

Republic of Maldives
Post-Tsunami Agriculture and Fisheries Rehabilitation
Programme
Project Performance Evaluation
Approach Paper

Contents

I. Background	1
II. Programme Overview	1
III. PPE Scope and Methodology	4
IV. Evaluation Process	6
V. Specific issues for this PPE	7
VI. Evaluation Team	10
VII. Background Documents	10

Republic of Maldives

Post-Tsunami Agriculture and Fisheries Rehabilitation Programme

(Project number 1347, loan number 663-MV, 692-MV, and grant number 783-MV)

Project Performance Evaluation

Approach Paper

I. Background

1. For completed investment projects financed by IFAD, its Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE) undertakes: (i) validation of project completion reports (PCRs) for all projects, based on a desk review of project completion reports (PCRs) and other documents; and (ii) project performance evaluations (PPEs) involving country visits for a number of selected projects (about 10 in a given year).¹
2. A PPE is conducted after a desk review of the PCR and other available documents, with the aim of providing additional evidence on project achievements and validating the conclusions of the PCR. In general terms, the main objectives of PPEs are to: (i) assess the results of the project; (ii) generate findings and recommendations for the design and implementation of ongoing and future operations in the country; and (iii) identify issues of corporate, operational or strategic interest that merit further evaluative work.
3. The Post-Tsunami Agriculture and Fisheries Rehabilitation Programme (PT-AFREP) in the Republic of Maldives (implemented between 2005 and 2013) has been selected for a Project Performance Evaluation. The Post-Tsunami Agriculture and Fisheries Rehabilitation Programme (PT-AFREP) in the Republic of Maldives (implemented between 2005 and 2013) has been selected for a Project Performance Evaluation in 2016. The PPE is expected to further contribute to an IOE Evaluation Synthesis report on fisheries, aquaculture and coastal areas development.

II. Programme Overview

4. **Programme area.** The original programme area for fishery activities included four fishery islands affected by the tsunami: Dhiggaru in Meemu atoll; Vilhufushi in Thaa atoll; Maamendhoo in Laamu atoll; and Madaveli in Ghaaf Dhalu atoll, with a **total population of 8,145**, which would benefit from improved fish handling facilities. About 150 fishers were to receive new vessels. Fishing communities in which inhabitants of tsunami-affected islands were resettled would also benefit from the programme.
5. Regarding the agriculture activities, the original programme aimed to cover 50 tsunami-affected islands. Among those islands, the Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Marine Resources (MFAMR) identified 26 most eligible islands as the **primary target area**, the selection based upon both the level of damage caused by the tsunami and the vulnerability of the rural population. The **second group** of 24 islands to be assisted would be selected by the MFAMR during implementation of the programme, based on: (a) agricultural importance; (b) incidence of poverty and vulnerability; and (c) levels of food insecurity. However, after the project

¹ The selection criteria for PPE include: (i) information gaps in PCRs; (ii) projects of strategic relevance that offer enhanced opportunities for learning; (iii) a need to build evidence for forthcoming corporate level evaluations, country strategy and programme evaluations or evaluation synthesis reports; and (iv) a regional balance of IOE's evaluation programme.

revitalization in 2009-2010, the revised geographical area in which to implement the revitalized agriculture component consisted of 30 islands, instead of the original 50 tsunami affected islands.²

