will change slowly, inconsistently, and from within. Policy development is not a linear process</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 6: the Purpose should be amended to :</p> <p><i>A process for <u>influencing</u> policy formulation in favour of pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</i></p> <p>This can be done as part of the TAPP amendment that is already on the agenda</p>	<p>27</p>
<p>Output 1 Community based fisheries management approaches developed, tested, and their impacts, sustainability and potential for expansion assessed</p>	<p>We still do not know after 8 years of CBFM 1 sites and three years of CBFM 2 whether the institutional and social arrangements will survive severance from the project. The only way to find out, within the project time frame, and thus learn lessons for the majority CBFM 2 sites, is to cut lose and monitor the CBFM 1 sites now</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 8: an exit strategy for as many CBFM 1 sites as is feasible should be finalised immediately, and executed as soon as possible in 2005 without waiting for the end of project. The sites should then be monitored on a regular basis – by the project, not the PNGO</p>	<p>29</p>
	<p>There are still gaps and weaknesses in both the training received by CBOs and the capacity of some PNGOs</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 10: the PNGO TNA should be expedited, and the results fed into the study being carried out by the consultant Mr Rahman. The results should then form the basis for a time-bound strategy to fill the most important gaps</p>	<p>33</p>

	The only progress since OPR 2 has been the design of survey forms that allow disaggregation of gender impact. These have not as yet been used, although this is planned for early 2005	RECOMMENDATION 11: the gender study should be executed with immediate effect and should provide an interim assessment by the end of the first quarter of 2005	33
	The project has been unable to recruit the gender specialist recommended in October 2003	RECOMMENDATION 12: a project gender specialist should be appointed as an absolute priority	33
	There is still no clear evidence of the specific impact of CBFM the project on the poor, whether negative or positive. Both results are indicated in some cases	RECOMMENDATION 13: the recent poverty assessment survey should be fully completed by the end of January 2005, and the project should seek peer review in carefully examining whether the CBFM 2 impact on poverty is clearly demonstrated. This should be checked by the DFID quarterly review	35
	The November 2004 micro-credit study does not answer the questions asked in OPR 2 about the impact of AIGAs on fishing pressure or on the livelihoods of poor people excluded by close seasons. Loans are given to people not involved in the fishery, and the relevance of this is not clear	RECOMMENDATION 14: the micro-credit study should be revisited, and a new approach designed bearing in mind the comments made here. Specifically, the link between credit and fishing pressure and between credit and fisheries management measures should be clearly demonstrated, as well as the issue of positive general impact of credit on livelihood parameters. A full-blown AIGA study is required (and indeed is required by the MOFL), and it may be appropriate to engage external consultants to assist.	37
	There is no formal agreement between the CBOs and the PNGO with respect to rights in respect of the water body (as does exist in FFP), and the arrangements for hand over of funds from NGO to CBO after project end are poorly defined	RECOMMENDATION 15: the terms of financial exit from the project by PNGOs should be reviewed, and the conditionalities and time frame reconsidered. This should be part of a broader and urgent exit strategy study suggested as in Recommendation 8	37
	Although advances have been made in assessing	RECOMMENDATION 16: the proposed joint study with	38

	fisheries benefits from CBFM 2, it is still not possible to separate the relative impact of natural environmental fluctuations, or of the different management tools used	MRAG should go ahead as a matter of urgency, BUT the TORs should be jointly agreed between the fisheries and social staff, and should be peer reviewed in Penang by WorldFish	
	OPR 2 suggested that the PM 36 impact survey was discarded in favour of a series of targeted case studies. These have not been completed and it is essential that remedial action is taken in concert with planning for the proposed PM 48 impact assessment	RECOMMENDATION 17: the project team should work as closely as possible to the proposed schedule for 2005 (Table 2), and as part of that scheduling develop TORs for the PM 48 impact survey in such a way as it will complement, rather than duplicate the existing case study proposals. It is further recommended that this be planned sufficiently in advance to allow recruitment of top quality external consultants to provide an objective perspective to the exercise	39
	There is some suggestion from the OPR 3 field trips, that the poor may face barriers to CBO entry after the initial set-up period as a result of the accumulated capital vested in the group	RECOMMENDATION 18: It is proposed that the CBFM 2 team ask the PNGOs to prepare a brief summary of the situation with respect to constraints to the poor joining CBOs after the initial set-up year. On the basis of this picture the team can then consider what strategies might be adopted to remove any barriers	49
Output 2 Coordination and administration mechanisms for linking local community management arrangements with larger fishery and wetland systems tested and assessed and constraints identified	There is as yet still no effective means of assessing the performance of the larger scale institutional arrangements	RECOMMENDATION 9 : the PNGOs must be further encouraged to undertake process documentation of the cluster system, and the WorldFish team must ensure that, as part of the communications strategy, the products are collated and disseminated both to influence policy and to encourage CBOs with feedback	29
Output 3	There is still no coherent, structured, approach to	RECOMMENDATION 1: Given the advances reported it	24

<p>To inform and influence all fisheries policy stakeholders of improved management approaches</p>	<p>either policy documentation or policy influence . In the meantime things have moved on, and CBFM is now on the lips of decision makers</p>	<p>is clearly time for CBFM 2 to re-analyse the information needs of the various stakeholder groups, and decide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exactly what messages the project now needs to get across (since the basic CBM message seems to have arrived already)? • Exactly who requires to be addressed with these specific (and few) messages? • How can the process documentation proposed in the last OPR be operationalised and used to feed the message packages identified as necessary? • How can the various message types for the different levels of the stakeholder matrix be linked through a coherent strategy? • How much more needs to be done at the community level – how many more folk shows etc- what works best now at this level? 	
	<p>The message about CBFM seems to have been embedded in GoB, but it means nothing if it does not become implemented government policy. LGED as a government department is attempting to draw to together all GoB key players in its Sunamgonji CB Resource Management Project, and may have valuable experience</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 2: it is proposed that CBFM 2, as part of its response to Output 3 and the Project Purpose, should prepare a strategy paper on the approach to scaling-up CBFM, in collaboration with the DoF, LGED and FFP, with advice from BIDS and the Joint Secretary in MOFL. An example of process is given in the text</p>	25
	<p>There is a window of policy opportunity opening with the new PRSP and the 3 year Rolling Plan, and CBFM 2 should be engaging with decision makers to ensure that pro-poor CBFM is part of the planning process and poverty reduction strategy</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 3: the communications strategy should take as an initial focal point, the monitoring of the policy processes emerging from the PRSP in December 2004, and should position itself to respond with hard evidence of impact on people and on fish production</p>	26
	<p>There is still no communications officer in the project despite OPR 2 recommendations in October 2003</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 4a: it is strongly advised that a Communications Officer be appointed as a matter of urgency, and 4b. that in the meantime WorldFish</p>	26

		designates a staff member to work with PNGOs to collate in one place examples of outcomes with clear bearing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy, governance and policy influence • Specific pro-poor benefits or events • Specific pro-women benefits or events • Specific pro-environment benefits or events 	
	Convincing GoB is now a tangible option and some attitudes (e.g. DG DoF) have already changed markedly	RECOMMENDATION 5: OVI 3.4 should be amended to: Greater awareness of project findings <u>and attitudinal change</u> evident within local and senior DoF, <u>MOFL</u> , and Administration and other relevant ministries by month 48	27
	One late joining partner NGO (Shisuk) has independently influenced GoB regarding its own approach to “CBFM” to the extent that it will be copied by GoB in 36 districts	. RECOMMENDATION 7: CBFM 2 should have a long hard look at how this was achieved, <u>and document the process</u> , learning lessons, adopting and adapting	27

Table 2 Project milestones for 2005

ACTIVITIES and MILESTONES (▲)	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept.	Oct
Completion of poverty assessment study	█	▲								
Design & execute a study of CBFM impact on the poor			█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Completion of Training Needs Assessment	█	▲								
RECRUITMENT OF GENDER SPECIALIST		▲								
RECRUITMENT OF COMMUNICATION OFFICER		▲								
Completion of communications strategy		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Monitor the progress of the PRSP and shape response
Investigate and document the Shisuk policy process		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Prepare a strategy paper on scaling up of CBFM						█	█	█	█	█
Execute macro-economic tradeoffs case study	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Execute new micro-credit and AIGA study			█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Execute gender case study				█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Execution of attitudinal surveys						█	█	█	█	█
Execution of joint fisheries - social modelling study										
Develop a participatory exit strategy for CBFM 1 CBOs	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Implement the exit strategy and monitor progress				
Review NGO-CBO MOAs and financial responsibilities			█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Initiate MRAG fisheries/social modelling (flood ?)				█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Prepare TORs for PM 48 impact survey; recruit team						█	█	█	█	█
Prepare briefing and design itinerary for OPR 4										█

GLOSSARY

ADC	Assistant Deputy Commissioner
AIGA	Alternative Income Generating Activity
BELA	Bangladesh Environmental Lawyers Association
BIDS	Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies
BIM	Beneficiary Impact Monitoring
BMC	Beel Management Committee
CAP	Country Assistance Plan (DFID)
CBMF	Community Based Fisheries Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CPUE	Catch Per Unit Effort
DC	Deputy Commissioner
DFIDB	Department for International Development, Bangladesh
DFO	District Fisheries Officer
DG	Director General (DoF)
DLS	Department of Livestock Services
DoF	Department of Fisheries
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations
FFP	Fourth Fisheries Project
FMC	Fisheries Management Committee
FSRFDS	Fisheries Sector Review and Future Development Study
FTEP 2	Fisheries Training and Extension Project
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LCD	Local Coordinating Group
LGRD	Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives
LGED	Local Government Engineering Department (LGRD)
MACH	Management of Aquatic Ecosystems through Community Husbandry
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOFL	Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock
MOL	Ministry of Land
NCFP	National Committee for Fish and Prawn
NFP	National Fisheries Policy
NCU	National Coordinating Unit
NWMP	National Water Management Plan
NFMP	New Fisheries Management Policy
OPR	Output to Purpose Review
PNGO	Partner NGO
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSM	Policy Stakeholder Matrix
QA	Quality Assurance
RLEP	Rural Livelihoods Evaluation Programme
RLF	Revolving Loan Fund
RMC	River Management Committee

RMO	Resource Management Organisation
TA	Technical Assistance
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
UDCC	Upazilla development Coordination Committee
UFO	Upazilla Fisheries Officer
UNO	Upazilla Nirbahi Officer
VDC	Village Development Committee
WID	Women in Development

CONTENTS

SECTION TITLES	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
GLOSSARY	13
1. INTRODUCTION	16
1.1 Background	16
1.2 Comments on Terms of Reference	16
1.3 Approach to OPR	16
2. THE OVER-ARCHING POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 GoB Policy Context	17
2.3 DFID Country Assistance Plan	18
2.4 Conformity of CBFM Outputs/Outcomes to Key Policy Themes	19
3. INFLUENCING POLICY – THE COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY	20
3.1 The Basis for a Strategy	20
3.2 The Performance to Date	21
3.3 The Options and Recommendations for the Future	24
3.4 Concluding Comments	26
4. INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES IN COMMUNITY BASED MANAGEMENT	28
4.1 Introduction	28
4.2 Status and Sustainability of Primary CBO Bodies	28
4.3 Clusters and Apex Bodies	29
4.4 The Role of Local and Central Governments	29
4.5 Conclusions on Sustainability	30
5. PROJECT IMPACT AND M&E SYSTEMS	30
5.1 Introduction	30
5.2 The Role and Performance of NGOs	31
5.3 CBFM and Gender – Women and Girls First?	33
5.4 CBFM and the Poor	34
5.5 Alternative Income Generation & Micro-Credit	35
5.6 Fisheries Research	37
5.7 Lease Value Issues	38
5.8 Final Impact Survey	39
6. PROGRESS AGAINST RECOMMENDATIONS OF OPR 2	39
7. PROGRESS TOWARDS DELIVERABLES	46
7.1 Key points on Outputs	46
7.2 Overall Assessment	46
7.3 The Logical Framework	47
8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OPR 3 AND MILESTONES FOR 2005	48
9. CONCLUSIONS ON DFID POLICY RELEVANCE - FUTURE DIRECTIONS	48
9.1 The Key Questions	48
9.2 Poverty Reduction and the Poverty Gap	48
9.3 Participatory Governance and Policy Influence	50
9.4 CBFM – Does it Really Work?	51
Table 1 Summary of Issues and Recommendations Against the Logframe	7
Table 2 Project Milestones for 2005	12
Table 3 Conformity of CBFM 2 to GoB Policy Themes	19
Table 4 Recommendations Summarised from Communications Reports	21
Table 5 Project Communication Activities	22
Table 6 Examples of Policy Influence	23
Table 7 Summary of Progress Against Recommendations from OPR 2	41
Table 8 Proposed Changes to Logical Framework	47
ANNEX 1 DFID OPR Form V1.0	53
ANNEX 2 Terms of Reference	69
ANNEX 3 Itinerary	77
Appendix 1 Comments and Response	79

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 CBFM 2 is the second phase of the Community Based Fisheries Management Project. The first phase from 1995-1999 was funded by the Ford Foundation, and operated in only a limited water bodies (19). CBFM 2 began in September 2001 and will end in August 2006. The goal of the project is to improve the policy process adopted by Government of Bangladesh (GoB) and the NGO community to ensure more equitable, sustainable and participatory management of resources. The key assumption is that achieving this goal will result in a significant contribution to poverty elimination in Bangladesh.

1.1.2 The objectives of the review were:

- To assess progress against the targets set in the Project Logical Framework
- To assess progress against the recommendations of the previous OPR
- To consider how the project fits the wider framework of emerging DFID and Government of Bangladesh (GoB) policies

1.2 Comments on the Terms of Reference (Annex 2)

1.2.1 In the second OPR it was noted that the value of very brief field visits to a small number of sites, was rather limited given the size, scope and inherent diversity of the project. This proved particularly true on the present review where there are now substantial outcomes to assess in addition to project processes.

1.2.2 The review benefited substantially from a mainly Bangladeshi team (one expatriate) which permitted insight, best use of field time, and direct access to key project documents written in Bengali. The review was also enhanced by the presence of one member of the Fourth Fisheries Project (FFP) team, and by the attachment of a consultant reviewing the IFAD funded component of the project.

1.3 Approach to the OPR (Itinerary, Annex 3)

- Briefing by DFIDB and RLEP
- Field visits to project sites
- Meeting with project stakeholders in Mymensingh
- Meetings with key stakeholders in Dhaka
- Cross-learning workshop with the FFP review team
- Debriefing with DFIDB and World Fish Centre
- Submission of draft report

2. THE OVER-ARCHING POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 In addition to the core project assessment, the review team was asked to consider the project (as currently designed and executed), in terms of the existing DFID Country Assistance Plan (CAP) and in the light of putative changes in DFIDB policies. These changes are likely to be away from sectoral projects towards a high impact, low transaction cost, programmatic approach (and budgetary support). This requirement implied that, even if successful in terms of the current logical framework, the project might benefit from re-orientation to contribute more directly to new

approaches being developed in DFIDB. The review was also asked to comment on the relevance of the project to emerging GoB policies, notably the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

2.1.2 It is important to note that although CBFM 2 is an action research project, and has some inherent flexibility, the project nevertheless provides very direct support to a wide range of communities (24,700 beneficiaries), and any changes would have to safeguard the livelihood investments of these people.

2.2 The GoB Policy Context

2.2.1 The stated purpose of CBFM 2 is to agree and operationalise a process for policy formulation in favour of pro-poor sustainable fisheries management. The GoB context is thus paramount. The Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (iPRSP) was in place and was reviewed during the last OPR (October 2003). The final PRSP will not be published until 31 December 2004. Although the content has thus not formally changed, the GoB has in the meantime made some clear policy statements regarding the thrust of the PRSP. The Minister for Finance and Planning recently noted the importance of good governance and a healthy political environment but laid special emphasis on the promotion of the agriculture sector and rural development as a route to creating employment and reducing poverty¹. The Fisheries Minister had, the previous day, announced record fisheries production (2.1 million tonnes)² and the sector, as part of “agriculture” looks set for substantial attention under the PRSP despite its limited appearance in the iPRSP. The March 2003 iPRSP included under agriculture:

- increased production from marine fisheries from more advanced practices
- increased production from inland waters through better management and improved aquaculture technology
- increased shrimp production and exports by better regulation of the industry at all levels
- mitigation of the negative impacts of water management structures through community collaboration
- scaling up of community based floodplain fisheries management to all floodplains
- the capacity of the Department of Fisheries (DoF) will be strengthened so that it can play an effective role in participation and cooperation with local communities and the private sector

2.2.2. This sectoral content must be considered in the context of the five over-arching policy areas outlined in the iPRSP:

- pro-poor economic growth
- human development of the poor
- women’s advancement and closing the gender gaps in development
- social protection of the poor (vulnerability)
- participatory governance

2.2.3 It is against these generic and sector-specific targets, that the performance and impact of CBFM 2 must be measured.

¹ Bangladesh Economic Association, 8 December 2004

² Financial Express, 7 December, 2004

2.2.4 The fundamental importance of the PRSP was highlighted during a meeting at the Planning Commission (8/12/04) where the Joint Chief responsible for natural resources confirmed that is no sixth Five Year Plan, but rather a three year rolling plan based on the PRSP. It was anticipated that poverty reduction would rest heavily on development of agriculture, and that fisheries would play a major part, with the possibility of increased resource allocation for the Department of Fisheries. The proposed emphasis was a private sector approach to fisheries development, and this was illustrated by the recent decision to promulgate the Shisuk approach to fisheries development in 36 Districts. Shisuk is a small NGO that joined CBFM 2 in 2003, and operates a Joint Stock Company approach to “community management”.

2.2.5 The need to re-orient fisheries policy to reflect the objectives and approaches of the PRSP was well recognised. The Joint Secretary Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock emphasised that their principle target was now the poor, and that their policies and programmes would follow the PRSP objectives. Some policy development is already in hand - the Department of Fisheries has produced a draft Open Water Fisheries Management Strategy that to an extent addresses some of the governance and advocacy issues that will need to be resolved for effective application of the PRSP, as well as embracing the need for sustainable resource use.

2.2.6 Since all GoB policy planning is in theory now inextricably linked to the PRSP, it is prudent to note that this approach is not universally accepted in Bangladesh. Some economists³ consider the PRSP to be simply a rehash of the structural adjustment programme approach with poverty substituted for economic growth, and little other change. The same authors consider the underlying free market paradigm to be ...”inherently iniquitous...”. Another author points to the need for agrarian reform, in particular reforms in land tenure and the distribution of khas land, and for the introduction of four-tier decentralised government and the abolition of the division level⁴.

2.2.7 There is nothing new in these statements - they simply reflect a fairly healthy scepticism about the ability of the PRSP to deliver answers to the key concerns of Bangladeshi people in the absence of political will. They also highlight areas of key concern to the CBFM 2 outcomes where access to natural resources, security of tenure and strong support from effective, empowered, local government are key to sustainability.

2.3 DFID – The Country Assistance Plan 2003-2006, Women and Girls First

2.3.1 The CAP context was also reviewed in the previous OPR, and this Plan has not changed in the interim. CBFM 2 still falls under the pillar embracing participatory governance, enhanced voice of the poor and improved non-material dimensions of well being, including security, power and social inclusion. DFID is, however, reviewing the impact of its demand led project approaches over the last five years or so, and asking questions about the policy and advocacy impact of such projects. The attitude towards the role of elites under poverty focused projects and the effectiveness of networking (e.g. the past major focus on conferences) in the wider development arena, are up for scrutiny.

2.3.2 Perhaps key to the deliberations is the consideration that it is difficult to tap into the PRSP via a suite of loosely connected projects. A more strategic approach with a trend towards high spend, large-scale and long duration programmes with low

³ 2004 Q.K Ahmad et al. The draft PRSP : a review. Bangladesh Journal of Political Economy, Vol 21

⁴ 2004 Muinul Ismal.

transaction costs appears to be on the horizon. Budgetary support for poverty reduction may also be on the cards. One of the simpler rationales behind this thinking is that in a country no longer so dependent on aid, and apparently increasingly resentful of donor interventions, a large coherent block of funding is more likely to ensure a seat at the top table than a diffuse cluster of smaller initiatives. There will probably still be scope for the demand side of the DFIDB work, but a project like CBFM 2 needs to provide clear quantitative evidence of sustainable impact on key policy areas such as poverty reduction and closing the gender gap.

