

ANNEX 4

DFID PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT - Annex D

Monitoring ID :

Type of Report: OUTPUT TO PURPOSE REVIEW

For quarterly monitoring, complete Part A and C; for annual review complete Parts A, B and C

PART A.

Country:	Bangladesh	Project:	Community-Based Fisheries Management – Phase II
Project Officer	Duncan King	Start Date:	1/9/01
Date of Visit:	4 th – 16 th October 2003	End Date:	30/9/06
Date of Report:	18 October 2003	MIS Code:	139 – 504 – CE - 001
		Risk Category:	

Goal Statement	OVI
Improved inland fisheries management policy and policy process adopted by the GoB and NGOs resulting in more sustainable, equitable and participatory management of resources.	<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	OVIs
<p>A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational.</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 (especially those focused on fisheries and wetlands)

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	Planned for next period
<p>1. Community based fisheries management approaches developed and tested, and their impacts, sustainability and potential for expansion assessed.</p> <p>SCORE: 1</p>		<p>Testing of CBFM approaches developed earlier is well underway.</p> <p>The project partners and communities have recently reviewed progress. Initial exit strategies have been identified by partners and are being revised.</p> <p>NGO support in one phase 1 site has been phased out and lessons about impact and sustainability of these approaches from phase 1 have been generated.</p> <p>It is important that the project is able to distinguish between the impacts of Phase I</p>	<p>Approaches are the types of process used to establish community-based management. They encompass both the process of establishing CBFM, the type of support given by the NGO, and the nature of the CBO formed for undertaking the management. Approaches are distinguished from models. The view that there is almost infinite variety of models, reflecting combinations of natural and social environment is still valid. WorldFish has used the term model to describe the nature of CBO established for CBFM, the limited number of models described in the Annual Report will need</p>

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments																																			
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)																																				
		and Phase II	to be reviewed in the light of actual CBOs that are evolving.																																			
1.1 At least five approaches to CBFM developed for use in 3 different types of waterbodies by project month 12.	Modified to reflect 3 principal approaches. These are fisher-managed, community-managed and women-managed fisheries. It was planned that each of the five NGOs would develop (i.e. conceptualise and articulate) a different model by month 12.	Three approaches documented in the Inception Report have been adopted, progress (corrected from Annual report) as follows: No of waterbodies by CBFM approach <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fisher</th> <th>Comm</th> <th>Women</th> <th>All</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>River</td> <td>14</td> <td>11</td> <td>0</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open beel</td> <td>18</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small beel</td> <td>6</td> <td>8</td> <td>0</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flood-plain</td> <td>1</td> <td>16</td> <td>2</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Closed beel</td> <td>12</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>51</td> <td>37</td> <td>2</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Fisher	Comm	Women	All	River	14	11	0	25	Open beel	18	2	0	20	Small beel	6	8	0	14	Flood-plain	1	16	2	19	Closed beel	12	0	0	12	Total	51	37	2	90	The main focus for this on-going work is now to ensure that the benefits derived by the various approaches are monitored effectively to enable impact assessment.
	Fisher	Comm	Women	All																																		
River	14	11	0	25																																		
Open beel	18	2	0	20																																		
Small beel	6	8	0	14																																		
Flood-plain	1	16	2	19																																		
Closed beel	12	0	0	12																																		
Total	51	37	2	90																																		
1.2 Fisher groups representing about 30,000 households in over 65 waterbodies established by project month 18.	It was anticipated that the household target for this OVI would be complete by month 24. Target household numbers were revised to 22,000 in last OPR	The project is working in 115 + 7 waterbodies. 109,940 households present, 18,136 are poor and fish for income. Group members in PM 24: BS 1,188 (all f), BRAC 2,182 (all m), Caritas 3,024 (79% m), CNRS 1,466 (89% m), CRED 455 (all m), Proshika 3,099 (84% m), SDC 333 (53% m); total 11,747.	The project should be more concerned with the quality of engagement with the target beneficiaries and appropriate poverty targeting, than with quantity per se. The community-managed fishery approach may result in a larger beneficiary group in those sites.																																			