6. At the end, the project had reached 6,086 households. No poverty prevalence data were provided for the programme area as the programme was primarily concerned with post-disaster rehabilitation.
7. **Programme objectives.** The overall goal of the programme was to contribute to restoring agricultural gross domestic product to pre-tsunami levels, returning the economy to a stable, long-term growth trend and reducing the fishery sector's vulnerability to natural disasters. Specifically, it aimed to help re-establish the country's fishing operations and augment the household income of fishers by restoring their livelihoods. With regard to agriculture, the programme aimed to encourage crop production in the atolls so as to rebuild the islanders' livelihoods and improve their diet, increase household income, reduce poverty and ensure food security.
8. **Target group and targeting approach.** Overall the Programme was aimed at poor households and adopted a geographical targeting approach. The **primary target group** for the agricultural component comprises poor farming households that depended on subsistence agriculture for food and income, and whose crops and production assets were destroyed/damaged by the tsunami. It was estimated that 5,000 households (or 20,000 beneficiaries) living in an area of approximately 1,000 ha would be assisted.³
9. **Programme components.** The Programme was organized around four main components as follows:
 - (i) **Recovery and sustainable development of the fisheries sector.** This component consisted of three sub-components: (a) support to fisheries production; (b) fish marketing; and (c) training and extension. About 40 per cent of the total programme cost was spent on this component and an equivalent proportion of the IFAD loan was allocated to associated credit lines, compared with 65 per cent at design stage (as Table 1 shows).
 - (ii) **Recovery and sustainable development of the agricultural sector.** This component involved four sub-components: (a) agricultural marketing; (b) adaptive research and agricultural extension; (c) strengthening the capacity of the Agriculture Centers; and (d) community farmers' organisations.⁴ At the design stage it was estimated that this component would cost 23.2 per cent of the overall budget. This had fallen to 15.9 per cent at project completion.
 - (iii) **Policy support to the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture.** Five sub-components were planned: (a) capacity building of MoFA staff; (b) strengthening of fisheries regulatory services; (c) diversification of capture fisheries; (d) organising the fisheries sector; and (e) follow-up implementation of the Agricultural Master Plan. These components were to consist of senior staff training, international visits, national workshops, consultancies and studies. Project costs attributed to this component rose from 8.6 per cent at design to 32.8 per cent at completion.
 - (iv) **Programme coordination.** The programme coordination component included the establishment of a Programme Implementation Unit (PIU) within MoFA, as well as staff training in procurement, audits, programme management and monitoring, preparation of reports and consultancies. The cost for this component rose from 2.8 per cent to 12 per cent.

² The supervision report also stated a conflicting number of 25 islands on the same page. Supervision Report, pp.73, 2013

³ With the reduction of the programme area for agriculture activities, the number of primary target groups was also reduced.

⁴ This sub-component did not exist until the Mid-term review and revitalization of the project.

Table 1 shows the financial weight attributed to each component.

10. **Project financing.** The sources of programme funds are shown in Table 2. According to the PCR, the disbursement of the SDR 1.4 million IFAD loan 663-MV was 99.9 per cent, the disbursement of the SDR 1.45 million IFAD loan 692-MV was 96.6 per cent and the disbursement of the IFAD grant was 99.4 per cent. The Italian grant did not materialize.⁵ The Government's actual cost amounted to 111.4 per cent of the estimated contribution at appraisal.

Table 1

Planned and actual programme financing by component (US\$ '000)

Component	Appraisal budget		Disbursed	
	US\$	%	US\$	%
A. Recovery and sustainable development of the fisheries sector	3,131	65.4	1,758.8	39.3
B. Recovery and sustainable development of the agriculture sector	1,111	23.2	710.4	15.9
C. Policy support to the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture	413.2	8.6	1,465.2	32.8
D. Programme coordination	132.6	2.8	538.9	12.0
Total	4,988.3	100	4,473.3	100

Table 2

Sources of programme funds (US\$ '000)

Financier	Appraisal		Disbursed	
	US\$	%	US\$	%
IFAD loan	4,095	82.1	4,258	95.2
IFAD grant	200	4.0		
Italian grant	500	10.0	0.0	0.0
Government	193	3.9	215	4.8
Beneficiaries	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	4,988	100	4,473	100

Notes: The IFAD budget is composed of three parts: a) Loan Number 663-MV (SDR 1,400,000, approximately equivalent to US\$ 2,100,000); b) Grant Number 783-MV (SDR 140,000, approximately equivalent to US\$210,000), Effective date 30th June 2006; c) Loan Number 692 – MV (SDR 1,450,000, approximately equivalent to US\$2,175,000), Effective Date 12th October 2006.

11. **Timeframe.** The initial IFAD loan (663-MV, USD 2.048 million) and grant (783-MV, USD 200,000) was approved on 19 April 2005 and became effective on 21 April 2006. The second loan (Loan 692-MV) for the same programme was approved in September 2005. The programme was completed on 31 December 2013, two years behind the original design.
12. **Implementation arrangements.** The Ministry of Fisheries Agriculture and Marine Resources (MFAMR) was the lead implementing agency. The programme was implemented as part of the Government's Economic Recovery and Reconstruction Programme, under the supervision of an independent steering committee comprising representatives of the Ministries of Finance and Treasury, Atoll Development, National Planning, and MFAMR, and of private-sector organizations. A programme implementation unit was set up in the MFAMR, to oversee the implementation of the project. The fisheries component was managed by the Director of Fisheries and Marine Resources; the agriculture component was managed, at the central level, by the Director of Agriculture and Forestry Services and, at each agriculture centre, by an agricultural officer.