2.3.3 A recent paper on women in rural Bangladesh⁵ lays out some of the challenges DFID faces in determining the shape of its future programmes. The paper asks some fundamental questions: what constitutes a successful result for women and girls, what outcomes are required and what are the tradeoffs in delivering on these outcomes? This is of vital relevance to projects such as CBFM 2 where women are specifically included in the project, but are either there as leaders (Hindu community women-led fisheries) or as participants in male-dominated fisheries CBOs. Women appear in only one OVI of the logical framework (1.5), and there in the context of indicators of social, economic and fisheries benefits for all stakeholders “including poor and women”. The project is certainly relevant to the Women and Girls focus of the CAP, but the design does not indicate serious reflection on the questions asked by IDL in their *Breaking New Ground*. This is inevitable given the historical context of a document written five years ago, but offers an opportunity to re-orient the way in which the beneficiary impacts are ultimately assessed, and the lessons learned are framed.

2.4 Conformity of CBFM 2 Outcomes and Outputs to Core Policy Themes

2.4.1 Table 3 is an attempt to relate the actual or likely outcomes of CBFM 2 in the context of DFID and GoB policies as outlined in the iPRSP (it was argued in OPR 2 that the CAP is closely modelled on the PRSP to ensure close synergy). The outcomes for the project to date and their actual contribution to the various policy areas are explored in Section 5 of this report on progress in Community Based Management.

Table 3 Conformity to Policy Themes

PRSP WIDER POLICY AREA	CBFM 2 GENERAL RESPONSE
1. Pro-poor economic growth	The project aims to improve the financial and physical capital of partner communities through increased access to fisheries benefits and micro-credit for livelihood diversification, thus contributing to rural development and employment options
2. Human development of the poor	The project provides support to development of human capital through appropriate awareness and media delivery, and through direct supply of information and training in technical and social mobilisation skills
3. Women’s advancement and closing of gender gap in development	The project specifically supports women-led CBFM, and encourages the participation of women in all project CBOs. Training for women includes both income generation skills and more socially relevant issues of

⁵ 2004. *Breaking new ground: livelihood choices, opportunities and tradeoffs for women and girls in Bangladesh*. The IDL Group

	Women in Development. Girls are engaged in the process of impact assessment in their communities
4. Social protection of the poor	The core of the project is the establishment of sustainable CBO for each water body. Under this arrangement savings mechanisms are established and the option is created for the creation of funds to support CBO members in times of crisis. The social capital developed is also intended to promote cohesive community action in response to threats
5. Participatory governance	CBO structure and networking is designed to recognise the importance of local elites and local government. Awareness of rights and support in exercising those rights is engendered through the assistance of NGOs and local officials. Formation of apex organisations represents an attempt to use power relations in the interests of the community. Building blocks for participatory governance are part of the project approach

2.4.2 It is probably true that any DFID project designed in the last five years or so would be able to complete a similar table, and the relevance lies in the detail. Consideration of future DFID thrusts, puts on the table two major questions that must also be answered in detail:

- If reducing poverty and closing the gender gap are primary targets of future DFID programmes is community based fisheries management an appropriate front line vehicle?
- If advocacy, participatory governance and policy influence are also primary targets of future programmes, can community based approaches to resource management contribute significantly (as well as benefiting)?

2.4.3 The first question is addressed in Section 5 of this report, and the second question is tackled in Section 3.

3. INFLUENCING POLICY – THE COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

3.1 The Basis for a Strategy

3.1.1 The second OPR (October 2003) was executed after 24 months of project activity, and came immediately after the completion of a consultancy to design a communications strategy. There had been no time to act upon the consultant’s report before the OPR and the review team awarded a score of 3 (likely to be partially achieved). The reason for the score was that although there had been substantial investment and some success in developing material for influencing people at grass roots level, is no coherent, structured approach to influencing people across the policy stakeholder matrix. A range of suggestions have been made as a result of two consultancies⁶ and OPR 2, and these are summarised in Table 4.

⁶ Huda, S (2003). Fishing in Muddy Waters: Policy Processes for Inland Fisheries in Bangladesh. April 2003, Worldfish Centre, Dhaka. .

⁶ Best, J & Ferdous, R (2003). Towards a Communications Strategy for CBFM-2. September 2003. Worldfish Centre, Dhaka.

Table 4 Recommendations summarized from communication reports

Focus	Recommendations/ Next Steps
What to communicate (Topic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply a message-based approach rather than a stakeholder based approach to communications. • The messages should be developed under a framework of a limited number of core strategic policy themes. • These should be evidence-based messages or lessons supported by sources. Compile message tables and design communications material accordingly. • Conduct studies on macro-economic trade offs, impact studies on poverty, equity, biodiversity to draw evidence-based lessons in support of CBFM approach for policy stakeholders.
Target (Audience/communication stakeholders)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting of stakeholders requires assessment of who it is important to communicate with on what theme. • Revisit categorization of the policy stakeholders to address this. • Package information on analysis of stakeholder communication context, interest/preference. Refining the Communication Matrix to a more limited number of channels for each stakeholders.
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop clear communication objectives for each type of message. • Draw information from the Stakeholder Matrix to derive communication objectives. Particularly, stakeholder role in policy process, required response, action or behaviour change.
Generic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint a communication officer who could lead the communication strategy development process and implement the strategy. • Utilize a champion (s) and networking approach to operationalize the strategy. • Involve key policy focused institutions such as CPD and BIDS in developing and implementing CBFM2 operational plan for influencing policy. • Develop an M&E plan for the communications strategy.

3.2 The Performance to Date

3.2.1 Very limited progress has been made on these recommendations, and there is still no fully coherent, stakeholder-wide strategy in operation. The project has also been unable to appoint a Communications Officer as recommended in OPR 2.

3.2.2 There has, however, been substantial activity at some levels of the Policy Stakeholder Matrix (PSM):

Table 5 Project Communications Activities

Media channel	Quantity Produced	Objectives and audience	Remarks
Newsletter	3 issues	Share project related information with a wide range of stakeholders	Activity reports, not message/lesson focused
CBO network newsletter	4 issues	Motivation to fishers	Should be continued
Community shows of Video Production Folk Media Progs Audio Cassette	>1 4 1	Awareness raising and motivation to community, CBOs	Message based e.g. on value of sanctuaries
TV spot	7	Promotional and informing the wider community	Message based but for general audience. Village people don't have access to private channels
Fish Fortnight	2	Promotional, Informing policy makers and wider community	
Monthly Press Report/Folk material book	?	Inform policy makers about fisheries related news.	Not project lessons on CBFM
Diaries Calendar	1 1	Promotional	The diary contains general messages not fisheries related information

3.2.3 Table 5 illustrates that CBFM 2 is involved in a range of communications activities with a variety of objectives. Some of the TV spots and video documentaries produced by Fem-com have worked as effective tools in creating awareness and motivation in the community (e.g. 200 kg of harmful current nets were burnt in one project site in Kishorganj). At the same time the broadcast of spots in the private TV channels seem to have a more promotional type of objective. Without clear objectives identified under a strategy, these activities seem to be somewhat ad hoc and their potential is not maximized by linking them strategically to different levels of the stakeholder matrix. Under a message-based strategy each message might have several objectives, and stakeholders and communication activities could be selected and designed accordingly. It will also help the project prioritize which objectives would contribute most to their logframe Purpose and Outputs and focus more on those within the remaining timeframe.

3.2.4 Despite the absence of the recommended strategic framework and action plan, there have been a number of strategically significant events to which CBFM 2 **could be said to** have contributed:

Table 6 Examples of Policy Influence

Issue	Processes Involved	Status
Exemption of 15% VAT on DoF project water bodies	A report prepared by BELA and submitted to DoF. DoF acted on it	Successfully exempted under GoB existing rules
Eliminate 3% income tax on lease value of project water bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report prepared by BELA • Brought to the attention of MOFL secretary by DOF (decision taken in the steering committee meeting) • MOFL secretary is requested to write to NBR, IRD, MOF 	Still in the process. The project is happy with the progress
Rationalisation of water body lease values	Requests will be submitted to respective DCs (DC has the power to reduce lease) by DoF	Last Steering Committee decision. Awaiting action
Amendment of fish Act 1950 on sanctuary management, and develop a law on sanctuary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report on management and legal recognition of sanctuary was prepared by BELA • A presentation provided to MOFL by Secretary IUCN Wetland Network Forum • MOFL raised it in the Parliamentary Standing Committee meeting 	Still in the process. Appears in DoF draft Open Water Management Strategy – a policy precursor

3.2.5 In the absence of any clear policy-influencing strategy or accompanying process documentation it is difficult to define exactly what role CBFM 2 has played in these events (although a strong role is undoubted). MACH, FFP, Danida, DFID and DoF itself have all have had a significant role in these tangible signs of policy influence. The outcomes are undoubtedly the result of an initially fortuitous programmatic approach embracing the efforts of a range of projects and individuals. Irrespective of the limited cohesion in the early days, the messages appear to have got across to some extent.

3.2.6 Nowhere is the progress more evident than in formerly entrenched line agencies. The Planning Commission informed the review team that community based management was “the only option” for Bangladesh; the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock were equally committed pending confirmation of sustainability. The greatest sea change is, however, in the Department of Fisheries, where the Director General was enthusiastic about the human and social aspects of a coastal CBM project, and agreed that he was now convinced about CBFM as the future (albeit in various guises). This is from a man of strong convictions who made it clear in 2001 and 2002 that he was interested only in production not livelihoods and poverty (it

was not his job), and in 2003 remained unconvinced about CBFM. The DG admitted openly that he had revised his view dramatically. A very senior District Fishery Officer held the same view, and agreed that a substantial restructuring of DoF was necessary to deliver its new role in support to CBFM.

3.3 The Options and Recommendations for the Future

3.3.1 Irrespective of the many caveats that must be applied to these anecdotes, the fact is that attitudinal change is within reach (even if what is being said is not fully meant, nobody would even say it two years ago). This in turn, raises new questions for the communications element (Output 3 and the Purpose) of CBFM 2. The Purpose requires that under CBFM 2, a process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management (should be) agreed and operational at project end. Output 3 requires that all fisheries policy stakeholders should be informed and influenced about improved management approaches.

3.3.2 RECOMMENDATION 1: Given the advances reported above, it is clearly time for CBFM 2 to re-analyse the information needs of the various stakeholder groups, and decide:

- Exactly what messages the project now needs to get across (since the basic CBM message seems to have arrived already)?
- Exactly who requires to be addressed with these specific (and few) messages?
- How the process documentation proposed in the last OPR can be operationalised and used to feed the message packages identified as necessary?
- How the various message types for the different levels of the stakeholder matrix can be linked through a coherent strategy?
- How much more needs to be done at the community level – how many more folk shows etc - what works best now at this level?

3.3.3. If it is assumed that CBFM is, in broad terms, an appropriate approach for management of aquatic resources in Bangladesh, key remaining questions include:

- Will the current favourable groundswell be converted into formal policy under the PRSP and incorporated in, and funded under, the three year rolling plan?
- Will the pro-poor rationale of CBFM be taken forward as it is spread under, for example, the Shisuk banner of joint stock companies?
- Will the pro-environment rationale be retained under DoF plans to extend pen culture in open waters and pond aquaculture?
- How will the approaches piloted under CBFM2, FFP, MACH and other projects be scaled-up to have truly national impact?

A key policy task for CBFM 2 now, is to help GoB in finding appropriate answers to these questions.

3.3.4 Taking the issue of scaling up, the review team offers a specific challenge and an example of how to address the communication strategy and action plan issues. The first, and possibly insuperable constraint, is that of capacity. DoF alone has neither the numbers nor the skills to take on the task of promoting CBFM nationwide even if it had the will and the necessary financial and physical resources. If NGOs were to undertake the task alone they would require funds, and it is perhaps questionable whether over-reliance (i.e. exclusive) on NGOs would be in the best

interests of improving governance. The Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives is implementing a large community based resource management project in Sunamgonj area. This project is based on cooperation between a wide range of government departments and may offer an option that does not rely so heavily on NGOs. CBFM 2 should look hard at this model as a way of scaling-up on a non-sectoral basis.

3.3.5 RECOMMENDATION 2: it is proposed that CBFM 2, as part of its response to Output 3 and the Project Purpose, should prepare a strategy paper on the approach to scaling-up CBFM in collaboration with the DoF and FFP, with advice from BIDS and the Joint Secretary in MOFL. The proposition to be explored could be:

Box 1 – A rationale for scaling up CBFM?

- 1. The DoF/MOFL/MOF/Prime Minister’s Office are all in favour of CBFM to varying extents, and in varying forms**
- 2. DoF has the will in principle to push some aspects of CBFM, but does not have the human resources in the field**
- 3. CBFM is not, on its own, an appropriate tool for major poverty reduction across Bangladesh, it must be linked to Alternative Income Generation/ employment opportunities**
- 4. Some of these opportunities require skills not found in DoF alone, but do reside in the staff of other line agencies**
- 5. There is already a mechanism for integrating rural service delivery at Upazilla level (UDCC) which draws together all the NR agencies (water, forest/environment, livestock, agriculture, fisheries) and administrators**
- 6. There is substantial under-utilised human capacity, at least in agriculture, which could be harnessed to support scale-up of CBM**
- 7. There is a power relation problem between MOFL and Min of Agriculture which prevents strategic collaboration, and can only be solved by clear policy decisions at the highest levels**

OPTION 1

- 8. CBFM 2 could develop a scale –up proposal that incorporates all key stakeholders, along with the necessary steps and responsibilities; identify the key targets to influence; prepare the necessary evidence in support of the proposal; develop a messaging package and initiate a campaign**

OPTION 2

- 9. Develop a brief that outlines the issues with supporting evidence, package appropriately and develop a consortium approach to lobbying and policy influence**

There are other options, but these serve as illustrations

3.3.6 A further, and even more fundamental requirement of the communication strategy is to ensure that the current momentum is not lost, and that when the PRSP emerges, the DoF is encouraged and assisted to produce and formalise a new policy coherent with the PRSP and rolling plan priorities. The draft Inland Capture Fisheries Strategy, if refocused, could be an entry point for CBFM 2 with DoF ownership.

3.3.7 RECOMMENDATION 3: the communications strategy should take as an initial focal point, the monitoring of the policy processes emerging from the PRSP in December 2004, and should position itself to respond with hard evidence of impact on people and on fish production.

3.3.8 It is clear from the reports and publicity generated by the project that there are many policy relevant outcomes that escape formal recognition as such. In addition to policy influence, the question posed in Section 2 was:

- Can community based approaches to resource management contribute significantly to advocacy and participatory governance?

3.3.9 Failure to document successes tends to lead to a negative answer to this question (which is more generic than the question of whether CBFM 2 can influence fisheries policy formulation). But the reality is very different, and simple examples of what would contribute are:

- The number and location of sites where the UP Chair provides direct support to communities (with examples of what each has delivered)
- The number and location of sites where Upazilla Nirbahi Officers, police or Upazilla/District Fisheries Officers have acted on behalf of communities (with examples such as the prevention of *bauth* fishing)
- Examples of cases where the CBOs themselves, or their cluster or apex committee representatives have tackled local government directly
- Examples of conflict resolution where local elites have solved problems in favour of project CBOs
- Examples of outcomes (e.g. conflict resolutions) that favour the very poor or women

3.3.10 There are many such examples in the heads of WordFish and NGO staff, or in various fliers, but the concept of process documentation in a targeted manner has not taken root yet. **RECOMMENDATION 4a: it is strongly advised that a communications officer be appointed as a matter of urgency, and 4b. that in the mean time WorldFish designates a staff member to work with PNGOs to collate in one place examples of outcomes with clear bearing on:**

- **Advocacy, governance and policy influence**
- **Specific pro-poor benefits or events**
- **Specific pro-women benefits or events**
- **Specific pro-environment benefits or events**

The Communications Officer will then have material from which to flesh out their communications strategy when it is finally designed.

3.4 Concluding Comments

3.4.1 OPR 2 pointed out that the wording of the Project Purpose was unrealistic for a single project and could only result from a programmatic approach. This kind of approach has in fact happened, initially by default and more recently by a concerted effort on behalf of interested projects. Nevertheless, the review team feel that the amendment proposed in OPR 2 does not go far enough. In reality it would be very hard for any single project to deliver a process for policy formulation within any normal project timeframe. The process of policy formulation is very much a national government issue which will change slowly, inconsistently and from within. In the most advanced of societies, policy development is never a linear exercise, and the expectation that it could be stabilised for fisheries over five years is, on reflection, ambitious. What the project can do, and to an extent already has done, is to contribute to the attitudinal shift that may result in the formulation of pro-poor sustainable fisheries policy. To reflect this:

3.4.2 RECOMMENDATION 5 is that OVI 3.4 be amended to: greater awareness of project findings and attitudinal change evident within local and senior DoF, MOFL, Land Administration and other relevant ministries by month 48 This will of course require careful monitoring and documentation under the communications strategy.

3.4.3 RECOMMENDATION 6: is that the Purpose should also be amended:

Current Version: A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational

OPR 2 recommendation: that CBFM 2 should contribute to a process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management being agreed and operational

OPR 3 recommendation: **A process for influencing policy formulation in favour of pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational**

3.4.3 This will also require careful monitoring, but more important it will require a specific and concerted effort by CBFM 2 and its partner projects, via the communications strategy, to ensure that current rhetoric is converted to a new pro-poor fisheries policy after the emergence of the PRSP and the new three-year rolling plan.

3.4.4 The final word on influencing policy could well be left to the NGO Shisuk. They joined CBFM 2 with their own ideas late in the project (2003). Since then they have accessed the seats of power to the extent that it is now GoB policy to extend the Shisuk approach to 36 Districts under a GoB programme. **RECOMMENDATION 7 is that CBFM 2 have a long hard look at how this was achieved, and document the process, learning lessons, adopting and adapting.**

3.4.5 In undertaking this study the project should bear in mind that Shisuk has successfully marketed one model for all areas. CBFM 2 stated at the outset that it is not possible to have one blueprint for all situations and is investigating 3 approaches and 8 models (including Shisuk). It is appropriate to explain the difference between the two philosophies, given that marketing one package is easier than marketing three/eight.

SECTION 4 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES IN CBFM

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The success of CBFM relies heavily on the institutional arrangements put in place at the community level, and on the linkages that the CBOs can develop and maintain within the sphere of local power relations. Although CBFM 2 is poverty focused, the project institutional arrangements have had to take account of the role and influence of elites in society. On the one hand inclusion offers the risks of capture, and on the other, attempted exclusion may lead to outright conflict that poor communities cannot win without major support from government (and/or NGOs).

4.1.2 OPR 2 commented that the complexity of the institutional arrangements proposed for some sites (notably open water and flood plain) led to questions over sustainability post-project. The MOFL posed the same point to the review team – yes, we are convinced about CBFM, but can we show that it will be sustainable after the project ends? With this in mind it is important to consider what has been learned to date, and what can be done to ensure the future for project CBOs.

4.2 The status of Primary CBO Groups (Beel, Village and River Management Committees)

4.2.1 Assessment is complicated by the fact that the project operates 3 approaches (fisher-led, community-led and women-led) and 8 models, related to the nature of the water bodies involved. Under CBFM 2 CBOs have been established in 120 water bodies (WB), and since OPR 2, substantial progress has been achieved in formalisation of these organisations, with 66 out of the 120 already registered with either the Department of Cooperative Societies or the Department of Social Welfare.

4.2.2 The success observed in accumulation of funds (Hamil Beel CBO had Tk 160,000 in their account), and the consideration being given by some CBOs to establishing micro-credit schemes for members, entrepreneurial schemes (e.g. poultry farm or sewing business) and safety nets for members in times of vulnerability, suggests that some CBOs at least, are functioning well. In open water sites in Pakundia visited by the review team, the members were very confident about their future, and adamant about increases in production and the viability of their CBO.

