

5.2 Low-temperature 300.

**SIFR**

**STRATEGY FOR INTERNATIONAL  
FISHERIES RESEARCH**

**EVALUATION REPORT**

**November 1995**

## **Preface**

An independent evaluation of the SIFR at the end of the second year of the initiative was suggested by the Third Fisheries Development Donor Consultation held in April 1994. In March 1995 the SIFR Steering Committee decided on an interactive workshop format for the evaluation which was scheduled to take place in September/October 1995.

In August 1995 Mr. Sten Sverdrup-Jensen, Director of the Institute for Fisheries Management and Coastal Community Development at the North Sea Centre in Denmark, was contracted as the Evaluator. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation are attached as Annex 1.

The Evaluation Workshop, held in Rome on 27 September 1995, followed on from the Evaluator's circulation of a questionnaire earlier that month to members of the Fisheries Development Donor Consultation. The Meeting Agenda and List of Participants are attached as Annexes 2 and 3.

The present Evaluation Report summarizes the main events and milestones in the short life of the SIFR initiative. It assesses the performance of SIFR in attaining its objectives based on statements made by donor agencies and by the desk research undertaken by the Evaluator. Finally, it presents two different options for a next phase of the SIFR initiative.

It should be noted that the SIFR is an ongoing process and that an impact assessment cannot be made at this early stage in the process. The present Report is therefore in the form of a Review Report rather than that of an (ex post) Evaluation Report.

As the UNDP project INT/91/045 "Support for Donor Coordination in Fisheries Research" has served as the financial basis of the SIFR initiative the evaluation is valid for this project also.

## **Acknowledgement**

The Evaluator would like to thank donor representatives who have participated in the Evaluation exercise for their valuable input and kind support. A special word of thanks goes to the SIFR Executive Secretary, Dr. Brian Davy and his Secretary, Ms. Faouzia M'Hadhbi for their great help in providing detailed factual information about SIFR and circulating the evaluation questionnaire to donor agencies' fishery focal points. Their help greatly facilitated the work of the Evaluator.

Hirtshals, November 1995

Sten Sverdrup-Jensen

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of abbreviations .....	4
1. Introduction .....	5
2. Strategy for International Fisheries Research .....	6
2.1 Adoption of the new SIFR initiative .....	6
2.2 SIFR Progress - March 1993 to March 1994 .....	8
2.3 SIFR Progress - April 1994 to September 1995 .....	9
2.4 Funding of SIFR .....	11
3. SIFR achievements in meeting objectives .....	11
3.1 Evaluation methodology applied .....	11
3.2 SIFR development objective .....	12
3.3 SIFR immediate objectives .....	13
4. The future SIFR .....	16
4.1 Options for the future .....	17
4.2 OPTION 1. "The Fisheries Research Support Unit" .....	17
4.3 OPTION 2. "The Fisheries Research Facilitating Unit" .....	20
4.4 Other options .....	21
References .....	22
ANNEXES	
Annex 1 (Terms of Reference) .....	24
Annex 2 (Provisional agenda - SIFR evaluation meeting) .....	28
Annex 3 (List of participants - SIFR evaluation meeting) .....	29
Annex 4 (Dissemination of information on SIFR 1992-94)31	
Annex 5 (List of donors & institutions visited/contacted by the ES) .....	35
Annex 6 (SIFR project, SIFR bulletins and SIFR publications) .....	37
Annex 7 (Demand-led research needs and priorities) .....	39
Annex 8 (Donor contributions) .....	40

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACFR	Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research
ACP-EEC	Africa Caribbean Pacific-European Economic Community
ASI	Advanced Science Institute
CEC DG	Commission of the European Community - Directorate General
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
EC	European Commission
ES	Executive Secretary
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
FIPIS	Fishery Project Information System
ICAM	Integrated Coastal Area Management
ICLARM	International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management
ICOD	International Centre for Ocean Development
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFOMA	International Fish Meal and Oil Manufacturers Association
LDC	Least Developed Countries
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
R&D	Research and Development
SC	Steering Committee
SIFR LFA	SIFR Logical Framework Analysis
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WB	World Bank

## 1. Introduction

### Study of International Fisheries Research

The SIFR acronym originally stood for "Study of International Fisheries Research". The Study initiative, which was financially supported by 18 multilateral, bilateral and private donors, was taken at the First Fisheries Development Donor Consultation held in Paris in 1986. The objectives of the Study were to:

- (a) determine the degree to which lack of information is an impediment to effective fisheries management and development;
- (b) assess the long-term (25-year) potential contribution of research to the economic and social progress of the sector in developing countries;
- (c) evaluate the capabilities of the developing countries to undertake the research needed; and
- (d) propose ways and means to enhance, during the forthcoming decade, the impact of international aid on developing countries' research capacity.

The Study Report, which was published in 1992, proposes a strategy for international cooperation in fisheries research, setting out the long-term objectives and operational targets for a program and discussing the scope of research and the appropriate location for different kinds of research at national, regional and international level.

The fourth objective of the Study was fulfilled in the Report by an Action Plan which contains the Study's suggestions for actions which can be taken by the donor community at national, regional and international level.

The Action Plan focuses on the provision of support to fisheries research which is complementary to that provided under the CGIAR (i.e. research undertaken by ICLARM).

An indicative plan for this complementary support calls for donors to: focus on helping countries to develop their fisheries policies and programs, and determine their research priorities, and to support the following; (a) national institutions linked to regional or wider networks; (b) the exchange of scientific information; (c) regional initiatives; (d) the transfer and adaptation of technology resulting from research; (e) additional research conducted by universities and advanced scientific institutes; and (f) the exchange of information on fisheries research activities.

When considering means of implementation, the Study calls for two types of support: (a) direct staff work to promote donor coordination; and (b) technical and scientific inputs and initiatives.

Scientific and technical inputs to support adaptive research would, according to the Action Plan, include:

- (a) assisting in the preparation of national research strategies and plans to strengthen national research capacities;
- (b) supporting regional research networks, twinning and other arrangements, to promote closer collaboration between institutes and individual scientists;
- (c) providing an active interface between research results and development programs, with the goal of promoting rapid transfer of technology; and
- (d) providing a channel to bring the results of strategic research to developing countries and ensure that they are adapted and applied.

The Study notes the comparative advantage of having the FAO Department of Fisheries, with its technical advisory capabilities, play a leading role in making these inputs available.

## **2. Strategy for International Fisheries Research**

### **2.1 Adoption of the new SIFR initiative**

The Draft Study Report was presented at the Second Fisheries Development Donor Consultation held in Paris in October 1991, where the implementation of the recommended Strategy and Action Plan for international collaboration in fisheries research was discussed.

The 'diagnosis' section of the Study was accepted by all participants and found particularly useful for donor consideration of support to fisheries research. The broad research themes identified in the Strategy were accepted by all parties. However, it was noted that sociological and economic aspects were under-emphasized and that in order to gain the attention of donor agencies, fisheries research would have to be promoted in the broader context of aquatic ecosystems and the communities that rely on them.

