

Report of the
FAO VIRTUAL GLOBAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON THE FISHERIES CO-MANAGEMENT EVALUATION
GUIDEBOOK

Rome, 7–11 and 17 September 2020

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2021

PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This report summarizes the proceedings of the FAO Virtual Global Expert Workshop on the Fisheries Co-management Evaluation Guidebook held on 7–11 and 17 September 2020 using the Zoom platform. The workshop was prepared and coordinated by Mr KwangSuk Oh, Senior Fishery Officer of the FAO Fisheries Division, Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch. The report was prepared by Ms Elisabetta Martone (Fishery Officer) and Mr Robert Pomeroy (Consultant). Mr Andrew Park (FAO Consultant) is acknowledged for his assistance in editing.

The preparation of this document benefitted from the funding provided through two FAO projects: “Fisheries Co-management Capacity Development Program” (GCP/GLO/046/ROK) and “Fisheries Co-Management Capacity Development for Blue Communities: Sustainable Fisheries and Diverse Livelihoods” (GCP/GLO/080/ROK).

ABSTRACT

The FAO Virtual Global Expert Workshop on the Fisheries Co-management Evaluation Guidebook was held on 7–11 and 17 September 2020 using the Zoom platform to produce a new draft of the guidebook on evaluating the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems. The workshop was attended by 42 participants: 25 experts, 5 FAO observers and 12 FAO core team members.

The workshop was organized into both plenary and breakout sessions, taking into consideration the participants’ time zones (Group A – North, Central, South America and the Caribbean; Group B – Africa and Europe; Group C – Asia and the Pacific). At the first plenary session, the guidebook’s structure was presented. During breakout sessions, the experts discussed how to develop an efficient methodology to evaluate the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems by addressing each section of the guidebook. The breakout session outcomes were reported at the second plenary session for further discussion. Based on these outcomes, an updated outline of the guidebook was then developed and discussed during the final plenary session. Suitable topics for case studies proposed by the experts were also discussed.

The updated outline contains important recommendations to be incorporated into the guidebook, including the following: the scale of the analysis should encompass all fisheries; the scope of the analysis should refer to existing fisheries co-management systems at fishery, community and sector levels; indicators should be included to evaluate the process, operations and function of the co-management systems, and the achievements of the co-management plans (i.e. output and outcome indicators grouped into four categories: social, economic, ecological and governance); good co-management practices should be described; co-management design, development and implementation processes should be modelled with flowcharts; definitions should be provided or improved (e.g. co-management plan, fisheries management plan and management effectiveness).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The contributions of the workshop participants are greatly acknowledged. The facilitators, Ms Helga Josupeit, Mr Robert Pomeroy and Ms Lena Westlund, were critical to the delivery of the workshop. Ms Yumi Son and Ms Turan Rahimzadeh provided invaluable support to its organization. This workshop was held thanks to the financial support of the Korea Maritime Institute of the Republic of Korea through the project “Fisheries Co-management Capacity Development Program” (GCP/GLO/046/ROK) and of the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea through the project “Fisheries Co-Management Capacity Development for Blue Communities: Sustainable Fisheries and Diverse Livelihoods” (GCP/GLO/080/ROK).

INTRODUCTION

1. The year 2020 marks the 25th anniversary of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), a document unanimously adopted by FAO Members in 1995. It establishes the principles and standards for the sustainable use of fishery resources, and was created in response to the dire situation of the 1980s in which fishery resources could no longer sustain fishing efforts. To further address fisheries issues, including unsustainable fisheries practices and deficiencies in the livelihoods of fishers and fishing communities, FAO has been working with national governments and civil society over the past decades and has introduced several international instruments, particularly the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) in 2012, and the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines) in 2014. The SSF Guidelines incorporate the arrangement of sharing responsibility and authority between government and resource users. This partnership arrangement is generally recognized as fisheries co-management. During the International Symposium on Fisheries Sustainability hosted at FAO headquarters in November 2019, participants from different sectors and regions around the world suggested to strengthen fisheries co-management and its principles in their discussions, key messages and recommendation actions.

2. Within this framework, FAO has established the two-year project “Fisheries Co-Management Capacity Development Program” (GCP/GLO/046/ROK) funded by the Korea Maritime Institute of the Republic of Korea, and the five-year project “Fisheries Co-Management Capacity Development for Blue Communities: Sustainable Fisheries and Diverse Livelihoods” (GCP/GLO/080/ROK) funded by the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea. The overall goal is that all stakeholders, especially policymakers, have a better understanding of the concept of fisheries co-management in order to establish appropriate types of fisheries co-management systems at the national or local level and implement well-designed fisheries co-management programmes on the ground. The following knowledge products will be produced: (i) a guidebook on evaluating the effectiveness of existing fisheries co-management systems; (ii) a knowledge product showcasing current management practices worldwide and featuring a series of case studies on evaluating fisheries co-management effectiveness by applying the guidebook; and (iii) a toolbox combined with e-learning courses to provide practical guidance on using the guidebook to evaluate fisheries co-management effectiveness.

3. Within this context, the FAO Virtual Global Expert Workshop on the Fisheries Co-management Evaluation Guidebook was organized. It was held on 7–11 and 17 September 2020 using the Zoom platform to produce an advance draft of the guidebook on evaluating the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems. In August 2020, a first draft of the guidebook was distributed to experts to gather their comments before the workshop. Based on the received feedback, a second draft was prepared and shared with the experts for discussion during the workshop. The workshop was attended by 42 participants: 25 experts, 5 FAO observers and 12 FAO core team members (Appendix 1).

PLENARY SESSION I

Opening

4. The moderator, Mr KwangSuk Oh, welcomed the participants and provided some guidance on the virtual workshop modalities. The official opening was conducted on the first day of the workshop. The ceremony was officiated by Mr Audun Lem, Deputy Director, FAO Fisheries Division (for his speech, see Appendix 2).

Agenda

5. Ms Yumi Son presented the agenda (Appendix 3) and introduced the participants. The workshop was organized into three plenary and three breakout sessions.

