

FINAL REPORT

EXTERNAL MIDTERM REVIEW

SUPPORT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE FOR FISH MARKETING PROJECT (2009-2013)



Improved clean water and sanitation facilities established at Kanala landing site in Ntoroko District, with support from QAFMP

Project number: UGA31391-0801

November, 2012



*This publication was produced for review by ICEIDA and GoU (MAAIF- DFR)
It was prepared by Food Safety Associates Ltd*

DISCLAIMER

This report is a product of the midterm review that was conducted by Food Safety Associates Ltd. The report was prepared under the auspices of the agreement between ICEIDA and FSA Ltd of 19th March 2012 in accordance with the relevant Terms of Reference thereof. The opinions expressed in this report are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily represent the views of ICEIDA, MAAIF or DFR or any of the institutions mentioned in the report.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The QAFMP midterm evaluation team (ET) is grateful to the officials of ICEIDA Uganda for their support of, and interest in this assignment. The evaluation team would like to thank specifically Mr. Gisli Palsson the ICEIDA Country Director and Mr. Arni Helgi Helgason – the ICEIDA Programmes Director, for not only availing themselves for long meetings with the team but also providing information that was required by the team.

We also appreciate the help and support rendered to the Evaluation Team (ET) by the project management team during the assignment especially; Mr. James Ssekatawa (The Project Manager) and Mr. Alfred Akankwasa (The Project Coordinator). The Team further acknowledges the guidance provided by Mr. Ben Twikirize, the ICEIDA Senior Project Officer (M&E) during the development of the final report.

Special thanks go to Dr. John Bosco Ahimbisibwe (Senior Fisheries Inspector) for the role he played by joining the ET as representative of DFR during the field missions in the project districts. The guidance he provided to the ET regarding the project implementation in the field was very crucial. His being there to answer many questions of institutional nature raised by the project stakeholders provided a better ground for the team to operate.

The Midterm evaluation was conducted from 27th March - 3rd June 2012. During the field missions both in Kampala/Entebbe and in the project districts of Hoima, Buliisa, Nebbi, Nakasongola, Ntoroko, Apac, Amortar, Serere and Buyende, large numbers and institutions were visited for secondary and primary data. We sincerely appreciate the contribution made by QAFMP stakeholders in directly being involved in this project during the midterm review missions. We would like to thank all of you and we express hope that the findings, conclusions and recommendations originating from this report will assist you in the continued implementation of, and involvement in the project.

Finally, as ET we observed that a lot of fine work has been done which deserves continuous follow-up and support for sustainability. We congratulate the implementation team and QAFMP stakeholders. We believe that the work will be a very useful contribution to improvement of quality of fish and fishery products from the project areas; which should improve market access and demand for fish for improved incomes of the people involved.

Ananias Bagumire (PhD)
Team Leader

Evaluation Team Members

1. Dr. Ananias Bagumire – Team Leader
2. Ms. Faith Wabulya Kiboneka – Evaluation Expert
3. Mr. David Baziwane – Evaluation Expert