⁵ The team will identify the reasons behind the cancellation of the Italian grant.

13. **Supervision arrangements.** Initially, the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) was appointed as a cooperating institution responsible for administering the financing and supervising the programme (as per the president report and loan agreement dated on June 2006), during which no supervision mission was undertaken. However, with the overall corporate shift to direct supervision, IFAD took over the direct supervision of the project effective from 1 January 2008, with the first supervision visit in November 2008.
14. **Adjustments during implementation.** According to the Pre-implementation Design Report, flexibility was built into the programme to allow adjustment to the rapid evolving (aid) situation⁶. Whilst the four major components of the programme remained constant, the mid-term review (MTR) in 2009 led to major changes in the nature of the various sub-components. For example, under the Fisheries component, the first sub-component concerned with replacing fishing vessels and equipping them with fish-storage facilities was dropped and funds reallocated to other activities. Another new sub-component involved a credit facility for fish hygiene improvements (ice plants and upgrading of fishing vessels) being offered to small and medium scale enterprises. More generally, the 'revitalisation process' after the MTR laid much more stress on institution and capacity building activities compared with the original programme design. There were similar modifications to the agricultural component of the programme. So for instance under the Agriculture component's sub-component of agriculture marketing, the original plan of upgrading/establishing a new fresh-produce market in Male was dropped, with the funds reallocated to other activities, in particular support for local level producers' cooperatives. Furthermore, the project area was also revised (see paragraph 4).
15. **Amendments to the financing agreement.** The financing agreement was amended six times for Loan No. 663-MV and Grant No. 783-MV and one time for Loan No. 692-MV: (i) reflecting changes made for supervision arrangement from UNOPS to IFAD's direct supervision (22 March 2008); (ii) revision on Procurement Guidelines (4 February 2009) (iii) revisions made during the mid-term review to the fisheries and agriculture component activities, as well as programme area (i.e. Revitalization Plan) (7 Sep 2009); (iv) increase of the authorized ceiling, modification of the disbursement condition, and modification of the composition of the steering committee (2 October 2010); and (v) loan reallocation and extension (22 December 2011 and 14 November 2012).⁷

III. PPE Scope and Methodology

16. The PPE exercise will be undertaken in accordance with the IFAD's Evaluation Policy⁸ and the IFAD Evaluation Manual (second edition, 2015). Analysis in the PPE will be assisted by a review of the theory of change of the project.
17. **Scope.** In view of the time and resources available, the PPE is generally not expected to undertake quantitative surveys or to examine the full spectrum of project activities, achievements and drawbacks. Rather, it will focus on selected key issues. The PPE will take account of the preliminary findings from a desk review of PCR and other key project documents and interviews at the IFAD headquarters. During the PPE mission, additional evidence and data will be collected to verify available information and each an independent assessment of performance and results.

⁶ As a result of the urgency of the situation, the normal IFAD three staged design phase, comprising Inception, Formulation, and Appraisal Missions, was not completed. Instead a single Design Mission visited the country. Thus, there was not enough time before the approval of the Programme by IFAD in April 2005 for thorough consultations with the Government of the Maldives concerning the design of its components and activities. Consequently, the Programme was approved during the internal review process of IFAD with provisions for an in-built flexibility during its implementation. In particular, the Technical Review Committee of IFAD requested that a pre-implementation mission be undertaken soon after the Programme was declared effective, in order to "adjust the design to the rapidly evolving (aid) situation, as well as to fill design gaps." (pp.1)