4.2.3 In general, it seems that at some beel and flood plain sites, despite inevitable conflicts, the principle of fisheries management CBOs is alive and well. How well the poor are represented in these bodies requires investigation despite PNGO selection criteria (see Section 5). Every review team field meeting with CBOs is dominated by a few articulate and palpably better-off individuals. This is, of course, not necessarily a bad thing, since such people are better able to deal with local power relations (i.e. they are part of) than less educated poor fishermen. The rider is that they must represent the interests of the poor, that benefits should be equitably shared, and that the capacity and empowerment of the poor is increased through membership. In Pakundia, the wealthier members of the CBOs had in some cases, donated land for sanctuaries or had given the deed to the CBO for a ten-year period free of charge.

4.2.4 Hamil Beel is a CBFM 1 site that is apparently ready to operate independently. The review mission met both the non-fishing influential committee members, and the fishermen (who were actually harvesting the beel at the time). Both groups were positive about the CBO. This presents a major opportunity for the CBFM 2 project to answer the question - is it really sustainable in the absence of external support?

The current answer is that we still do not know after 8 years of CBFM 1 sites and three years of CBFM 2. This is largely due to the high degree of reliance on NGOs, and the fact that no CBO has, as yet, been weaned off PNGO support. **RECOMMENDATION 8: an exit strategy for CBFM 1 sites should be finalised immediately, and executed as soon as possible in 2005 without waiting for the end of project.** This will be of immense value in answering the question posed, and in anticipating the problem-specific support and process needed by the majority of sites under CBFM 2 when they also graduate.

4.3 Cluster and Apex Bodies

4.3.1 The idea of the cluster group is central to the idea of integrated, water body-wide fisheries management. No one local CBO can impose management rules that will impact on a large open water or contiguous river system. Each CBO nominates representatives to a cluster committee which then acts as a problem solver for inter-CBO and wider CBFM issues. The project has now established cluster committees for 13 clusters covering 80 water bodies, and the system can be considered up and running, an advance from the OPR 2 situation. The cluster committee members met by the review team again appeared to be more influential people with the confidence (and the time) to represent the CBO. The duties to date at the few sites visited did not appear particularly demanding, although the project has no coherent process documentation to record exactly how these organisations are working.

4.3.2 It is still early days to gain any firm idea of the likely sustainability of the clusters, but it is clear that there must be close monitoring of the issues they deal with, the processes they adopt and the outcomes they generate. The same point was made in OPR 2. It should be noted that clusters will remain informal bodies and will not be registered.

4.3.3 **RECOMMENDATION 9 : the PNGOs must be further encouraged to undertake process documentation of the cluster system, and the WorldFish team must ensure that, as part of the communications strategy, the products are collated and disseminated both to influence policy and to encourage CBOs with feedback**

4.3.4 At the time of OPR 2 the idea of an apex body to draw together clusters was still a paper concept, and part of some rather daunting institutional organigrams produced by partner NGOs. CNRS as the main PNGO for the open water sites where this model is most relevant, have now established 4 apex bodies, and will ultimately register these bodies as formal entities (any body with 10 primary groups may register an apex body). At some project sites UP chairmen, members and local government officials (e.g.UFO) are attending CBO meetings as advisors, and the Upazilla Nirbahi Officer (UNO) is an adviser to the apex committee.

4.3.5 Under the process of registration of the apex body, related provisions like management, functions and assistance to the CBOs along with composition of apex executive body, general/advisory members and their roles should be included in its by-laws. However, the performance of apex organisations in Bangladesh tends not to be encouraging, and the post-project motivation of the bodies will have to be high if they are to survive. The same recommendation as for clusters applies.

4.4 The Role of Local and Central Government

4.4.1 The OPR team found that in some cases UNO, UFO and UP Chairman were providing major assistance to the CBOs. Union Parishad Chairs, as always, found time to meet the review team and promote the interests of their constituents. But where major vested interests are at work, CBOs alone may find it hard to gain support from the law-agencies and influential elites. This can be overcome, as in the case of *bauth* fishing, but the continued support of local government post-project is vital to sustainability, and needs to be reflected in any new policies emerging from the PRSP and 3 year planning processes at central level. The role of NGOs in influencing and instigating support at local level is also a factor to consider in the post-project situation.

4.4.2 Community based resource management cannot operate only under the banner of the MOFL and there should be wider ownership of the idea in central government. Management issues arising from the environmental linkages in floodplains with other users, needs cooperation of the many relevant departments of the government. In addition, the resources needed to scale-up CBFM will not be found within the DoF, and a fully integrated approach will be necessary if this is to be taken. An example is the excavation work done under CBFM 2. This is vital to maintenance of sanctuaries and inter-connectivity, but will require to be repeated in 10-15 years time. The CBOs may require assistance in this, for example from the UP Annual Development Programme.

4.5 Conclusion

4.5.1 Overall, the current performance of primary groups appears to be sound in many cases, and there is some evidence that the cluster concept is operational at some sites. The apex body concept is now emerging as operational in some sites. However, there is still, after 8 years, no clear answer to the question, is the institutional basis sustainable? It falls upon the project to immediately establish a monitoring and communications system to address this issue. However, for the primary groups there is a better option – cut loose those CBOs with 8 years support (CBFM 1) as recommended above, and take the opportunity to see what happens in the absence of the NGO. This is the only way this question will be answered to any degree within the timeframe of the project.

5. PROGRESS ON PROJECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND M&E SYSTEMS

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The report on the impacts of CBFM under the project Phase 1 (published March 2004) should give some measure of what might be expected under CBFM 2. There was a heavy emphasis on river sites (10) in CBFM 1 and it was noted that, rather than improving cooperation, CBFM was relatively ineffectual in resolving the long running conflicts that exist in the rivers. This was a result of the 1995 GoB declaration of rivers as open access, and the problem is still there in CBFM 2. In general, CBFM 1 led to benefits in accountability and transparency, although in some cases the election of BMC committee members polarised the fishermen. Higher fish catches were delivered in beel sites that implemented fisheries management practices. Where leases were paid, CBOs were able to enforce rules and could call on government support where needed. Success in open waters relied heavily on community cooperation and support of local government.

5.1.2 Participant households caught up with other households in terms of assets and had significantly higher incomes in 2001 than in 1996. This was due in part to fishery gains, and in part to diversification of income generating activities. The relationship

between credit, AIGAs and fishing pressure and close season mitigation was not, however, clearly demonstrated.

5.1.3 The sustainability of the institutional processes was tested during the gap of more than 1 year, between Phase 1 and Phase 2. All seven of the beel sites CBOs survived, but only 1 of the 10 river site committees continued to function during the interim. It was concluded that in Phase 1, fisheries communities demonstrated that they can be responsible for fisheries, and improve management, given the right institutional support and recognition.

5.2 The Role and Performance of NGOs

5.2.1 PNGOs have played a crucial central role in CBFM 2, and in this they have benefited from past experience of the project with CBFM 1. Three approaches and eight methods have been developed and tested in about 120 water bodies, and testing at the ground level is essentially done by the PNGOs. The hydrological complexities of these water bodies vary from one to another, and the institutional structures involved in each hydrological system vary accordingly. Management issues and tools also differ from site to site, but generally they involve social intervention such as beneficiary group formation, leadership skills and awareness, and technical interventions such as habitat restoration, creation of sanctuaries and operation of closed seasons. The issues at the water body level are therefore complex and can not be boxed in a single blueprint. The performance of the NGOs therefore depends to a large extent on their capability to understand the diverse issues involved in the management of the project water bodies and on how to involve the project beneficiaries, the community at large and the local administration, in solving complex social and biological issues in a participatory way. This in turn depends on the training given to the PNGOs and DoF staff on one hand, and the project beneficiaries on the other. This issue was raised by the second OPR, and 3 concrete recommendations were made to the World Fish Centre:

- Commissioning a TNA for CBO management to deliver an outline for the required training
- Engaging someone with responsibility for training oversight and Quality Assurance
- The relative advantage of DoF expertise in aquaculture management and the NGO advantage in community management should be considered during the DoF open water management planning committee meetings

5.2.2 Training is provided at two levels, to relatively senior management staff of DoF and the PNGOs (i.e. the project staff) and to the members of the CBOs (project beneficiaries). Training needs at these levels were always recognised, but there are still outstanding requirements. A consultant has now been hired to develop a TNA at both levels and as a part of the process a training inventory has been prepared⁷.

Training inventory at the level of project staff

5.2.3 Training has been provided on about 37 issues ranging from the basics of open water fisheries management to census of waterfowl. Many training sessions were implemented by the PNGOs themselves. The effectiveness of this approach was raised in OPR 2. CNRS conducted 36 sessions followed by Proshika (16) and BRAC (9). WorldFish conducted training on broader issues such as AIGA and orientation of CBFM 2. The training methods applied (lectures, brainstorming, etc) and aids (white

⁷ 2004 Rahman in prep

board, flip chart, OHP etc.) are traditional and the duration of training ranged from 2 to 5 days. Training was conducted once for all staff, and no formal needs assessment has been done and there has been no follow-up support. On-the-job training was not provided. This type of traditional training approach is not really suitable for an action-oriented research project where new experiences at the field level should be fed back to the central level and training subjects and tools can then be revised on a periodic basis.

Training inventory at the level of stakeholders/project beneficiaries

5.2.4 Training has been provided on about 40 issues ranging from group and micro-credit management to participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation. Although DoF staff were involved in 'all' of the training events as 'resource persons', it is unclear what their role and contribution might have been for courses unrelated to fisheries and aquaculture technology (e.g. social development issues, goat rearing, adult literacy etc.). There is a need to define and evaluate the 'strategic value' of DoF staff engagement. Could their time be better utilised elsewhere (particularly for some of the training topics)? What training events contribute to their own expertise and how may it benefit specific target groups? What process might be developed to ascertain the value of DoF staff involvement as resource persons (this term normally refers to additional trainers with specific skills to add to the course not easily undertaken by the trainers themselves) Better definition of the term 'resource persons' in this context is required

Again, no formal TNA was done and training needs were determined by partner organisations on an informal basis. CNRS again provided the largest number of training sessions (25), followed by Caritas (21), CRED (11). The same training method and aids were used and the duration of training was similar to those organised for the Project staff. No assessment of training needs was done. The NGOs do not have a system to formally check to what extent the participants learned from the training exercise, where the gaps are, and no feed-back mechanism for improvement in training issues and methods exist.

The project needs to focus more coherently on the strategic elements of the capacity building process. This will enable the team to develop training cycle management processes and strategies appropriate for the complex matrix of beneficiaries, training events, capacity building approaches and training providers.

5.2.5 During the team's fieldwork in Hamil Beel (Madhupur) it was observed that a female member of the PNGO had been maintaining the accounts of the CBO, and the CBO hired an accountant when she went on maternity leave. The CBO members interviewed informed the team that none of them are capable of maintaining financial records and that they had received no training on financial record-keeping (WorldFish later confirmed that some members have indeed received training). It may be mentioned that Hamil Beel was presented to the team as a success story where the PNGO was thinking of withdrawing project support because the community was considered to be in a position to look after its interests. Also, the CBO of Hamil Beel has generated a total savings of around Tk. 160,000 which appears to remain mainly idle although they have been giving credit to its members in a limited way. This shows that even a mature project site may perform poorly when it comes to financial matters.

5.2.6 A beneficiary TNA is currently underway by the PNGOs, although only CNRS has completed as yet, and their approach left something to be desired. It is possibly too late to reassess these issues and this should have received serious consideration after the second OPR but little has been done to address the recommendations. It is

extremely important to revise training methods and subjects according to the feedback received from the knowledge gathered at the ground level.

5.2.7 RECOMMENDATION 10: The PNGO TNA should be expedited, and the results fed into the study being carried out by the consultant. The results should then form the basis for a time-bound strategy to fill the most important gaps.

5.3 CBFM and Gender - Women and Girls First?

5.3.1 In the present cultural construct of Bangladeshi society, women have a limited role to play in the open water fisheries. Finding genuine opportunities for women is therefore difficult in CBFM 2, other than in Hindu communities where women are active fishers. The FFP encountered the same problem. This issue must be recognised before commencing any discussion on gender issues related to a project like the CBFM 2.

5.3.2 The project needs to observe and rationalise the role women can play in fisheries management. There is no reason why women members should be included in community organisations if they cannot influence collective decisions. The FFP had similar quota for female representation in the CBOs (2 per BMC) but it was effectively tokenism. How women specifically benefit from a project like CBFM 2 is not even clear to PNGO managers of the project at the local level. When asked how women are benefiting from the project a senior member responded by saying that since everybody (i.e. households) is benefiting from the project the women are also benefiting. In Rajdhala beel in Netrokona women participate during stocking to ensure the quality of fingerlings stocked. These fingerlings are bought by their husbands. When asked why women are better in monitoring quality there was no convincing answer.

5.3.3 Women can directly and indirectly benefit from CBFM 2. They can directly benefit from higher income of the household and can indirectly benefit from participation in income generating activities introduced through disbursement of micro-credit. While it has been reported that overall income of beneficiary households has increased, there is as yet no study to evaluate how much income has gone to women. Neither is there any documentation on the impact of credit on women. We do not know whether credit is used by women or just passed on to the husbands. We also do not know the type of training received by women. On the whole the project has failed to distinguish women's participation from equity. OPR1 and OPR2 observed this and recommended both targeted survey and gender analysis.

5.3.4 Based on the comments from previous OPRs, the project has now developed a gender strategy plan. This strategy plan has outlined clear time-bound and achievable steps to improve the gender orientation of the project. It has to be seen how the project performs and monitors achievement or otherwise of these objectives. Meanwhile, steps have been taken to conduct a specific study to assess gender impact of project interventions.

5.3.5 RECOMMENDATION 11: the gender study should be executed with immediate effect and should provide an interim assessment by the end of the first quarter of 2005.

5.3.6 RECOMMENDATION 12: a project gender specialist should be appointed as an absolute priority.

5.4 CBFM and the Poor

5.4.1 It is not simple to specifically relate poverty and fisheries. When we consider poverty as a multi-dimensional phenomenon and move away from the traditionally measured income poverty concept, it is relatively easy to observe the qualitative links but they are hard to quantify. For example, when we talk about access, exclusion, sustainability, vulnerability and so on, the relevance to fishers becomes relatively clear, but again hard to quantify. Even considering income poverty or other “head count” measures, it is not easy to cull out the specific impact of fisheries on poverty.

5.4.2 Fishers benefit from an overall national development pattern that may not be directly related to fisheries but may be the result of growth in infrastructure, health and education programmes of the Government and NGOs. When asked what the fishers do during a closed season, the common answer is they pursue other types of work. Other than the Hindu professional fishers, in most cases today's fishers pursue a wide range of activities. Environmental factors have decreased the size of the open water fisheries area and, as aquaculture production has increased, the main stimulus of growth is no longer coming from the capture fisheries. Aquaculture is capital intensive and may not be very pro-poor, but its growth can improve contribute to improving the condition of the poor mainly through lowering the price of fish rather than through increasing involvement of fishers. Given this background, the number of full time professional fishers has declined and the target beneficiary of a fisheries project is determined more on the basis of the degree of their involvement (part-time fishers, occasional fishers etc.) in fisheries.

5.4.3 Thompson⁸ provides information on poverty status of the households from census data collected by the project. It can be seen that many of the very poor (no land, does labouring) and poor (own up to 1 acre of land) are found to be not fishers at all. In fact extreme poverty that relates to ill health, female-headed households, adverse sex ratio, and absence can hardly be addressed by CBFM 2 type of interventions. Having said that, the CBFM 2 type of project addresses those types of poverty-related issues that are hard to quantify. The social capital generated by group formations, interaction with NGOs, local administration, DoF and so on leads to empowerment that has positive effects on project beneficiaries. In addition, subsistence fishing may act as a seasonal survival safety net to the very poor, and increases in natural production should act in favour of such people given access (e.g. in open water systems).

5.4.4 The project has yet to document its impact on poverty satisfactorily, although there is some evidence on poverty impact for CBFM 1⁹. Under CBFM 2, a credit impact study, (despite its limitations – see Section 5.5), shows improvement in livelihoods indicators for project beneficiaries as compared to control site fishers. Field level information shows increase in catches, and examples of empowerment are also there. For example, in Rajdhala beel in Netrokona, the Hindu fisher community retained access rights over the Project Water Body (PWB) despite repeated capture attempts by the rich and the influential. Success on the poverty front will also depend on the ability of the PNGOs to provide credit and training to the poor members of the fisher households. The project has already gathered, and it is under the process of gathering, data that can be useful for assessing the poverty impact of the project, but the data is not yet processed and there is limited value in knowing the results at the end of the project. The managers of the project should

⁸ 2004 Thompson P. Lessons from Community Based Fisheries Management in Bangladesh, Briefing Paper, March 2004, World Fish Centre.

⁹ 2004 Thompson P. Impacts of the CBFM 1

keep in mind that all this information must be processed fast and the lessons learned on the poverty impact should be disseminated. This is absolutely essential for influencing policy. There is also a tendency of the project to depend heavily on quantitative data. As mentioned before, qualitative information is important to capture the multidimensional aspect of poverty. More innovative ways of measuring the impact of the project on poverty could be developed by the researchers of the WORLDFISH.

5.4.5 RECOMMENDATION 13: the recent poverty assessment survey should be fully completed by the end of January 2005, and the project should seek peer review in carefully examining whether the CBFM 2 impact on poverty is clearly demonstrated. This should be checked by the DFID quarterly review.

5.5 Alternative Income Generating Activities and Micro-Credit

5.5.1 As per the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) PNGOs are required to provide livelihood, employment and income generating activity opportunities for households, including as appropriate, professional fishers, subsistence fishers and other poor wetland users. AIGAs are intended to reduce pressure on fisheries, promote conservation measures and support poor fishers in the closed season. It is generally accepted that micro-credit is a key instrument that can provide income-generating activities to its receivers. The MOA also stipulates that training and credit benefits should be limited to direct beneficiaries of the project. For this purpose a total project revolving fund of Tk. 15, 260,000 has been earmarked and out of which an amount of Tk. 10,566,000 (about 69%) has already been disbursed to project beneficiaries¹⁰.

5.5.2 In many ways the MOAs appear to be either vague or incomplete as far as some major issues are concerned. For example, "other poor wetland users" who can benefit from micro-credit may not be related to fisheries in any meaningful way. Providing credit to them may not result in reduction of fishing pressure on the PWB but may rather open the floodgate for potential fisheries-unrelated borrowers. This was clear in Hamil Beel in Madhupur where some of the women who got credit had nothing to do with fishing, and their husbands were not fishers. Fishing pressure in this beel was contained directly by limiting membership to the club of beneficiaries by the construction of various entry barriers.

5.5.3 This also happened to some cluster water body sites in Pakundia managed by CNRS where a new entrant has to contribute a cumulative amount contributed by old members since the inception of the project. We have also seen in a river site in Kalihati where a closed season of 3 months is observed and the poor fishers who had to follow the closed season were not compensated at all. The CBO had a saving of Tk. 16,000 and four loans were given to members who were not affected by the closed season. Thus the project is either providing credit that may not be related to reducing fishing pressure on project water bodies not provided at all to those who have to suffer from the implementation of the project.

5.5.4 A study was conducted in November, 2004 to measure the impact of micro-credit¹¹ Table 3 on page 8 of the report provides information on loans provided to various AIGA activities. A large number of loans have been provided for boat

¹⁰ 2004. CBFM-2 Progress in 2004, 30 June 2004

¹¹ 2004. Md. Ferdous Alam, K. Kuperan Viswanathan, A.K.M. Firoz Khan, "Impact of CBFM Micro Credit Programme on the Livelihoods of Fishers and Fisheries Production in Bangladesh".

purchasing, fishing net purchase, stocking etc. which are more likely to increase fishing pressure rather than reducing it in the PWB. Obviously, they can hardly be called alternative livelihoods.