The Evaluation Team wishes to acknowledge the contribution of Ms. Faith Kyomuhendo in drafting of the report and for her comments that enabled improvement of HIV/AIDs section of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VI
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	1
1.3 FISHERIES SECTOR IN UGANDA AND QAFMP CONTEXT	5
1.4 PURPOSE OF MIDTERM REVIEW	12
1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT	13
2.0 METHODOLOGY	14
2.1 PREPARATION	14
2.2 FIELD WORK	14
3.0 FINDINGS OF THE MIDTERM REVIEW	17
3.1 RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT	17
3.2 PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS	21
3.3 PROJECT EFFICIENCY	35
3.4 SUSTAINABILITY	38
4.0 CONCLUSIONS.....	40
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	42
5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO DFR AND ICEIDA	42
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES	43
5.3 DISTRICT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.....	43
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM	43
5.5 ICEIDA AND OTHER DONORS	43
6.0 LESSONS LEARNED	45
APPENDIX 1: SELECTED SOURCES OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION	47
APPENDIX 2: REPORTING ON THE LOG FRAME FOR QAFMP	48
APPENDIX 3: PROPOSED QAFMP INTERVENTION LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	50
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION	55
ANNEX 2: PROJECT EVALUATION QUESTIONS DISCUSSED WITH ICEIDA AS A DONOR	59
ANNEX 3: EVALUATION QUESTIONS DISCUSSED WITH PROJECT IMPLEMENTERS	61
ANNEX 4: SUMMARY TABLES OF MTR FINDINGS (ADDITIONAL DATA).....	65
ANNEX 5: PERSONS CONSULTED DURING EVALUATION MISSION	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	African Development Bank
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
BMU	Beach Management Unit
CA	Competent Authority
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
CCA	Central Competent Authority
CD	Country Director
CDO	Community Development Officer
CF	Commissioner for Fisheries
COMESA	Common Market for East and Southern Africa
COP	Codes of Practice
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCDO	District Community Development Officer
DFO	District Fisheries Officer
DFR	Department of Fisheries Resources
DR	Democratic Republic
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DSIP	Development Strategy and Investments Plan
EAC	East African Community
ET	Evaluation Team
EU	European Union
FAL	Functional Adult Literacy
FDP	Fisheries Development Project
FI	Fisheries Inspector
FOs	Fisheries Officers
FTI	Fisheries Training Institute
FTP	Fisheries Training Programme
Gol	Government of Iceland
GoU	Government of Uganda
HACCP	Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point
HIV	Human Immune Virus
ICEIDA	Icelandic International Development Agency
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFMP	Implementation of Fisheries Management Plan
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IT	Information Technology
KARDC	Kajjansi Aquaculture Research and Development Centre
KM	Kilometre
LAKIMO	Lake Kyoga Integrated Management Organization

LC III	Local Council Three
LCV	Local Council Five
LG	Local Government
LGFD	Local government Fisheries Department
LGLSP	Local Government Livelihoods Support Programme
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MFEPD	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NDP	National Development Plan
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PM	Project Manager
PMT	Project Management Team
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PS	Permanent Secretary
PSC	Project Supervisory Committee
QA	Quality Assurance
QAFMP	Quality Assurance for Fisheries Marketing Project
SACCOs	Savings and Credit Cooperative Organizations
SIO	Senior Implementation Officer
SoN	Source of Nile
SOP	Standard Operating procedure
TL	Team Leader
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Trainer of Trainers
UNBS	Uganda National Bureau of Standards
UNU	United Nations University
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollars

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This report presents the findings of the external midterm review of the Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project (QAFMP), which is being implemented by the Department of Fisheries Resources (DFR) under the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) with support from Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA). The project has been operational in 10 districts surrounding Lake Albert (*Ntoroko, Hoima, Buliisa and Nebbi*) and Lake Kyoga (*Nakasongola, Apac, Amolatar, Soroti, Serere and Buyende*) since April 2009 and it is planned to end in 2013. QAFMP aims at reducing poverty and improving the livelihoods of people in fish dependent communities. This is to be accomplished by increasing the volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets, through reduction in post-harvest losses.

Purpose of the Midterm Review

An independent external evaluation team was commissioned to undertake a comprehensive midterm review of the project to determine, among others; the achievements in implementation so far; the challenges that may affect the project in achieving its intended objectives; and the changes needed to improve the project's performance in the remaining timeframe. The scope of the review was to cover the first half of project implementation up to 2011. The area of study were the designated districts around Lake Albert and Lake Kyoga where project activities have been taking place, as well as the central competent authority and other participating institutions.

The ET conducted the review from March to June 2012. In all, the team undertook 28-days of field work to collect quantitative and qualitative data through document review, direct observation during site visits, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Data and information was collected from a cross-section of project stakeholders and beneficiaries such as ICEIDA, DFR, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development (MFPED), the project districts of Hoima, Buliisa, Nebbi, Nakasongola, Apac, Amolatar, Serere, Buyende and Ntoroko and selected beneficiary communities at fish landing sites, particularly the members of beach management units (BMUs).