The participants all agreed that a major limitation to the development of needs-oriented research strategies in developing countries was the low priority given to fisheries research. It was suggested that the existence of a CGIAR fisheries research centre (ICLARM) and a mechanism for complementary donor support (SIFR) would enhance the position of fisheries research as a candidate for donor assistance.

It was agreed that the informal Fisheries Development Donor Consultation should continue as the SIFR initiative forum and consultations be held on a biannual basis. A Steering Committee.

SC, appointed by the participants in the Consultation, and with representatives from the World Bank, UNDP, EC, FAO and bilateral donors, would take responsibility for the follow-up.

Dissemination of the Study Report, an executive summary and a leaflet targeted at senior managers and administrators in both developing and developed countries was given high priority for follow up. The findings and recommendations could then be discussed at regional and national meetings of scientists and research administrators and in bilateral negotiations.

The Steering Committee of the Study submitted a proposal for the appointment of a facilitator/executive secretary to:

- (a) take a catalytic role in the follow-up process and progressively add details to the indicative plan in consultation with donors, recipients and ICLARM; and
- (b) collaborate with a (new) research unit in FAO to assess potential for donor coordination on the basis of the indicative plan.

The proposal generated a heated debate on the need for such a person, the role of the facilitator vis-à-vis the role of FAO, and the affiliation of the post. The appointment of a facilitator was finally agreed, albeit with some reservations. A committee was appointed to prepare a logical framework for the SIFR follow-up and for funding reasons it was decided by the SC to base the Facilitator with the WB.

With regard to the funding of SIFR in the new "strategy mode", the WB and UNDP made commitments to cover the salary, operations and administrative support costs of the Facilitator, while the EC would cover the cost of complementary activities, particularly meetings in several regions to disseminate SIFR and to promote the drawing up of regional research plans and fundable proposals. IDRC and FAO also made commitments to this effect.

The intentions of the SC to take rapid action on the appointment of the SIFR Facilitator/Executive Secretary (ES) and to get the new SIFR, "Strategy for International Fisheries Research" off the ground did not materialize. It was not until June 1992 that the UNDP Project Document "Support for Donor Coordination in Fisheries Research" was formally approved and not until March 1993 that the first ES, Dr. Ziad Shehadeh (appointed in October 1992) could take up his position.

In the meantime, the base of the ES had, for WB internal reasons, been moved from the WB to the IDRC in Ottawa, Canada and resolutions found to the associated administrative difficulties. Little progress had been made in pursuit of SIFR objectives except for awareness creation through the distribution of the Study Report and presentation of the Report by SC members and others, at various regional and global meetings as specified in Annex 4.

## 2.2 SIFR Progress - March 1993 to March 1994 (Executive Secretary: Dr. Ziad Shehadeh)

The SIFR Action Plan priorities, set out by the SC at the time when the ES first took up his position, were for a two-year period for which core funding had been secured to promote:

- (a) the continued dissemination of information on SIFR;
- (b) the identification of demand-driven research priorities;
- (c) the development of a research agenda on the basis of identified priorities.

The immediate work priorities set for the ES were:

- (a) establishment of the SIFR Secretariat at IDRC;
- (b) preparation of a work plan for the first year;
- (c) initial tour of donors and selected institutions; and
- (d) preparation of the first issue of a SIFR newsletter.

The report of the ES submitted to the Third Fisheries Development Donor Consultation (April 1994) summarizes the main achievements of SIFR during the first year of operation. They include:

- the establishment of the SIFR Secretariat at IDRC,
- the preparation of a SIFR workplan June 1993 - April 1994,
- the continued dissemination of the SIFR Report and Summary (documented in Annex 4).
- the establishment of liaison with donor agencies, CGIAR, ICLARM, FAO and various institutions in donor countries and in Asia (documented in Annex 5),
- the establishment of the SIFR Bulletin as a means of rapid communication with donors and development partners, and completion of preparations for publishing of a quarterly SIFR newsletter (four nos. of the Bulletin issued by March 1994 as documented in Annex 6),
- the initiation of a major effort for the identification of demand-led fisheries research needs and priorities, and coordination with FAO on its initiatives to this end (documented in Annex 7), and



- the initiation of activities for (i) the identification of projects for collaborative donor support, and (ii) exploring ways and means of following up with donors on the result of the priority-setting of research initiatives.

Work on the identification of demand-led research needs and priorities accounted for most of the ES's time and energy. SIFR played a catalytic and/or collaborative role with direct involvement concentrated in the preparatory and follow-up phases. Preparatory activities for the research priority-setting exercise included the identification of interested donors and implementing institutions, and the planning of the exercises, including the preparation of project concept papers. Follow-up activities involved disseminating summaries of the results of the research priority-setting exercises through the SIFR Bulletin, distribution of workshop reports and the preparation of project concept papers, based on identified needs and priorities and their dissemination to donors.

Modest progress was made in the matching of identified research needs of developing countries with the aid policies and strategies of the donors, and the identification of on-going and/or pipeline projects that could serve as focal points for donor collaboration. In his report, the ES notes that "Procedural options for both "identification" and "matching" have to be explored with the donors to arrive at workable approaches".

At the SC meeting in October 1993, the ES recommended the preparation of "a refined (SIFR) strategy, with a clear statement of rationale and objectives, and a framework of activities which sets down practical approaches to strategic objectives". The recommendation was based on the apparent lack of consensus among SC members on the strategic objectives of SIFR, as observed by the ES. There was serious disagreement between the ES and the SC on the issue as the SC felt that the strategy, as set down in the SIFR Study, was clear and adequate. The disagreement contributed to the decision of the ES not to continue after the end of this initial one year contract in March 1994.

### 2.3 SIFR Progress - April 1994 to September 1995 (Executive Secretary: Dr. Brian Davy)

Following the resignation of Dr. Shehadeh the SIFR initiative went through a period of reduced activity. Dr. Brian Davy, member of the SC, provided interim support to the SIFR Secretariat, while continuing his normal duties, until in September 1994 he took up the ES position on secondment from IDRC.

Acting upon the recommendation of the Donor Consultation in April 1994, the SC at its meeting in November 1994, decided that SIFR should, in priority order:

- (a) focus efforts on the identification of projects for immediate donor collaboration, from approved projects, projects in the pipeline and running projects.

## 2.4 Funding of SIFR

Core funding of the SIFR initiative for a two year (experimental) period was committed in 1992 by UNDP ( US\$300,000),and the WB (US\$90,000).This total amount of US\$390,000 was to cover ES salary, travel expenses and administrative costs. Office space and secretarial support was provided from IDRC as a contribution in kind.

SIFR "field" activities such as workshops, studies, publications etc. were to be sponsored by contributions from the international donor community.

By 31 July 1995 the Revenues Received and Pledged totalled Ca\$1,019,810 equivalent to US\$ 762,350 of which:

	<u>Ca\$</u>
IDRC	742,610 (including Ca\$320,500 for "Sustainable Oceans Development")
ICOD	25,000
UNDP	252,200

Total expenses and commitments on core activities up to 31 July 1995 totalled Ca\$534,537 leaving Ca\$488,555 (US\$364,500) for the continuation of activities (or Ca\$205,180 (US\$153,100) if funds earmarked for "Sustainable Oceans Development" are excluded).