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
<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>100% of waterbodies have established CBOs for waterbody management.</p> <p>50% of project sites have some improved fishery/wetland management practices being followed.</p>	<p>Census indicates some fall in number of target fisher households. But waterbody number increased over original estimate (some have dropped from last OPR). Groups established in almost all waterbodies, some more to be formed, but some NGOs in some sites are not taking group approach but rather village committees, so number of groups likely to be lower than revised target.</p> <p>The 115 waterbodies represent 10 substantial clusters of waterbodies and 38 individual ones.</p> <p>In 104 out of 115 sites/waterbodies management committees have been formed.</p> <p>Fisheries management actions have been initiated by CBOs in about 50% sites by PM 24, e.g. closed season: BS 6, BRAC 10, Caritas 9, CNRS 34, CRED 1, Proshika 5 sites (total 65 sites); sanctuaries in 48 sites; stocking in about 14 sites; habitat restoration and reintroduction of rare fish in a few sites; gear restrictions (partially</p>	<p>Attention should be paid to not becoming over-stretched as a result of working in more than the original target number of waterbodies.</p> <p>Establishment of CBOs is about on track (and already there are 39 more than was originally anticipated). Some of the sites without CBOs are problematic due to legal cases or being leased out locally and are expected to be dropped shortly. 3 new NGOs joined the project in June 2003 and are due to form CBOs.</p> <p>There is no standard format for management plans, so MOVs will include PAPDs, management committee minutes and record books and NGO field activity calendars.</p>

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
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.	The last OPR recommended that to see change in these indicators, a full 2 year gap should be allowed between baseline and re-survey for impact. Given the intensity of the baseline survey, it is recommended that this OVI be re-planned to provide for a limited re-survey in month 36 and a full impact survey in month 54 (mid Year 5). If possible, the month 36 survey should inform the MTR.	<p>complied with) in many sites..</p> <p>Baseline household surveys were completed on schedule in Oct 2002. No mid-term impact survey was planned for year 2. Household monitoring in sample sites and catch and effort monitoring in most sites continued through the year.</p>	<p>A limited mid-term impact survey at household level is proposed in early 2004 so that analysis can be done during 2004. In most cases the NGOs will have been active for 2 years by then.</p> <p>Several working papers – case studies from baseline and impact surveys and analysis of fish catch and effort data are due to be completed in the early part of project year 3.</p> <p>Gender strategy has identified need for more targeted studies on impacts on women, for example of micro-credit and fishery management.</p> <p>The OVI as stated requires that the design of the monitoring programme includes the ability to disaggregate the indicators according to both gender and poverty. The project must ensure that the data it collects can be suitably disaggregated to demonstrate impacts on poverty and gender.</p> <p>The fisheries catch effort surveys remain appropriate, but more effort is needed to link the fisheries and social research, and to link fisheries and environmental factors</p>

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
1.6 Institutional sustainability of approaches assessed by project month 54, with follow up post project assessment 2 years after end of project.	<p>Revise the institutional assessment format from the inception report in consultation with partners. To pilot and then undertake a first round survey for all CBOs/waterbodies. To modify the tool to cover also higher level institutions for clusters of waterbodies.</p> <p>Undertake process documentation of CBOs. To explore group's own criteria for success and sustainability.</p>	<p>Institutional assessment tool was revised and expanded based on testing and partner inputs. First round survey completed. Cluster organisations/ committees have now been formed but too early to make assessments.</p> <p>Process documentation training held, and information is being collected through diaries but system still to be finalised.</p> <p>Consultations were held in six representative sites (most from the first phase as the CBOs were better established) to discuss CBO's own criteria for success and sustainability.</p>	<p>Analysis of institutional assessments needed.</p> <p>Development of assessment tool for cluster organisations and first round survey should be within project year 3.</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>SCORE: 2</p>			<p>The process of identifying and testing mechanisms remains an achievable target.. Assessment of impact and sustainability will be challenging within the project time frame, and will require priority focus.</p>

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
<p>2.1 Potential link mechanisms designed based on discussions with participants, local government and NGOs by project month 12.</p> <p><i>Proposed new OVI Institutional analysis of the roles and responsibilities and distribution of costs and benefits between the different tiers of linked institutions completed by month 18.</i></p>	<p>Design and review feasibility of cluster management bodies (apex tiers of CBOs). Initiate meetings between CBOs in cluster sites.</p> <p>The OVI indicates that link mechanisms will be designed by month 12, however the OVI is lacking quantification of how many mechanisms, vis-à-vis the number of approaches and models of CBO organisation.</p>	<p>All the NGOs working in cluster sites identified structures for linking the CBOs. This was led by NGOs and has been thought out in terms of how to link with DOF and local government through advisory committees and meetings with UFOs for example.</p> <p>The benefits of coordination and cluster committees are already apparent to the members of CBOs that are in clusters.</p>	<p>The extent to which higher level committees can provide a conflict management function should be examined (OVI 2.3).</p> <p>Given the gaps in understanding the functions of the various higher level committees in federated groups, the proposed intermediate OVI before OVI 2.2, should be adopted together with associated activities.</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>Establishment of cluster groups is well under way, and the structures for linking wider systems should be identified</p>	<p>Most 1st tier institutions formed, and a variety of different hierarchies have been proposed by PNGOs. No apex groups have been formed yet, but CBOs are in active debate with PNGOs.</p>	<p>The project has 10 substantial clusters of waterbodies in which this type of institution could be formed. Establishing management institutions covering wider eco-systems in 6 of these 10 clusters is a reasonable aim. However given the addition of a new precursor OVI, the date of attaining this OVI should be changed to month 30.</p> <p>The MOV for this OVI is similar to OVI</p>