Presentation and discussion of the guidebook

6. Mr Robert Pomeroy presented the draft of the guidebook on evaluating the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems, in particular sections 1 “Introduction” and 2 “The adaptive policy analytical framework”. In detail, he explained the purpose of the guidebook: to offer a process and method to evaluate the performance of fisheries co-management systems in order to enhance their effectiveness and improve knowledge about fisheries co-management. He mentioned that the concept of management effectiveness refers to the degree to which management actions are achieving the goals and objectives of the fisheries co-management plan. Next, he described the outline of the document and presented the adaptive policy analytical framework, which consists of three complementary and linked parts (i.e. the context, the process of implementation and the performance measures of fisheries co-management). He addressed the comments provided by the experts, some of which were already included in the second draft, which had been circulated before the workshop. Comments mainly related to the scope, scale and practicality of the guidebook, as well as the evaluation process. The choice of Ostrom’s framework as the adaptive policy analytical framework used in this guidebook was also addressed.

7. Mr Pomeroy moderated the group discussion on sections 1 and 2 of the guidebook. Regarding the analysis scale, different points of view emerged. Some experts suggested focusing on small-scale fisheries only, while others advised widening the analysis to include both small- and large-scale fisheries. Some experts pointed out the complexity of the guidebook. Some suggested that the guidebook address also the national-level policy and legal framework as an important enabling factor of a co-management system. Many experts emphasized the need to evaluate both the co-management system itself and the co-management plan, as well as the importance of including process indicators in the evaluation process envisaged in the guidebook. Many also recommended identifying the guidebook’s users and designing the evaluation process accordingly.

8. Mr Pomeroy briefly introduced the guidebook’s section on goals and indicators. He discussed the results of the poll of the experts on prioritizing the goals and indicators and proposing additional ones (Appendix 4). This topic was further addressed during the third breakout session.

9. Ms Elisabetta Martone provided a summary of the first plenary session of the workshop. Mr Oh provided the closing of the first day.

BREAKOUT SESSIONS

10. During the three breakout sessions, the participants were divided into three groups to discuss how to develop an efficient methodology to evaluate the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems, addressing each section of the guidebook. The groups were formed taking into consideration the participants’ time zones: Group A – North, Central, South America and the Caribbean; Group B – Africa and Europe; Group C – Asia and the Pacific. The breakout sessions of Group A were facilitated by Ms Helga Josupeit, by Ms Lena Westlund for Group B, and by Mr Pomeroy for Group C. The facilitators first presented specific contents of the guidebook and then opened the discussion in each group.

11. The first breakout session addressed section 3 “The fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation process” of the guidebook, focusing specifically on subsections 3.1 “Preparation”, 3.2 “Context of fisheries co-management” and 3.3 “Co-management process”.

12. The facilitators presented the tasks needed to set up the evaluation in the preparation step, which consist of: (1) identifying the evaluation team and stakeholder participation; (2) formulating the

workplan; (3) identifying boundaries of the co-management system; (4) identifying and collaborating with stakeholder groups; and (5) compiling secondary data.

13. They informed the experts that the context step (section 3.2) describes the characteristics of the fisheries co-management system being evaluated by looking at all relevant secondary data of the major attributes of the resource, the resource users and the institutional and organizational arrangements.

14. The facilitators explained that the process step (section 3.3) involves describing the process taken in the development and implementation of the fisheries co-management system, and is organized into three phases: “beginning” or pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation or fisheries co-management system sustainability.

15. The second breakout session addressed subsection 3.4 “The fisheries co-management management effectiveness evaluation” and section 4 “Post-evaluation and adaptive management” in the guidebook.

16. The facilitators first explained that the evaluation process is structured around four steps (selecting the indicators, planning the evaluation, conducting the evaluation, and communicating the results) and a set of related logical steps. They then introduced adaptive management as a process of “learning by doing” through the integration of design, management and monitoring to systematically test assumptions, learn and adapt.

17. The third breakout session addressed section 5 “The management effectiveness indicators” together with the poll results of the guidebook.

18. The facilitators explained that four performance measures – social, economic, ecological and governance – were selected for evaluating the management effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems. For each of the performance measures, they listed the proposed generic goals to be achieved through co-management, and the proposed indicators to measure the performance of the fisheries co-management system in achieving its goals.

19. The main points discussed by each group during breakout sessions I, II and III are reported in Appendixes 5, 6 and 7, respectively.

PLENARY SESSION II

20. Mr Oh moderated the second plenary session. The break-out session recommendations were reported for further discussion. The facilitators, Ms Josupeit, Mr Pomeroy and Ms Westlund, presented the results of each group’s discussions during the breakout sessions.

21. Mr Pomeroy then opened and facilitated the group discussion. The importance of the participatory component in carrying out the evaluation was stressed, as well as the importance of identifying a baseline.

22. Some experts recommended reducing the number of steps by merging the context and process steps; evaluating both the performance of the fisheries co-management system itself and the goals and objectives stated in the fisheries co-management system plan; and providing a simplified handbook in addition to the guidebook.

23. Experts suggested inserting additional figures in the guidebook, and also considering different methods to communicate the evaluation outcomes according to the audience.

24. Experts recommended formulating process indicators in addition to the outcome and output indicators. Some suggested developing innovative process and governance indicators by bringing real examples from the field into the indicators themselves.

25. During the discussion, it was confirmed that the practicality and applicability of the guidebook will be addressed and tested through the development of a toolbox and case studies.
26. Ms Martone provided a summary of the second plenary session. Mr Oh closed the fifth day of the workshop.

