

FINAL REPORT

EXTERNAL REVIEW

OF THE

**SMALL-SCALE OFFSHORE FISHERY
TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
(SOFTDP)**



15 – 25 SEPTEMBER 2008



**Government of the
Republic of Malawi**



iceida

ICELANDIC INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
ÞRÓUNARSAMVINNUSTOFNUN ÍSLANDS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) commissioned an external review of the Small-scale Offshore Fishery Technology Development Project (SOFTDP) in September 2008. SOFTDP is conducted in cooperation with the Department of Fisheries (DoF) on behalf of the Government of Malawi (GoM), with Phase I expected to terminate in December 2008. Dependent upon outcomes of Phase I, an additional 4-year Phase II is planned with regards to technology transfer and evaluation. The specific objectives of SOFTDP are to

1. Develop appropriate fishing gear for small-scale offshore fishery,
2. Develop an appropriate vessel for offshore use by small-scale fishery,
3. Improve the capacity of small-scale fishers for operation in the offshore zone of Lake Malawi, and
4. Assess socio-economic and environmental effects of the proposed fishery.

The Review Team was charged within the Terms of Reference (TOR) to (i) evaluate the status and progress of the SOFTDP cooperation between ICEIDA and DoF, and (ii) make recommendations regarding the next phase of the project. The review included (i) interviews with personnel representing the primary partners and other stakeholders, (ii) scrutinizing various project documents and minutes of meetings, and (iii) site visits to the Madzedze Demonstration Project and other fishing villages near Monkey Bay.

The Review Team documented distinct achievements of the SOFTDP program in training and capacity development, especially noting the community participation and support for the Madzedze Demonstration Project. However, the Review Team recognized that these efforts were secondary objectives to the primary objectives of developing fishing gear and vessels for small-scale exploitation of the offshore fisheries. While various reports and minutes of meetings existed to demonstrate that the project management team had given considerable consideration to various gears and boat designs, the major contentious issues were that (1) no quantitative testing of gear had been performed, and (2) only the hull of a single vessel was under construction at the time of review.

Compounding the issue of (lack of) demonstrated accomplishment aimed toward the primary objectives of SOFTDP, there was an underlying sentiment from DoF that “Malawi had lost ownership of the project” (to paraphrase). This is a vexing issue not easily addressed in a typical program review, i.e., review findings and recommendations are based upon a discovery process and opinions are formed based on a synthesis of input from the stakeholders “as a whole.” Hence, to adequately address such a fundamental concern would have required prior knowledge by the Review Team for it (the Team) to have effectively prepared for and targeted the issue of “...loss of ownership.” In short, the Review Team can only speculate on this issue. However, the issue seems to have manifested itself about mid-term of SOFTDP, 2006-2007, and may be attributable to a number of factors alluded to below.

It is the Professional Opinion of the Review Team that the current governance, management and coordination of SOFTDP are not conducive to the success of the project. However, it must be emphasized that this concern (a) is an issue of the administrative, management and coordination *processes* followed rather than the *personalities* involved, (b) appears to be a cascading effect of the history of the project, and (c) crosses the table to both cooperating

partners. That is, the reviewers are of the opinion that procedures and policies of governance and project management followed in the front end of the project (since 2005) deleteriously affected its performance in the latter stages of Phase I and will continue to do so into Phase II unless steps are taken to remedy the root causes of the major issues.

By example, the highest level of governance of SOFTDP was inadequate, highlighted by the fact that the Project Supervisory Board (PSB) had not met in two years to consider and approve the Revised Project Implementation Plan (PIP) of July 2006. The highest level of project management, the Project Steering Committee (PSC), did not adhere to the priority objectives from the onset of SOFTDP and further was ineffectual, e.g., in soliciting project reports upon which the efficacy of the project is based. The Project Implementation Unit (PIU), responsible for the day-to-day operation of SOFTDP, was impacted in its efforts by (1) the lack of a Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) manual agreed upon by both parties (outlining amongst other issues the general policies on allowances, expense reimbursement, travel, vehicles, etc.), and (2) a shift in Project Managers (PM) midway through Phase I.