⁷ The loan extension has also been made to the Loan No.692-MV

⁸ <http://www.ifad.org/pub/policy/oe.pdf>

18. **Evaluation criteria.** In line with the IOE's Evaluation Manual (2015), the key evaluation criteria applied in PPEs in principle include the following:
- (i) **Rural poverty impact**, which is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a results of development interventions. Four impact domains are employed to generate a composite indication of rural poverty impact: (i) household income and assets; (ii) human and social capital and empowerment; (iii) food security and agricultural productivity; and (iv) institutions and policies. A composite rating will be provided for the criterion of "rural poverty impact" but not for each of the impact domains.
 - (ii) **Relevance**,⁹ which is assessed both in terms of alignment of project objectives with country and IFAD policies for agriculture and rural development and the needs of the rural poor, as well as project design features geared to the achievement of project objectives.
 - (iii) **Effectiveness**, which measures the extent to which the project's immediate objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
 - (iv) **Efficiency**, which indicates how economically resources/inputs (e.g. funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
 - (v) **Sustainability of benefits**, indicating the likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.
 - (vi) **Gender equality and women's empowerment**, indicating the extent to which IFAD's interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment, for example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision making work loan balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods.
 - (vii) **Innovation and scaling up**, assessing the extent to which IFAD development interventions: (a) have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (b) have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and other agencies.
 - (viii) **Environment and natural resource management**, assessing the extent to which a project contributes to changes in the protection, rehabilitation or depletion of natural resource and the environment.
 - (ix) **Adaptation to climate change**, assessing the contribution of the project to increase climate resilience and increase beneficiaries' capacity to manage short- and long-term climate risks.
 - (x) **Overall project achievement** provides an overarching assessment of the intervention, drawing upon the analysis and ratings for all above-mentioned criteria.
 - (xi) **Performance of partners**, including the performance of IFAD and the Government, will be assessed on an individual basis, with a view to the partners' expected role and responsibility in the project life cycle.
19. **Rating system.** In line with the practice adopted in many other international financial institutions and UN organizations, IOE uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 being the lowest score (highly unsatisfactory).

⁹ An average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of benefits will the project performance rating.

20. **Data collection.** The PPE will be built on the initial findings from a review of the PCR and other documents. In order to obtain further information, interviews will be conducted both at IFAD headquarters and in the country. During the in-country work, additional primary and secondary data will be collected in order to reach an independent assessment of performance and results. Data collection methods will mostly include qualitative participatory techniques. The methods deployed will consist of individual and group interviews with project stakeholders, beneficiaries and other key informants and resource persons, and direct observations. The PPE will also make use – where applicable – of additional data available through the programme’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. Triangulation will be applied to verify findings emerging from different information sources.
21. **Stakeholders’ participation.** In compliance with the IOE Evaluation Policy, the main project stakeholders will be involved throughout the PPE. This will ensure that the key concerns of the stakeholders are taken into account, that the evaluators fully understand the context in which the programme was implemented, and that opportunities and constraints faced by the implementing institutions are identified. Regular interaction and communication will be established with the Asia and the Pacific Division (APR) of IFAD and with the Government. Formal and informal opportunities will be explored during the process for the purpose of discussing findings, lessons and recommendations.

IV. Evaluation Process

22. Following a desk review of PCR and other key project documents, the PPE will involve following steps:
 - **Country work.** The PPE mission is scheduled for the period of 19– 27 Sep 2016. It will interact with representatives from the government and other institutions, beneficiaries and key informants, in Male and in the field. At the end of the mission, a wrap-up meeting will be held in Male to summarize the preliminary findings and discuss key strategic and operational issues. The IFAD country programme manager and/or country programme officer for the Maldives is expected to participate in the wrap-up meeting.
 - **Report drafting and peer review.** After the field visit, a draft PPE report will be prepared and submitted to IOE internal peer review for quality assurance.
 - **Comments by APR and the Government.** The draft PPE report will be shared simultaneously with APR and the Government for review and comment. IOE will finalize the report following receipt of comments by APR and the Government and prepare the audit trail.
 - **Management response by APR.** A written management response on the final PPE report will be prepared by the Programme Management Department. This will be included in the PPE report, when published.
 - **Communication and dissemination.** The final report will be disseminated among key stakeholders and the evaluation report published by IOE, both online and in print.

23. **Tentative timetable** for the PPE process is as follows:

Date	Activities
June – Sep 2016	Desk review
18 – 27 Sep 2016	Mission to the Maldives
Sep – October 2016	Preparation of draft report
Nov 2016	IOE internal peer review
Nov 2016	Draft PPE report sent to APR and Government for comments
Dec 2016	Finalisation of the report
Dec 2016	Publication and dissemination

24. **Field visit site selection:** Given the limited schedule for the field visit, the field visit sites are selected based on the following criteria:

- a. project investment allocation: the activities received higher investment allocation, priority will be given for site selection;
- b. representative of different activities: both fishery component (e.g. fish market and ice-plants), agriculture component (e.g. community organization, agriculture center), and policy component (e.g. quarantine center) have all given respective attention. Within the same type of activity, different performance level have also been considered to ensure representativeness.
- c. overlap of various activities: to maximize the time, if one island have multiple activities carried out, priority will be given;
- d. accessibility: local transportation availability and time span for travel.