PLENARY SESSION III

27. Mr Oh moderated the third plenary session. Ms Son presented the agenda.
28. Mr Pomeroy presented the revised outline of the guidebook (Appendix 8), which was drafted based on the discussions that had taken place during the breakout and plenary sessions. The updated outline contains important elements to be incorporated into the final version of the guidebook, including, *inter alia*, the analysis scale should encompass all fisheries; the scope of the analysis should refer to existing fisheries co-management systems at fishery, community and sector levels; indicators to evaluate both the co-management systems process, operation and function, and the co-management plan achievements (i.e. output and outcome indicators grouped into social, economic, ecological and governance categories), should be included; co-management good practices should be described; co-management design, development and implementation processes should be modelled with flowcharts; definitions should be provided or improved (e.g. co-management plan, fisheries management plan, management effectiveness).
29. Ms Martone presented the main open issues raised during the breakout sessions on which further discussion was deemed pivotal to finalize the guidebook: (i) reorganize the guidebook to encompass two modules: how to set up a co-management system and how to evaluate it; (ii) rather than developing a list of process indicators, describe areas that need to be covered by the evaluation and provide examples of indicators as they will need to be described and contextualized; (iii) given the literature already available on goals and indicators, develop innovative indicators (e.g. “the co-management plan has been translated into the stakeholders’ native languages”); and (iv) separate or merge process and governance indicators.
30. Mr Pomeroy then facilitated the group discussion and further described the final contents of the guidebook. In particular, he reiterated that the scope of the guidebook is to evaluate the effectiveness of fisheries co-management. He confirmed that the indicators will be reformulated and prioritized, and innovative process and governance indicators will be developed.
31. A series of case studies will be carried out to feed the knowledge product mentioned under bullet point (ii) in the above introduction. Ms Martone listed the case studies suggested by the experts grouped under two categories: “co-management evaluation” and “co-management description”. Mr Oh informed the audience that the scope is to both showcase current management practices of the existing fisheries co-management systems and to evaluate the effectiveness of fisheries co-management by applying the guidebook. He further explained that the practices will be selected based on both geographical and evaluation criteria, and highlighted that no case studies had been proposed under the category “co-management evaluation” for African countries. Some experts suggested developing a shorter version of case studies showcasing good practices.
32. Mr Oh introduced the timeline for the completion of the knowledge products. In particular, the guidebook, handbook and knowledge product featuring a series of case studies will be due within the first quarter of 2021; the toolbox will be due within the fourth quarter of 2021. Within this workplan, two expert workshops are planned respectively for the first and second quarters of 2021 for the development of the toolbox, with a global conference planned for the fourth quarter of 2021 to share the guidebook and toolbox and to raise awareness on the importance of evaluating the fisheries co-management systems.
33. Mr Lem delivered the closing remarks (Appendix 9). Mr Oh then closed the sixth and final day of the workshop.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Experts	Title and affiliation
Anthony Charles	Senior Research Fellow in Environment and Sustainability Professor, School of the Environment & School of Business Director, Community Conservation Research Network Saint Mary's University Canada
Jan Frederik Danielsen	Deputy Director-General Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries Norway
Douglas Deokro Lee	Professor of Dept. of Public Administration Director, Research Institute for Governance Sejong University Republic of Korea
Elena Finkbeiner	Coastal Community Fisheries Program Manager, Global Fisheries and Aquaculture Program Conservation International, Center for Oceans United States of America
Donghun Go	Senior Researcher Korea Maritime Institute Republic of Korea
Hugh Govan	Regional Coordinator LMMA Network / University of the South Pacific Fiji
Joseph Jo	Manager Korea Fisheries Infrastructure Public Agency Republic of Korea
Moustapha Kebe	Independent small-scale fisheries expert Senegal
Mitchell Lay	Fisher and Program Coordinator Caribbean Network of FisherFolk Organisations and Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute Belize
Editrudith Lukanga	Executive Director Environment Management and Economic Development Organization United Republic of Tanzania
Patrick McConney	Senior Lecturer, Marine Resource Management Planning Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies University of the West Indies Barbados
Suzanne Njeri	Vice-President African Continental Network of Women Fish Processors and Traders Kenya
Xiao Recio-Blanco	Director of Ocean Program Environmental Law Institute United States of America
Rocky Sanchez Tirona	Vice-President Rare, Inc. Philippines and Micronesia (Federated States of)
Massimo Sarti	Full Professor, Geologic and Climatic Risk Assessment Department of Life and Environmental Sciences Polytechnic University of Marche Italy

Yugraj Singh Yadava	Director Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-Governmental Organisation India
Vivienne Solis Rivera	Associate fellow CoopeSoliDar R.L. Costa Rica
Merle Sowman	Director of the Environmental Evaluation Unit, Dept. of Environmental & Geological Sciences Associate Professor in the Department of Environmental and Geographical Science University of Cape Town South Africa
Shion Takemura	Researcher Fisheries Research and Education Agency Japan
Paul Tuda	Research Scientist Leibniz Centre for Tropical Marine Research Germany
Sergi Tudela i Casanovas	Director General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs Department of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Food Government of Catalonia Spain
Kuperan Viswanathan	Professor of Resource and Environmental Economics University of Utara Malaysia
Tang Yi	Professor Shanghai Ocean University China
Dahae Yoo	Associate Korea Fisheries Infrastructure Public Agency Republic of Korea
Johan Williams	Independent Adviser Norway
FAO Observers	
Victoria Chomo	Senior Fishery Officer Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Nicole Franz	Fishery Planning Analyst Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Amber Himes Cornell	Fishery Officer Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Audun Lem	Deputy Director Fisheries Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Rebecca Metzner	Head Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO

FAO Core team	
Yeseul Byun	FAO Consultant Products, Trade and Marketing Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Riccardo Fortuna	Data Clerk Statistics and Information Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Helga Josupeit	FAO Consultant Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Juan Lechuga Sanchez	FAO Consultant Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Elisabetta Martone	Fishery Officer Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
KwangSuk Oh	Senior Fishery Officer Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Robert Pomeroy	Emeritus Professor University of Connecticut United States of America
Turan Rahimzadeh	FAO Consultant Products, Trade and Marketing Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Yumi Son	FAO Consultant Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Jiaxi Wang	Fishery Officer Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Weiwei Wang	Fishery Officer Products, Trade and Marketing Branch Fisheries Division FAO
Lena Westlund	FAO Consultant Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch Fisheries Division FAO

APPENDIX 2: OPENING STATEMENT BY MR AUDUN LEM, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, FAO FISHERIES DIVISION

Distinguished experts and participants, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen,

It is an immense pleasure and a big privilege for me to be given the opportunity to address this important gathering. I wish to convey to you all the warmest season greetings of Mr Qu Dongyu, Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), which I have the honour to represent in this virtual global expert workshop on the fisheries co-management guidebook. On behalf of the Fisheries Division, let me welcome you to this workshop.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The year 2020 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), a document unanimously adopted by FAO Members in 1995. It sets the principles and standards for the sustainable use of fishery resources in response to the dire situation that several global fish stocks collapsed in the 1980s and fishery resources would no longer sustain fishing efforts. The recently published State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020 indicates that the long-term trend in total global capture fisheries has been relatively stable since the late 1980s. However, increasing global population, climate change, and growing demand for fishery products are all emerging challenges that threaten the sustainable use of fishery resources.

To further address the fisheries governance issues including unsustainable fisheries and lack of livelihoods for fishers and fishing communities, FAO has been working with the international community over the past decades and introduced several international instruments, particularly the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) in 2012, and the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines) in 2014. These guidelines incorporate the arrangement of sharing responsibility and authority between government and resource users. This partnership arrangement is generally recognized as fisheries co-management.