5.5.5 This particular study made some sweeping conclusions and before they are further verified, we would like to make some comments on the report:

- **Methodology** – the methodology of this credit impact study is somewhat flawed because it compared livelihood outcome indicators of the fisher borrowers with fisher non-borrowers from the control sites. Ideally it should compare fisher borrowers from both study and control sites. Failing to do so would result in establishing the impact gains of micro-credit alone. This is particularly true when the link between micro-credit and AIGAs is weak as pointed out earlier. The report would also benefit from incorporating qualitative techniques alongside the quantitative ones so that more in depth verifiable results could be obtained.
- **Sample selection** - the average size of the loan taken by the sample households (Tk. 4,996 for CBFM1 sites and Tk. 12,322 from CBFM2 sites) greatly exceeds those reported by Rob 2004 loc. cit. (Tk. 3,196) for the entire project. This may have biased the results as returns from larger loans, particularly when taken repeatedly over a longer period, are likely to be larger.
- **The results** - the link between improvement in livelihoods indicators and reduction of fishing pressure, or how lean season survival strategies were undertaken is not established. What has been established is the livelihoods outcome of micro-credit but how it affected the fisheries is missing in the report.

5.5.6 The fund provided for micro-credit support appears to be “gratis” to the PNGO. The MOA remains vague on this issue. It says that the implementing NGO will have to *“continue to provide credit from the revolving fund for fisheries and wetland management for **at least 15 years after the end of the project or until such time as the funds in question can be transferred entirely to community based organisations that are deemed competent to manage their own revolving loan funds for the same purpose**”* (emphasis added). The idea that the NGOs will have to provide funds to the beneficiaries is implied rather than clearly stated. There is no proposed institutional mechanism that will monitor use of funds by the PNGOs, and the implication that the NGO may remain in the PWB site for 15 years is hardly questioned. A Joint Committee (DFID, WORLD FISH, DoF and PNGO) will take the decision on which CBOs are performing well and to which this fund would be transferred. But it will meet 3 times in 15 years for making this evaluation. If CBFM 2 is discontinued, the fate of the fund will remain uncertain. One Taka at an interest rate of 12% per annum as recommended by the Steering Committee will result in almost an increase by 10 times if used for 20 years. This is a large amount of money and the managers of the project should renegotiate contractual arrangements with the PNGOs so that all ambiguities are taken care of.

5.5.7 To sum up, the relationship between micro-credit and AIGA is weak and the project has failed to demonstrate the link. Thus micro-credit appears as an add on that is not nested in a way that conforms to the design and actual practice of CBFM 2. The funds for micro-credit have to be properly monitored to make sure that they go to the community, and preferably at the end of the project rather than 15 years down the line. An improved understanding of the factors influencing community decision-

making when choosing livelihood options is required if AIGAs are to genuinely contribute to reducing pressure on natural resources. This should be borne in mind during the proposed revisiting of the micro-credit study.

5.5.8 RECOMMENDATION 14 : the micro-credit study should be revisited, and a new approach designed bearing in mind the comments made here. Specifically, the link between credit and fishing pressure and between credit and fisheries management measures should be clearly demonstrated, as well as the issue of positive general impact of credit on livelihood parameters. A full-blown AIGA study is required (and indeed is required by the MOFL) and it may be appropriate to engage external consultants to assist.

5.5.9 RECOMMENDATION 15: the terms of financial exit from the project by PNGOs should be reviewed, and the conditionalities and time frame reconsidered. This should be part of a broader and urgent exit strategy study suggested as Recommendation 8 (page 29)

5.6 Fisheries Research

5.6.1 The previous review mission commented that the fisheries programme was collecting large volumes of data without producing outputs that would be of value in understanding the impacts of CBFM. It was also noted that there appeared to be few links between the social and fisheries data sets and programmes.

5.6.2 This situation has changed considerably, and technical papers - both internal and peer-reviewed papers for conferences have been produced. A series of papers now document the status of fisheries resources in a range of water bodies. The Annual Report for 2003 provides considerable detail on fisheries results, including statements with some supporting evidence, that fisheries production has increased in most types of water body during CBFM 2.

5.6.3 Whilst the evidence for increase is generally persuasive, there tends to be something of an assumption of causality. OPR 2 commented that it would be difficult to separate the actual impacts of the CBFM 2 management measures from background environmental factors. The project is encouraging a range of management strategies, several of which may be used in the same water body, and it is at present difficult to determine cause and effect. For example, at Beel Boro in Pakundia the CBO has a *katha* which it fishes to collect revenue for the CBO bank account. In 2003 the *katha* was fished once and produced fish worth Tk 100. In December 2004 the same *katha* produced TK 3,500 on the first fishing, and will be fished another 2 or 3 times this year. The obvious question is – does this increase result from the sanctuary, the excavation works (improving water flow), the closed season enforcement or simply from the fact that, hydrologically, this was a good year. Next year may answer the last question, but not the others.

5.6.4 The previous review also noted that the data collected had, as yet, not been used to address very real problems being faced by communities. The example used was that of Ashurar Beel where increasing fishing pressure appeared to be impacting on the catch expectations of the fishermen despite their management efforts. The project has since modelled the Ashurar Beel fishery and has concluded that there is indeed a major problem with increasing fishing pressure. From this and another flood plain fishery modelling exercise it is concluded that the project is now in a position to offer advice on appropriate levels of effort and gear types for the maintenance of a sustainable fishery. To follow this up, the CBFM 2 team held a workshop at Ashurar

to explain the fishery status, and to advise on remedial action. The fishermen have apparently agreed to reduce the numbers of some types of gear.

5.6.5 This represents a very serious effort on behalf of the fisheries team to address the issues raised in OPR 2. Inevitably, issues remain. The attribution of catches to different causal factors is one, and the integration of fisheries and social data is another. The models produced to date do not adequately consider environmental parameters, nor do they include social issues. Thus, if a fishery analysis implies a need for decrease in effort or gear type, how will this be addressed, who will suffer (e.g. will it effect the poorer fishers most), and how should AIGA micro-credit be applied as a compensatory measure? This key linkage is still missing in CBFM 2.

5.6.6 To address environmental, management method impact, and social data integration, the fisheries team has proposed a joint modelling study (largely with existing data) with MRAG of the UK. **RECOMMENDATION 16 is that this study should go ahead as a matter of urgency, BUT the TORs should be jointly agreed between the fisheries and social staff, and should be peer reviewed in Penang by WorldFish.**

5.6.7 This proposed study will be valuable in understanding the full impact of CBFM 2, but a key issue should be borne in mind. However good such a model may be, it is only practically valuable as long as there are people competent to apply it in advising CBOs. After the project, who will take on this task, and how will CBOs know that such advice is available, and how will they access it?

5.7 The Lease Value Issue

5.7.1 During previous OPRs the question of lease values has been a hot issue, not only for CBFM 2, but also for FFP, MACH and the Danida projects. The concern has been:

- The lease values are arbitrary and may be higher than the likely sustained output of the water body
- The policy of increasing the lease fee by 25% on first purchase and then by 10% pa thereafter, placed a high burden on newly formed CBOs with limited assets
- The requirement to pay 15% VAT and 3% tax on top of high lease values was an added burden to fragile new ventures

5.7.2 In the meantime, there has been major progress of a sort. The 10% annual increase has been abolished and the 15% VAT waived, for project water bodies under project-based, poor-focused CBFM. In addition, the waiving of the 3% tax is under active consideration having been agreed by the project Steering Committee.

5.7.3 The picture therefore looks encouraging on the surface, but in fact there are some fundamental issues remaining. The tax relief is in fact a form of subsidy for project water bodies, and does not apply across the sector as a whole. The premise of initiating and scaling-up a management approach on the basis of government subsidy raises obvious questions about genuine economic viability of CBFM in jalmohals. The core issue is in fact the lease valuation. If the lease value is realistic in the context of the production potential of a well-managed water body then there should be no need for subsidy after the initial kick-start (along with supporting guidance). The key, and complex issue to resolve, is thus how to establish an equitable and realistic lease value. This requires working not only with the MOL, but

also with the Deputy Commissioners who effectively control this leasing process. Once resolved, the CBOs should be able to pay tax as any other citizen, and contribute to the wider national development.

5.7.4 It is perhaps worthy of note that the results for CBFM 2 in open water capture fisheries are so far optimistic, and hold wider implications for the future of the nation's wetland systems, without the issue of lease payments. On the other hand, they also raise issues about private ownership and security of access.

5.8 The Final Impact Survey

5.8.1 OPR 2 recommended that the original Project Month 36 (PM) mid-term impact assessment survey should be superseded by a series of carefully targeted case studies. In the event most of the proposed studies have yet to be completed satisfactorily for a range of reasons, not least of which were the major staff changes in the WorldFish team. OPR 2 also suggested that the final PM 54 impact survey be brought forward to PM 48 in order to ensure that the information on impact was fully available and published by the end of the project, thus avoiding the publications "overhang".

5.8.2 Given the need for rapid action on catching up with the proposed case studies **RECOMMENDATION 17 : is that the project team should work as closely as possible to the proposed schedule for 2005 (Table 2), and as part of that scheduling, develop TORs for the PM 48 impact survey in such a way that it will complement, rather than duplicate the existing case study proposals. It is further recommended that this be planned sufficiently in advance to allow recruitment of top quality external consultants to provide an objective perspective to the exercise.**

6. PROGRESS AGAINST RECOMMENDATIONS OF OPR 2

6.1 Progress against each recommendation is detailed in Table 7. This formal basis for comparison precludes recognition of some of the advances made in the year since OPR 2. In that review a good deal of comment was made on the tendency to produce large quantities of data without on-going analysis and production of papers that would be of benefit to communities. As evidenced by the 2003 Annual Report, and the project publications list, this was taken to heart and several fisheries papers have emerged. They still lack the necessary social integration, but there is now a basis for assessing whether the fisheries research will contribute to the CBFM approach.

6.2 Several of the recommendations of OPR 2 have not yet been addressed. This is regrettable, but should be seen in the light of the staff issues that have had to be addressed since the last review. The main social scientist left the project, followed by the Team Leader. As acknowledged in earlier reviews these two people were at the heart of the CBFM 2 project, and their loss was obviously a major set-back for the team. WorldFish succeeded in filling these posts, only for the new Team Leader to fall ill and step out of the project for three months. In the face of these set-backs, the progress made must be considered as positive, if rather behind the anticipated position.

6.3 In Section 9 the review team have set out a schedule and milestones for the project, to assist in keeping the project on track for its completion in 2006. This will

require further consultation with WorldFish when they have had more time to consider the operational implications.

Table 7 Summary of progress against the recommendations from OPR 2

LOG FRAME	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS TAKEN
<p>Purpose</p> <p>A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the third OPR should review the wording of the Purpose in the light of developments both within the sector and within the wider external policy environment, notably the move to a programmatic approach 	<p>The Purpose will be amended when the TAPP is revised to account for extra finance due to incorporation of two new water bodies and related additional finance for DoF</p>
<p>Output 1</p> <p>Community based fisheries management approaches developed, tested, and their impacts, sustainability and potential for expansion assessed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> produce an integrated summary of the 6 year catch data by the end of 2003 assemble a joint team to facilitate resolution of real fisheries related problems at Ashurar Beel revise the overall project research plan to ensure better integration of effort and output <p>Ensure collection of data on key environmental parameters and collaborate with both MRAG and FFP</p> <p>It is recommended that the project commission a study of the development, effectiveness and future for AIGAs in fisheries communities</p> <p>WorldFish to commission a TNA for CBO management resulting in an outline for the required training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A summary of 6 years data for 10 water bodies prepared and two papers derived and presented at Asian Fisheries Forum A joint team held a workshop at Ashurar Beel to discuss findings with the CBO. BMC agreed the findings and agreed to reduce effort of certain gears Changes to improve fisheries data collection made partly on advice from MRAG, but the point about better integrating scientific and social research has been missed <p>MRAG and WorldFish have developed a proposal for a joint analysis that will link (mainly existing) environmental, fisheries and social data and improve the practical application of the model constructed by CBFM 2. The proposal is under review</p> <p>A small study of micro-credit had been carried out and the results used to comment on AIGAs. In reality, the key questions about AIGAs – whether they relieve pressure on the resource base and help the poor in close seasons, remain unanswered</p> <p>Each NGO has been asked to carry out a TNA. Only CNRS has delivered so far, and the document is a little off the mark, having failed to get to grips with what the BMCs want, as opposed to what the NGO thinks they need. A single external consultancy might have yielded better results</p>

	WorldFish should consider engaging someone with responsibility for training oversight and QA. This person would also be able to give training advice to the partners	This has not happened, but a consultant was hired to inventory all training and to make recommendations. Data available, not yet written up
	WorldFish should prioritise an assessment on the use and impact of micro-credit, and undertake it at the earliest opportunity	A small study has been completed which suggest some interesting impacts. However, although controls are included it is not entirely clear whether benefits emerging are entirely the result of CBFM 2 micro-credit. The use of CBFM credit for fishing related activities does not help the disaggregation of impact. This was an internal study under pressure (written in November 2004), and an independent specialist might have been a better approach
	WorldFish should develop a publication plan, and DFID and WorldFish HQ should consider how best to deal with overhang	Although many papers have been produced since OPR 2, and some presented externally (in one case acclaimed) this has not been addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WorldFish should appoint a gender focal point for the project DoF should appoint their own WID focal and should work with the project to develop a programme for mainstreaming gender into this area of its work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has not been done DoF have been unable to recruit a suitable person
	The recommendation from OPR1 “that the project’s monitoring instruments are reviewed to ensure the necessary separation of gender benefit will be possible in reporting the impact of CBFM on women, so that OVI 1.5 is attainable” remains valid and is of high priority	Specific data collection forms have been designed to facilitate collection of gender-specific data, but these will not be employed until 2005. A very slow response, 15 months from OPR 2 before action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate mid-term gender impact study, which should link to the credit study is now recommended The DFIDB Social Development Team should also be made aware of the study in order that they may provide advice and guidance. In addressing this aspect, a linkage should be made with the on-going DFID Nutrition Scoping Study (led by Dilruba Haider) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has not been done. The preliminary micro-credit study did not cover this aspect in any depth No contact made No linkage made
	The PNGOs should each establish a gender focal point, or preferably link the project into their mainstream gender programmes,	Not done, but CNRS has developed a gender policy for the first time, and along with this a one year gender action plan

	a participatory poverty assessment to be carried out in a sample of waterbodies in 2004, alongside the other recommended case studies	A poverty analysis was carried out in eight water bodies. Data are available, but report not yet prepared
	WorldFish should reconsider the mid-term impact survey, with consideration given to undertaking a number of more targeted case studies instead	<p>Only the micro-credit case study has been fully completed, and this requires specialist review. AIGAs were not adequately covered, nor was gender</p> <p>The poverty assessment study has been executed but the report was not completed before the OPR 3</p> <p>The fisheries staff have worked hard to address the Ashurur Beel issue with a (joint) workshop and a paper, but the latter is totally fishery focused. The segregation of science and social data remains. The workshop report could in fact have made a good case study</p> <p>The 2003 Annual Report carries a good account of the impact of fisheries management on production, and a model of potential value in helping DoF & BMCs to manage is complete</p>
Output 2 Coordination and administration mechanisms for linking local community management arrangements with larger fishery and wetland systems tested and assessed, and constraints identified	PNGOs should be asked to establish a portfolio of significant events, and WORLDFISH should collate a database as part of the communications strategy	Not done in any strategic manner. PNGOs are asked to take care of process documentation, but there is not central coordination which would, in any case, be difficult without a strategy to work towards
	a study of the participation of elites in other (fish and non-fish) projects may provide an idea of pros and cons	Not yet done

Output 3 To inform and influence all fisheries policy stakeholders of improved management approaches	The recommendation that a study be commissioned on macro-economic trade-offs and social implications in CBFM remains a high priority. WorldFish should consider using their in-house expertise to complement project efforts in this area	Not yet done. Recommended in OPR 1 and OPR 2.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project should clearly define the major policy themes and externalities likely to constrain CBFM, as a first stage and then develop an action plan in consultation with FSRFDS Steering Committee and DoF the project should appoint a full time Communications Officer. A part time appointee would be better than none it is recommended that each partner appoints a communications focal points to oversee internal and external communications about CBFM, and co-ordinate with the WorldFish communications officer. This should be integrated with the existing media machines of the major PNGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not done Not done Not done <p>This is not to say that significant progress has not been made with awareness, publicity and publications, but the strategic issues have not been resolved</p>
	The project should attempt to engage strategic non-sectoral institutions as advisers in support of a champion (e.g. CPD and BIDS). This would be a natural progression from the existing Media Advisory Committee	Attempted, but hard to find anybody willing to take on this role. The Steering Committee is the closest to a champion at present, and they have made some supportive decisions if these are acted upon by GoB
Other	RLEP should consider recruitment of local consultants immediately before the OPR to carry out field investigation of issues identified by the OPR team (based on report)	Not taken up
	WorldFish to find a solution. Meantime, focus on recruitment of a top quality office manager	WorldFish reorganised its office and re-staffed the gaps
	Worldfish and DFID to find a mechanism for engaging Dr Parvin on a full time basis as a matter of priority before her services are lost elsewhere	WorldFish reorganised its office and re-staffed the gaps
	The revised version of the logical framework should be used as the working document of the project, but formal adoption should be delayed until OPR 3 has undertaken the proposed revision of the Purpose	Will be done when the TAPP is modified

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">the final impact survey should be moved from month 54 to month 48. It is recognised that delay until month 54 would yield a full 4 year data set, but at this time, the recommendation for a change to month 48 is considered the better option for yielding timely outputs	WorldFish has agreed this
--	---	---------------------------

7. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS TOWARDS DELIVERABLES

7.1 Key Points on Outputs

7.1.1 The detailed findings of the review process are reported in Annex 1 (DFID OPR Format), and issues and recommendations are summarised in Table 1. Only key points are given here.

Output 1

7.1.2 The score allocated was 3 as compared with 1/2 as in the previous OPR, and 1 in OPR 1. Although there is every expectation that all approaches will be developed and tested, there remains doubt over the degree to which the impact will be satisfactorily assessed. The impact of fisheries management on resource levels appears to be well in hand now, but this is not true of the social data. The micro-credit study has yielded little on AIGA impact or on gender impact, and the provision of CBFM 2 credit to some women with no fishery connections, plus the use of some credit for fisheries-related activities (boats, water body stocking) will not make the assessment of impact any easier. The failure to address many of the issues raised in OPR 2 leads to an inevitable down-grading of the score.

Output 2

7.1.3 The score allocated was 2/3 compared with 2 in OPR 2. This reflects continuing uncertainty with respect to the sustainability of the institutional arrangements post-project, a concern also raised by the Joint Secretary in the MOFL. The CBOs, NGOs and WorldFish have all requested an extension of the project, largely on the grounds that there is not enough time for the CBOs to bed in and become independent. This was mainly for non-CBFM 1 sites. There was general agreement that the recently formed apex groups in particular would remain relatively untested by the end of project.

7.1.4 In addition, there is a lack of clarity in the CBFM 2 team about the commitments of the PNGOs post-project. The process of transferring the revolving funds on the basis of CBO merit is not well defined, and how this will be monitored (and by whom) is not specified, although it is assumed DoF will undertake supervision. This could have an impact on CBO sustainability, and should be clarified as soon as possible.

Output 3

7.1.5 The score allocated is 2/3 compared with 3 in OPR 2. This improvement reflects the fact that the project has produced some evidence that it has already contributed to influencing stakeholders at community, local and central government levels even in the absence of a communications strategy and the proposed attitudinal surveys. This conclusion was supported by the Joint Secretary, MOFL, who complimented the project on its awareness and media work. Full adoption of the recommendations of OPR 2 and OPR 3 should rapidly lead to a score of 2, and on evidence to date, completion of sound attitudinal surveys could deliver a score of 1 by end of project.