Key Findings

Overall, the project was well conceived to address an imbalance in service delivery in the area of fish quality assurance which prior to QAFMP had only benefited fishing communities around Lake Victoria. The fishing communities on other Lake systems especially, Lake Kyoga and Lake Albert were neglected yet they too contributed significant quantities of fish on the market including exports to the regional and international markets.

The specific findings from the midterm review of the QAFMP project are presented in line with the evaluation criteria of relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as set out in the terms of reference, and they respond to the key evaluation questions that were formulated under each criterion.

1. Relevance

The MTR team found the QAFM project intervention to be highly relevant and timely and to a greater extent responds to the needs of the targeted fishing communities. At the design stage, the project was aligned to the Government of Uganda policy framework in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) whose overarching objective was poverty eradication, and it is contextually still relevant under Uganda's current development framework in the National Development Plan (NDP) that intertwines economic growth and poverty eradication. The project is also in coherence with ICEIDA's policy on development cooperation, whose main focus is to fight poverty and promote social and economic development among poorest countries and communities in Africa and other developing countries.

The project was initiated on request of the Department of Fisheries Resources because of the need to address the quality assurance service delivery needs in the Lake Kyoga and Lake Albert regions, which were not being reached by existing government and donor funded interventions. During the project identification and formulation process, stakeholders were involved in the needs assessment exercise, Logframe formulation consultative workshops and later through the baseline study. The ET also found that to a great extent the project intervention logic responds to the core problem of low fish quality and high post-harvest losses which affect the volume and value of fish marketed, leading to low incomes and high poverty levels among the fish dependent communities.

However there were weaknesses in the formulation of the project Logframe. Whereas the project development objective was a clear statement of goal, the project purpose or immediate objective was broadly defined and it missed the aspect of value addition. The outputs were fragmented and some were not coherent with the project outcome. The ET also established that there were alterations in outputs and approach made before this review was commissioned. Whereas some could have been supportive of the project purpose and goals, their implementation was not focused on the project area. Others were neither aligned to the project strategy nor focused on the target population.

2. Effectiveness

The project has to a large extent been effective in the delivery of the planned outputs, and most of the stakeholders were satisfied with the current delivery mechanism used in implementing this project.

Project Coordination, Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

The ET found that the project coordination and management worked well through the PSC and PMT and stakeholders rated it as satisfactory because it was not prone to bureaucratic delays in decision making and disbursement of funds, which facilitated timely implementation of activities. The PMT was effective in carrying out field supervision and monitoring missions and in compiling biannual progress reports that indicate the outputs produced, activities implemented, challenges encountered and recommendations on practical issues. The PSC reviewed bi-annual reports and passed all the plans and budgets and major modifications on the project.

However, there was no mechanism for monitoring the indicators at outcome level to determine if the project was on course to contribute to the anticipated impact. It was

also established that the bi-annual reporting system is not effective in keeping every one informed on the progress of the project and quarterly reporting framework was preferred by stakeholders, particularly in local governments.

Delivery of Outputs

The planned outputs of the project have been achieved with varying degrees of effectiveness as summarised in the table below:

S/n	Project Outputs	Target	Actual	%
1	Training of Trainers (ToT) for BMU's in fish quality assurance conducted			
	- Number of national ToT trained in FAL and BMU governance	15	8	53
	- Number of district ToT trained in FAL and BMU governance	20	36	180
2	BMUs trained in fish quality assurance			
	- BMU facilitators trained in mainly in FAL and BMU governance	450	639	142
	- Number of BMUs covered	150	200	133
3	National fish inspectors' office renovated and equipped	1	1	100
	- Documentation/rapid alert centre established	1	0	0
4	District fisheries offices renovated/built	9	8	89
5	Fish service centres at Landing sites constructed with ADB support furnished	7	0	0
6	Quality assurance manual for DFR (CA) developed	1	1	100
7	LG Fish Inspectors trained in fish quality (refresher)	60	57	95
	- Community (BMU) fish inspectors trained	180	0	0
8	Clean water and sanitation facilities developed at fish landing sites	20	6	30
9	National and LG fish inspectors trained in ICT			
	- Number of national fish inspectors trained	16	8	50
	- Number of LG fish inspectors trained	40	16	40
10	National fish inspection database established	1	1	100
	- Number of district databases established	10	0	0
11	Code of practice for fish farms prepared	1	1	100
	- Number of inspectors trained	10	0	0
	- Number of fish farmers trained	100	1	0
12	Code of practice for artisanal fish processing prepared	1	1	100