Donor contributions to field activities up to March 1994 are estimated at US\$486,000 plus 7 months of expert time (Annex 8). No estimate has been made of contributions after March 1994. Based on initial expressions of interest, donor contributions to SIFR field activities have fallen far below SC expectations.

## **3. SIFR achievements in meeting objectives**

### 3.1 Evaluation methodology applied

The interactive method applied for assessing to what extent the SIFR objectives have been met comprised: (a) circulation of the response to an evaluation questionnaire among some 85 persons identified on the SIFR Donor List<sup>1</sup> and participants in the Evaluation Workshop, and (b) discussion among the workshop participants on the details of the response.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comprises participants in the Fisheries Development Donor Consultation and others. Some donor agencies are represented on the list by two or more persons.

A total of 19 persons, representing, a.o., the major donors in the fisheries sector responded to the questionnaire which asked for answers to a series of "Yes/No" questions related to the fulfilment of SIFR objectives and for qualifying comments to the answers made. Not all respondents answered all questions.

The discussion among the 35 participants in the Evaluation Workshop - among them three invited representatives from developing countries - was guided by the Evaluator.

### 3.2 SIFR development objective

*To improve the effectiveness of donor assistance to fisheries research for the benefit of developing countries.*

A small majority of the respondents (11) is of the opinion that SIFR has not contributed in any significant way to this overall objective. This is, however, not because effectiveness has improved, but for other reasons: A large majority (16) finds that there is still a significant need for improvement, and most of these (14) believe that a facilitating mechanism such as SIFR would have a significant role to play.

#### Comments/discussion:

The SIFR Study has been a useful instrument for taking up the research issue with some donors, supporting a stronger argument both internally and in discussions with partner countries. It has influenced the evolution of perceptions and concepts and continues to do so. However, fisheries is not a donor priority sector and fisheries research does not have much appeal with those who determine aid policies.

The SIFR initiative in its present form suffers from the lack of a mandate and official recognition by donors. Many donors cannot contribute to SIFR core activities for this reason. Affiliation with and/or institutionalization within a multilateral organization, would help to overcome the problem.

The role of SIFR needs to be more clearly defined; objectives need revision. It is not clear whether the target of SIFR initiatives are the donors, the recipient countries or both. This touches upon the role of SIFR vis-à-vis FAO. According to the latter, it was intended that SIFR would target the donors, while FAO would target the recipient countries, in accordance with its mandate.

Donor commitment to the concept of coordinated action and to SIFR as the facilitating mechanism would need reconfirmation. The present exclusion of recipient countries from the SIFR governance needs reconsideration.

### 3.3 SIFR immediate objectives

*(a) To disseminate the SIFR Study and stimulate developing country reaction to it.*

The respondents almost unanimously (17) agree that there is still a need to draw the attention of developing countries to the analysis and conclusions of the SIFR Study. However, ambiguity is expressed as to ways and means. A small majority (10) thinks that regional (thematic) workshops would continue to be an appropriate method.

Comments/discussion:

Irrespective of the efforts made to disseminate information on SIFR (Annex 4), the Study is unknown to many, if not most, LDCs. The Study and its conclusions are in particular unknown to the private sector in the developing countries and to policy makers and senior administrators. The recipient country representatives attending the Evaluation Workshop recommended continued distribution of the Study and also asked for information on funding directions from donors.

Workshops are found useful if some form of follow-up is warranted. Follow-up may be the creation of regional research networks or the funding of national or regional research projects identified from the priority-setting exercises in the workshops. It is difficult for donor agencies to attend technical workshop due to a shortage of manpower resources. Donors cannot make commitments at short notice. Projects have to fit in with current policies and priorities. This is the reason for the modest donor follow-up on project proposals originating from SIFR workshops and reports. It was further stated that donors tend to respond to government requests rather than to workshop outcome or SIFR proposals.

It is difficult to encourage national/regional decision makers, who are instrumental in the allocation of national funding to fisheries research, to attend technical workshops; particularly if there is no donor participation.

*(b) To increase awareness of donors and recipients of needs and priorities with relation to the Indicative Plan and increase effective coordination.*

Only two out of three respondents (13) are aware of the research needs and priorities identified in the "Fisheries donors' indicative plan for complementary support to research" which forms part of the SIFR Study Action Plan. Of these, more than half (7) are of the opinion that the Indicative Plan should be revised. Almost all respondents (17) state that they feel a need for more effective coordination of their agency's support to fisheries research, with the support of other donors. This applies to fisheries research at both the international (strategic research) level and at the regional and national (applied research) levels.

#### Comments/discussion:

SIFR activities should focus on institutional and policy issues. The greatest operational concerns are the establishment of an enabling environment for research up-stream and the interface between research and decision making down-stream. Therefore it is critically important to involve people responsible for fisheries management, i.e. policy makers and senior administrators, in setting the priorities for fisheries research at the national and (sub-) regional levels.

In this context, SIFR should consider shifting the focus of awareness-creating activities from the regional to the (sub-) regional and national levels, and to work more directly with government agencies in a few carefully selected countries. Initiatives to encourage donor support for fisheries research at the national and (sub-) regional levels have to come from the countries themselves; and the appropriate place for countries to raise the issue would be at the existing fora for interaction with donors, e.g. Round table discussions, Coordinating Committees etc. SIFR could, assisted by FAO, be helpful in the formulation of national fisheries research plans and the proposals for donor assistance. This approach might motivate developing countries to promote the SIFR initiative to the donors.

The wish for more (effective) coordination is more often than not a wish that other agencies would adjust their plans and activities in accordance with the plans and activities of the agency in question. Lack of coordination is not the consequence of a lack of good will and intentions, but reflects the fact that donors have their own aid policies, interests and agendas and their own administrative practices. Very often the flexibility required cannot be provided, particularly where projects are already on-going or ready to take off. Recipient countries are normally in a better position to ensure coordination and should be involved anyway. However, national line ministries often do not have sufficient capacity or capability to ensure coordination of donor supported activities. Where this is the case SIFR should be able to assist on request.

#### *(c) To improve coordination among implementing agencies.*

Respondents to the questionnaire unanimously agree that there is a need for a more synergistic relationship between implementing agencies. Answers are rather more ambiguous (11 Yes/7 No) as to the need for a facilitation mechanism, such as SIFR, to promote collaboration and information exchange between implementing agencies.

#### Comments/discussion:

At the strategic research level there is a need for greater interaction between ICLARM, FAO and ASIs to identify priority areas for complementary research and to coordinate such research. In April 1994 the FAO Expert Consultation on Fisheries Research identified a series of research topics and priorities for FAO in the following fields: analysis of change in the world fisheries situation; food policy for fisheries; small pelagic fisheries; aquaculture; and applied research needs to support UNCED.

A greater need for synergistic relationships is found among national and regional research institutions. SIFR could play a catalytic role in establishing such relations particularly at the regional level through promotion of research networks. However, there may be regionally-based institutions better placed for the function, e.g. the Mekong Secretariat, Forum Fisheries Agency etc. SIFR should therefore focus on (sub-) regions where such institutions are not currently in existence e.g. the Great African Lakes. SIFR may also facilitate a (missing) flow of research information to fisheries research and management institutions in developing countries.