7.2 Overall Progress

7.2.1 The overall Outputs score allocated was an averaged 2.7 (3+2.5+2.5), a decline from OPR 2 (1.5+2+3). The different distribution of points reflects an improved chance of success in influencing key stakeholders, and lingering doubts

over the testing and assessment of the institutional mechanisms and impact. The Purpose score remains at 3. The ability of the project to deliver the Purpose will depend to an extent on the outcome of recommendations for modifying the wording. It is considered that, even with full delivery on all three Outputs, achieving a new and operational policy formulation process is beyond the reach of any single project. Delivery of a new process for influencing policy formulation is, however, within the reach of a programmatic approach bringing together all relevant projects. Linkages and partnerships between projects, and between institutions is thus critical. At this time, the institutional climate is favourable for such an approach, and with the imminent arrival of the PRSP, the timing is also potentially auspicious.

7.3 The Logical Framework

7.3.1 The following changes are proposed for the logical framework, Most are derived from OPR 2, with one addition from OPR 3 (OVI 3.4). The rationale for the change of Purpose is argued in Section 3.

Table 8 Proposed Changes to the Logframe

CURRENT FORMULATION	Proposed Purpose	Proposed OVIs
Purpose A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational	A process <u>for influencing</u> policy formulation in favour of pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational	Unchanged
	Original OVIs	Proposed OVIs
Output 1 Community based fisheries management approaches developed and tested, and their impacts, sustainability and potential for expansion assessed	No change	N/A
Output 2 Co-ordination and administration mechanisms for linking local community management arrangements within larger fishery and wetland systems identified, tested and assessed, and constraints to this identified.	2.4 MOL and local administration (union to district) support to <u>enable and legitimise</u> co-management demonstrated by project month 24 2.6 Potential to scale up improved management approaches to nation assessed and reported on by project month <u>50</u>	2.4 MOL and local administration (union to district) support to co-management demonstrated by project month <u>36</u> . 2.6 Potential to scale up improved management approaches to nation assessed and reported on by project month 60
Output 3 To inform and influence all fisheries policy stakeholders of improved management approaches	An additional OVI suggested (as 3.2). Numbering of OVIs 3.2 – 3.5 therefore to be adjusted to 3.3 – 3.6 3.2 Changes in attitude <u>and behaviour</u> of participant fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by month <u>36</u> 3.3 Changes in attitude <u>and behaviour</u> of other	3. 2 <u>Key policy-related themes identified and an action plan for development of supporting messages in place by month 30 (OPR 2)</u> 3.3 Changes in attitude of participant fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by month 48 3.4 Changes in attitude of other fishers and rural

	fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by month <u>60</u>	communities towards fish conservation by month 48
	3.4 Greater awareness of project findings evident within local and senior DoF, Land Administration and relevant ministries by month 48	3.5 Greater awareness of project findings <u>and attitudinal change</u> evident within local and senior DoF, <u>MOFL</u> , Land Administration and other relevant ministries by month 48

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OPR 3 AND MILESTONES FOR 2005

8.1 In OPR 2 it was noted that OPR 1 was the baseline review that made recommendations covering the whole of the project timeframe and process, and that there should be less need for baseline in subsequent reports. That largely holds true, and the recommendations in OPR 3 have been limited to those elements essential to the future project process. These are largely related to the assessment of impact and sustainability, and to the documentation of project process.

8.2 The recommendations are summarised in Table 1, directly behind the Executive Summary. In addition, the OPR TORs require that a time-bound road map for the next project period be produced with milestones related to key tasks and recommendations. This is given in Table 2.

9. CONCLUSIONS ON DFID POLICY RELEVANCE - FUTURE DIRECTIONS

9.1 The Key Questions

9.1.1 In Section 2, two questions were posed:

- If reducing poverty and closing the gender gap are the primary targets of future DFID programmes, is community based fisheries management an appropriate front line vehicle?
- If advocacy, participatory governance and policy influence are also primary targets of future programmes, can community based approaches to resource management contribute significantly (as well as benefiting)?

9.1.2 The review TORs ask a further question:

- Does CBFM really work?

9.2 Poverty Reduction and the Gender Gap

9.2.1 The conclusions reached in Section 5 with respect to gender, suggest that CBFM is too focused on a sector where women are not traditionally key players to be a front line vehicle for Women and Girls First. Women undoubtedly benefit in terms of general livelihood improvement (e.g. income, and thus access to health care, access to education for children) as a result of the participation of male household members in a fisheries CBO, but they are not generally empowered through CBFM. The exceptions are the Hindu communities where women do traditionally fish and have their own women-led CBOs. Even here, the role of the men on committees is substantial, but there is more of a feeling of partnership and empowerment than in

the majority of non-Hindu CBOs where the mandatory two women on CBO committees are often (but not always) a token gesture.

9.2.2 Women do gain directly from activities of the CBFM 2 when they are recipients of micro-credit, either through the project, or through the presence of the PNGO implementing the project. In theory, this contributes to the generation of AIGAs that will take the pressure off the fishery resources and help the poor through the closed season, although this has yet to be clearly demonstrated. In practice it is arguable whether this requires a CBFM project rather than just a micro-credit programme for the wives of poor fishermen. The benefits of income, human and social capacity building for women would still apply. There is a counter argument to this view - that women should be aware of, and participate in, natural resource management as a right. CBFM 2 may thus offer an entry point for an empowerment process that will take a long time in the present cultural context, but is nonetheless valid.

9.2.3 The access to, and the participatory management and sustainable use of, the resource base remains paramount to the livelihoods of poor communities – this is not in question. Whether the fisheries CBOs essential to resource management will form a key platform in the fight for women’s advancement is doubtful.

9.2.4 The role of CBFM in poverty reduction should be significant. This is not yet proven with a substantial volume of evidence, but the tools and the approach to providing this evidence are in hand, and will emerge from CBFM 2. Given the reliance of very poor people on subsistence fishing, particularly when no source of income is available to them (e.g seasonal labour opportunities), the maintenance of healthy water bodies and fish populations is obviously of importance. The apparent success of the project in generating production increases in open waters should certainly be of direct value to the poor.

9.2.5 There are, however, some caveats to be explored. The operation of closed seasons for improved fisheries production may potentially be damaging to the poor if they are denied access to the fishery for 2-3 months. This may be the case in some river sites operated by CBOs under CBFM 2. There is also the possibility of exclusion by CBOs that have invested in the stocking of closed beels, although in practice it appears that the poor are usually permitted to fish for small fish in shallow water. The other question is that of participation of the poor in the CBO processes and benefits.

9.2.6 The criteria for membership of a CBO vary somewhat from PNGO to PNGO, but all have a mandatory proportion of people somehow classified as poor. In reality, there tends to be a divide, where the poorer, less articulate and less literate members of the CBO are less influential in the determination of policy and activities, although their share should be protected and equal. It is inevitable that elites will, and should, play a role in the effective operation of the CBOs (e.g. they can spare the time), but the degree of capture and the equity of benefit distribution when the PNGOs withdraw, will require monitoring.

9.2.7 A further issue is equity of access to membership of the CBO after the initial, NGO-guided set-up period. All members save a fixed amount each month into the CBO bank account, and in some cases may also be obliged to purchase a share. As the sum in the bank account increases through savings and revenue from the fishing, the sum required to join and gain an equal share rises. In one beel the sum required to join would now be Tk 3,000 – 4,000, effectively placing new membership beyond the poor. **RECOMMENDATION 18** : This issue has not been highlighted in previous OPRs, but requires specific attention. It is proposed that the CBFM 2 team ask the

PNGOs to prepare a brief summary of the situation with respect to constraints to the poor joining CBOs after the initial set-up year. On the basis of this picture the team can then consider what strategies might be adopted to remove any barriers. There is, of course, a fundamental issue here, which is that of just how many people a water body (and thus a CBO) can support, and whether CBO entry should be a finite process.

9.3 Participatory Governance and Policy Influence

9.3.1 It is in the area of participatory governance, advocacy and influence that the CBFM approach should score highest in terms of DFIDB priorities. The entry point is fisheries management, but the thrust of the project has included:

- Pro-poor advocacy at all levels of government
- Pro-poor policy influence
- Empowerment of communities, and in some cases women, through social mobilisation and development of human capital
- Creation of intra- and inter- community linkages
- Creation of community - local government linkages
- Creation of awareness of rights and opportunities

9.3.2 The formation of equitable institutional arrangements at community level has, in principle, produced a power base from which authority, and local power relations can be tackled. The election processes within groups, the transparency of accounting and benefit sharing systems and the process of saving through a CBO managed bank account are, on the face of it, an excellent grounding for understanding, and demanding, process transparency at local government level. The registration of the CBOs, the formation of clusters of CBOs, and in some cases of apex bodies, further adds to weight in the local power relations web. Internally, some CBOs are considering establishing a safety net fund to support members during periods of particular vulnerability, and some groups are already providing a micro-credit service for members. Independence inevitably brings confidence and increases the likelihood of knowing and exercising rights.

9.3.3 In addition, the confidence generated through a unified organisation has led in some areas, to fishermen going directly to the key point of government for solutions to their problems (e.g. UFO, or NBO), a behaviour apparently rare in the past. The issue of bauth, or force fishing is a popular example of the CBFM 2 team. This is a traditional practice where a group of people decide to announce a bauth which involves many (thousands) people descending on a chosen water body and fishing it to virtual zero resource level. This practice is obviously contrary to the effort put into resource conservation by the CBOs. When this threat occurred at Beel Boro, the CBO contacted the NGO which in turn contacted local government. Local government brought in the police and the NGO called in its folk art performers and helped them develop an anti-bauth awareness programme. Police, folk troupe and fisheries officers then descended on the town concerned and between them persuaded the bauth instigators to cancel the event.

9.3.4 This is a well-known story, usually told to demonstrate the strength of the CBFM arrangements. It is repeated here, because it also demonstrates the fragility of the system. The communities turned first to the NGO, not to local government. The CBO alone may have been unable to muster the courage or the influence to get beyond the UFO, and would perhaps have stopped short of approaching the police. The message to the would-be fishers was delivered by a folk troupe organised by the

NGO. Although the performers are people from the communities, it is asking a lot to believe that such a system can be maintained post-project (i.e. post-NGO).

9.3.5 Nevertheless, there are many instances of Union and Upazilla officers providing help to the CBOs and, given time, the power base of the CBFM may well raise to a level where it can contribute to pressure for improved governance. The key word is, however, “**contribute**”. CBFM needs to be part of a far wider programme aimed at bringing community organisations to bear on the question of improved, transparent, and decentralised local government. Linkages with, for example, the non-sectoral demand side projects already supported by DFID under the CAP participatory governance pillar (e.g. Nijera Kori and Manusher Jonno), would offer an opportunity to bring a natural resource base project alongside the mainstream governance agenda. Such linkages would be complemented and amplified through the existing cooperation between CBFM 2, FFP, MACH and other projects, notably those of LGD and the UNDP/FAO Coastal Environment Project in Coxes Bazaar.

9.3.6 It is a similar case with policy influence. CBFM 2 has demonstrated that it can contribute to changing the views of senior government staff to the point where the Planning Commission states that CBFM is the “only way forward for Bangladesh”. This was not achieved by CBFM 2 alone, but by a consortium of like-minded project staff that rather fortuitously formed a programmatic approach to policy influence. The successes with tax waivers on project sites is another, more tangible, example of influence, albeit open to suggestions of government subsidy.

9.3.7 In short, if it proves to be sustainable in the absence of both project and NGOs (and this is, as yet, a very big if), CBFM as currently designed could create a win-win situation for communities under the umbrella of a programmatic governance-focused approach to poverty elimination in Bangladesh.

9.4 CBFM –Does it Really Work?

9.4.1 The answer has to be conditional. At the present time, with project and PNGO support, CBFM certainly appears to be working in various ways. Fish production has increased, and there is preliminary evidence that beneficiaries’ have derived more livelihood benefits than comparable non-beneficiaries (control samples) during the project period. There are the usual caveats that there is background economic growth anyway, and it has been an unusually good year for fish....but the fact remains that CBOs appear very positive, and many have substantial sums in their bank account.

9.4.2 The caveat that matters is the one raised by the Joint Secretary in the MOFL. Is it really sustainable in the absence of external support? The simple answer is that we still do not know after 8 years of CBFM 1 sites and three years of CBFM 2. This is largely due to the high degree of reliance on NGOs, and the fact that no CBO has, as yet, been weaned off PNGO support. Recommendation 8 was that an exit strategy for CBFM 1 sites be finalised immediately, and executed as soon as possible in 2005. This will be of immense value in answering the question posed, and in anticipating the problem-specific support and process needed by the majority of sites under CBFM 2 when they also graduate. The PNGOs will also learn a great deal about exit strategies.

9.4.3 A further clue in answering the question does it work, might be gained from looking at the fate of CBFM 1 CBOs during the period (2 years) between the end of phase 1 and the beginning of Phase 2. In the case of Rajdhala Beel, the CBO lost the right of access to the water body to an influential person, and regained it in CBFM

2 only on payment of the two year lease period between phases. In short, the CBO could not hold onto their water body after five years of support.

9.4.4 The issue of elite capture will, in fact, feature strongly in answering does it work? The project does not appear to have documented in detail how problems with elites have been solved under the project. The key issue is whether the group formation, awareness training, and other additions to human and social capital can help to resist the attentions of the powerful. The project should, as part of the process documentation, pay particular attention to assembling evidence on this issues (See Recommendation 1, page 20)

9.4.5 The LGED is already operating a large-scale community based resource management project in Sunamgonj with substantial support from GoB as well as IFAD. The approach is based on multi-departmental cooperation rather than NGOs, and may offer a more holistic focal point for the future of CBFM than the DoF alone. This power base may be able to support the kind of programmatic approach to using community based management as a vehicle for improved governance and poverty reduction implied in this report.

ANNEX 1

Annual or Output to Purpose Review (OPR)

Part A - Project Data

Project Short Title	Community-Based Fisheries Management – Phase II		
Benefiting Country / Region	Bangladesh	MIS code	139 – 504 – CE - 001
Current Project Officer Name	Duncan King	Approved Commitment	£ 5.2 million
Actual Start Date (dd/mm/yyyy)	01/09/01	Spend To Date	To 31/10/04 US \$ 3,906,160
Planned End Date (dd/mm/yyyy)	30/09/06	Date of Review	01/12/04 – 15/12/04

Part B - Recommendations

Summary of Recommendations	Responsibility
1. Details are summarised with full attribution in Table 1 of the OPR report.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

Part C – Project Scoring Assessment

Goal Statement	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)
<p>Improved inland fisheries management policy and policy process adopted by the GoB and NGOs resulting in more sustainable, equitable and participatory management of resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy document reflecting the findings of the research approved by government and operational by the end of the project. • Revised policy instruments for the implementation of the new policy in place within a year of project end. • All new projects concerned with inland fisheries resource management approved after the project end reflect the findings of the research. • More community wetland and fishery management organisations, and NGOs adopting findings of the project and active in supporting such organisations. • GoB and NGOs collaborate in other projects adopting improved strategies and institutional arrangements.

Purpose Statement	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) *	Progress	Recommendations/Comments
<p>A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational.</p> <p>Proposed change to:</p> <p><i>A process for influencing policy formulation in favour of pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on a more transparent policy formulation process. • Significant changes in the policy stakeholder matrix to be more participatory and pro-poor. • Before the project end wide sharing of evidence, strong links and policy dialogue among and between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DoF projects, particularly with FFP - Other agencies, departments, ministries and donors and their projects - NGOs - Community based organisations (focused on fisheries and wetlands) 	<p>The project has contributed substantially to recent attitudinal changes in government, and looks set to improve this with the arrival of hard evidence-based recommendations .</p>	<p>The Purpose as originally framed is unrealistic for a single project. What has already been achieved has resulted from a de facto programmatic approach from a group of DFID, Danida and USAID projects cooperating.</p> <p>A revised wording for the Purpose is recommended.</p>

Purpose to Goal
There are recent changes in the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, Department of Fisheries, and in the Planning Commission that give some indications of a favourable policy environment evolving, but will depend on the final shape and implementation of the new PRSP

Project Purpose Rating - General / Overall progress assessment *	3 but with potential for 2
Justification *	If the revised formulation of the Purpose proposed in this review is accepted, then the chance of a 2 rating with reasonable attribution is not out of reach. The original Purpose was unrealistic for a single project. What has already been achieved has resulted from a de facto programmatic approach from a group of DFID, Danida and USAID projects cooperating

State how far the project has helped to deliver the objectives of the Country Assistance Plan (where appropriate)
To date, the CBOs formed under the project have begun a process directly relevant to the empowerment of communities and the development of participatory governance. Clear benefits to communities have been demonstrated, but the full impact on poverty and women has yet to be assessed.

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
1. Community based fisheries management approaches developed and tested, and their impacts, sustainability and potential for expansion assessed.	<p>1.1 At least five approaches to CBFM developed for use in 3 different types of water-bodies by project month 12</p> <p><i>Modification to three approaches was noted in OPR 2. These are documented in the Annual Report.</i></p> <p>1.2 Fisher groups representing about 30,000 households in over 65 water bodies established by project month 18</p>	<p>Three approaches and 8 models under test. Approaches: fisher-led, community led and women-led management. Five types of water body: small beel, open beel, closed beel, river, flood plain.</p> <p>Target number of water bodies exceeded (120). 5 new water bodies at Dhampara included. 24,705 beneficiaries of whom 16,580 fish for income on full time basis and are</p>	<p>There is a danger that impact assessment will focus only on actual benefits and will not address the relative merits of the various approaches and methods. It will be important during month 48 impact assessment survey analysis to ensure that key pros and cons are identified in line with the site circumstances</p> <p>As stated in OPR 2 the project must focus on quality not quantity, and must ensure that it is possible to distinguish between impacts of CBFM 1 and CBFM 2</p>	3

	<p><i>Target hh reduced to 22,000 in OPR 1</i></p> <p>1.3 Appropriate management bodies under these approaches established in 50% of project sites by project month 12 and 100% by project month 24</p> <p>1.4 Fishers and their management bodies introduce improved fishery and wetland management practices in 50% of project sites by project month 24 and 80% by project month 36</p> <p>1.5 Changes in social, economic and fishery indicators for all stakeholders including poor and women in all project and control areas assessed by project months 24 and 54</p>	<p>poor. 8,125 part time and subsistence fishers. Number of beneficiaries increased from 11,747 at last OPR</p> <p>The original target of CBOs for 65 water bodies has already been exceeded. Management committees formed in 104 of 120 water bodies (87%).</p> <p>Fisheries management actions have been initiated in about 80% of sites. There was unanimity at the few sites visited that fish production has increased since management started. 114 fish sanctuaries, Awareness raising and motivation on-going at remaining 20% of sites</p> <p>In OPR 1 it was recommended that the first assessment should be delayed until PM 36. OPR 2 recognised that this may not provide the specific answers needed and suggested a more targeted case studies instead, notably:</p> <p>Gender impact Micro-credit Assessment of AIGAs Study of macro-economic trade-offs in CBFM</p>	<p>Additionally, it is vital that benefits to women and to the poor are disaggregated. This has greater priority than numbers at this stage</p> <p>Target of 100% likely to be achieved and in a larger number of water bodies than planned. The impact of the (new) Shisuk approach to management will require careful specific evaluation</p> <p>Assessment of this will involve the numbers of sites with sanctuaries, closed seasons, site restoration, species re- introductions and gear restrictions. It will be essential during impact assessment to establish the impact of these measures on the poor, as well as on the fishery production</p> <p>In line with the case study suggestions, it was recommended that a gender focal point be established in CBFM 2, and also in the PNGOs. This has not been done as yet, although CNRS has produced a one-year gender action plan. Immediate action is recommended to recruit a gender specialist and coordinate the NGO response to the focal point idea</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Linkage between fisheries and social data sets</p> <p>Of these only a micro-credit study has been attempted, although this includes consideration of some AIGA and gender. Two papers have been produced attempting to better link fisheries and poverty issues.</p> <p>Baseline surveys completed except for new sites. Monitoring of consumption and income on-going with 17 control sites. Baseline indicators established.</p> <p>The household survey forms have been modified by WORLD FISH to permit disaggregation of benefits for women and the poor. Will be used as of 2005</p> <p>OPR 2 suggested that the month 54 assessment be brought forward to month 48</p> <p>A Training Needs Assessment has been produced by CNRS and other</p>	<p>The macro-economic trade-off paper was recommended in OPR 1 and 2. A new senior staff member is taking this on, but has a long way to go. This is an essential part of the policy influencing strategy and should be given priority</p> <p>More comprehensive and wide reaching assessment of gender and impact AIGA impact is required. The November micro-credit report was executed internally. Consideration should be given to use of outside expertise for such work to free the staff for their data collection and analysis duties</p> <p>The delay in introducing new data collection forms means that gender analysis at the hh benefit level may be limited. It will be important to introduce the amended system urgently</p> <p>Given the issues of impact assessment raised in this review it is strongly advised that a strategy for the proposed PM 48 impact assessment survey be developed immediately, and that external specialist expertise be</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>1.6 Institutional sustainability of approaches assessed by project month 54, with follow up post project assessment 2 years after end of project</p>	<p>been produced by CNRS and other NGOs are due to complete by January 2005</p> <p>MRAG has put a proposal to WORLD FISH regarding analysis of the impact of CBFM on fish production, resource sustainability and fishers well-being. This is under consideration,</p> <p>OPR 2 emphasised the need for process documentation and the development of an assessment tool for clusters. An institutional survey was carried out in 2003 and will be repeated in 2005</p>	<p>engaged to guide this process</p> <p>Given that some doubts remain about the compartmentalisation of the social and scientific components, and about the direct uptake of research results by communities this should be given a high priority</p> <p>The sustainability of the CBOs and their cluster organisations is key, and a clear assessment process must be in place for the OPM 48 impact survey. In the meantime it would add weight to Output 3 if the current process documentation by NGOs were strengthened and collated as part of the Communications Strategy</p>	
<p>2. Co-ordination and administration mechanisms for linking local community management arrangements within larger fishery and wetland systems identified, tested and assessed, and constraints to this identified.</p>	<p>2.1 Potential link mechanisms designed based on discussions with participants, local government and NGOs by project month 12</p>	<p>13 Cluster arrangements have been established by the NGOs in consultation with WORLD FISH and DoF</p>	<p>The establishment of a wide range of clusters plus some apex organisations permits a realistic attempt at assessing effectiveness; it will be difficult to assess sustainability of the top level of the tier within the project timeframe.</p>	<p>2/ 3</p>