➤ Capacity Building Trainings

The capacity building trainings were conducted covering trainers of trainers, and training of BMUs (output 1 & 2), refresher training for fish inspectors (output 7), and training in ICT for fish inspectors (output 9). The ET found that though the training in output 1 and 2 were conducted and to a large degree the numbers targeted were achieved and some targets were exceeded, the effectiveness of the training was limited because the approach used, of FAL in BMUs, which did not address extensive training in fish quality foreseen in the project document. Similarly, the refresher training of local government fish inspectors in quality assurance, inspection and certification was undertaken but the duration of the course was too short to prepare the staff to take on their roles as fish inspectors. The training of community fish inspectors has not taken off. The project trained 8 out of 16 national inspectors and 16 out of 40 district inspectors that were targeted in information, communication technology (ICT).

➤ *Infrastructure, facilities and equipment for fish inspection and quality assurance*

The national fish inspector's offices at Bugolobi (output 3) was renovated and equipped with computers and vehicles to facilitate the work of inspection services. However the establishment of the documentation and rapid alert centre has not been done, because of changed priority by DFR. The project planned to construct/renovate 9 district fisheries offices but ended up constructing 6 new offices and renovated 2 existing offices. The 9 offices were furnished, equipped with computers and motorcycles as planned. The furnishing of 7 landing site centres constructed under a separate project with support from ADB was not done as planned.

The project has so far completed the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at 6 landing sites out of the target of 20 that are planned. Compared to the target, it is apparent that there was low effectiveness but this was understandable given the cost changes and the budget revisions that were made coupled with delays in securing land. The fisheries inspection database has been established at DFR as planned but none has been established in any of the project districts. The data base usage is also limited to the data obtained from the gazetted landing sites and factories around Lake Victoria and does not cover any data from the project area.

➤ *Preparation of operational procedures and guidelines for fish quality inspection*

The quality assurance manual for the competent authority (DFR) has been prepared and only awaits final editing and printing. Additional regulatory documents such as Fish Rules and Inspector's guides were produced to facilitate the implementation of the manual. The code of practice for fish farms was prepared and is only awaiting the printing of final copies, but none of the planned 100 farmers have been trained. In addition, the preparation of the code of practice for artisanal fish processing was completed but has not been printed. Unless these guidelines are printed and put to use the benefits accruing from this set of outputs will not reach the intended target.

Outcomes and impacts

The ET noted that it was too early to assess the impacts of the project because some of the planned outputs, particularly the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at fish landing sites was still work in progress. There was also a limitation because of lack of data, particularly at the level of outcome indicators (volume and value of fish marketed and levels of post-harvest losses). The baseline data and performance targets at the level of outcome and impacts were not included in the project log frame. The ET also established that the project management and implementers did not collect and maintain the outcome indicator tracking data, largely because the fish quality inspection services linking the project districts to the DFR data base has not been operationalised.

The above findings notwithstanding, the ET found that the project has delivered benefits to the institutions and the community through capacity building interventions and development of fish handling infrastructure and facilities at landing sites, which have the potential to significantly contribute to the project impact of reduced poverty and improved livelihoods of the fish dependent communities in the project area. Qualitative data collected shows some pointers to the likely impacts of the project particularly the increase in the prices of fish at some of the improved landing sites. However, the data collected was not sufficient for the ET to fully attribute the price increases to the project interventions directly. Other factors could also be at play such as the short fall in supply of capture fish.