*(d) To provide support to the Steering Committee in updating the Indicative Plan for submission to the Third Fisheries Donor Consultation in 1993 (1994).*

The question as to whether there was a continuing need for an SIFR Secretariat, as the executive body of the Fisheries Development Donor Consultation and the SC, was put to donors. Only a small majority of the respondents to this question (9 out of 16) answered in the affirmative, whereas the rest were reluctant to support a continuation of the present SIFR.

#### Comments/discussion:

The majority of the respondents in favour of a continuation agreed that SIFR core funding should be provided from multilateral agencies. Bilateral agencies should primarily support SIFR field activities. With regard to the organizational set-up, some respondents have pointed out the need for the affiliation of SIFR with an international organization with an adequate mandate, e.g. with ICLARM, FAO or UNDP.

The Evaluator asked the donors participating the Evaluation Workshop for their outlook on the possible continuation of SIFR beyond the funding period (i.e. after the Fisheries Development Donor Consultation in April 1996). The enquiry revealed that continued funding of SIFR core activities from present sources of funding may not be easy because of general budget cuts and/or a change of priorities. Only IDRC has made a commitment to continue support to SIFR provided that other donors also participate. Most bilateral agencies find it difficult to finance SIFR core activities within the present institutional framework. Funding may be easier if SIFR were to be affiliated with an international organization. Bilateral funding of SIFR field activities may be possible particularly where they fit in with ongoing projects/programs supported by the donor in question.

The FAO representative affirmed the continued interest and willingness of the organization to provide staff time and other technical support to SIFR.

#### 4. The future SIFR

Donor response to the questionnaire circulated by the Evaluator and to the discussion held at the Evaluation Workshop, has clearly indicated that there is still a considerable need for:

- (a) improvement in the effectiveness of donor assistance to fisheries research;
- (b) coordination among donors on identification, planning and implementation of fisheries research projects in close dialogue with partner countries;
- (c) awareness creation in developing countries of the importance of research for the long term maximization of the social benefits accruing from fisheries, particularly among senior sector managers/administrators,
- (d) an international mechanism/body to facilitate the coordination and awareness creation.

However, when it comes to the more operational questions as to how, when and at what level and scale coordination and awareness creation should take place, donors' views are much more diverse, reflecting the differences in overall aid policies, sector strategies, project approaches, organizational structures and administrative practices among the donors. The diversity of views also reflects the varying ways in which donor agencies are able to support different forms/mechanisms of collaborative donor efforts.

The donor response to the questionnaire and the statements made in the follow-up discussion have made it clear that substantial changes in the scope, activities and possibly the organizational set-up and location of the SIFR as well, would be needed for the initiative to become fully recognized, utilized and financially supported by the international donor community. Some of the donors have given continued support to the SIFR process contingent on including partner countries in the governance.

However, while donors did provide comment during the evaluation, it emerged that there was little agreement on what changes were necessary to enable the SIFR initiative to respond to the need to facilitate the coordination of donor support. This support would ideally be extended to fisheries research, its promotion and awareness creation.

Against this background, it is recommended that for the remainder of its "strategy" phase ( i.e. until present core funding terminates), the SIFR initiative should concentrate on defining its own future objectives, outputs, activities, organization, governance, affiliation and funding.

#### 4.1 Options for the future

A number of design options could be considered for the SIFR initiative. Each design option would correspond to a specific set of objectives and a specific mode in which activities would be implemented.

In response to the broad suggestions offered by the donor community for the design of the future SIFR, two different options are presented below. Option one would mean a major revision of the SIFR objectives, a redirection of activity focus and scope, and a substantial change in the organizational set-up, including the relocation of the SIFR Secretariat. The second option would call for a redirection of SIFR focus and scope of activities, while the organizational set-up and affiliation would, by and large, remain unchanged.

Both options would contribute to the fulfilment of the overall SIFR development objective: Fisheries management decision making in developing countries based on the application of requisite and sufficient scientific information.

Both options would require active support from the international donor community in terms of funding of SIFR core operations and field activities and interaction with SIFR staff. There would also be a need to define a mechanism for consultation with partner countries to determine their willingness to participate in the SIFR process.

#### 4.2 OPTION 1. "The Fisheries Research Support Unit"

This option is based on the assumption that coordination of donor support to fisheries research would have a better chance of materializing through initiatives taken by the individual donor agencies at their own discretion, rather than through matchmaking by a third party facilitator. The critical factor would be the easy access by donor agencies and partner countries to up-dated key information on development cooperation in fisheries R&D in developing countries on a project by project, country by country basis. One role of the Support Unit would be to provide such information on a regular basis and in a user friendly format to all concerned with fisheries development. Information should comprise pipeline projects as well as ongoing and recently terminated projects and also, to the extent possible, include projects supported by NGO's and other non-donor organizations. Up-dated information on donors' overall aid policies, as well as specific policies related to fisheries development and research, should form part of the information package. Information on the policies, priorities and projects of partner countries should also be included.

This option is also based on the assumption that donor agencies will increasingly require information relevant to their fisheries agenda through institutionalized channels as they will, in the future, have fewer and fewer fisheries advisors among their technical staff. A lower number



of advisors means much reduced informal sector-networking between donor agencies and much less information passed through the informal channels than previously.

Further, the option is based on the premise that there would be an important role for catalytic action in the establishment or strengthening of professional, regional research networks. Such networks, which may include fisheries administrators, could in time be expanded to play an instrumental role in the setting down of national research agendas. They may also play an important part in creating awareness among decision makers of new advancements in research, with a possible impact on fisheries management. Additionally, they may, because of their transnational character, play an important role in exposing developing country researchers, who may otherwise work in isolation from the international research community, to their peers in neighbouring countries and even further afield.

Finally, it is assumed that the focus of the Support Unit would have to be widened to provide both the enabling environment for research and research activities and also the interface between research and decision making. Unless the results generated from fisheries research are communicated to decision makers and well understood by them, and subsequently applied, donor support to research would contribute only modestly to development.

- Immediate objectives:**
- (a) To keep donors and partner countries regularly up-dated with key information on the policies and projects of those donors supporting fisheries research and management; as well as to inform on the policies, priorities and projects of partner countries in order to improve coordination and hence effectiveness of the assistance;
  - (b) To establish regional or international fisheries research networks within main scientific areas and to maintain the networks where relevant and desired.

#### Activities

- ad objective (a)** Donor agencies, partner countries and NGO's would be kept up-dated by the Support Unit on pipeline, ongoing and recently terminated projects in the fields of fisheries research and management in developing countries. In addition, all participants would be regularly up-dated on the aid policies and sector strategies of those involved, and have access to key information on institutions undertaking fisheries research in both developing and developed countries.

- ad objective (b) After contacts with fisheries scientists, research institutions, fisheries and other authorities to be included as members, the Support Unit would effect the setting up or strengthening of research networks at international, regional or sub-regional levels. Activities would include development of the concept of the individual network, the legal and organizational set-up, recruitment and affiliation of a network of coordinators and organization of initial regional meetings for setting network priorities, etc. Administration of some of the research networks may also be part of the function.