	<p>2.2 Management institutions established to cover at least 6 wider eco-systems (both fishery focus, and whole wetland/floodplain focus) by project month 24.</p> <p>2.3 Mechanisms to improve co-ordination and conflict resolution between organisations and among fishery stakeholders developed and tested by project month 36.</p> <p>2.4 MOL and local administration (union to district) support to enable and legitimise co-management demonstrated by project month 24.</p> <p><i>Suggest amendment to: MOL and local administration (union to district) support to co-management demonstrated by project month <u>36</u></i></p> <p>2.5 Appropriate changes in fishery administration and legal framework recommended based on pilot experience and supporting</p>	<p>The cluster committees set up at all 13 sites covering 80 water bodies including the former BWDB sites at Dhampara. Apex committees have been formed at some sites (4 for CNRS) but these are not yet registered</p> <p>Apex bodies established at some sites (4 for CNRS) but not yet registered. Clusters claim a demand led conflict resolution function. Networking workshops completed for three tiers, and a national workshop planned</p> <p>The operation of cluster committees has provided examples of the potential for conflict resolution between resource users (e.g. river sites). Involvement of UP and UFO offices is variable in effectiveness, and depends much on individuals</p> <p>The problem of securing access to small river sites falling under the MoYS has still not been resolved. The Steering Committee has made a</p>	<p>There has been some marked success in use of institutional arrangements to address community constraints (e.g. bauth fishing), but the process of documenting and collating the evidence is not yet effective</p> <p>It should be clearly understood by CBOs that rivers are open access under current law, and attempts to exclude or control fishers by the Project CBOs could be construed as illegal. However, the DoF regards imposition of a closed season as provided under current fisheries regulations, and supports the CBOs in this respect. The river sites are nevertheless the least secure, and urgent action is required via the Steering Committee</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

	<p>studies by project month 54</p> <p>2.6 Potential to scale up improved management approaches to nation assessed and reported on by project month 50</p>	<p>decision to press for a solution. The exemption from 15% VAT is in place and proposed elimination of the 3% tax is in hand. It is proposed to amend the 1950 Fish Act to formally recognise sanctuaries</p> <p>No specific progress at this time, but various project activities offer scope for promotion of adoption</p>	<p>Scaling-up is viewed as feasible by some, but the debate always returns to the question of finance and HR capacity. How will any executive body fund scale-up. It is recommended that efforts be made to influence the Open Water Strategy as a policy document of GoB</p>	
<p>3. To inform and influence all fisheries policy stakeholders of improved management approaches</p> <p><i>OPR 2 Proposed new OVI: Key policy- related themes identified and an action plan for development and targeting of supporting messages in place by month 30</i></p>	<p>3.1 Policy formulation study completed by project month 12 and policy stakeholder matrix revised to form baseline.</p>	<p>It was proposed in OPR 2 that the communications strategy should yield an action plan for influencing the various policy stakeholders. This has not been addressed, nor has it been possible to appoint a suitable full or part time communications specialist</p>	<p>The project has yet to get to grips with this Output despite accumulating a range of worthy policy-relevant achievements. A consultant should be appointed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define clearly who we are trying to influence • Define clearly what we are trying to convince them of • Collate and develop the existing evidence of policy-relevant outcomes • Develop an action plan building on this exercise <p>This is a matter for urgency</p>	2/ 3

	<p>3.2 Changes in attitudes and behaviour of participant fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by project month 36.</p> <p><i>Suggest remove behaviour and move to month 48</i></p> <p>3.3 Changes in attitudes and behaviour of other fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by project month 60</p> <p><i>Suggest remove behaviour and move to month 48</i></p> <p>3.4 Greater awareness of project findings evident within local and senior DoF, Land Administration, and relevant ministries by project month 48.</p> <p>3.5 Greater awareness of NGOs including non-project NGOs of project findings and improved fishery management issues by project month 48.</p>	<p>There appears to be increasing anecdotal evidence of change in attitude in some CBOs as a result of the apparent gains in production they attribute to the excavation work, the sanctuaries and the closed seasons. An attitudinal survey is planned for 2005</p> <p>Changes in the wider community should happen in parallel in open waters where conservation measures benefit everybody. This may not be so easy in closed beels. A survey is planned for 2005</p> <p>The degree of cooperation achieved at some sites, and the favourable decisions taken by the Steering Group, suggest that progress has been made here. The wide range of feedback and networking workshops have probably contributed to this process, but it is the practical, tangible actions that are most persuasive (e.g. bauth fishing suppression and the donation of land for sanctuaries by CBO members). The work at the grass roots level remains the focus (folk talent approach and media) but the project is still failing to target decisions makers in a cohesive manner</p>	<p>The reality is that success talks. If the increases in production claimed at open water sites are sustained and proven, then there will be scope for attitudinal change. It is thus important to ensure that success stories are accurately and widely disseminated and explained</p> <p>The successful creation of awareness at all stakeholder levels depends to a large extent on the formulation and implementation of an action plan for a communications strategy</p> <p>These OVIs are logically related to OVI 1.6</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

Project Outputs Rating - General / Overall progress assessment *	2.8 (3+2.5+2.5)
Justification *	
<p>The progress of the project, based largely on the field activity of the NGOs, remains good. However, the score for Output 1 has slipped consistently from 1 to 1/2 to 3 over the three reviews. This results from the inability of the project to provide the clear evidence required to substantiate the gains claimed. The data are collected, but they are not being used effectively. Although the poor and women feature small in the Outputs and OVIs it is important that the project impact on these groups is well understood, and this is in doubt. There is also the question of whether there will be sufficient time under the project for the sustainability of the cluster and apex bodies to be fully tested (Output 2). . Finally, there may be some difficulty in disaggregating the impact of CBFM 2 from (a) the general development in Bangladesh as a whole and (b) the activities of other NGOs and projects. If the survey system can address these issues, and the communications strategy becomes a reality, then the project may well largely achieve its Purpose. This requires immediate action</p>	
Purpose Attribution *	
<p>In the previous OPR it was noted that attribution would be difficult. However, if the proposed amendment to the Purpose is accepted this will become more achievable. In addition, there is now clear evidence (largely verbal) from senior government staff that influence has already been exerted in favour of pro-poor management, and CBFM 2 has contributed to that progress. Success is, however, very much dependent on implementation of the recommended communication strategy, and execution of attitudinal studies.</p>	

Part D – Risk Management

The risk level for the project should be reassessed during Annual / Output-to-Purpose Reviews.

Risk Category*	
New risks identified	
The current wording of the Purpose was always high risk, and puts this objective out of reach of the CBFM 2 project as a single entity. However, the combined influence of a range of projects (e.g. MACH, FFP, FTEP2, CBFM2) may, together with GoB efforts over the last 20 years or more, contribute to delivery of the required policy process. The greatest risks are that (i) any benefits to the poor will be balanced (to some extent) by negative impacts (ii) the institutional arrangements will not be sustainable post-project (iii) that CBFM may not work effectively, in the Bangladesh context	
Action being taken to monitor / manage risks	
The OPR process is consistently pressing for process documentation that will permit identification of progress, or loss of ground, in the context of the key risks. Awareness generation and creation of a strategy for influencing policy makers are key elements of risk management	
Recommended changes to plans or management strategies in respect of project associated risks	
The recommendations of OPR 2 remain valid.	
Does the Logframe Require Revision?	
The Purpose should be amended to reflect a more programmatic approach to the stated objective. Some revised OVIs are suggested.	
Do the PIMS Markers Require Revision? [Mandatory for projects approved prior to 01/04/1998]	
No	
Method of Scoring – state the team composition, the methods used to conduct the review, how the scoring was agreed upon, and whether partners and stakeholders were involved. *	
B Blake: Team Leader – Institutional/ sustainable livelihoods specialist with fisheries background (expatriate); Kazi Ali Toufique: Economist (Local) with specific expertise in flood plain fisheries; Anwar Zahid: Institutional specialist (local) with local government and cooperatives experience; Zahirul Islam: FFP fisheries specialist with direct experience of CBFM, present for cross-learning opportunity; Esha Husain: RLEP staff focusing on communication strategy. The Team Leader has participated in all three reviews. The review was based on site visits and CBO discussions, interviews with PNGOs, Project staff, local and central government staff. Conclusions	

were also exchanged and debated with the Fourth Fisheries Project. Scoring was based on progress against the scores allocated on the second OPR and on the criteria provided for mark allocation. The project stakeholders in CBFM 2 and WorldFish Centre were involved, plus the representative of FFP.

Part E – Lessons Learned

You can no longer input general lessons learned. You need to specify at least one of the categories of lessons learned in sections 1,2 and 3 below.

Lessons learned, and suggested dissemination.*	
1. Working with Partners	<p>The project is implemented by WorldFish Centre which works through 13 Partner NGOs. The NGOs in turn work with 120 CBOs. A further key partnership is that developed between the project and the Department of Fisheries. These partnerships have taken three years to mature and the issues and processes are informative. The key lessons are obvious: (a) without trust and transparency partnerships are not effective (b) this trust can only be built where the objectives and responsibilities of the partnership are clearly defined at the outset and gains and credit are shared (c) even with these circumstances it will still be necessary to carefully monitor the vested interests of the different partners since there will always be differences of emphasis.</p> <p>There is a major unanswered question with respect to NGOs. In OPR 2 some emphasis was placed on whether the larger PNGOs were internalising key elements of CBFM 2 (e.g. partnership with government, mainstreaming gender) into their own strategies and missions. There is, as yet, little evidence that these NGOs are acting as anything other than consulting companies in the project context (albeit very committed).</p> <p>The role of government and NGO is in fact crucial to post-project sustainability. The NGOs alone lack the mandate, and the DoF lacks the capacity, to follow-up and support CBFM. Is the commitment to partnership there? There is evidence of attitudinal shift on both sides, but the battle is far from won. Partnerships are not an option, but a practical necessity.</p>

	<p>Another crucial partnership, is that between the CBFM beneficiaries and their local government institutions . The project has provided frequent examples of cooperation of Union Parishad Chairs and even Upazilla Nirbahi Officers, in defending the interests of the CBOs. However, these forms of partnership are inevitably dependent on individuals and cannot be considered as institutionalised under CBFM 2. One clear lesson is perhaps that, as with the MACH project, local government ought to be included as formal partners in the project design and implementation process, rather than as incidental supporters. It is interesting that donor supported CBFM in Cambodia has also largely ignored the Commune Councils as partners – a lesson now being learned the hard way.</p> <p>Partnership between projects has become a feature of CBFM2, rather than being a designed-in element. The cooperation with MACH, Danida and FFP was limited in the project early years, and is only now being addressed. The programmatic approach to convincing government on certain key issues has been fortuitous, although recently effective. The fact remains that, after 8 years of CBFM 2 and four years of FFP, the rhetoric of government has recently shifted in favour of CBFM as policy. What remains is to ensure that this apparent change is followed-up by promotion of pro-poor CBFM into the fabric of national development and poverty reduction strategy. This will involve partnership between projects, between NGOs and government, and between communities and their representatives and service providers</p> <p>Finally, the use of an international body (ICLARM/WorldFish) as an implementing agency has involved a form of partnership between donor and agency, and between agency and GoB. There has been little to suggest any conflict of interest between the mission of the agency and that of DFIDB or GoB. On the other hand, there has been little evidence of the project benefiting from the global experience and added value that ICLARM should offer. It seems likely that this will now change under the new WorldFish project management structure.</p>
2. Best Practice / Innovation	<p>It is proposed that this can be better addressed in the next OPR, but in the meantime, the strong project emphasis on networking has created very good connectivity between the NGOs and between NGO and DoF. A major achievement in Bangladesh. This networking has been carefully orchestrated and tiered, starting at the local level and expanding to areas, then regions, and finally to the central level. The sharing of experience between CBOs was particularly valuable, as was the bringing together of CBOs, NGOs and DoF staff in a forum where views could be frankly</p>

	expressed. The early meetings with DoF tended to be heated and defensive, but as confidence and mutuality of purpose emerged debate has become more constructive. Perhaps the key question is whether such networking will survive the end of project?
3. Project / Programme Management	The combination, within one post, of the key tasks of manager/administrator on the one hand, and chief technical expert on the other, is not appropriate in complex, data rich projects. Devolvement of responsibilities under a clear office hierarchy is more effective. The use of an international organisation as implementing agency has benefits in terms of institutional systems and efficiency, but also constrains control of project process in terms of human resource allocation.

Key Issues / Points of information

If appropriate, please comment on the effectiveness of the institutional relationships involved with the project (eg comment on processes and how relationships have evolved)

What key documentary evidence is available to support the conclusions of this report? List any supporting documents annexed to this report.

Notes for completion

- Where ratings are required please consider the following:
 - 1. = Likely to be **completely** achieved. The outputs /purpose are well on the way to completion (or completed)

2. = Likely to be **largely** achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs have been achieved, particularly the most important ones.

3. = Likely to be **partly** achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.

4. = Only likely to be achieved **to a very limited extent**. Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.

5. = **Unlikely** to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose

X. = Too early to judge. It is impossible to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or purpose. This should be used sparingly.

ANNEX 2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Output To Purpose Review

(Third Review)

1. Project Title

Community-Based Fisheries Management Project-Phase 2 (2001 to 2006)

2. Background

Bangladesh's four million hectares of inland water supports rich and complex fisheries which provide an income for some 1.5 million full time and 11 million part time fishers, and are directly exploited by about 80% of rural households who catch fish for food. Fish are the main source of animal protein in Bangladesh. There is considerable evidence that increasing resource competition is leading to unsustainable utilisation, declining catches and increasing conflict. Existing institutional arrangements for inland fisheries do not promote sustainable exploitation or equitable access by poor fishers.

There is growing evidence from studies worldwide that community-based fisheries management (CBFM) can empower communities to enforce responsible management practices that can lead to sustainable harvests and fair access. The community-based fisheries management pilot project¹² has developed several models of Government-NGO-fisher management partnerships within the Bangladesh context. A partnership of DoF and NGOs, with overall support and co-ordination from WorldFish Center, initiated user-community participation in management of 19 rivers and beels by establishing waterbody management committees which either represent only fishers holding rights to a fishery, or all stakeholders in a common resource. These committees have improved local level decision-making, achieved greater compliance with the fishery management rules they adopt, and in some locations have started to make fisheries more sustainable and more productive by establishing local fish sanctuaries or enhancing fish stocks. The approach has linked this with NGO supported training and credit.

This project will continue and expand on the activities started by CBFM-1 in terms of both number and variety of wetlands and fisheries. This is necessary to test CBFM approaches in the range of fisheries and wetlands found in Bangladesh and to develop a sufficient body of evidence that can support arguments for those approaches found to be successful. The project will expand previous knowledge within Bangladesh and beyond, initiate and develop innovative co-management arrangements in a range of diverse habitats, assess the potential for sustainability and equity, understand the policy processes which operate within the sector, and (by engaging in wide-ranging partnerships) inform and influence policy and practice based on demonstrated and well documented effectiveness of improved management options at the local level, and on pilot work and assessments of how these arrangements could be scaled up.

The sustainability of models already developed is not yet demonstrated. However, there is a growing consensus that co-management (CBFM supported by government) offers the best chance of ensuring more sustainable fishing levels and long term access for the rural poor to capture fishery resources, given limited government resources and competing demands to exploit fisheries.

¹² The first phase of Community Based Fisheries Management (CBFM-1) was funded by the Ford Foundation and implemented in Bangladesh during 1995-1999 through the Government, non-government organisations and WorldFish Center.

This is a five-year project supported by Department for International Development and being implemented by WorldFish Center through a partnership between DoF, WorldFish Center, and 8 NGOs. The over-arching aim of the project is to influence GoB policy¹³ and practice by determining the longer-term benefits of community and co-management arrangements in diverse fisheries in terms of sustained production and in terms of poverty alleviation. The project also has a specific output addressing issues of policy advocacy and the purpose of the project is to generate a policy dialogue and agree a process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management. This supports the goal to 'sustainably improve the livelihoods of poor people dependent on aquatic resources through the adoption of improved inland fisheries management policy and policy process resulting in more sustainable, equitable and participatory management of these resources'.

The last OPR was from 4th to 16th October 2003 where it was stated in the report summary that, "*Significant progress has been made since OPR 1 and the project continues to demonstrate its value in understanding the opportunities that CBFM offers to poor and vulnerable people. On present course the project is likely to offer a depth of insight into CBFM which is rare in global terms. The key question remains – does it really work?*" This review will assess whether the project remains on course to answer this fundamental question.

3. Overall objectives

The overall objective of the consultancy is to assess:

- Assess progress towards the achievement of the project Goal and Purpose as set out in project logical framework. It will also review the progress against Outputs, consider the validity of these Outputs as currently specified, the need for any modifications and that the assumptions (and risks) are still valid using DFID's Office Instructions as a guideline (OI Vol II: G 1);
- Evaluate the validity of the existing approaches and strategies being used to contribute to poverty alleviation and in informing and influencing policy for the benefit of the poor and develop recommendations to enable the project to more effectively achieve this.

4. Methodology

The consultancy is seen as working very closely with the WorldFish Center project leader and staff. The consultancy will offer guidance and advise on strategy, focus on the lesson learning that has taken place, and prepare a framework establishing a clear timebound process (through achieving key milestones) of following-up on key issues that has the agreement of the key stakeholders to take this forward. This framework will be the basis for future monitoring and assessing progress against the milestones that were agreed during the mission.

The OPR Mission will receive an initial briefing from WorldFish Center/DFID/RLEP and other stakeholders with regard to the TORs for this mission to ensure a common understanding and perspective. WorldFish Center will be responsible for the operational aspects of the review and the itinerary will be finalised on arrival in Bangladesh.

¹³ The GoB has just produced a National Strategy for Poverty Reduction and Economic Growth (Interim-Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper). Although the project will be informing/influencing sectoral policies (National Fishery Policy) the team should ensure that these are aligned with the, and support, the I-PRSP

The team will undertake meetings and field visits as required to undertake their TORs and meet with project partners (including DoF/MoFL), project beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. The team members will, in addition to conducting the review, participate fully in writing the draft report.