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
2.3 Mechanisms to improve co-ordination and conflict resolution between organisations and among fishery stakeholders developed and tested by project month 36.			1.6, but at higher tiers of the institutional hierarchy. There is an urgent need for process documentation since some cooperative activities at the higher levels have already taken place This OVI should be moved to the Activity level, contributing to OVI 2.2. The activity should make reference to findings from DFID's Conflict in Tropical Fisheries research project.
2.4 MOL and local administration (union to district) support to enable and legitimise co-management demonstrated by project month 24.	Xxx No progress expected in year 1.	MOL have handed over leases on 58 jalmahals to DOF for a 10 year period to date, but a number of jalmahals leases are still on court cases and other disputes. UP Chairmen and members sit on some waterbody management committees.	This OVI should be changed to month 36 to give a logical chronological sequence of Output OVIs. The MOV indicates that support would be evidenced through case studies on the actions of local courts and administration. However, it is unclear what is inferred by 'enabling' and 'legitimising'. There is no provision in Bangladesh law for local by-laws. Nor is it clear what the role of traditional authorities such as the samaj and salish are in these enabling and legitimisation processes. This OVI should be rephrased for clarity.
2.5 Appropriate changes in	No progress expected in year 2.	None.	This OVI links to the policy objectives of

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
<p>fishery administration and legal framework recommended based on pilot experience and supporting 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>	No progress expected in year 2.	None.	<p>Output 3. Its MOVs and the targets of the communications in the MOV should be consistent with the PSM and the proposed communications strategy.</p> <p>The chronology of this OVI is not logical. A typo is assumed – it should be attained by month 60.</p> <p>This OVI will depend on case studies and lessons from other CBFM initiatives such as FFP and MACH before they close, and thus also ties to Activity 3.5 amongst others. This OVI should be kept under review as the prospect of a national openwater fisheries management plan evolves under DOF.</p>
<p>3. To inform and influence all fisheries policy stakeholders of improved management approaches.</p> <p>SCORE: 3</p>			<p>There is a large jump between this output and the project purpose. The operationalisation of the communications strategy is essential to support the effective use of the field research results delivered under Outputs 1 & 2</p>
<p>3.1 Policy formulation study completed by project month 12 and policy stakeholder matrix revised to form baseline.</p>	The policy formulation study was delayed and rescheduled for year 2.	An initial communications strategy as well as updated policy stakeholder matrix have been prepared. An issue-based approach is proposed that would target key stakeholders rather than a strategy for	The communications strategy, informed by the policy process study, should be converted into an action plan based on carefully selected policy-related themes and a messaging strategy for the various

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	Planned for next period
<p>Proposed new OVI <i>Strategic target institutions and individuals identified at all levels in the stakeholder matrix and an appropriate promotional strategy for each target prepared by month 21</i></p> <p><i>Proposed revision to new OVI</i> <i>Key policy- related themes identified and an action plan for development and targeting of supporting messages in place by month 30</i></p>		each target stakeholder	<p>tiers of the PSM. This process should be clearly aligned with, and informed by, the Fisheries Sector Review outcomes.</p> <p>The new OVI proposed in OPR 1 should be adapted accordingly</p> <p>.</p>
<p>3.2 Changes in attitudes and behaviour of participant fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by project month 36.</p>	<p>NGO activities would continue to change attitudes in wider community in project sites.</p>	<p>In addition to NGO and CBO activities, 15 folk theatre groups were trained and over 70 shows held, which has raised wider awareness and helped generate support and compliance for actions such as gear restrictions.</p>	<p>It will be important to disaggregate the performance of Phase I and II. Attitudes could be accessed as part of OVI 1.5, but the task of discrete audience feedback monitoring may prove formidable. For target communities rule setting and compliance may offer an</p>

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	
3.3 Changes in attitudes and behaviour of other fishers and rural communities towards fish conservation by project month 60.	No progress expected in year 2.	Anecdotally there are already changes in attitude and behaviour in some areas where CBOs have persuaded outsiders to comply with their conservation rules. This is a daunting task and it may prove difficult to assess change in behaviour of non-participants	indicator It is suggested that this OVI be reconsidered, and that the task be restricted to attitude survey. It is also suggested that OVIs 3.2 and 3.3 be addressed in close association with OVI 1.5, and that the due date be revised from month 60 to month 48
3.4 Greater awareness of project findings evident within local and senior DoF, Land Administration, and relevant ministries by project month 48.	Continue raising awareness locally through field activities, develop strategy for reaching macro level stakeholders.	Wider awareness of the project process has been generated at the local government, Upazila and District levels. There is some enhanced awareness in senior levels of DoF. A communication strategy is partly developed but needs to then be implemented.	“Greater awareness” assumes that there is already some knowledge of project findings. It is not clear for which institutions this might be true. It is therefore a high priority to develop the strategy for reaching macro level stakeholders, and to identify targets for policy briefing
3.5 Greater awareness of NGOs including non-project NGOs of project findings and improved fishery management issues by project month 48.	Progress will, to an extent, be dependent on the development of an effective communications strategy	The project activities in networking CBOs from different projects, and the Regional CBFM 2 workshops have all contributed to increasing awareness	Awareness raising through partners with other NGOs including findings in CBFM-2