The team has also consulted IFAD country program team and project team in the field for site selection to ensure the field visit is efficient and practical.

V. Specific issues for this PPE

25. **Evaluation criteria in this PPE.** Among the standard evaluation criteria mentioned in paragraph 16, based on the preliminary review of the project documents and PCR, the criterion for "adaptation to climate change" may not be rated unless the PPE mission reveals any relevant programme contribution worthwhile noting – positive or negative – in this regard. It is also noted that at the time the programme was designed, there was no specific attention of this agenda.

26. **Key issues for PPE investigation.** A PPE is a project evaluation with a limited scope and resources. As such, PPEs are not expected to investigate all activities financed under the project or to undertake an in-depth impact assessment. Key selected issues to be reviewed based on the initial desk review are presented below. These may be fine-tuned based on further considerations or information availability, consultation with APR and the Government.

(i) Targeting, coverage, and gender focus. There are three issues that have a bearing on the outreach and impact of programme services:

- a. Whether or not the project area selection was realistic and supported by sound diagnosis (i.e. the damage caused by the Tsunami and poverty incidence). This becomes even more significant given the reduction of the project area (see paragraph 4) and the lack of time for the satisfactory preparation of project design;
- b. Whether or not a single geographic targeting strategy rather than a strategy specifically targeting poor people is sufficient to benefit poor people;

- c. Given the lack of a gender mainstreaming strategy, how far did the project contribute to women's empowerment?

Taking into account these issues, the PPE will review: (a) the project's ability to reach its target group and the strategy to achieve it; (b) the extent of project results and impacts on various groups of the rural communities, with special attention to women; and (c) the role of and efforts made by IFAD to incorporate the issues concerning gender in project design and also during implementation through supervision missions and the MTR.

(ii) Relevance of project redesign and justification of increased policy support costs. Table 1 shows that the investment components (Component A and B) were greatly reduced (from 89% to 55%) whilst those financing activities in policy strengthening and institutional capacity building increased as did management costs (Component C and D). Considering the project's goal and objective in restoring agricultural production and fishery operation to pre-tsunami levels, it is important to investigate:

- a. whether the redesign was relevant to the beneficiaries' needs five years after the Tsunami;
- b. what relevance did these activities have for the pro-poor aspects of the programme;
- c. what has the funding of "policy support" supported and whether it was effective in building the human and institutional capacities of relevant stakeholders, generating an enabling policy environment for both agriculture and fishery industry development.

The mission will attempt to identify the reasons for such high policy support and project coordination costs and investigate how those activities are relevant to project objectives and beneficiaries' needs. A set of indicators will be developed to assess various activities under the policy support component and how these relate to the objectives of the project.

(iii) Project effectiveness in restoring the country's fishing operations:

There are no data on changes in post-harvest losses, the scale of fishing operations and the size of fish catches, or household fishery incomes. The only reference cited by the PCR comes from key informant interviews and focus group discussions. These indicate that women in Maduvvaree found the trainings on fish processing and handling very helpful, resulting in increased number of household participating in the dried fish business. Considering the planned activities on fishing vessels construction and fishing landing sites did not materialise, and only 157 people were trained in the fisheries sector, the PPE team will assess to what extent the programme has achieved the set objective of restoring the country's fishing operations, whether the improved technology, regulations, and institutions will reduce future risks, and what contextual factors have affected it. The team will also work to gather more quantitative/qualitative information changes in post-harvest loss, size of fishing operations and fish catches, and household incomes. Additionally, with its support in joining India Ocean Tuna Commission and Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification, has the project made Maldivian tuna more attractive in the international market thus generating greater income for the country?

(iv) Project effectiveness in supporting agricultural sector. The project supported the formation of producer cooperatives (i.e. CBPO) in a number of islands, a major innovation in the Maldivian context. What is not clear however is how far these cooperatives have been successful in improving cooperative agriculture production, promoting agriculture products' access to market, and facilitating the adoption of environmentally sustainable farming

practice; and how many are still functioning. The project also provided training for agricultural personnel both locally and abroad. Again, it is unclear as to what extent poor farmers have benefited from this training, whether these personnel are still active in agriculture and what their impact, and the impact of adaptive research, has been. The team will attempt to identify the degree to which these activities and others in the agricultural sector have improved the livelihoods of poor people.