The following outputs were assessed as having the potential to contribute to the project outcomes with varying degrees:

- The project components under outputs 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 will contribute to greater extents in the achievement of the project outcomes and contribute to realisation of the project impact of reducing poverty and improving the people's livelihoods through improved quality of fish and fishery products.
- The immediate benefits to the community are likely to be accrued from the improved clean water and sanitation facilities at fish landing sites after construction and operationalisation of facilities under output 8. However, the high cost and the resulting modifications in budget may not make it possible to achieve the target of 20 landing sites that were planned for improvement unless more resources are secured. The ET observed that in some areas facilities other than those designed by the project were highly needed to have a greater impact on quality and safety of the products going to the market. For instance improvement of sanitation facilities at Panyamur port market in Nebbi district, as opposed to landing facilities, would have a greater impact on a wider scale.
- The implementation of an extensive training of fish inspectors and BMUs in fish quality assurance planned under outputs 1 and 2 would have delivered immediate benefits to the community to realise greater impact on reduction of poverty and improvement of livelihoods through improved production and marketing of quality fish and fishery products. However, the introduction of Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) in BMU training approach affected the delivery of this output and significant changes will need to be made in its implementation if its intended outcomes are to be realised.
- Some benefits of the project are also likely to be realised through the implementation of output 4, the construction and refurbishment of the district fisheries offices in all districts, but some districts like Ntoroko and Serere have not benefited from these facilities, which limits the effectiveness of this output in those areas.
- There are no possible mechanisms in place for implementation of output 5.

3. Efficiency

Project efficiency was assessed in terms of how well the resources of the project were economically utilised to deliver the planned outputs and results. The ICEIDA pledged to provide an overall budget of USD 3,411,369 for the five years to implement the planned activities and deliver the outputs in the project document. By the end of the 3rd year of the project life (2011) USD 2,526,099 had so far been released and spent, representing 74% absorption rate. Overall ICEIDA was efficient in ensuring timely disbursement of the required funds for the implementation of project activities. It was noted that the use of existing government structures at the sub-county, district and national level to coordinate, supervise and monitor the implementation of QAFMP project activities, without creating parallel project structures, was an important cost saving strategy.

More resources than allocated in budget were expended on installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at the fish landing sites. Overall, the evaluation team noted that there were generally higher costs in the delivery of most outputs compared to what was provided in the original budget, which explains expenditure above the allocated budget in some of the outputs such as the improvement of water and

sanitation facilities at the landing sites. The ET found that this problem was largely a result of interplay of two factors, namely the inflationary pressure coupled with gross under costing of the activities/outputs at the outset of the project, rather than a question of lack of efficiency. The ET also found that more resources than planned were expended on Training of Trainers and FAL training of BMUs under outputs 1 and 2. Since FAL approach minimised the contribution of these outputs to the anticipated project impact, ET believes that such increased spending would have had a greater impact if it occurred on other outputs that directly contribute to improved fish quality.

4. Sustainability

The assessment of sustainability focused on determining the likelihood of continued services and benefits from QAFMP by the DFR, LGs and communities in the target districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga when external support from ICEIDA stops. The results from the midterm review were mixed. Some stakeholders were confident of the continuity of the project outputs and they cited the following supporting evidence:

- The project is anchored within government structures and development plans at national (MAAIF, DFR) and local government levels (Districts and Sub-counties) hence there is a likelihood that some of the operation and maintenance (O&M) costs will be catered for in their recurrent budgets.
- There has been extensive investment in the capacity building interventions which have strengthened the central government, local government and community institutions and to some extent the human resource capacity, especially the skills training, and provision of office facilities, equipment and tools. Given that the key implementing partners/actors are mainly government employees the project services and benefits are likely to be sustained.
- The primary beneficiaries who are the fishing community are organised in BMU structures that have the legal mandate to co-manage fisheries resources in their own localities and have defined sources of revenue to finance and sustain some project activities at the fish landing sites. The potential for these community institutions to sustain the benefits is high and they are being given the capacity in form of training and facilities.
- There is evidence on the ground to support the above potentials such as replacement of stolen solar panels, raising money to support FAL in BMU classes, and active participation of LG officials in project activities.