General progress assessment - Project Purpose	3
Justification	

For a research project dependent on data collection and data analysis 24 months is a short period in which to assess impact. The process of the project is good, the impact can only, at this stage, be estimated. Early signs are positive.

General progress assessment - Project Outputs	2 - (1.5 +2+3)
--	-----------------------

Justification

Clear progress has been made in all three outputs; Output 3 now requires to put strategies and studies into action for a 2 next year

PART B.

Purpose /OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>A process for policy formulation for pro-poor sustainable fisheries management agreed and operational.</p> <p>Agreement on a more transparent policy formulation process.</p> <p>Significant changes in the policy stakeholder matrix to be more participatory and pro-poor.</p> <p>Before the project end wide sharing of evidence, strong links and policy dialogue among and between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOF projects, particularly with FFP • Other agencies, departments, ministries and donors and their projects • NGOs <p>Community based organisations (especially those focused on fisheries and wetlands)</p>	<p>Through DOF project-generated proposals for exempting waterbody leases from VAT and for a ceiling on lease rates per ha for handed over waterbodies were taken up by MOFL with MOL.</p> <p>Informal links and dialogue with other projects (FFP, MACH, etc).</p> <p>Initiated CBO networking through workshops in 4 regions where all CBFM-2 and many non-CBFM CBOs came together (about 180 committees/CBOs were represented in total) to share experience and highlight future issues. In each case the CBOs have formed ad hoc convening committees to further their networking with a view to sharing experience, strengthening their own activities, and influencing higher authorities.</p>	<p>The experience of the Fourth Fisheries Project suggests that there may be considerable resistance to policy change in some areas of government. This is backed by the findings of the Fisheries Sector Review that clearly identify the absence of a coherent policy process as a major constraint to change.</p> <p>The project is, therefore, seeking a more transparent process where perhaps no process exists. The purpose may accordingly be either easier or more difficult to achieve – time will tell.</p> <p>What is clear is that CBFM-2 is unlikely to achieve the intended policy formulation process alone, and the assistance of the donors , via the Sector Review process and other projects, will be essential. However, the current institutional arrangements in DoF militate against inter-project cooperation.</p> <p>The Purpose as worded does not reflect DFID’s programmatic approach to development in Bangladesh and requires revision at OPR 3</p>

Attribution

The need to pay some attention to Output MoVs, especially for Output 3, is discussed in the text. Attribution for the Purpose is going to be difficult. Now that the communications strategy and policy processes study are available the next step is identify the key themes and messages, and to undertake attitudinal surveys of mid to upper policy stakeholders to determine their current views for comparison

at end of project.

Purpose to Goal

Signs of change in the external policy environment provide some cause for optimism at this early stage

DOES LOGFRAME REQUIRE REVISION?

The Purpose should be reviewed at the next OPR, and the revised logframe (including OPR 1 changes to OVIs and activities) should be formally adopted by DFID and the GoB

DO PIMS MARKERS REQUIRE REVISION [Mandatory for projects approved prior to 1.8.98]

No

Quality of Scoring

The OPR team is the largely same as that for OPR 1, and this continuity provides a measure of confidence in the scoring. The team has been bolstered by one local consultant, and this adds an improved field dimension

Lessons learned, and suggested dissemination

It is recommended that this report be circulated to all CBFM projects and relevant donor advisers

Part C

Key Issues / Points of information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty: Need to analyse beneficiary distribution within poverty categories 1 and 2 after another year ; who is slipping through the CBFM net? Who can and cannot benefit from CBFM under the various approaches being tested? • Gender: Need a Gender Strategy and improved gender analysis • Communications: Need to link media & policy strategies and develop a comprehensive communications strategy based on a revised Policy Stakeholder Matrix • M & E: Need a reality check at next OPR; are all the data types collected really being used; nb biological data as well as socio-economic

Recommendations	Responsibility	Date for completion
1. See Table 1		
2.		
3.		
4.		

Review team:	Barry Blake , Julian Barr, Clement Peris
People met:	See Annex 2

Scoring system:

1 = likely to be completely achieved

2 = likely to be largely achieved

3 = likely to be partially achieved

4 = only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent

5 = unlikely to be realised

x = too early to judge extent of achievement