### Organizational set-up

The Fisheries Research Support Unit would be an autonomous operation established as a joint venture between FAO<sup>2</sup> and a group of interested donors (with the possible participation of NGO's). Membership would be open to donors and FAO, the latter as the representative of developed and developing countries. A Steering Committee, comprising representatives from the donor community, FAO and the partner countries would provide the governance. Donor representatives would be appointed by the Fisheries Development Donor Consultation<sup>3</sup>, and the developing country representatives by the FAO Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research, ACFR. The Unit would be hosted by FAO but would operate independently of FAO like the CGIAR/TAC Secretariat. The Unit Chief appointed by the Steering Committee would be in charge of the operation which could in time, depending on the level of donor support and the scale of network activities, comprise a staff of up to 4 persons.

In addition to accommodation, FAO input would be the FIPIS database with information on more than 5000 projects<sup>4</sup>. FAO might also contribute staff and technical support. The advantages of establishing the Unit within FAO include proximity to the world's largest centre of fisheries expertise and information.

Donor input would comprise the funding of the activities of the Steering Committee, Unit operations and field activities. Donor contributions might be made in the form of direct financial contributions, secondment of staff to the Unit and/or the sponsoring and running of research networks or related field activities. Financial contributions would, however, be required for the maintenance of core functions.

---

<sup>2</sup> FAO support for this option would be needed.

<sup>3</sup> It is assumed that this informal forum for donor interaction will remain active in years to come.

<sup>4</sup> The FIPIS database is currently being evaluated as to its performance and effectiveness. The evaluation will address the structure of the database and its programming; the methodology of input and possibility of electronic transfer from donor agencies; the ease of information retrieval and the structure of searches; the use of the database as a communication tool; and development options.

Partner country inputs would include research facilities, staff time, information and networking arrangements.

#### 4.3 OPTION 2. "The Fisheries Research Facilitating Unit"

This option is based on the assumption that coordination of donor support to fisheries research and management may, in particular circumstances, require the assistance of a third party facilitator. Such cases requiring either pro-active or reactive facilitation would typically comprise:

- (a) situations where several donor agencies are supporting activities (or are planning to do so) of a similar nature in one country and where the capacity of the national authorities to coordinate the support is insufficient.
- (b) (sub-) regional projects where more countries and/or donor agencies are (or are considering becoming) involved and where no regional authority/body exists capable of coordinating the activities/support. An example would be projects addressing research/management issues related to the African Great Lakes.
- (c) national or (sub-) regional complex projects where fisheries research/management is only one important aspect among many others, where more line ministries/authorities are stakeholders, and where more than one donor is (or is considering becoming) involved. This would typically include Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) projects.

- Immediate objectives:
- (a) To facilitate intensified coordination of donor assistance to national and transnational fisheries research and management projects in order to increase the effectiveness of the assistance.
  - (b) To improve coordination of donor assistance to national and (sub-) regional ICAM projects and collaboration between the various stakeholders.

#### Activities:

- ad objective (a) Project coordination initiatives would be taken based on indications from developing country authorities, donor agencies or FAO that such coordination by a third party facilitator would be advisable/necessary and cost efficient. Where national fisheries research and management projects are concerned, the intervention of the Facilitating Unit might typically be the establishment of a forum for dialogue and coordination of plans and

activities between donor agencies and national authorities and, if needed, the assistance to the latter in setting research priorities. In the case of transnational projects, coordinating initiatives would typically comprise facilitation of the interaction between the project partners (international and national) in organizing the project and structuring the planning and implementation process.

- ad objective (b) Coordinating initiatives may also be called for by national authorities, donor agencies or international organizations, but a more pro-active role for the Unit would be required because of the complexity of projects and the wide spectrum of authorities and other stakeholders involved. SIFR activities could include the identification of project sites, involving interested donor agencies and national authorities at various levels, and the formulation of the project concept. Further activities could include the facilitation of the interaction between the project partners as mentioned above.

#### **Organizational set-up**

The Fisheries Research Facilitating Unit would be an independent association established by a group of interested multilateral and bilateral donor agencies and FAO. Membership would be open to donor agencies and FAO. A Steering Committee comprising representatives from the donor community, FAO and possibly partner countries would provide the governance. Donor representatives would be appointed by the Fisheries Development Donor Consultation; and the developing country representatives by the ACFR. The Unit would be hosted by IDRC but operated independently. An Executive Secretary, appointed by the Steering Committee, would be in charge of the Unit which could, depending on the level of donor support and the scale of activities, comprise a staff of 3-4 persons.

Donor input to the Unit would cover the funding of the activities of the Steering Committee and Unit operations and activities in the field. Financial contributions in the range of US\$300,000/year would be required for the core functions.

#### **4.4 Other options**

Hybrids of the two options presented above may constitute alternative options. However, SIFR should under no circumstances be designed to pursue more than a limited number (maximum three) of objectives at a time to ensure focus.

## References

### A. Minutes of Meetings and Reports

1. Second Fisheries Development Donor Consultation, Paris, 7-9 October 1991, Report.
2. SIFR Steering Committee Meeting, Paris, 9 October 1991, Minutes.
3. Fisheries Donors Steering Committee Meeting, Brussels, 15-18 September 1992, Minutes.
4. Fisheries Donors Steering Committee Meeting, Rome, 13-16 & 18 March 1993, Minutes.
5. Report of the SIFR Executive Secretary, 11 March - 30 September 1993.
6. Fisheries Donors Steering Committee Meeting, Bergen, 11-12 October 1993, Minutes.
7. Third Fisheries Development Donor Consultation, Paris, 25-27 April 1994, Report of the SIFR Executive Secretary.
8. Third Fisheries Development Donor Consultation, Paris, 25-27 April 1994, Final Report.
9. Report of the SIFR Executive Secretary, 1 April to 31 October 1994.
10. SIFR Steering Committee Meeting, 14 & 15 November, New York, Notes.
11. Report of the SIFR Executive Secretary, 1 November, 1994 - 28 February 1995.
12. SIFR Steering Committee Meeting, FAO, Rome, 9-15 March 1995, Notes.
13. Report of the SIFR Executive Secretary, 1 March - 15 September 1995.
14. SIFR Financial Report to 31 July 1995.

### B. Other Documents

14. "Support for Donor Coordination in Fisheries Research", UNDP Project Document.
15. A Study of International Fisheries Research, World Bank, Policy and Research Series No. 19, 1992.
16. FAO Expert Consultation on Fisheries Research, Rome 12-15 April 1994. FAO Fisheries Circular No. 877.

17. Some experiences with "Secretariats", IDRC, October 1994.
18. Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Strategy, SIFR, February 1993.
19. Fisheries Information in Asia: Needs and Opportunities, SIFR, 1995.
20. Aquatic Biodiversity Conservation: A review of current issues and efforts, SIFR, 1995.
21. A strategy for postharvest fisheries in Asia, SIFR. 1995.
22. SIFR Bulletins 1 - 6.
23. Information note to the Fisheries Donors Steering Committee, Rome, March 1995.  
"Resolution on fisheries in the context of ACP-EEC cooperation adopted by the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly on 7 October 1993 in Brussels. Follow-up concerning fisheries and aquatic resources research". CEC DG VIII.

(TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR  
EVALUATION OF INT/91/043  
Support to Donor Coordination in Fisheries Research  
(SIFR)  
Strategy For International Fisheries Research

### Background

The original agreement was signed by UNDP/OPS on July 7, 1992. This project was funded in association with the World Bank and IDRC. The project was initially for 24 months duration.

The immediate objectives of the project were:

- To disseminate the SIFR report and stimulate developing country reaction to it;
- To increase awareness of donors and recipients of needs and priorities with relation to the Indicative Plan and increase effective coordination;
- To improve coordination among implementing agencies; and
- To provide support to the Steering Committee in updating the Indicative Plan for submission to the Third Fisheries Development Donor Consultation in 1993.

The donor coordination facilitator (SIFR Executive Secretary) took up his post in April 1993 at the SIFR Secretariat in Ottawa, Canada.

SIFR is guided by a Steering Committee composed of representatives of the World Bank, UNDP, FAO, Commission of European Communities, IDRC and NORAD.

### Purpose

To evaluate the progress in meeting the objective of this project and if warranted to make recommendations for improvements for the remainder of the project.

### Terms of Reference

Specifically, the external evaluation will:

1. evaluate the work to date and outputs of this project subsequent to the publication of the Study of International Fisheries Research. It would include a review of all the inputs including those of the three agencies supporting the Secretariat (World Bank, UNDP and IDRC).
2. An evaluation workshop will be held in Rome on September 27th, 1993. This

workshop will be attended by selected representatives of the Fisheries Donor Consultations. In addition, national program representatives who have participated in the SIFR program to date will also be invited to attend.

3. A suggested evaluation methodology is as follows:

- a) prepare a questionnaire using the draft outline in Appendix A;
- b) present the analyzed results of the returns to this questionnaire at the Evaluation Workshop and then probe why there was or was not the desired fit with the original objectives.

The advantage of this meeting approach would be the strong interaction element among all participants; this would allow a more effective and interactive restructuring of SIFR. It was agreed that this would be done in English to keep costs to a minimum.

Timing

The evaluator should allocate his time as follows:

New York - 1 day - briefing with UNDP and UN/OPS

Ottawa - 4 days - briefing with SIFR Executive Secretary

Rome - 3 days - (26, 27 & 28 September) to meet the SIFR Steering Committee (26th), lead the one-day evaluation with donor representatives and 3 developing country representatives (27th) and final meetings (28th)

New York - 3 days - finalize report and debrief



## APPENDIX A

### SIFR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

To improve the effectiveness of donor assistance to fisheries research for the benefit of developing countries.

### IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

#### Objective I:

To disseminate the SIFR report and stimulate developing country reaction to it:

**Output 1.1** A Strategy for International Fisheries Research (SIFR) which is well understood by donors and recipients and which is actively used in aid negotiations with national and regional fisheries research organizations.

**Activity 1.1.1** Disseminate information generated in the SIFR Report.

**Activity 1.1.2** In collaboration with donors, provide financial support for individual workshops aimed at presenting the SIFR and obtaining the reaction of developing countries to it.

**Output 1.2** Regional Research Plans

**Activity 1.2.1** In cooperation with donor and recipient organizations, facilitate the planning and implementation of regional workshops dealing with support to fisheries research in developing countries and provide assistance to the FAO staff engaged in fisheries research, support and information in the preparation of regional research plans.

#### Objective II:

To increase awareness of donors and recipients of needs and priorities with relation to the Indicative Plan and increase effective coordination.

**Output 2.1** Improved donor coordination including coordination programmes and joint projects.

**Activity 2.1.1** Review the policies, on-going programmes and future actions of donor agencies in respect to fisheries research.

**Activity 2.1.2** Provide catalytic support to networking between developing countries to

focus their requirements for international support.

Activity 2.1.3 Provide a limited amount of "last resort" small grant funding (to complement the work of one or more donors in a given field e.g. to finance the participation of a country institute in a collaborative research effort)

Activity 2.1.4 Draw up and disseminate to donors and recipients periodic revisions of the Indicative Plan for priorities and support to fisheries research at the regional level in developing countries as well as for selected national programs.

Activity 2.1.5 Based on the identification of research priorities at national and regional levels and of funding requirements, facilitate the matching of these with donors' interest and resources.

### Objective III:

To improve coordination among implementing agencies.

Output 3.1 A more synergistic relationship among implementing agencies.

Activity 3.1.1 Maintain a close working relationship with the FAO staff engaged in fisheries research support and information and eventually with the FAO Fisheries Research Unit proposed in the SIFR report.

Activity 3.1.2 Maintain a close working relationship with the fisheries research activities of the OCEAR to promote, complement and facilitate information exchange between the fisheries program supported by the OCEAR and activities under the donor's Indicative Plan.

Activity 3.1.3 Seek cooperation with private sector research interests.

### Objective IV:

To provide support to the Steering Committee in updating the Indicative Plan for submission to the Third Fisheries Development Donor Consultation in 1993.

Output 4.1 An improved Indicative Plan which grows out of SIFR but includes a more detailed picture of current and proposed support to fisheries research.

Activity 4.1.1 Consult with donors and recipients, monitor progress in the implementation of the Indicative Plan and report accordingly.

Activity 4.1.2 Act as Secretary to the Steering Committee for the follow-up of the Indicative Plan.

## PROVISIONAL AGENDA

## SIFR EVALUATION MEETING - ISTITUTO ITALO-AFRICANO

27 SEPTEMBER 1995

1. 9:00 - 9:10 a.m.

Welcome

- a. Introduction
- b. Summary of SIFR Objectives

2. 9:10 - 9:30 a.m.

Briefing by the Evaluator

- a. Nature and Scope of Evaluation
- b. Report on Analysis of Received Questionnaires

3. 9:30 - 10:30 a.m. (coffee, 10:30 - 11:00 a.m.; luncheon, 12:30 p.m.)

Evaluation Discussion

- a. Continuing Relevance of Development Objective
- b. Review of Objectives, modes of operation and institutional arrangements (Questionnaire).

4. 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Next Steps

- a. Possible Future of SIFR
- b. Use of Report of this Evaluation
- c. Fisheries Donor Consultation, April 1996

5. Closing

## OTHER ARRANGEMENTS

- \* Coffee is available from bars inside and near the Istituto.
- \* Lunch is also available from bars and restaurants near the Istituto.
- \* The SIFR Steering Committee will arrange a reception at a restaurant (map attached) at 18:30. There will later be a no-host dinner (fish) at the same restaurant at 19:30. All are welcome and encouraged to join in.

## SIFR EVALUATION MEETING

27 September 1995

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR: Sten Sverdrup-Jensen

## SIFR STEERING COMMITTEE:

World Bank	Eduardo Loayza
UNDP	Philip Reynolds
EC	Andreas Laggis
FAO	David James
CANADA	Brian Davy
NORWAY	Kirsten Bjoru (unable to attend)

## PARTICIPANTS FROM PARTNER COUNTRIES:

COTE D'IVOIRE	Antoinette Ziehi, Institut des Savanas, Département des Ressources Animales, Bouake.
ECUADOR	Jorge Calderon, CENAIM Eduardo Cervantes
MALAYSIA	Liong Pit Chong, Chief, National Prawn Fry Production and Research Centre, Kota Kuala Muda, Kedah.