The lack of a SOP manual further impacted the project in not having an agreed upon Terms of Reference (TOR) for personnel, committees, and counterparts. For example, the exact management roles of the PSC and PIU, and their respective Chairmen, are ambiguous and overlap.

Thus, with respect to the TOR of the Review Team to evaluate the status and progress of SOFTDP cooperation between ICEIDA and DoF, the Review Team concluded that the contracting partners have distinct challenges before them to successfully implement the objectives of SOFTDP within the original project period for Phase I, 2005-2008. As a consequence, the Review Team recommended a 1-year extension of Phase I through December 2009 with the proposed Phase II being contingent upon the outcomes of the extension. Additional recommendations were provided for the Phase I extension and Phase II. With these regards, the Review Team conveyed a sense of urgency for the successful implementation of SOFTDP to the ICEIDA Country Director and DoF administration in an exit interview on 24 September 2008. Additionally, a DRAFT SUMMARY of the Review's Team's findings and recommendations were presented to each party to facilitate immediate co-planning to address the identified concerns.

Most importantly, both parties are fundamentally committed to the success of SOFTDP. The perceived value of SOFTDP and its objectives cannot be understated, either by the donor (ICEIDA) or its cooperating partner (DoF). That is, SOFTDP has been listed by the Government of Malawi as a Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) with regards to national needs and priorities, while the nearly 20-year legacy of ICEIDA in Malawi is linked to the successful implementation of SOFTDP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
ABBREVIATIONS	v
PROJECT SUMMARY SHEET	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW	3
A. EXTERNAL REVIEW	3
B. REVIEW FINDINGS	3
1. Perceived value of SOFTDP	3
2. Progress	3
a. Training/Capacity Development	3
b. Gear development	4
c. Boat development	4
C. CONSTRAINTS ON THE SUCCESS OF THE SOFTDP PROJECT	4
1. Governance: Project Supervisory Board (PSB)	5
2. Project management and coordination	5
a. Project Steering Committee (PSC)	5
1) Training/Capacity Development	5
2) Gear development	6
3) Boat building	6
4) Report preparation	6
b. Project Implementation Unit (PIU)	6
3. Other stakeholder involvement	7
a. African Development Bank	7
b. Bunda College, University of Malawi	8
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	8
A. SCHEDULE	8
B. GOVERNANCE BY THE PROJECT SUPERVISORY BOARD (PSB)	8
C. PROJECT MANAGEMENT and COORDINATION	9
D. INTERNAL MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT	10
E. EXTERNAL REVIEW	11
IV. CONCLUSIONS	12
V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	12
APPENDIX 1. List of Persons Interviewed by the Review Team	13
APPENDIX 2. Literature Reviewed	14

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB – African Development Bank
CIDA – Canadian International Development Agency
DoF - Department of Fisheries
FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations
FEU - Fishing Economic Unit
GoM - Government of Malawi
ICEIDA - Icelandic International Development Agency
LMAFDP - Lake Malawi Artisanal Fisheries Development Project
MAFS - Ministry of Agriculture & Food Security
MOMNRE - Ministry of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment
MOV - Means of Verification
OVI - Objective Verifiable Indicators
PCU – Project Coordinating Unit (African Development Bank)
PD- Project Document
PIP - Project Implementation Plan
PIU - Project Implementation Unit
PM - Project Manager
PSB - Project Supervisory Board
PSC - Project Steering Committee
PSIP - Public Sector Investment Programme
SOFTDP - Small-scale Offshore Fishery Technology Development Project
SOP - Standard Operating Procedures
TOR - Terms of Reference

V. PROJECT SUMMARY SHEET

Country:	Malawi
Sector:	Fishing Sector
Executing Agencies:	MOMNRE/MAFS, ICEIDA
Project Title:	Small-Scale Offshore Fishery Technology Development Project
Project Period:	01.10.2004-30.09.2008
Total Estimated Cost:	1,760,000 US\$
Donor:	ICEIDA
Tentative ICEIDA contribution:	1,560,000 US\$
Tentative GoM contribution:	200,000 US\$