However, some findings from the field visits and interviews with some stakeholders showed that there are concerns arising from weaknesses in the project design and implementation arrangements that are likely to undermine sustainability of the project services and benefits:

- The project lacks a clear exit strategy/plan in the event that ICEIDA withdraws the support after 2013.
- The potential for sustainability of output 2 where FAL in BMU training approach was used is low because of lack of in-built incentives for the BMU facilitators.
- The participation of the formal government structures at the level of DFR and the district was not well elaborated. Though the project structures at national level

(PMT and PSC) are working well, local governments and BMUs perceived project ownership to be with DFR or ICEIDA officials. This is mainly because of the feeling of being left out in the decision making of PSC and the top-down approach used in project implementation.

- There are some delays in operationalising infrastructure and facilities developed by the project and their operation and maintenance plans are not clearly defined. Hence the skills acquired by the LG staff in the capacity building training are not put to immediate use, which affects their retention and transfer, and effective utilisation of the facilities themselves.
- Likewise, the national fish inspection services are not yet extended to the project districts to facilitate proper infrastructure utilisation and enabling the staff and BMUs utilise the acquired skills in improving the safety and quality of fish placed on markets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations to DFR and ICEIDA

1. The project narrative (log frame) should be reviewed to harmonise the goal, purpose and outputs. ET has suggested a new log frame. (Appendix 2)
2. There is need to extend the current project to utilise the project remaining funds for activities that are key to expanding the impacts of the project within the remaining time frame. Such activities would include:
 - Training for fish handlers, fish driers, fish processors, fish traders etc (current Output 2) aimed at enhancing the skills of fish operators to produce quality and safe fish and fishery products (as opposed to FAL)
 - Construct and furnish district fisheries offices in the new districts of Ntoroko and Serere (current Output 4)
 - Support the introduction of inspection activities in all the project districts through, introduction of regulatory activities, training, mentoring and dissemination of the following in Lake Kyoga/Albert districts (Output 6):
 - Fish (Quality Assurance) and Aquaculture (Rules),
 - Manual of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs),
 - Fish inspectors' guide
 - Organise refresher hands-on training courses for district fisheries staff to train and refresh them in quality assurance, inspection and certification of fish as established by the Rules and SOPs. (current Output 7)
 - Through output 8 “Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities in at least 20 fish landing sites”:
 - Review the project target for the development of improved fish handling facilities based on the projected resource envelope and focus the interventions by responding to the emerging needs of the target beneficiaries, particularly women and other groups involved in artisanal fish processing and marketing
 - Provide water and sanitation facilities at Panyimur port market in Nebbi district which serves largely as a port for landing fish destined to West Nile and Northern Uganda, as well as Eastern DRC and Southern

Sudan. This should be done in response to the dire need of these facilities as demonstrated by the District and Local leadership and witnessed by ET.

- Improve facilities for artisanal fish handling and processing at the landing sites in Hoima district
 - Provide IT equipment and train the staff in Ntoroko, and Serere in ICT (current Output 9)
 - Support development of specific simplified guidelines for fish safety and quality assurance for fish feed producers, and fish farm (grow out producers), in quality assurance – training for aquaculture operators should be arranged through fish farm associations (current Output 11). Also support the training of local government fisheries staff in quality assurance, inspection and certification of aquaculture based on SOPs and Fish Rules
 - Support development of product specific simplified guidelines for operators involved in handling of *Mukene* and other small fish, filleting and sun drying of fish, smoking, fresh fish trade, fish packaging, fish storage etc; These guidelines should be used for training the artisanal fish operators in output 2 (under current Output 12). Also support the development of national standards for mukene products and the regulations for controlling safety and quality in artisanal operations (regulations to cover criteria for gazetted landing sites handling regional and locally marketed fish and fishery products)
3. After the end of the project consider another phase that should be scaled up to the other districts on Lakes Kyoga and Albert, as a form of exit strategy. The entire intervention under 2nd phase (including the specific activities) could cover the areas identified for support in the various sections of the report including supporting model facilities for handling, processing and marketing of fish by artisanal operators .
4. Drop and expunge entire Output 5 from the project document.