The team will be composed of one expatriate international consultant and three local consultants.

The consultant team leader will be expected to collaborate with team leader from the FFP review team to cross-learn issues relating especially to Community co-management of water bodies (in FFP it is known as the Open Water Component - OWC).

The members of the Mission team are listed below with specific areas of focus during the mission:

1. Barry Blake (Team Leader) - Community based fisheries management approaches, policy processes and institutional environment.
2. Anwar Zahid – Institutional reform, governance and policy processes
3. Kazi Ali Toufique – Social development, livelihood impact and gender issues
4. Esha Husain – Communications development (one week only)

Additional DoF/MoFL, IFAD, WorldFish Center and DFIDB staff will attend key meetings and may join the review team for some or all of the fieldwork.

These additional DFID team members include:

- Martin Leach, DFIDB Programme Manager
- Duncan King, DFIDB Livelihoods Programme Adviser
- Amita Dey, DFIDB Social Development Adviser
- Ailsa Gaunt, Programme Support Officer

Ms Patricia Almada Villela and Dr Hans Middendorp will represent IFAD on the review team. Their TORs provided by IFAD, Rome are attached as Appendix 1. Ms Villela will review the IFAD grant component of CBFM2 located in Sunamganj and also make valuable contributions to the review discussions. Dr Middendorp will join the team near the end of the review to mainly contribute to the cross-learning session on 14th December which have added value as he will have just completed a similar mission in Vietnam.

So that both CBFM2 and FFP may learn from one another a representative from each project will join the other review team (FFP World Bank led review is going on at the same time). The National Consultant Mr Zahirul Islam will join the CBFM2 review team from FFP.

5. Scope of work

Specifically, the team will assess progress against the outputs as well as the progress towards achieving the purpose and goal. The team will review progress against the specific recommendations of the last OPR and will also review key project documentation (see briefing material), work with other members of the review team, WorldFish Center, DoF/MoFL, national consultants and liaise with other key agencies, in particular officials from other line Ministries and Departments (Land, Water, Local Government).

The team should also be aware of, and take into account, the outputs from the Fisheries Future Sector Review, changing focus within the donor community with regard to options for community-based and open-water fisheries in Bangladesh and

work being undertaken through other Donors (Dutch, DANIDA, USAID (e.g. MACH), IFAD) NGOs and DoF (particularly FFP). Similarly, the team should consider how the project may reorient itself within the existing framework towards contributing to the achievement of the DFID CAP and GoB PRSP.

The “does it really work?” question raised in the last OPR is increasingly being asked within DFIDB. The dynamics within DFIDB has changed significantly with a clear trend towards high spend, large scale and long lasting impact programmes incurring low transaction costs. Will this project after 10 years of CBFM 1 & 2 achieve real and lasting impact in sustainable community fishery management that benefits poor people; does it have the potential for scale up? And, has it successfully influenced CBFM approaches undertaken by major stakeholders, most importantly GoB? If not, project restructuring may be necessary and should be considered by the review team.

The tasks listed below guide the review team to the most important issues and critical challenges which the project is known to be facing at this time.

Institutional arrangements and policy environment

The project faces many institutional barriers to implementing effective CBM practices within the very complex array of stakeholder interests and regulatory framework. Critical issues faced by the project relate to developing an effective CBFM process approach that can influence future water body management policy and how it tackles existing legal and administrative barriers constraining the project led development of these processes.

Developing the ‘approach’¹⁴

1. Consider whether project information is sufficiently well tested, proven and appropriately evidenced to be incorporated into a policy influencing agenda. Is there a need to adjust targets and OVIs for the policy influencing process? Comment on the overall existing action plan for policy influencing. Is developing the approach and influencing policy realistic within the five year timeframe?
2. What progress has the project made towards assessing impact, sustainability and potential expansion of the approach? Even though scaling up may not be possible within the project period what plans are being considered to design a scaling up initiative.
3. The development of coordination mechanisms and ‘clusters’ for co-management arrangements may be the key for scaling-up effective CBFM. From available project documentation what lessons can be drawn thus far and how might the process to develop ‘networked clusters’ be improved?
4. To what extent has the institutional analysis of roles and responsibilities between the different tiers of linked institutions improved the implementation of ‘management institutions’ for clusters of water bodies and how has it contributed towards conflict resolution mechanisms.
5. Is the project investing an appropriate amount of time and resources to learning about policy influencing and like management approaches from other projects (e.g. FFP and MACH)? How are the three projects and NGOs (also involved in the other projects) linking to cross-learn and co-develop

¹⁴ Approach does not relate to a *blueprint* approach but defines effective broad CBM processes and practices in certain WB environments (physical parameters, stakeholder dynamics & capacity, political and legal entities)

management systems and policy influencing approaches? Could more be done to share their experiences and by collective action influence policy?

6. Comment on how the time lag between executing research, documenting findings and producing accurate evidenced information may affect opportunities to influence policy.

Tackling existing 'institutional' barriers

7. Comment on the projects progress in dealing with disproportionately high lease values, 25% increase in the first year and 3% income tax levied on poor fishers.
8. Comment on how problems of WB demarcation and Jalmohals of less than 20 acres not transferred by Ministry of Youth and Sports to MoFL.
9. Consider within the stakeholder matrix who might be the 'drivers of change' and who stands to win or lose by scaling up CBFM through CBOs. The existing tendering process is favourable to rich individual lessees and some government officials and it is not favourable to poor people in large groups sharing profit. What steps might the project take to ameliorate this?

Communications and influencing the policy process

[This relates to the communications process within the overall policy influencing plan]

10. Output 3 states "inform and influence policy stakeholders" embodied in one sentence. Informing may be achieved through a dissemination strategy and influencing through a communication strategy. To what extent has the project engaged policy stakeholders through these strategies?
11. The last OPR recommended that attempts should be made to involve key policy focused institutions such as CPD and BIDS in developing and implementing CBFM2 operational plan for influencing policy.
12. Comment on how the project has strategically linked the policy process study and communications strategy to deliver policy related themes for various tiers of the policy stakeholder matrix.
13. In developing a coherent policy process how does the project consider better targeting of institutions and individuals, promote a champion within the project with good stakeholder networks, communication unit headed by Communication Officer, stronger links with other projects to mitigate the process.

Power Relations

14. Comment on the steps taken by the project to improve their understanding of power relations that drive the management of complex heterogeneous cluster systems set up by the project e.g. roles of different actors and their rights, access and exclusion; community structures (e.g. *samaj* and *mathor*); social, political and religious factors etc.
15. Has the project progressed in dealing constructively with local elite factions. Comments on steps taken by the project to mediate the negative effects of elite capture e.g training on conflict resolution.
16. Comment on how the project has responded to resolve resource conflict issues such as use of *kathas* and *kuas* and disproportionate catch returns between CBO's presently outside the control of CBOs e.g parts of WB cluster more productive than others giving higher returns to some CBOs even though they may have invested in fish stocking equally (fish migrating to more favourable parts of the WBs).

Livelihood impact and gender issues

17. Any community-based fisheries management system will potentially exclude people from the fishery. There is evidence that poor fishers have lost their fishing areas (Annual Report 2003). Comment on the socio-economic analyses initiated by the project to assess impact of the project on the poor. Are the monitoring systems in place capturing issues of access, exclusion, equity and livelihood impact for beneficiaries. Does the research plan coherently integrate social analysis and technical components?
18. Comment on progress implementing project gender strategy, appointment of gender focal points, improved gender sensitive monitoring instruments and involvement of women and girls in the AIGA.
19. The micro-credit/AIGA component started in Jan 2003 justifying a closer look at its effectiveness and recommendations for future disbursement. How does it integrate with the CBO fishery activities?
20. Comment on how the project has attempted to orientate itself towards supporting the DFID Country Assistance Plan "*Women and Girls First*" 2003 – 2006 and identify areas within the capacity of the project framework where greater focus may be applied to supporting achievement of CAP objectives and its 7 priority areas.

Capacity Building

21. Comment on the quality of the capacity building process for NGOs, CBOs and project staff? Does it achieve training objectives? Is it strategic? Does it monitor its own effectiveness? What is the impact?
22. Comment on investment costs for capacity building at all levels and to what extent have the recipient organisations internalised these skills and knowledge to obviate the need for future external training.
23. Review the provisions for training and credit being made by the NGOs for additional skills and income sources, and their appropriateness and fit with fishery management actions such as closed seasons that affect fisher income flows.

Other Issues

24. OPR2 calls for a revision of the Purpose at OPR3. Is this still relevant? If so, state clearly the reasons for this and how this will change project orientation. Also give a clear timeline for acceptance and implementation of the new purpose.
25. The impact of physical and natural calamities on the productive capacity of WBs may be underestimated. To complement the social mobilisation and management strategies, how can the project develop a process for all actors concerned (CBOs, government, NGOs) mitigate the problems of environmental degradation e.g. erosion, siltation, loss of biodiversity and pollution mainly from factory waste?

6. Expected Outcomes and Deliverables

Before departure the team will present their findings to a meeting of key stakeholders, project staff and DFID Advisers. The chairperson, venue, date and time to be confirmed and organised by WorldFish Center/DoF. This will present an opportunity to discuss the findings, incorporate feedback into the report and reach agreement on key issues.

The team must complete the DFID OPR standard tables and agree progress scores during the review that will detail project progress at Output to Purpose level. A draft copy of the report, prepared in MS Word, and will be left with the Rural Livelihoods Programme Adviser before departure for comment and a final copy sent to DFID within 14 days of completion of the review.

7. Competencies and Expertise Required

Consultants will be appointed with the following range of competencies.

- Good understanding of the fisheries sector and development issues in Bangladesh;
- Extensive experience in community management and development of community based organisations (CBO's);
- Strong social development analytical skills and good understanding of gender, equity, poverty issues in Bangladesh;
- Good understanding and familiarity of using the sustainable livelihoods approach;
- Experience of working with government agencies in Bangladesh
 - Experience of DFID's policy and commitment to poverty reduction;
 - Understanding of change management and organisational, institutional process in development agencies;
 - Excellent knowledge of strategies and practices for communications in development;
 - Excellent report drafting, communication skills and team working will be required.

8. Conduct of Work

The consultants will facilitate the process of the review and the preparation of the report. They will be based at the WorldFish Center and RLEP/BETS Office¹⁵ who will provide logistical support and facilitation to the review.

The Review and RLEP Team Leaders will be responsible for allocating responsibility and coordinating different aspects of the review in liaison with CBFM-2 project team and DFID advisers.

9. Inputs and timing

The core part of the in-country review will take place between the 1st and 15th December, 2004.

The total input for the core team will consist of 16/19 days (depending on individual consultant contracts), broken down into:

- 1 or 2 days preparation (reading briefing materials before arrival in Bangladesh)
- 15 days in-country
- 1 or 2 days final report writing

10. Briefing Information

- Government of Bangladesh Technical Assistance Project Proforma: (January 2001).
- DFIDB Project Memorandum for the Community Based Fisheries Management Project (Summary, Technical Annex, Social Appraisal and Stakeholder Analysis) May 2000.

¹⁵ BETS Gulshan address: House No. 10, Road No. 135, Gulshan-1, Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh. Telephone: (88-02) 9861531-2. RLEP Team Leader, Alan Brooks. Ext. 128. Mob. 018-225366.

- CBFM-2 Inception Report. April 2002.
- CBFM-2 OPR-1 and OPR-2 reports
- CBFM-2 Annual Report 2003
- CBFM-2 QMRs for 2004.
- DFID Bangladesh Country Assistance Plan 2003 – 2006. “*Women and Girls First*”
- Gender Review 2004 by R. Waterhouse and S Huq.
- Community Co-management. Thematic Lesson Paper (TLP) series (RLEP 2004).
- Breaking New Ground
- Hands Not Land
- Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSP), Govt. of Bangladesh

Annex 3 Itinerary for 3rd OPR Team - CBFM-2 Project

Date	Time	Event	
01/12/2004		Arrive Dhaka	Briefing at DFID at 02:00 p.m.
	03:00 p.m.	Field trip to Mymensingh (B.Blake, Kazi Ali Toufique, Patricia, Zahid, Zahir, Mina, Firoz and Muzaffar- 8 members)	
02/12/2004	08:00 a.m. to 04:00 p.m.	Team – A will visit Rajdhala Beel and Dhampara (possibly Boaliar Doba) cluster sites (Team – B will visit Beel Bhora cluster sites in Pakundia with CBRS
03/12/2004	09:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.	Open for team's reflection and write up	
	03:00 to 05:00 p.m.	Round table meeting with the selected CBFM-2 Project staff members, DoF officers, local government and PNGOs) at BFRI rest house	
04/12/2004	07:30 a.m.	Travel to Hamil Beel (two teams together), Madhupur, Tangail	
	09:00 to 10:30 a.m.	Visit to Hamil Beel	
	10:30 a.m.	Travel to Charan cluster sites, Kailihati, Tangail	
	11:30 p.m.	Team – A will visit to the flood plain sites	Team – B will visit to the Charan Beel site
	01:30 p.m.	Return to CNRS site office	
	02:30 p.m.	River site visit by two teams together	
	04:00 p.m.	Return to Dhaka by road	
05/12/2004	08:00 a.m. to 4:0 p.m	Team discussion and write up	
06/12/2004	10:00 a.m.	Plenary presentation on CBFM-2 project's progress and achievements (focusing challenges, key issues, highlights of progresses made to OVIs)	
	02:00 p.m.	One team comprising, Ms. Patricia Almada Villela, Mr. Zahirul Islam and Mr. A.K.M. Firoz Khan will visit Sunamganj by air	
07/12/2004		Dhaka team: Open for team's reflection and write up	Sunamganj team: Visit to ERA (local NGO) sites in Sunamganj
08/12/2004	a.m.	Dhaka team: Meeting with Joint Chief and other senior staff in the Planning Commission	Sunamganj team: Visit to SUJON cluster (local NGO) sites in Sunamganj
	a.m.	Dhaka team: Visit to BARC: Dr. Khabir Ahmed, Member- Director (in-charge), Fisheries	
09/12/2004	a.m.	Visit to the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock: Secretary, Joint Secretary and Joint Chief (Planning)- <i>Members, CBFM2 Steering Committee</i>	
	10:30 a.m. to 01:00 p.m.	Dhaka team: DoF visit: meet Director General for fisheries	Sunamganj team: Visit to CBRMP and DoF in Sunamganj
	01:00 to 02:00 p.m.	PD/AD, CBFM-2 Project Office, DoF	
	02:30 p.m.	Dhaka team: Meeting with Team Leader, Fourth Fisheries Project	Sunaganj team: Presentation by CBFM-SSEA project PNGOs in Sunamganj (project office)
10/12/2004	08:00 to 04:00 p.m.	Dhaka team: Open for team's reflection and write up	Sunamganj team will fly to Dhaka in the afternoon
11/12/2004	08:00 to 04:00 p.m.	Team meeting and write up	
12/12/2004		Dhaka team: Day for team meeting/write up/visit to other organizations (MACH)	Jessore team: Visit to Goakhola-Hatiara cluster sites (Muzaffar/ Mostafa

			Rahman/Habib (WorldFish) will accompany the team to the field visits.
13/12/2004	09:30 a.m.	Dhaka team: Day for team meeting/ write up/visits (upon requirements) ; preparation for workshop and debriefing	Jessore team: return to Dhaka
14/12/2004	09:00 a.m.	Cross learning workshop on FFP and CBFM-2 review findings (attendees: DFID, DoF, WorldFish and Review Team Members, including, Ms. Patricia Almada Villela of IFAD, and PNGOs	
	Afternoon	Team's preparation for debriefing session of the following day	
15/12/2004	10:00 a.m.	Debriefing session at DFID - OPR team members and WorldFish Staff	

Appendix 1

Comments on the report from DFIDB & CBFM2 advisory/management teams and response by the review team

A) DFIDB

Comments on Community-Based Fisheries Management-2 Third OPR

1. The report covers the key issues and is well presented, it has clearly benefited from having a Team Leader who has been involved with the project, can bring a more global perspective and from having a strong national team to support the OPR process.

2. The report highlights that **progress has in general been disappointing** since the previous OPR and makes a number of recommendations to address this. The focus must now be on

- delivering project outcomes,
- providing a more strategic approach to promoting & influencing policy (supported by a coherent and well-defined communications strategy);
- providing robust evidence-based information on the social benefits;
- addressing issues of impact, performance of institutional arrangements and sustainability.

3. It is essential that there is a much **stronger and far more strategic role for the World Fish Centre in supporting this process**, providing external professional inputs and being more closely involved in delivering the outcomes of the project. It will need to provide strong internal and external professional support, especially to the gender study and completing the poverty assessment survey.

4. Community-based approaches are by definition local interventions and require a process of participatory decision-making. However, scaling-up of successful interventions is a challenge but it is very important to expand the scope of benefits. However, this must be underpinned by demonstrating clear benefits to policy makers and supporting the process of community-based involvement, the government's Open Water Fisheries policy presents one potential avenue. The review team has proposed the **preparation of a strategy paper on the approach to scaling-up CBFM-2** that I fully support. The project must build strong alliances with other ongoing processes that are beginning to create a potential window of opportunity. In this respect they should critically look at the scope for incorporating community-based management systems into wider government programmes taking the large community-based management project in Sunamgonj as one example.

5. The impression given in the report (para 9.2.7) is that the joining fee to become a member of CBOs (para 9.2.7) may be shifting the status of the resource to that of a private good. This, in turn, **may be negatively impacting on poor people by affecting their access to these resources.**

Could the team expand on this point and measures the project should take to monitor/address this.

6. Providing alternatives incentives (livelihood options) are crucial to the success of natural resource management to reduce the pressure on the resource. **An improved understanding is needed of the factors influencing communities' decision-making on choosing various livelihood options.** This understanding will be essential to provide appropriate incentives to reduce fisheries pressure, promote sound management and conservation measures and support livelihoods during closed seasons. The project should seriously consider engaging external consultants, drawing on global best practices and learning from the ongoing work with the Fourth Fisheries project that is being managed by Debbie Williams. The FAO Coastal project in Cox's Bazar may also have relevant experiences and lessons for CBFM-2.

7. I cannot emphasis strongly enough the need for **rigorous and robust process documentation.** There is much anecdotal information and project Team Leader must address this as it will be impossible to define what role CBFM-2 has played in any changing people's behaviour, attitude and how it has contributed to a process of policy formulation

8. I also support the change in the wording of the Purpose in that the **project should contribute to a process for policy formulation** and accept that the project cannot achieve this alone.

9. The page numbers for recommendations in Table 1 need to be changed (eg recommendation 1 is on Page 25, not 23)

10. Lastly, and to reiterate what was discussed with the project team prior to this review. As stated in the report CBFM-2 is an action-orientated research project that is taking an innovative approach to addressing models and approaches for sustainable, equitable management of the aquatic resource-base in Bangladesh and contributing to poverty reduction strategies. However, the team recognise that dynamics and restructuring within DFIDB and the clear trend towards higher spend, much lower transaction costs, impact and scale. This is the environment in which this project will continue to be judged. **We need to have utmost confidence in that there will be significant progress in achieving the outcomes that will have real and lasting impact with positive impacts on poor people.** Progress has been disappointing and, whilst there are mitigating circumstances the WFC has to closely monitor progress, employ professional external specialists where appropriate and immediately address the key issues raised in the report.

11. Finally, clearly the issue of an extension was raised (as reported in the Executive Summary) with regards to the project. At this stage the objective of the team should be to ensure that all support is given to CBOs to become independent and to assess measures for ensuring this happens. **It is highly unlikely that DFIDB will consider an extension and it is disturbing if**

project staff are even considering it at this stage and potentially will raise expectations that cannot be met in the future.