## DONOR COUNTRIES:

DENMARK	Thomas Gloerfeld-Tarp
FINLAND	Ossi Lindquist Hannu Mölssa
FRANCE	Frédéric Macqueron
GERMANY	Martin Bilio Werner Schmidt
GREECE	Eleni Mountouri Faie Zambelis Argyris Kallianiotis Alexis Tsangridis

ICELAND	Tumi Tomanson
ITALY	Nino Merola
JAPAN	Hiromoto Watanabe, First Secretary, Embassy of Japan, Rome.
THE NETHERLANDS	Fritz Roest Martin van der Knaap
NORWAY	Gabriela Bianchi
PORTUGAL	Francisco Garcia
SPAIN	Miguel Recio Miguel Peña
SWEDEN	Magnus Torell
UNITED KINGDOM	John Tarbit Dick Beales
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Becky Rootes, NOAA, Washington
FAO	Ziad Shehadeh Mario Pedini
Greenpeace	Mathew Gianni
European Commission	Cornelia E. Nauen

## DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON SIFR (1992-'94)

Information Provided at Meetings	Year
1. Asian Fisheries Forum, Singapore	'92
2. CEC/STD3 Meeting, Malaysia	'92
3. 12th Session FAO/CECAF, Ghana	'92
4. ICLARM, GIFT Project Meeting, Philippines	'92
5. ICLARM/National Research Support Programme (NRSP) Meeting, Singapore	'92
6. Nordic Fisheries Advisers Meeting	'92
7. World Fisheries Congress, Greece	'92
8. Annual Meeting of the EEC Fisheries Development Advisors, France	'93
9. CGIAR Center Week, Washington, D.C., USA	'93
10. FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), Italy	'93
11. FAO/CIFA Working Party on Aquaculture, Zimbabwe	'93
12. FAO/GFCM 20th Session, Malta	'93
13. FAO/IOFC/Gulf Fisheries Committee, Iran	'93
14. FAO/IOFC/ Committee for the Development and Management of Fisheries in the Bay of Bengal (BOBC)	'93
15. FAO/IPFC SCORRAD, Thailand	'93
16. FAO/COPESCAL Working Party on Aquaculture, Colombia	'93
17. ICLARM/UNDP International Workshop on Genetics in Aquaculture (INGA), Philippines	'93
18. Second AFS Symposium on Diseases in Asian Aquaculture, Thailand	'93
19. Sub-Committee on Aquaculture, USA	'93
20. UNDP (DGIP/DOALOS) Consultative Meeting on Training in Integrated Management of Coastal & Marine Areas for Sustainable Development, Sardinia	'93
21. UNDP Administrator's Policy Group (various meetings), UNDP, NY, USA	'93

Distribution of Report and/or Summary	By	Year
1. Asian Fisheries Society (AFS)	SIFR SC*	'92
2. Fisheries directors & directors of fisheries research institutions (80)	Fisheries Dept., FAO	'92
3. Participants in SIFR missions and working groups	Fisheries Dept./FAO	'92
4. Agrodev Canada Inc., Ontario, Canada	IDRC	'93
5. Asian Development Bank, Philippines	SIFR ES**	'93
6. Central Institute of Freshwater Aquaculture (ICAR), India	"	'93
7. Centro Nacional de Acuicultura e Investigaciones Marinas (CENAIM), Ecuador	"	'93
8. Delegado Regional de Cooperacion Paises Andinos, Embassy of France, Caracas, Venezuela	"	'93
9. Department of Research, National Board of Fisheries, Sweden	"	'93
10. FAO Regional Office for the Near East & N. Africa, Egypt	"	'93
11. Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Solomon Islands	"	'93
12. Freshwater Aquaculture Center, Central Luzon State University (FAC/CLSU), Philippines	"	'93
13. Institute of Aquaculture Research Ltd., Norway	"	'93
14. Institute of Social Studies, Netherlands	"	'93
15. International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR), Netherlands	"	'93
16. International Union of Biological Sciences/RBA Programme, Netherlands	"	'93
17. Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research (KISR), Kuwait	"	'93
18. Libraries ( 168 in 91 countries)	WB	'93
19. Library of Congress, USA	"	'93
20. Marine Policy Center, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA	SIFR ES	'93

21.	Marine Resources Assessment Group Ltd., UK	"	'93
22.	Maryland Biotechnology Institute, Maryland, USA	"	'93
23.	Maurice Lamontagne Institute, Dept. Fisheries & Oceans, Quebec, Canada	IDRC	'93
24.	Mekong Delta Farming Systems R&D Center, Cantho, Vietnam	SIFR ES	'93
25.	MI International, Newfoundland, Canada	IDRC	'93
26.	Ministry of Fisheries, Dept. Science & Technology, Vietnam	SIFR ES	'93
27.	NACA, Thailand	"	'93
28.	Renewable Resources Assessment Group, Centre for Environmental Technology, UK	SIFR ES	'93
29.	Seaconsult Ltd., Newfoundland, Canada	IDRC	'93
30.	SEAFDEC Liaison Office, Thailand	SIFR ES	'93
31.	Shanghai Fisheries University, China	"	'93
32.	Swedish Centre for Coastal Development & Management of Aquatic Resources, National Board of Fisheries, Sweden	"	'93
33.	UNDP Resident Representatives (all countries)	UNDP	'93
34.	University of Trondheim, Norwegian Institute of Technology, Norway	SIFR ES	'93
35.	World Bank distributors (65)	WB	'93
36.	World Bank resident representatives/mission offices (75)	WB	'93
37.	World Bank university outreach program (500 copies)	WB	'93-'94
38.	FAO-SEAFDEC Workshop on Fishery Information & Statistics in Asia (15)	SIFR consultant	'94
39.	Malaysian Institute of Marine Affairs, Malaysia	SIFR ES	'94
40.	Moi University, Dept. Fisheries, Kenya	"	'94

\* SC = Steering Committee \*\* ES = Executive Secretary

#### Articles, Reviews, Announcements, Interviews, Press Releases, Translations

1.	Article: NAGA	ICLARM	'92
2.	Article: EC Fisheries Cooperation Bulletin	CEC, DG VIII	'92



- |     |  |                |             |
|-----|--|----------------|-------------|
| 3.  | Announcement of SIFR publications to: (a) 65 WB distributors and (b) 400 editors of journals/periodicals   | WB             | '93         |
| 4.  | Review copies of SIFR's "Fish for the Future" sent to relevant periodicals/scholarly publications and 20 abstracting, computer database, and microfiche services | WB             | '93         |
| 5.  | Translation of SIFR's "Fish for the Future" to Arabic, Chinese & Spanish   | FAO            | '93         |
| 6.  | Display of SIFR report & summary displayed at scholarly/professional conferences   | WB             | '93-'94     |
| 7.  | Press release (English & French), Canada   | IDRC           | '94         |
| 8.  | Interview: Radio Canada (French)   | IDRC           | '94         |
| 9.  | Interview: CBC, Canada (English)   | IDRC           | '94         |
| 10. | Interview: Evening Telegram, Canada (English)  | IDRC           | '94         |
| 11. | Article: <i>Marine Policy</i>  | CEC/DG<br>VIII | In<br>press |

## LIST OF DONORS & INSTITUTIONS VISITED/CONTACTED BY THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

### Donors

1. Asian Development Bank, Manila, Philippines
2. Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), Cronula, Australia
3. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Hull, Canada
4. Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), Copenhagen, Denmark
5. Directorate General for International Cooperation, The Hague, Netherlands
6. Direzione Generale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo, Rome, Italy
7. Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA), Reykjavik, Iceland
8. International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada
9. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Multi-lateral Dept., Oslo, Norway
10. Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), Oslo, Norway
11. Overseas Development Administration (ODA), London, UK
12. Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation with Developing Countries (SAREC), Stockholm, Sweden
13. Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), Stockholm, Sweden
14. United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Rosslyn, VA, USA
15. World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA

### Institutions

1. ASEAN-CEC Aquaculture Development & Coordination Programme, Bangkok, Thailand
2. ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta, Indonesia
3. Asian Fisheries Society, Manila, Philippines
4. Centro Nacional de Acuicultura e Investigaciones Marinas (CENAIM), Ecuador
5. Department of Fisheries & Oceans, Ottawa, Canada
6. Department of Research, National Board of Fisheries, Goteborg, Sweden
7. FAO Regional Office for Asia & the Pacific (RAPA), Bangkok, Thailand.
8. FAO Regional Office for the Middle East & North Africa, Egypt.
9. Fisheries Department, FAO, Rome, Italy
10. Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Solomon Islands
11. Freshwater Aquaculture Center, Munoz, Philippines

12. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway
13. International Agricultural Centre (IAC), Wageningen, Netherlands
14. International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM), Manila, Philippines
15. International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR), The Hague, Netherlands
16. Marine Policy Center, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Mass., USA
17. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), NOAA, Silver Spring, MD, USA
18. Natural Resources Institute (NRI), Chatham, Kent, UK
19. Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia & the Pacific (NACA), Bangkok, Thailand
20. North Sea Centre, Hirtshals, Denmark
21. Secretariat, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA
22. Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), Liaison Office, Bangkok, Thailand
23. Special Program for African Agricultural Research (SPAAR), World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA
24. Swedish Centre for Coastal Development & Management of Aquatic Resources (SWEDMAR), National Board of Fisheries, Goteborg, Sweden
25. The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Fisheries, Oslo, Norway

## SIFR PROJECTS

- Fisheries Information and Statistics in Asia
- ICAM (Integrated Coastal Area Management)
- International Research Network on Shrimp Pathology - Immunology - Genetics
- Aquatic Biodiversity Conservation
- Management of the African Great Lakes (Lake Victoria)
- INGA (International Network for Genetics in Aquaculture)

## SIFR BULLETINS

- No. 1 Issued December 1993  
Title: Identification Of Demand-Led Fishery Priorities and Needs:  
Workshop on Fishery Information & Statistics in Asia
- No. 2 Issued January 1994  
Title: Identification Of Demand-Led Fishery Priorities and Needs:  
Fish Productivity (Aquaculture): Development and Research Needs in Sub-Saharan Africa
- No. 3 Issued January 1994  
Title: Regional Workshop on Fisheries Commodity Conservation and Utilization  
Demand-Led Research Needs & Priorities in Asia
- No. 4 Issued February 1994  
Title: Opportunity For Donor Collaboration  
Inter-Regional Research On Fish Genetics  
The International Network on Genetics in Aquaculture (INGA)
- No. 5 Issued February 1995  
Title: INGA Update
- No. 6 Issued March 1995  
Title: Information For Aquatic Resources Management in Asia

## SIFR PUBLICATIONS

38

Published by SIFR in 1995:

- Fisheries information in Asia : needs and opportunities. Ottawa, ON, SIFR, 1995. 65 p.  
Author: Cho, Yong-Ja  
UDC: 007:639.2(5)
- Aquatic biodiversity conservation : a review of current issues and efforts. Ottawa, ON, SIFR, 1995. 56 p.  
Authors: Maclean, R.H.  
Jones, R.W.  
UDC: 574(204)
- A strategy for postharvest fisheries research in Asia. Ottawa, ON, SIFR, 1995. 116 p.  
Study Conducted by: National Resources Institute (NRI)  
Chatham, Great Britain  
UDC: 639.2.001.5(5)

# DEMAND-LED RESEARCH NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

39

	Resource Conservation and Management	Fish Productivity (Aquaculture)	Commodity Conservation and Utilization (Post Harvest)	Human Linkages, Socio- Economics and Policy	Fisherie Informatic
ASIA		1. Report Pending  2. FAO  3. Asian Fisheries Society (AFS)	1.- Report Completed: "A Strategy For Post Harvest Fisheries Research In Asia"  - Concept Paper to CIDA: Identification of Demand-Led Fisheries Research Priorities in Developing Countries: Commodity Conservation & Utilization (Post Harvest Fisheries) in Asia  2. NRI/ODA	1. Concept Paper to DANIDA: "Identification of Demand-Led Fisheries Research Priorities in Developing Countries"  2. NORTH SEA CENTRE ICLARM AFSSRN	1. Report completed: "Fisheries Information in Asia: Needs and Opportunities"  2. IDRC/WB/UNDP FAO-RAPA/SEAFDEC  3. ICLARM/BOBP/Mekong Secretariat
AFRICA		1. Report Completed: "Aquaculture Development and Research in Sub-Saharan Africa" FAO TP 23 + 23 Supplement 16 Concept Papers  2. FAO  3. Other CEC Project support	1. Concept Paper: "Commodity Conservation and Utilization in Africa"   3. ODA interested to fund	1. Concept Paper to DANIDA: "Identification of Demand-Led Fisheries Research Priorities in Developing Countries"	
LATIN. AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN		1. Report Pending  2. FAO-Italy (Aquila)  3. Spain?	1. Concept Paper to CIDA		
SOUTH PACIFIC	1. Study Cancelled by FFA  2. FFA/SPC  3. CIDA/IDRC				
MEDITERRANEAN					
EASTERN EUROPE					

1. Output/When

2. Lead Agency

3. Other Supporting Agencies

Donor	Amount (SUS)	Expert time (m/m)	Activity
1. UN Economic Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)	80,000		Aquaculture research priorities in sub-sahara Africa
2. CEC/DG XII	38,000		"
3. ALCOM Project (Africa)		1	"
4. FAO/Italy TF AQUILLA II Project (L. America)	60,000	1	Aquaculture research priorities in L. America
5. UNDP MEDRAP II Project		1	Aquaculture research priorities in the Mediterranean
6. IFREMER		1	"
7. FAO	35,000	3	Aquaculture research priorities (Africa & L. America)
8. FAO	14,000		Workshop on fishery information and statistics in Asia
9. IDRC	35,000		"
10. WB Consultant Trust Fund	35,000		"
11. SEAFDEC	22,000		"
12. FFA/CIDA	60,000		Research priorities in the S. Pacific Islands
13. IDRC	7,000		"
14. ODA	100,000		Research priorities in post harve fisheries (Asia)
Total	486,000	7	