During the International Symposium on Fisheries Sustainability hosted at FAO headquarters in November 2019, participants from different sectors and regions around the world have suggested to strengthen fisheries co-management and its principles in their discussions, key messages and recommendation actions.

Distinguished experts and participants, ladies and gentlemen,

In this context, FAO has established a global project on fisheries co-management funded by the Government of the Republic of Korea. The overall goals and challenges of this project are that all stakeholders, especially policymakers, have a better understanding of the concept of fisheries co-management in order to establish an appropriate type of fisheries co-management system in the national or local context and implement well-designed fisheries co-management programmes on the ground. In doing so, it will assist all fisheries stakeholders and policymakers in designing and implementing effective fisheries co-management systems for sustainable fisheries governance.

This project aims to produce three knowledge products: (i) a new guidebook contributing to evaluating fisheries co-management management effectiveness is produced at the first virtual expert workshop this week; (ii) an advanced knowledge product showcasing the current management practices of the existing fisheries co-management systems worldwide, to be produced through the global conference in 2021; and (iii) a new knowledge product (toolbox) combined with e-learning courses to provide practical guidance on assessing the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems is produced through the secondary expert workshop in 2021.

We expect the newly produced knowledge products to enhance the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems around the world and improve knowledge about fisheries co-management that is widely applicable for sustainable fisheries and livelihoods.

Ladies and gentlemen,

This expert workshop is the first event in this project. I do not wish to anticipate on the discussions that will take place in this meeting. Nevertheless, allow me to recall that the aim of this workshop is to produce a draft guidebook assisting member states in designing their contextualized methodologies to evaluate the performance of their fisheries co-management systems worldwide.

During the workshop you will discuss how to develop an efficient methodology to assess the management effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems.

Distinguished experts and participants, ladies and gentlemen,

At this juncture, I wish to say my sincere gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Korea and its Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries and the Korea Maritime Institute, which, through the projects “Fisheries Co-management Capacity Development for Blue Communities: Sustainable Fisheries and Diverse Livelihoods” (GCP/GLO/080/ROK) and “Fisheries Co-management Capacity Development Program” (GCP/GLO/046/ROK), respectively, have generously funded this workshop for enhancing sustainable fisheries and diverse livelihoods at fishing communities.

I also want to note the presence, in this virtual room, of colleagues from FAO headquarters in Rome. They are at your disposal as resource persons for this workshop. Our facilitators, Ms Helga Josupeit, Prof. Robert Pomeroy and Ms Lena Westlund, joined to share your international experiences. We value your input. Last, I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the effort of all the participants. We highly appreciate you kindly joining us from all over the world, regardless of the time zone. With these few remarks, I would like to conclude my intervention by wishing you a fruitful workshop.

APPENDIX 3: AGENDA

Day	Title	Objective	Format	Advance reading
Day 1 7 September 2020 (2 hours, 30 minutes)	Plenary session I: Introduction to the workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness of the objective and expected outputs of the workshop • Understand the value of the guidebook • Seek feedback on the draft guidebook's analytical policy framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome remarks • Introduction of participants • Introduction to the programme • Introduction to the draft guidebook • Review of sections 1 and 2 of the draft guidebook • Group discussion 	Sections 1 and 2 of the draft guidebook
Day 2 8 September 2020 (3 hours)	Breakout session I: Fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek feedback on the fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakout session I: Sections 3.1–3.3 of the draft guidebook 	Sections 3.1–3.3 of the draft guidebook
Day 3 9 September 2020 (3 hours)	Breakout session II: Fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation process & post-evaluation and adaptive management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek feedback on the fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation and adaptive management • Focus on who is supposed to do the evaluation and what is the process in the discussions for sections 3.4 and 4 	Breakout session II: Sections 3.4 and 4 of the draft guidebook	Sections 3.4 and 4 of the draft guidebook
Day 4 10 September 2020 (3 hours)	Breakout session III: Goals and indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek feedback on types of goals and indicators to measure fisheries co-management effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakout session III: Section 5 of the draft guidebook 	Section 5 of the draft guidebook
Day 5 11 September 2020 (2 hours)	Plenary session II: Summary of breakout session discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share the breakout session discussions from the three groups with all participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group A presentation • Group B presentation • Group C presentation • Group discussion • Recap • Wrap-up 	
Day 6 17 September 2020 (2 hours, 10 minutes)	Plenary session III: Final draft guidebook and closing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek feedback on the final guidebook and discuss case studies for the global conference to be held in 2021 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation and discussion on the new outline of the guidebook • Next steps • Closing remarks 	New outline of the guidebook

APPENDIX 4: POLL ON THE MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS GOALS AND INDICATORS FOR EACH AREA

For each area, please select your priorities from the list of goals and indicators.

**Required*

1. Social goals (multiple choice) *
 - Benefits from fisheries equitably distributed
 - Compatibility between management and local culture maximized
 - Environmental awareness and knowledge enhanced
 - Secure sector attractiveness and generational turnover
 - Compatibility between fishing and other marine uses ensured
 - Quality employments maximized
 - Other _____

2. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

3. Social indicators (multiple choice) *
 - Equitable management that represents the range of interests of stakeholders and accommodates the full diversity of those interests
 - Maximum use of indigenous and traditional knowledge
 - Community standards of behaviour enhanced
 - Support for co-management among different stakeholder groups enhanced
 - Gender, youth and ethnicity aspects have been integrated
 - Co-management stakeholders feel that access rights to fisheries are allocated fairly
 - Social learning (collective knowledge, shared values)
 - Social protection
 - Stakeholders think that co-management has benefited them socially
 - Percentage of young fishers
 - Percent variation of fish sales
 - Percent variation of mean value of fish
 - Percent variation of quality employments
 - Percent variation local marine resource users
 - Increased adaptive capacity of stakeholders
 - Other _____

4. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

5. Economic goals (multiple choice) *
 - Livelihoods enhanced or maintained
 - Food security and nutrition enhanced or maintained
 - Social development enhanced or maintained
 - Other _____

6. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

7. Economic indicators (multiple choice) *
 - Economic development enhanced or maintained
 - Benefits of operating and maintaining co-management arrangements exceed the costs
 - Economic incentives in place for stakeholders to support co-management
 - Stakeholders think that co-management has benefited them economically
 - Stakeholders do not worry that their household would not have enough food

- Income distribution
 - Increase in jobs and revenues from other blue economy sectors
 - Other _____
8. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
9. Ecological goals (multiple choice) *
- Marine fisheries resources sustained and protected
 - Inland fisheries resources sustained and protected
 - Fisheries resources sustained and protected
 - Sustainable resource management
 - Healthy, resilient ecosystems secure multiple services to local communities
 - Essential fish habitats well protected
 - Low-impact and selective fishing in place
 - Other _____
10. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
11. Ecological indicators (multiple choice) *
- Fishers are not exceeding the sustainable yield of the fishery
 - Improved stewardship by resource users to maintain productivity and ecological characteristics of the resource
 - Management measures for fisheries management are appropriate and operational
 - There is an ecosystem approach to fisheries management plan
 - Stakeholders feel that co-management has improved the fish stock in the area
 - Stakeholders feel that the condition of the fish resource is stable or has improved thanks to co-management
 - Stakeholders expect the fishery to maintain its current level of productivity over the next five years
 - Stakeholders feel that co-management has improved fish habitats in the area
 - Percent variation of surface of habitat protection
 - Percent variation of areas covered by essential fish habitats in good state of conservation
 - Percentage of discards and incidence of by-catch
 - Other _____
12. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
13. Governance goals (multiple choice) *
- Effective management structures and strategies maintained
 - Effective stakeholder participation and representation ensured
 - Resource use conflicts managed and reduced
 - Management plan compliance by resource users enhanced
 - There is a functional and structured co-management scheme agreed and respected by all parties
 - Other _____
14. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
15. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
1. Co-management institutions are established *
 - Effective social institutions (organizations, administrative team) are in place and active
 - Social institutions were voluntarily organized

- The co-management administrative team engage in community development projects
 - Scientists are included in the co-management administrative team
 - Other _____
16. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
17. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
2. Political will and power sharing *
- Power-sharing arrangement among stakeholder partners
 - All main stakeholders are empowered and capable to actively participate in decision-making
 - Political will among leaders to share power
 - Other _____
18. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
19. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
3. Fisheries co-management systems are established *
- Higher degree of legitimacy of the management system by stakeholders
 - The management process has a clear purpose and a transparent operation
 - There is an active co-management administrative team
 - There has been registration and recognition of co-management arrangements by government
 - Co-management internal rules and by-laws in place
 - Co-management plan in place
 - Financing able to sustain operations
 - Co-management administrative team manages finances
 - Co-management administrative team coordinates with government, research institutions, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and non-state actors
 - Collective fishing agreement
 - Formal legal framework regulating fisheries co-management in place
 - Co-management administrative team has a conflict management mechanism
 - Other _____
20. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
21. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
4. Degree of enforcement *
- High-level of rule compliance
 - Existence of practical and implementable enforcement procedures
 - Other _____
22. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
23. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
5. Consultation and participation in decision-making process *
- Decision-making is transparent to all stakeholders
 - Decision makers are accountable to those that they represent
 - Decision makers are representative of all stakeholder groups
 - All those with a legitimate interest are involved in decision-making
 - The stakeholders are involved in developing fisheries management rules and regulations
 - Decision-making by and leadership in the co-management administrative team are accountable and transparent
 - The stakeholders are involved in developing fisheries management rules and regulations

- Co-management stakeholders feel that their participation in the co-management operation is satisfactory
 - Decisions are driven by consensus
 - Cross-scale interactions
 - Other _____
24. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
25. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
6. Gender balance and indigenous people *
- The number of indigenous people members among the co-management administrative team reflects their groups in the community
 - The number of female members among the co-management stakeholders reflects inclusion of women
 - Women and indigenous people participate actively in co-management activities
 - Other _____
26. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
27. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
7. Communication and transparency *
- All main stakeholders understand the objectives of co-management and have adequate and timely access to information
 - Increased communication and understanding among all stakeholders
 - There is a basic understanding among stakeholders about the purpose and operation of co-management
 - Co-management stakeholders consider that corruption is not an issue
 - Co-management stakeholders feel that elections for the co-management administrative team were/are open to everyone, transparent and follow democratic processes
 - The co-management administrative team meets with members on a regular basis
 - Other _____
28. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
29. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
8. Partnership, collaboration and networks *
- Partnerships and networks are developed and maintained
 - Active collaboration and coordination between partners
 - Willingness of fishers to follow rules
 - External observers are allowed to co-management working sessions
 - Cooperation and collaboration among stakeholders
 - Co-management administrative team develops networks and partnerships with other co-management organizations
 - Other _____
30. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____
31. Governance indicators (multiple choice)
9. Adaptive management *
- The management process is adaptive
 - There is real-time monitoring of the fishery and mechanisms are in place for adaptive adjustments

- Resilient management structures and strategies
- Other _____

32. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

33. Governance indicators (multiple choice)

10. Active leadership *

- Active and effective leadership
- Facilitative leadership
- Other _____

34. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

35. Process indicators (multiple choice)

1. Pre-implementation *

- Initiation (internal and/or external)
- Core team
- Problem recognition and consensus among stakeholders
- Core group
- Plan of action
- Information to stakeholders
- Community meetings and discussion with government, NGOs, donors
- Preliminary (project) plan and strategy
- Seek funding
- Legal framework
- Approvals
- Linkages between government, community, NGOs, stakeholders
- Other _____

36. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

37. Process indicators (multiple choice)

2. Implementation *

- Goals and objectives from fisheries management and co-management plan(s)
- Year established
- Type of co-management (instructive, consultative, cooperative, advisory, informative)
- Community entry and integration (through a series of meetings and discussions with community members, other stakeholders and government officials)
- Support (government, NGO, academia, donors)
- Area profile/research and participatory research (baseline data)
- Community organizer and community organization
- Environmental education, capacity development, social communication
- Leadership development and role clarification
- Co-management objectives, strategy and plan (goals, objectives, activities)
- Conflict management mechanism
- Co-management administrative body (to conduct and oversee the co-management plan)
- Evaluation and monitoring plan
- Co-management agreement
- Co-management organization (to manage overall co-management programme)
- Financing
- Legal and policy support (legitimizing local institutional arrangements)
- Publicizing

- Plan implementation (about resource management and community development)
- Activities (livelihoods, economic/social/community development)
- Enforcement and compliance
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Networking and advocacy
- Other _____

38. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

39. Process indicators (multiple choice)
3. Post-implementation or sustainability *
- Scaling up
 - Evaluation
 - Adaptive management
 - Other _____

40. If you have selected “other” in the question above, please specify.
Enter your answer _____

41. Thank you for your survey
☆☆☆☆☆

APPENDIX 5: BREAKOUT SESSION I

Group A

During breakout session I, some experts of Group A suggested that the guidebook be reorganized into two modules: how to set up a co-management system, and how to carry out its evaluation.

The experts suggested using a participatory approach in setting up the evaluation process, also taking into account the customary structures.

Looking at the evaluation of fisheries co-management systems from a small-scale fisheries perspective, some experts recommended that the organization and rights of fisheries communities be taken into account.

While addressing the preparation step of the evaluation process, some experts pointed out the need to identify the power structure in the co-management system (to ensure the evaluation detects any imbalance or inequity), the stakeholders excluded from the evaluation process, and the modalities that led to their exclusions.

Some experts raised the possibility of including the evaluation process as part of fisheries co-management regulations.

The experts suggested including a model of fisheries co-management system in the guidebook, setting a baseline against which to evaluate the fisheries co-management system (e.g. by identifying good practices), and formulating process indicators.

They lively debated whether the guidebook should be developed for internal evaluators (self-evaluation) or external evaluators.

Some experts emphasized the importance of collecting gender-disaggregated data and performing trend analysis of secondary data. It was also suggested to include informed consent for data collection. The experts debated whether to collect primary data during the co-management system implementation only, or also during its evaluation.

It was recommended that the graphic design in the guidebook be improved with flowcharts.

Group B

For the preparation step of the evaluation process, the experts of Group B suggested performing a structured stakeholder analysis to include women, vulnerable groups and those not directly involved in the co-management system. The experts recommended that the evaluation team be legitimized by primary stakeholder (e.g. government and resource users / right holders). They also pointed out that the budget for performing the evaluation should forecast expenses for the primary stakeholders' engagement.

The experts suggested merging the context and process steps into a new step, "description and profiles of co-management system and its context".

With reference to the evaluation step, they envisaged two levels: the evaluation of outputs and outcomes according to the fisheries co-management plan, and the evaluation of process by looking at the fisheries co-management system itself.

The experts recommended clarifying the objective of the evaluation and the target users of the guidebook, and further describing co-management systems through good practices. In addition, they suggested prioritizing the indicators to further explain the data requirements and benchmarks for performing the evaluation.

Group C

The experts of Group C agreed that the aim of the guidebook is to cover all fisheries, while the toolbox will address small-scale fisheries and large-scale fisheries separately.

The experts suggested reducing the number of steps in the evaluation process to three: preparation, description and evaluation. During the discussion, they agreed that the steps could be simplified without compromising the practicality and applicability of the guidebook.

In addressing issues related to the complexity and cost of performing an evaluation, the experts recommended highlighting in the guidebook that the selection of method and indicators should be based on resources available.

Similar to Group A, the experts in this group recommended that the graphics and illustrations in the guidebook be improved.

They stressed that there can be two audiences for the guidebook – government fisheries officers and community and fisheries co-managers.

With reference to the preparation step, the experts recommended identifying the level of analysis, whether at national, local or fishery level, and clarifying whether the evaluation is to be conducted by internal or external evaluators.

As for the context step, they suggested that the process could be simplified without compromising the practicality. They pointed out that the evaluation should address both process and outputs and outcomes.

In the process step, they recommended identifying the individuals excluded from the fisheries co-management process (and the reasons for their exclusion) and formulating process indicators.

APPENDIX 6: BREAKOUT SESSION II

Group A

In addressing the “select your indicators” step (subsection 3.4) in breakout session II, the experts of Group A proposed developing indicators to measure the active participatory approach of the co-management systems, in particular from a gender perspective. They stressed that identification of the interaction – correlation in statistical terms – among indicators is fundamental. Some experts advocated for having more holistic goals and objectives in the fisheries co-management plans instead of focusing on specific issues only.

For the “planning your evaluation” step, some experts reiterated the importance of setting up the baseline during the co-management planning phase. They stressed the importance of identifying feasible indicators in terms of financial and human resources. In this step, some experts pointed out that evaluation should be shaped by considering how the results will be used by the different audiences and by differentiating between local and broader fisheries co-management systems.

For the “conducting the evaluation” step, the experts suggested including a task for the organization of stakeholder meetings. The objective of these meetings should be to present the evaluation results and gather feedback. Experts pointed out that data should be analysed by considering the scope of the evaluation and that the results should be validated through a critical analysis. They reiterated the need to include process indicators.

For the “communicating the evaluation results” step, the opportunity to differentiate the communication products according to the different target audiences was proposed.

Some experts highlighted that the cost implications of conducting adaptive management should be acknowledged. Some pointed out that adaptive management, being a “learning by doing” process, could generate acceptability issues by stakeholders. They also debated on how often adaptive management should be performed.

Group B

The experts of Group B reiterated that the evaluation should address both the evaluation of the outputs and outcomes according to the fisheries co-management plan and the evaluation of process by looking at the fisheries co-management system itself. To this end, they suggested different approaches: to conduct parallel evaluations or to first address the system and then the plan, or the informally agreed goals and objectives if the latter is not available.

With reference to the “select your indicators” step, the experts recommended having process indicators for evaluating the fisheries co-management system and indicators for evaluating the goals and objectives of the fisheries co-management plan objectives. In the process of selecting the indicators, they pointed out the importance of having participation from primary stakeholders and a methodology to engage with them.

The experts stressed that the “plan your evaluation” step should be done in earlier phases. They asked that the purpose, context and stage of the fisheries co-management process in which the evaluation is taking place be clarified.

For the “conduct your evaluation” step, they recommended a participatory approach for the validation and use of results.

As for section 4 “Post-evaluation and adaptive management”, the experts recommended that the guidebook explain the existence of two levels of adaptive management – based on continuous monitoring and on effectiveness evaluation – as both needed and useful.

They recommended selecting the audience of the evaluation results before initiating the process. They also stressed that modes adopted for presenting the evaluation results depend on the audience.

Group C

Experts of Group C suggested developing a handbook as a simplified version of the guidebook and diversifying communication methods according to the users, for example videos, social channels and comics.

The experts highlighted that the prerequisite for performing an evaluation is the availability of sufficient resources. Therefore, the financial resources for evaluation should be allocated at the beginning for any fisheries co-management project. They also stressed that the project should be already underway in order for the evaluation to be meaningful.

As a guiding principle, the experts pointed out that understanding the goals of the fisheries co-management project is pivotal for carrying out any evaluation.