Recommendations to MAAIF, Department of Fisheries Resources

- Extend national inspection activities to cover fish and fishery products from the Lakes Kyoga and Albert
- Develop and disseminate the guidelines for the maintenance of clean water and sanitation facilities instated at landing sites.
- Develop a monitoring mechanism for tracking the outcome indicators

District Local Governments

- Nominate a committee chaired by the CAO or his representative to oversee the activities of the QAFMP in the districts.
- Put in place mechanisms for management of the clean water and sanitation facilities at the landing sites
- Support fisheries staff to initiate and maintain inspection and surveillance of the health conditions in the fish supply chain.
- Put in place effective mechanisms for sustaining all the QAFMP supported activities and facilities.

Project management Team

- Improve on the reporting of the project activities and report every quarter.
- Liaise with the Commissioner for Fisheries and CAOs to streamline handing-over and commissioning of the project supported facilities in the districts.
- Improve the coordination with the relevant officers of MFPED to ensure full involvement of the MFPED in monitoring of the project activities as is case with similar projects.
- Implement a monitoring mechanism for tracking the outcome indicators

ICEIDA and other donors

Future interventions in the Lake Kyoga and Albert regions should support small artisanal operators who handle, process, and market the largest proportion of the landed fish. The support could come in form of development of feasible model facilities and technologies for improving the quality and value of dried and processed fish, and providing improved facilities for drying, salting, smoking, processing, packaging, storage, and marketing. Such interventions should be preceded by a comprehensive value chain analysis to understand the artisanal post harvest operations and the specific needs of handlers, driers, processors and traders. The facilities to be supported should come from priority lists generated through a participatory needs assessment where the voices of weaker players e.g. women who dominate post harvest artisanal sub-sector, are heard.

LESSONS LEARNED

1. Log frame

When the project document is not properly developed, with clearly articulated objectives and outcomes, it affects the clarity of the project during implementation and the coherence of project outputs. This may affect the manner in which the project achieves what it is set out to accomplish

2. Value chain analysis to determine appropriate support to operators

When a project is meant to establish facilities that improve processes in the value chain of a commodity like fish in locations of different agro-ecological zones or in the regions of different social-economic and social cultural set ups (eg Lake Kyoga and Lake Albert); it is important, first to carry out a value chain analysis to ensure that facilities to be provided will address the needs of majority of the operators.

3. Feasibility/suitability studies for new facilities

Likewise, even when the value chain analysis is undertaken and facilities suited to benefit categories of operators are determined; a feasibility/suitability study for each facility is necessary to ensure that the facility is fit for the purpose in accordance with the practices of the end users. It is important to note that a single design does not cater for the differences in socio-economic and social cultural set-ups, which could minimise the benefits that the communities accrue from the project.

4. Change of project focus

Even if an approach to delivery of a service has been tested, used and succeeded in one area under a project with a different purpose (eg FAL in BMUs), it is not wise to

introduce that approach in another project, since it may contradict the purpose and affect the contribution of the project outputs to the intended impact.

5. Training materials in local languages

When developing information and material for training, sensitisation and or publicity on any programme in local languages; care must be taken to ensure that generalisation of similar dialects is avoided, as in most cases the so called similar dialects may after all not be the same. For instance, although Alur are said to speak Luo language, materials developed in Langi could not be understood by the Alur. In such situations, the local languages should be accompanied with materials in English to help those who can understand English and facilitate interpretation where language gap exists.