B) CBFM-2/WorldFish comments with review team response appended to each point in bold text

NB – the proposals made for remedial action made in Table 1 of this paper, and emphasized in Dr Mahfuzuddin’s covering letter are an excellent response, and these will be mentioned in the revised OPR 3 report Executive Summary as an immediate post-review response

Comments made in the Executive Summary: Output 2 (vi), page 2 (now page 3)

1. Clarity in the CBFM 2 team about PNGOs in post-project. The micro-credit report entitled, “An overview and analysis of the micro-credit policies, operation plans and financial projections of the 6 partner NGOs” dated, November 2002 was shared with the OPR-2 team. The team strongly supported all the credit operation plans (COPs) (ref. page-32 of the second OPR for CBFM-2) in line with agreed MOAs. It is clearly mentioned in the MOA between WorldFish, PNGOs and DOF that the process of transferring the project revolving loan fund (RLF) will be made by each PNGO on the basis of CBO merit that will be determined by a joint review team in the last year of the project. It is also mentioned in the COP that the PNGOs will be responsible for managing RLF for those CBOs that are yet to attain maturity. However, in the light of the questions raised by the team regarding PNGOs commitment, the project Steering Committee will revisit this issue, and a viable plan of action will be developed to prepare the CBOs to manage the RLF. It should be noted that DoF will not be able to undertake supervision of micro-credit as they neither have adequate staff in the field nor do they have micro-credit related experience.

No response required here – just to emphasise that the OPR team was concerned, not with the WorldFish performance to date, but with the view that the proposed timescale, and the lack of capacity of DoF in this area needed to be re-visited, as acknowledged here.

Regarding comments made in Section 3.2.5, Page 21 (now page 23)

2. Policy Influencing Strategy. There is sufficient reason to believe that CBFM 2 had been behind realizing the changes in Government approach to VAT and income tax. Concerted effort by the project through facts and figures, and DOF and BELA’s persistence made this happen. The role of other projects should be seen as a positive development. Being able to realize 15% VAT exemption (in association with BELA and DoF), the exemption of 3% income tax for poor fishers is also under active consideration with the NBR. This latter effort is being expedited through the steering committee of the CBFM-2 project. All these are recorded and evidenced in the formal

documents on the steering committee meeting minutes. Activities to build awareness among policy stakeholders as well as raise mass awareness through project initiated media tools and campaign using both print and electronic media are project's strategic approach.

Again, no response required – there is indeed good reason to believe the contribution made by CBFM 2. The OPR merely wanted to point out that, with better documentation, this vital role could be seen as part of a clear, and on-going process that will continue to end of project, and hopefully beyond. A small amendment noting the undoubted CBFM contribution is made in this section.

Comments made in section 5.2.4, page 30 (now page 32)

3. Lack of involvement of DOF staffs in Trainings. We are a bit surprised with the team's comment that no DOF staffs were present in the trainings at the beneficiaries/stakeholders level. This is simply not true. In fact, in 100% of such trainings, DoF staff (DFO, SUFO, UFO) was present as resource persons, and the project had clear provision of budget for DOF's participation. Likewise, TNA were conducted in all cases by PNGOs, some have done formal TNA, while others have kept informal records.

Since the point made in 5.2.4 refers to 'presence in these training sessions' and does not stipulate exactly what this presence entails the paragraph is amended to reflect their engagement as resource persons. However, it can be argued that if DoF staff are involved "in 100% of such trainings" one wonders what role they have as resource persons for training topics such as 'social analysis and development', 'goat rearing and poultry' and 'duck rearing', to name but a few.

The training inventory report (Rahman 2004) states, "There was no formal training needs assessment done by all partner organizations" (p.19 of the draft report).

Given this is a draft report and the sketchiness of training process and performance information thus far, the most salient point to carry forward is that greater attention is required to improve components of, and, documentation of, the training cycle management process. Some consideration needs to be given to the specific role of DoF as resource persons e.g. define and appraise the strategic value of their engagement?

Comments made in section 5.2.5, page 30 (now page 32)

4. CBO Sustainability. It is not true that the beneficiaries received no training on financial record keeping. This training was organized earlier during the CBFM-1 period. But, it may be the case that those who have received this training are not elected as a member in the current executive committee. Even if the CBO members are not capable of keeping financial records that does not mean the CBO will not be sustainable. Employing an outsider to look after the CBO accounts might even prove their willingness to rely on

professional services to avoid risks and consequences of improper financial management.

The first part of the point is well taken and the text will be amended to reflect that those interviewed by the OPR had no training in this area. However, the more important part remains. If the Committee has to rely on an external accountant, there is the implication that they may not be capable of monitoring the performance of that employee, and this would threaten sustainability if a dishonest person were recruited. This follows concerns expressed in the earlier OPR about the depth of financial understanding in the CBFM groups, and is reflected in many countries, including Cambodia. This is an area of relative weakness in CBFM, and the OPR draws attention to the wider issue.

Comments made in section 2.1, page 14 (now page 16)

5. No. Of CBFM-1 Waterbodies. It should be noted that the number of WBs in the CBFM-1 was 19, and not 17. However, 4 out of these 19 WB have dropped-out due to complications regarding renew of lease agreement leading to suspension of the NGO activities.

Noted

Comments made in Section 5.5.4 and 5.5.5 (Page 34) (now page 35 & 36)

6. Micro Credit Study. We simply cannot agree with the comments made on the micro credit study regarding its methodological soundness and validity of its conclusions. The study is based on the state of the art methods of data collection. The study used one of the standard approaches of measuring impact such as before and after, with-without and target-control comparisons. There are available studies that have made use of similar methodology such as “Impact study of the Zakouria Micro Credit Program”, “The Impact of an Integrated Micro-credit Program on Women’s Empowerment and fertility Behavior in Rural Bangladesh”, etc. Given the objective of the study that focused on the link between credit, AIGAs and livelihoods of the beneficiaries the method followed is a valid one. The suggestion to include borrower fishers in the control areas could potentially add value with respect to establishing link between AIGAs and fishing pressure. But, identify borrowers in the control areas would be a complex time consuming effort as there is it require separate tracking of credit operations in those areas.

In section 5.5.4 of the OPR-3 draft report tried to establish a hypothesis that some of the AIGAs such as boat purchase are contributing to increased fishing pressure. This may not be true as boats may be used for other non-fishing AIGAs such transportation. Again these cases occupy only 18% of the borrowers.

On the other hand, sample selection might have invited some bias for which the average amount of credit appears to be extraordinarily high. This is because only limited number of NGO samples could be included for the study as there were not many PNGOs, which had **CBFM-1 credit operations**.

Therefore we had to purposively limit within 4 PNGOs. It was also mentioned during the presentation that fish processing was identified by one PNGO as an AIGA, and very high amount of credit was delivered for that particular purpose. On the contrary Rab (2004) has provided figures using the total amount of credit and total number of beneficiaries of the **CBFM-2 credit programme alone**. Hence, it is quite natural that the quoted figure will differ from the one reported in the study in view.

There is a fundamental issue of understanding here. The comments made by the OPR team emphasise two absolutely critical points. Firstly, that the purpose of CBFM2 is not to demonstrate that credit improves the lives of fisheries communities. Secondly, the purpose of the CBFM2 credit component is not just to improve the livelihoods of people involved in both fishing and in the CBFM project. The purpose of CBFM 2 as an action research project is to demonstrate that CBFM can deliver sustainable improved livelihoods by: (a) improved use and management of natural resources and (b) by decreasing pressure on those resources through encouragement of income generating activities not related directly to use of aquatic resources. The view of the OPR is that the micro-credit study does not fully address the issues of whether CBFM in itself has contributed to the reported livelihood improvements, not does it demonstrate that the credit given has in any way contributed to taking pressure off the resource base. These are not easy things to do! We therefore welcome the study proposed as Point 5 of Dr Mahfuzuddin's letter of 16 January, and suggest that the expert help required could include Dr Toufique, at least in the design. The OPR team and process should be seen as supportive and participatory, not As a police operation, and this would help. The proposed study will be noted in the text.

7. Link between livelihood indicators and fishing pressure. This certainly deserves a special study, as the scope of the micro credit study did not allow the link between livelihoods and reduction of fishing pressure. The project team will undertake a separate study that will establish link between credit, AIGAs and fishing pressure. External assistance in the form of consultancy services will also be sought to have a quality study by end of May as recommended by the OPR-3 team.

No response required

Comments made in section 5.7.3, page 36 (now page 38)

8. Subsidy Issue. The project in no way is advocating subsidy for the CBOs by seeking income tax exemption. We are seeking exemption of 3% income tax for the fishers who individually earn far below the taxable limit of TK 100,000. The base should be the individual income received from the waterbodies and not the total income of the waterbody. Therefore, statement "the question of a premise of initiating and scaling-up a management approach on the basis of government subsidy raises obvious questions about the genuine economic viability of CBFM-2 in Jalmahals" does not hold.

Again there may be a small issue of mutual understanding here. The OPR team view (and this was led by a national economist of some standing) was that the economic future of Bangladesh relies to a significant extent on getting away from donor aid dependency and continuing to develop strong, private sector-driven, economic growth, under-pinned by due revenue collection from the people who can afford to pay. The fish resources of Bangladesh are a national asset, and the argument intended is that, if the CBFM approach is truly sustainable, the participants should be able to contribute equitably to the national economic growth. Obviously, the very poor may need special assistance at outset, but this should clearly be seen as start-up support, and not as a long-term national policy of tax relief. This view should, in no way effect the continuing implementation of CBFM 2, but serves as a marker for one kind of indication of post-project sustainability – i.e. are “subsidies” still needed?

Table 1 Summary of Issues and Recommendations against the Logical Framework

LOGFRAME	ISSUES	RECOMMENDATIONS	Planned Responses
<p>Purpose A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</p>	<p><u>Current Version</u>: A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</p> <p><u>OPR 2 recommendation</u>: that CBFM 2 should <i>contribute to</i> a process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management being agreed and operational</p> <p>But - The actual <u>process</u> of policy formulation is very much a national government issue which will change slowly, inconsistently, and from within. Policy development is not a linear process</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 6: the Purpose should be amended to :</p> <p><i>A process for <u>influencing</u> policy formulation in favour of pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational</i></p> <p>This can be done as part of the TAPP amendment that is already on the agenda</p>	<p>Agreed. In fact TAPP change is in process. Revised log frame will take care of this. Revision will be confirmed with DFID.</p>
<p>Output 1 Community based fisheries management approaches developed, tested, and their impacts, sustainability and potential for expansion assessed</p>	<p>We still do not know after 8 years of CBFM 1 sites and three years of CBFM 2 whether the institutional and social arrangements will survive severance from the project. The only way to find out, within the project time frame, and thus learn lessons for the majority CBFM 2 sites, is to cut lose and monitor the CBFM 1 sites now</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 8: an exit strategy for as many CBFM 1 sites as is feasible should be finalised immediately, and executed as soon as possible in 2005 without waiting for the end of project. The sites should then be monitored on a regular basis – by the project, not the PNGO</p>	<p>Agreed. An exit strategy for the selected waterbodies will be completed by end of March 2005, and PNGO operations will be ceased by end of May. WorldFish in collaboration with DOF and PNGOs will prepare an appropriate tool to monitor activities of these CBOs in these waterbodies</p>
	<p>There are still gaps and weaknesses in both the training received by CBOs and the capacity of some PNGOs</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION 10: the PNGO TNA should be expedited, and the results fed into the study being carried out by the consultant Mr. Rahman. The results should then form the basis for a time-bound strategy to fill the most important gaps</p>	<p>We have reviewed the TNAs done by the PNGOs. Though all PNGOs have conducted TNAs, only a few NGOs have done formal TNAs. Most the PNGOs conducted informal TNA, which need to be documented. The project will assign a consultant to finalize the TNAs so that these results can be fed</p>

			into the training inventory study done by Matiur Rahman. On the other hand, "No DoF staff was involved in the training sessions" as mentioned in page 30 is not true. In fact, in 100% of the training, DoF staff (DFO, SUFO, UFO) was present as resource persons.
	The only progress since OPR 2 has been the design of survey forms that have not as yet been used	RECOMMENDATION 11: the gender study should be executed with immediate effect and should provide an interim assessment by the end of the first quarter of 2005	Agreed. A gender study will be executed soon. In fact we have finalized data collection instruments for the study. We have identified a gender specialist who is willing to work as part time basis. If this arrangement is agreed, she will implement the gender study in close cooperation with the project -staff , and designated gender focal point of PNGOs .
	The project has been unable to recruit the gender specialist recommended in October 2003	RECOMMENDATION 12: a project gender specialist should be appointed as an absolute priority	Agreed. A gender specialist will soon be recruited by the WorldFish Center. A part-time specialist can be appointed immediately. PNGOs and DoF have already been asked to assign a gender focal point for the CBFM-2 programme and many of the PNGOs have already nominated a focal point.
	There is still no clear evidence of the specific impact of CBFM the project on the poor, whether negative or positive. Both results are indicated in some cases	RECOMMENDATION 13: the recent poverty assessment survey should be fully completed by the end of January 2005, and the project should seek peer review in carefully examining whether the CBFM 2 impact on poverty is clearly demonstrated. This should be checked by the DFID quarterly review	Poverty assessment survey has been done in 5 different geographical locations. However, production of the report on poverty situation of CBFM-2 beneficiaries can only be completed by the end of the first quarter with the assistance of an external consultant.

			However, poverty impact study on the same will be implemented by an external consultant during March-May 2005 as suggested.
	The November 2004 micro-credit study does not answer the questions asked in OPR 2 about the impact of AIGAs on fishing on pressure or on the livelihoods of poor people excluded by close seasons. Loans are given to people not involved in the fishery, and the relevance of this is not clear	RECOMMENDATION 14: the micro-credit study should be revisited, and a new approach designed bearing in mind the comments made here. Specifically, the link between credit and fishing pressure and between credit and fisheries management measures should be clearly demonstrated, as well as the issue of positive general impact of credit on livelihood parameters. A full-blown AIGA study is required (and indeed is required by the MOFL), and it may be appropriate to engage external consultants to assist.	Micro credit study linking AIGAs and fishing pressure will be done by external consultant. A full blown study on AIGA will also be done through assistance of external consultant under same ToR coverage. It will be done during March-May 2005.
	There is no formal agreement between the CBOs and the PNGO with respect to rights in respect of the water body (as does exist in FFP), and the arrangements for hand over of funds from NGO to CBO after project end are poorly defined	RECOMMENDATION 15: the terms of financial exit from the project by PNGOs should be reviewed, and the conditionalities and time frame reconsidered. This should be part of a broader and urgent exit strategy study suggested as in Recommendation 8	The project will review the experiences of other similar projects and discuss with partners to find a viable solution with respect to rights in the waterbodies by the CBOs and terms of financial exit from the project by the PNGOs.
	Although advances have been made in assessing fisheries benefits from CBFM 2, it is still not possible to separate the relative impact of natural environmental fluctuations, or of the different management tools used	RECOMMENDATION 16: the proposed joint study with MRAG should go ahead as a matter of urgency, BUT the TORs should be jointly agreed between the fisheries and social staff, and should be peer reviewed in Penang by WorldFish	Agreed. MRAG already proposed a ToR for joint study on three topical areas with regard to fisheries resources management and livelihoods impacts. This will be finalized after peer review made by the WorldFish Center Headquarters.
	OPR 2 suggested that the PM 36 impact survey was discarded in favour of a series of targeted case studies. These have not been completed and it is essential that remedial action is taken in concert with planning for the proposed PM 48 impact assessment	RECOMMENDATION 17: the project team should work as closely as possible to the proposed schedule for 2005 (Table 2), and as part of that scheduling develop TORs for the PM 48 impact survey in such a way as it will complement, rather than duplicate the existing case study proposals. It is further recommended that this be planned sufficiently in advance to allow recruitment of top quality external consultants to provide an objective perspective to the exercise	Agreed. Steps will be undertaken to develop ToR consistent with proposed schedule to start the impact survey in PM 48 and get it completed by external consultant.
Output 2 Coordination and	There is as yet still no effective means of assessing the performance of the larger	RECOMMENDATION 9 : the PNGOs must be further encouraged to undertake process documentation of the	Agreed as recommended and ToR of the Communication Specialist will

administration mechanisms for linking local community management arrangements with larger fishery and wetland systems tested and assessed and constraints identified	scale institutional arrangements	cluster system, and the WorldFish team must ensure that, as part of the communications strategy, the products are collated and disseminated both to influence policy and to encourage CBOs with feedback	include supports required for this recommendation.
Output 3 To inform and influence all fisheries policy stakeholders of improved management approaches	There is still no coherent, structured, approach to either policy documentation or policy influence. Mean time things have moved on, and CBFM is now on the lips of decision makers	RECOMMENDATION 1: Given the advances reported it is clearly time for CBFM 2 to re-analyse the information needs of the various stakeholder groups, and decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exactly what messages the project now needs to get across (since the basic CBM message seems to have arrived already)? • Exactly who requires to be addressed with these specific (and few) messages? • How the process documentation proposed in the last OPR can be operationalised and used to feed the message packages identified as necessary? • How the various message types for the different levels of the stakeholder matrix can be linked through a coherent strategy? • How much more needs to be done at the community level – how many more folk shows etc- what works best now at this level? 	Agreed. The project puts high priority in developing appropriate communication messages for different stakeholder groups. In this regard the project made progress in appointing a communication and media officer through Australian Youth Ambassador for Development (AYAD) Programme. She will work in collaboration with a locally recruited communication specialist who will be hired on a priority basis. WorldFish in-house Division on Information and Communication in Penang will support the team.
	The message about CBFM seems to have been embedded in GoB, but it means nothing if it does not become implemented government policy. LGED as a government department is attempting to draw to together all GoB key players in its Sunamgonji CB Resource Management Project, and may have valuable experience	RECOMMENDATION 2: it is proposed that CBFM 2, as part of its response to Output 3 and the Project Purpose, should prepare a strategy paper on the approach to scaling-up CBFM, in collaboration with the DoF, LGED and FFP, with advice from BIDS and the Joint Secretary in MOFL. An example of process is given in the text	Agreed. Strategy paper to scale up CBFM-2 will be developed in collaboration with DoF, LGED and FFP taking advice from BIDS and Joint Secretary, MoFL.
	There is a window of policy opportunity opening with the new PRSP and the 3 year	RECOMMENDATION 3: the communications strategy should take as an initial focal point, the monitoring of the	Agreed. The project will take steps to highlight how the CBFM-2 can

	Rolling Plan	policy processes emerging from the PRSP in December 2004, and should position itself to respond with hard evidence of impact on people and on fish production	contribute to the national economic development. Upon assessing the possible roles of CBFM-2 in the economic development, these will be communicated to PRSP. The project will also look for ways as to how to incorporate these in the PRSP.
	There is still no communications officer in the project despite OPR 2 recommendations in October 2003	<p>RECOMMENDATION 4a: it is strongly advised that a Communications Officer be appointed as a matter of urgency, and 4b. that in the meantime WorldFish designates a staff member to work with PNGOs to collate in one place examples of outcomes with clear bearing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy, governance and policy influence • Specific pro-poor benefits or events • Specific pro-women benefits or events • Specific pro-environment benefits or events 	Agreed. As mentioned earlier, a communication specialist (MsTara Vickers, AYAD, AUSAID) has already been offered the position for CBFM-2. She will join soon. She will work closely with a locally hired communication specialist. The communication team will work with the gender specialist, and PNGO gender focal points, and fisheries biologist of the project to collate and prepare women and environment related messages from the hard data.
	Convincing GoB is now a tangible option and some attitudes (e.g. DG DoF) have already changed markedly	<p>RECOMMENDATION 5: OVI 3.4 should be amended to: Greater awareness of project findings <u>and attitudinal change</u> evident within local and senior DoF, <u>MOFL</u>, Land Administration and other relevant ministries by month 48</p>	Agreed. OV1 3.4 will be amended when the TAPP will be revised.
	One late joining partner NGO (SHISUK) has independently influenced GoB regarding its own approach to "CBFM" to the extent that it will be copied by GoB in 36 districts	<p>RECOMMENDATION 7: CBFM 2 should have a long hard look at how this was achieved, <u>and document the process</u>, learning lessons, adopting and adapting</p>	Agreed. CBFM-2 will give a hard look in documenting the process and lessons learnt on the communication path from the experiences of Shishuk. A ToR will be developed to review as to how this was done. An external consultant will be employed to do this.