APPENDIX 7: BREAKOUT SESSION III

Group A

In breakout session III, the experts of Group A recommended that the proposed indicators in the guidebook be reformulated and reduced.

Some experts suggested that the guidebook clarify the purpose of having a long list of indicators, as well as the purpose of the evaluation itself, as this was fundamental for selecting and prioritizing indicators.

The experts pointed out that process indicators refer to the process of establishing and operating the co-management system. When evaluating the fisheries co-management system, they recommended there be a focus on both governance and process goals/indicators.

The experts suggested developing non-traditional process and governance indicators by bringing real-world examples into the indicators themselves (e.g. “co-management plan has been developed with the adequate participation of different stakeholders; “co-management plan has been translated into the stakeholders’ native languages”; “the legal framework gives the communities themselves, and their representatives, the responsibility to create the management plan”; “members receive advance information before decision-making”; “stakeholder knowledge is considered in the processes”).

Group B

The experts of Group B stressed that the evaluation consists of two consecutive parts: the evaluation of the performance of the fisheries co-management system, and the evaluation of the goals and objectives as stated in the fisheries co-management plan.

For the evaluation of the fisheries co-management system, experts pointed out that process and governance indicators are needed to evaluate how the fisheries co-management system was set up and how it functions. They suggested including fisheries co-management good practices to guide and underpin the formulation of indicators in the guidebook. Rather than providing a list of indicators to choose from, they suggested describing broader areas that need to be covered by the evaluation and providing examples of indicators as they will need to be contextualized.

For the evaluation of the fisheries co-management plan, they stressed that the type of indicators needed will depend on the actual objectives stated in the plan.

The experts suggested that a more user-friendly handbook be developed along with the guidebook, containing schematics, graphs, illustrations, examples in boxes, etc.

Group C

The experts of Group C agreed that process and governance should be separated, with the governance indicators focusing on the institutional aspect and the process indicators directly addressing the fisheries co-management system itself.

The experts suggested that priorities for the process indicators be identified during the three steps of the evaluation process. They provided many examples; namely, stakeholders informed, community meetings, problem recognition, legal framework, plan of action, management plan, goals and objectives, organizations, monitoring and evaluation plan, leadership, conflict management, community entry, and integration and adaptive management.

For the governance indicators, experts suggested having indicators that measure power distribution. To ensure the process is democratic, they suggested having an indicator to verify if there is balanced leadership with respect to the majority of the user groups, and an indicator of democratic leadership rotation. In addition, they pointed out that the evaluation should take into consideration traditional community rules. Experts suggested that a flexible partnership could be established to facilitate enforcement by local communities. They favoured the involvement of social scientists in the establishment of the fisheries co-management system and in conducting the evaluation. Experts also suggested that conflict management mechanisms be put in place during the pre-implementation phase.

For the social indicators, the experts suggested establishing a community-level mechanism to stimulate social learning (e.g. “peer-to-peer”). They mentioned that attention should be paid to social cohesion, for example by creating an enabling environment. They also suggested that resilience indicators should be considered, such as economic and social resilience development.

With reference to the economic indicators, experts stressed the importance of the goals “livelihoods enhanced or maintained” and “food security and nutrition enhanced or maintained”. For the last category, they suggested adding “ecosystems are sustained” as an ecological indicator.

APPENDIX 8: REVISED DRAFT GUIDEBOOK OUTLINE

Revised guidebook outline

- Reorganize the guidebook to encompass two modules: how to set up co-management schemes and how to evaluate them (Group A).
- Include case studies from existing experience and testing.
- Incorporate individual comments from experts. Many were included in the second version of guidebook, and more in the third version.
- Include boxes, graphics, flowcharts, etc.

1. Introduction

- Purpose
- Scale: all fisheries (small-scale, commercial/large-scale, recreational, inland/marine)
- Scope: existing fisheries co-management systems at fishery/community/sector levels (not evaluating national institutional/legal/policy framework for fisheries co-management, although this will be described; process and governance indicators will also be developed)
- Scope: (i) indicators to evaluate the co-management system process (indicators on activities [process] and on operation/function [governance]) and (ii) indicators on co-management plan achievements (output and outcome indicators: social, economic, ecological, governance); how the co-management system was set-up and functions, and how well goals and objectives are achieved; process indicators have some overlap/link with governance indicators
- Audience: who commissioned the evaluation and who carried out the evaluation; government fisheries (national/provincial/state/district/municipal), co-managers of fishery (resource users), donors, NGOs, consultants, academics
- Using results
- Overview of sections of guidebook
- Associated handbook and toolbox

1.1 Overview of the fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation process

- Three steps in evaluation process
- Objectives
- Who initiates the evaluation (self-evaluation vs external/commissioned evaluation)
- Who should do the evaluation
- Who should be involved in the evaluation (right holders)
- Important considerations in conducting the evaluation (not all indicators need be evaluated, frequency of evaluation, link to monitoring and evaluation, participation, etc.)
- Summarizing core activities: identifying plan, selecting indicators, measuring indicators, communicating results
- Type of indicators needed will depend on the actual objectives stated in the plan (e.g. if no economic objectives, then no economic indicators)
- Process indicators have some overlap/link with governance indicators
- Gender, indigenous people and youth

1.2 FAO and international frameworks related to fisheries co-management

- Strategic Development Goals (to be added)

1.3 What is fisheries co-management?

- Definition (FAO definition)
- Types: community-based and sector-based
- Continuum/types
- Benefits/principles (i.e. participation, transparency, etc.)
- Success factors/good practices of co-management
- Description of good practices for co-management (based on experiences/literature)
- Model of design, development and implementation process of co-management (flowchart and description of specific individual activities at different phases of pre-implementation, implementation and sustainability)
- Updated references

- Co-management plan and fisheries management plan

1.4 What is management effectiveness? (in text box)

- Reference to Hockings *et al.* 2000¹ management effectiveness framework

1.5 Why evaluate fisheries co-management effectiveness?

- Purpose of doing an evaluation

1.6 How to use this guidebook and handbook

- How to use
- Who will use

2. Adaptive policy analytical framework

3. Fisheries co-management effectiveness evaluation process

3.1 Introduction

- Objectives/purpose of conducting the evaluation (link to 1.5)
- Who initiates the evaluation (self-evaluation vs external commissioned evaluation)
- Who should do the evaluation
- Not all indicators need be evaluated
- Frequency
- Link to ongoing monitoring and evaluation
- Participation (who is included and excluded; equity)
- Different levels of evaluation
- Definition of process indicators and governance indicators
- Link to using results for adaptive management
- Budget and resources available
- Audience
- Evaluation of process and plan
- How well the co-management system functions, and how well goals and objectives are achieved
- Gender, indigenous people and youth