- (v) Project efficiency.** There are major questions concerning the efficiency of the project. The non-operation of three out of four constructed fish markets, the non-materialization of the fish-landing site, and the shrinking of the programme area all appear to indicate major inefficiencies in the programme. The project beneficiary size needs to be further verified, so that the unit cost per beneficiary can be determined. Programme implementation cost rose to 12.0 per cent of the total budget compared to 2.8 per cent allocated at programme design. This again has to be assessed in terms of efficiency. The PPE team will assess the project efficiency compared with other IFAD operations implemented in Maldives, other post-emergency/Tsunami projects conducted by IFAD in other countries, and other post-Tsunami projects implemented at the same time period by other international agencies. Furthermore, given the nature of the programme, the significant delay in project implementation delayed critical rehabilitation activities (it was finally completed 9 years after the disaster had occurred), which raises issues concerning project relevance and IFAD's ability to respond to emergency situations.
- (vi) Programme impact.** The measurable evidence on rural poverty impact is very limited. The project supervision reports and PCR have repeatedly pointed to the weaknesses in the monitoring and evaluation system of the project. Although an outcome impact study was conducted, there is still very limited quantitative data or analysis on any of the four impact domains.¹⁰ Other difficulties in assessing the project impact include: records of beneficiaries and the details of the outcomes were not well maintained; no data was collected from a control area which could allow comparison studies; and the baseline data was collected in such a way that pre- and post-project analysis is extremely difficult.¹¹ The PPE team will conduct focus group discussions to better understand the project's impact on various domains and also use secondary household survey data to support the analysis if available. For example, the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (2002/2003 and 2009/2010) may shed light on some of the poverty impact aspects.
- (vii) Sustainability of programme benefits:** The PPE will pay particular attention to the sustainability of economic and financial impacts on fishery and agriculture activities. At the policy level the key question is the degree to which training and general support will continue to inform national level policy making. At more local levels, there are questions as to the viability of the one fish market which is still functioning. There are also issues concerning the credit supplied to ice-plants and the degree to which this will continue after the end of the project. As far as the agricultural sector is concerned, there are issues concerning the long term viability of local level producer cooperatives (the CBPOs) and the degree to which personnel trained by the project have and will remain active in this sector. Furthermore, the team will try to assess whether any increase in household incomes from fishery/agriculture has been sustained since the end of the project, and what fishery/agricultural producers

¹⁰ i.e. household income and net assets, human and social capital and empowerment, food security and agricultural productivity, and institutions and policies

¹¹ The baseline study was conducted on secondary data and did not focus on the beneficiaries of the Project (Outcome Impact Survey: p.46).

think will happen in the future. As for fishery component specifically, whether the fisheries management system (the tracking equipment and so on) is being run in a fashion, which indicates sustainability - e.g. replacement of equipment; further training.)

(viii) Environment sustainability and natural resource management. Given the environment vulnerable situation of the country, the aspect of environment and natural resource management is also critical to assess the impact of the intervention. The following key questions will be answered to understand this issue: (i) whether certification of MSC and member of IOTC will imply positive fishery activities and natural resource management in the country, and how it will affect fish stocks and ecosystem; (ii) whether the training on traditional fishery processing and reduced fish processing and waste on the beaches would affect environment sustainability in large; (iii) whether the improved agricultural practices (e.g. soil and moisture conservation, biological pest control, and organic agriculture) would bring a positive contribution to natural resource management.

27. The team will consist of Ms Shijie Yang, IOE Evaluation Analyst and Mr Roderick Stirrat (Fishery and Agriculture expert, IOE consultant). The team will be responsible for the final delivery of the report, under the supervision of Mr Fabrizio Felloni, Lead Evaluation Officer, IOE.

VI. Background Documents

28. The key background documents for the exercise will include the following:

PT-AFRP project specific documents

- Appraisal Report (2005)
- IFAD President's Report (2005)
- Design Report (Pre-implementation version) (2006)
- Mid-term review report (2009)
- Programme Financing Agreement (2005) and Amendments
- Supervision Mission Aide Memoire and Reports (2008-2013)
- Project status reports (2008-2013)
- Project completion report (2014)
- Baseline Assessment Report (2009)
- Outcome Impact Survey (2014)

General and others

- IFAD (2015). Evaluation Manual – Second Edition
- IOE (2012). Guidelines for the Project Completion Report Validation (PCR) and Project Performance Assessment.
- IFAD (2011). IFAD Evaluation Policy.
- Various IFAD Policies and Strategies, in particular, Strategic Framework (2002-2006), Rural Finance, Rural Enterprise, Targeting, Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment