

9310113-②
PD-ARB-196-01

DOC. ③ INSIDE

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Small Scale Fisheries Development University of Rhode Island			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0113	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/AGR
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>80-37</u>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>69</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>79</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>79</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION <i>Technical 3/28/80</i>	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ <u>2,010,000</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>5/4/69</u>	
B. U.S. \$ <u>2,010,000</u>			To (month/yr.) <u>8/31/79</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>8/28-31/79</u>	

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decision and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Prepare PID for a Cooperative Agreement with URI to continue support to the Center developed under the 211(d) grant to assist the University in refining and maintaining the technical capability in the field of fishery management and development and to provide for the use of such capability for enhancing the fisheries sector, serving the needs of the LDCs.	K. Osborn (AID)	March 15, 1980
2. Prepare PP for the Cooperative Agreement (To include an assessment of the demand for services from URI)	K. Osborn (AID)	May 15, 1980
3. Prepare PAF	K. Osborn (AID)	June 15, 1980
4. Prepare Action Memo and PIO/T	K. Osborn (AID)	July 1, 1980

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change implementation Plan
C.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER BANK AND PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

MMozynski, DS/AGR
 Kenneth W. Osborn, DS/AGR/F, Project Manager *KWC 3/24/80*
 Gerald Donovan, Director, ICMRD, URI
 Claire Idyll, NOAA, Evaluation Team Leader

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: *[Signature]*
 Date: 3/28/80
 Tony Babb

Project Evaluation Summary (PES) - Part II

13. Summary

The project (a 211(d) grant) was terminated, effective December 31, 1979, after a period of more than ten years of operation. The final evaluation report concluded that progress of the project was excellent in that the University met and surpassed the conditions of the grant, indicating that the project was well designed to enable the University to develop the capability to make significant contributions to small scale fisheries development through A.I.D. or other elements of the international development community. However, the evaluation report deals too much with the fact that funding for the facility should be continued by A.I.D. and it does not provide enough detail on (a) what the project accomplished, (b) what should be emphasized in the recommended follow-on agreement and (c) who has made use of the grant and how. The report further alludes to a lack of an A.I.D. fisheries strategy and in addition a lack of A.I.D. program emphasis on small scale fisheries, at the time that the capability at URI was being developed. In fact, A.I.D. has a fishery strategy paper, prepared in 1976. The Fisheries Division is presently updating this document. The apparent lack of emphasis of A.I.D. on fisheries is related to the lack of recognition of claims to zones of extended jurisdiction on the part of foreign governments by the U.S. until recent years; American private fishing vessels operated in those claimed zones and the State Department discouraged A.I.D. involvement in marine fishery development where jurisdictional disputes existed.

The evaluation report concludes that A.I.D. should continue to support the URI International Center for Marine Resource Development, to enable it to retain its key faculty and the necessary back-up support. This recommendation will be examined and a proposal prepared, if warranted. The PID mentioned in Part I, Section 8, is part of this process of examination.

14. Evaluation Methodology

During the course of this project, three evaluations were conducted that provided guidance to the University of Rhode Island for modifications to improve its performance. As the end of the project approached, it was decided that a terminal review would be useful to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the project in meeting the original and amended purpose and the goal. The evaluation was conducted by a team of four, consisting of three A.I.D. employees as follows: Dr. Dillard Gates, Africa Bureau, Mr. Edward Williams, Asia Bureau, and Dr. Twig Johnson, Program and Policy Coordination Bureau; and Dr. Clarence Idyll, Office of International Fisheries, NOAA, Team Leader.

15. External Factors

During the course of the project, the State Department posture in regard to claims of extended jurisdiction by other governments, resulted in a policy of discouraging U.S. involvement in small-scale fishery development projects in LDCs. This resulted in USAID's making less than optimal use of the resources developed at the University of Rhode Island's International Center for Marine Resources Development.

16. Inputs

Not pertinent at this time.

17. Outputs

The project has resulted in the publication of over 100 technical and scientific reports on all aspects of small scale marine fisheries. Nearly 100 individuals from the U.S. and LDCs were trained in various aspects of small scale fisheries at the University's campus in Rhode Island. The fisheries information service developed under the grant sent out something more than 5,000 publications, reports, etc., in response to requests for these materials. A total of 30 requests for assistance in small scale fisheries from A.I.D. were met by the provisions of services from the International Center for Marine Resource Development.

18. Purpose

To develop a capability to assist LDCs in the development and better use of their fishery resources.

19. Goal/Subgoal

To increase the food supply and economic and social conditions of small scale fishermen in LDCs.

20. Beneficiaries

USAID's, LDC governments and ultimately the small scale fishermen and fishing communities, that are among the poorest in the LDCs.

21. Unplanned Effects

Not pertinent at this time.

22. Lesson Learned

That 211(d) is an effective tool for developing a powerful institutional capability to assist A.I.D. in developing resources of the LDCs, but not in maintaining and sustaining that capability over an extended period of time. A Cooperative Agreement would appear to be an ideal follow-on to the 211(d) grant in order to maintain the URI response capability to assist A.I.D. in enhancing the fisheries sector to serve the needs of LDCs.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

The February 8, 1980, Evaluation Report is attached.