3.2 Management evaluation process

- Checklist of steps and activities (to be added)

Step 1: Preparation

- Purpose/objective, audience
- All preparation sections merged here (3.1, 3.4.2)
- Structured stakeholder analysis (also those not directly involved in the co-management activities; women, vulnerable groups)
- Who leads and who participates
- Evaluation team should be legitimized by primary stakeholders (resource users / right holders & government)
- Budget – also for primary stakeholder engagement
- Participatory
- Process embedded in regulations
- Power structures identified
- Data collection
- Identifying co-management plan, who wrote plan, stakeholder participation
- What to do if no co-management plan exists or is poor
- Baseline data to be used
- Building capacity of resource users to undertake evaluation
- Approaches to engage with stakeholders

¹ Hockings, M., Stolton, S. and Dudley, N. 2000. *Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

Step 2: Description of context and process

- Sub-step A: Context
- Sub-step B: Process
- Description/profile

Step 3: Management evaluation process

- Summarizing core activities: identifying plan, selecting indicators, measuring indicators, communicating results
- Determining what benchmarks should be used for the process evaluation of the co-management system
- How to select indicators
- Audience and communication products (diversify communication methods)
- Validation of results
- Not all data collection methods need be included; primary and secondary data; different methods and types of questions; using references; using toolbox
- Data to be collected and data available
- Results are always useful!
- Type of indicators needed will depend on the actual objectives stated in the plan (e.g. if no economic objectives, then no economic indicators)
- Selecting indicators
- Collecting data and understanding the perceptions of primary stakeholders
- Validating and using results in a participatory way

4. Post-evaluation and adaptive management

- Links to operational monitoring and evaluation
- Two different levels of adaptive management, which are both useful:
 - Adaptive management based on continuous monitoring
 - Adaptive management based on an evaluation
- More description of use of results
- Frequency
- Cost implications
- Guidance on how to revise/adapt goals and objectives
- Who will lead adaptation process
- Using a framework to guide adaptive management process: goals, results, what to do next (actions at different levels; who should address them, what government/community needs to do)

5. Conclusions

Annex 1: Management effectiveness indicators

- (i) Indicators to evaluate the co-management system process (indicators on activities [process] and operation/function [governance]) and (ii) indicators on co-management plan achievements (output and outcome indicators: social, economic, ecological, governance)
- Two sets of indicators: (1) process indicators and (2) co-management plan indicators (social, economic, ecological, governance; selection will depend upon the plan goals and objectives)
- Process indicators have some overlap/link with governance indicators
- Rather than listing process indicators, describe areas/groupings that need to be covered by the evaluation and provide examples of indicators as they will need to be described and contextualized (Group B)
- Review existing indicators that could be used
- Define different types of indicators (process, social, economic, ecological, governance)
- Some indicators can be both process indicators (Was a fisher organization formed?) and governance indicators (How well does the fisher organization represent the members in co-management decision-making?)
- Ensure that indicators are written as indicators
- Develop non-traditional and innovative indicators
- Identify core indicators

- Use poll/ranking of indicators to prioritize
- Prioritize indicators to identify core indicators
- Determine data requirements
- Include gender, indigenous people and youth indicators
- Proposed innovative indicators (Group A), based on the literature already available on goals and indicators:
 - Co-management plan has been developed with the adequate participation of different stakeholders
 - Co-management plan has been translated into the stakeholders' native languages
 - Legal framework gives the communities themselves, and their representatives, the responsibility to create the management plan
 - Members receive advance information before decision-making
 - Stakeholder knowledge / local measures are considered in the processes
 - Co-management plan includes a gender perspective
- Separate or merge process and governance indicators (Group B)
- Governance indicators focus on the achievement of the plan goals and objectives
- Process indicators address the suitability of the fisheries co-management design, development and implementation process
- Social and economic resilience indicators
- Social, economic, governance and ecological indicators are classified functionally
- Organization indicators can be both process and governance indicators
- Process indicators measure the way the fisheries co-management system is set up to work
- Elaborate an indicator at pre-implementation stage to show that the process is not impeded by lack of legislation, and that there is an explicit provision for setting up or supporting fisheries co-management

Annex 2: Analytical framework

APPENDIX 9: CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR AUDUN LEM, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, FAO FISHERIES DIVISION

Distinguished experts and participants, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen,

On behalf of the Fisheries Division, I would like to thank all the participants for your active participation and your valuable contributions over the last week. I would also like to thank our organizers and facilitators for keeping us on track.

Distinguished experts and participants,

Today, we have gathered to share the results of the FAO Virtual Global Expert Workshop on the Fisheries Co-Management Guidebook.

The aim of this workshop was to produce a draft guidebook assisting member states in designing their contextualized methodologies to evaluate the performance of their fisheries co-management systems worldwide.

We have been exposed to the contents of the guidebook. It is not my intention to repeat them.

Allow me to just recall that the experts, you have provided comprehensive comments on the first draft of guidebook before this workshop took place. Based on which, a second draft was produced and shared.

During the workshop you discussed how to develop an efficient methodology to evaluate the management effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems.

Your vigorous participation in the discussions that have taken place in the last week has been acknowledged and highly appreciated. Based on which, an updated outline of the guidebook has been developed and discussed today, during this plenary session.

The updated outline contains important elements to be included in the guidebook: *inter alia*, the guidebook analysis scale should encompass all fisheries; the scope of the analysis should refer to both co-management system and co-management plan. Moreover, the guidebook should include also process indicators together with the social, economic, ecological and governance indicators, and describe co-management good practices.

Distinguished experts and participants, ladies and gentlemen,

Significant improvements have been achieved in the guidebook and laudable suggestions were recorded today during this gathering, given its limited duration. However, there are challenging tasks ahead. The most important two upcoming challenges include translating the updated outline into the final version of the guidebook and developing case studies on fisheries co-management. These two tasks are critical for enhancing the effectiveness of fisheries co-management systems around the world and improving knowledge about fisheries co-management applicable for sustainable fisheries and livelihoods.

I wish to conclude my intervention by showing, once again, my appreciation for the privilege to register everyone's virtual presence and valuable contributions to this workshop.

And I thank you all for your attention.

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.