6. Project planning for two different lakes

The fisheries of Lake Kyoga and that for Lake Albert are different. The communities of the two lakes are also different especially considering Lake Albert as a trans-national lake (shared by Uganda and DR Congo). This means the value chains; the nature of the operators, the nature of products, and the market niche for the products, are different. This variation should always be considered when planning deliverables that impact on the fisher communities

7. Involvement of local governments in project decision making

Because of the differences in the operations of central and local governments, it is important to include the representatives of local governments on the Project Steering Committee to avoid a top down decision mechanisms where the centre decides on matters that affect the districts, yet the districts are the beneficiaries of the project who will have to ensure sustainability of the activities. Decisions made at the centre could lack local practicability which could affect the implementation of the project activities

8. Memorandum of Understanding

At the very beginning of the project of this nature, it is important for the parties to the project implementation to sign a memorandum of understanding detailing the responsibility of each party in implementation and obligations to sustain the project outputs and activities

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

This report presents the findings of the midterm review of the Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project (2009-2013), which is being implemented by the Department of Fisheries Resources under the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries with support from Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA). The midterm review was conducted between March and June 2012.

The report covers the main findings, recommendations and lessons learned during the implementation in the first half of the project life from April 2009 to the end of 2011.

1.2 Project Description

ICEIDA has been supporting the quality assurance for fish and fishery products in Uganda since 2001 with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries through the Department of fisheries Resources as its main partner. The current cooperation between ICEIDA and the Government of Uganda in the fisheries sub-sector focuses on strengthening economic growth, promoting social and economic development, reducing poverty as well as improving the livelihoods of fish dependent communities through improving the quality and safety of fish for the domestic, regional and export market. The current cooperation is based on the Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project (QAFMP) which became operational from 2009 and is planned to end in 2013.

Project official information

Country: Uganda

Sector: Fisheries (sub-sector).

Executing agencies: Government of Uganda (GoU) through the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
Government of Iceland (GoI) through ICEIDA

Title of Project: Support to Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project

Project number: UGA 31391-0801

Project Period: 1st April 2009 to 31st December 2013

Project Budget: USD 3,925,237

Donor : ICEIDA

Tentative ICEIDA contribution: USD 3,411,369 (87%)

Tentative GoU/Partners Contribution (In kind): USD 513,867 (13%)

Project Development Objective

To reduce poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for the domestic, regional and export market as well as improving the livelihoods of fish dependent communities.

Immediate Development objective

To increase volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets through reduction in post-harvest losses.

The Expected Outputs are:

1. 15 national fish inspectors and 20 district inspectors trained as district and/or BMU trainers.
2. 150 BMU's from prioritized districts around lake Albert and Kyoga received extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance
3. The national fish inspector's offices and documentation/Rapid Alert System¹ centre refurbished, furnished and equipped at the Ice Plant in Bugolobi.
4. Nine district fisheries offices constructed, refurbished and equipped with transport and inspection means.
5. Seven fisheries service centers furnished (two of type (A)² at landing sites in Kalangala and five of type (B)³ in Buliisa, Soroti, Amolartar, Nakasongola and Kamuli districts) including 1 motor cycle each.
6. Quality Assurance manual for CA prepared for the fisheries inspection services.
7. 60 lake districts inspectors and 180 community fish inspectors refreshed in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures and Regional cooperation meetings/study tours attended by 10 inspectors per year
8. Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities in at least 20 fishing landing sites.
9. 16 national and 40 district fish inspectors trained in ICT and Information Management
10. Fisheries inspection database functional (one at central with focal points in each of the 11 districts including Kalangala)
11. Code of practice for fish farms prepared and 10 aquaculture inspectors and 100 farmers trained.
12. Code of Practice for artisanal fish processing prepared

Project Areas and Targeted Beneficiaries

The project which started in 2009 has been implemented mainly in the 10 districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga regions which include: Hoima, Buliisa, Ntoroko (originally Bundibugyo), Nebbi, Nakasongola, Apac, Amolartar, Serere (original part of Soroti), Soroti and Buyende (originally Kamuli). The project beneficiaries are the DFR, which is the competent authority at the central government level, the 10 local governments, and the fishing communities, particularly BMUs.

Project Rationale

Prior to QAFMP most attention for improving the quality of fish products had been focused on fish and fishery products from Lake Victoria which dominate exports to the international markets especially the European Union. The project was therefore conceived to address service delivery needs in the area of fish quality assurance on Lake Kyoga and Lake Albert that suffered obvious quality challenges yet they contributed significant quantities of fish on the market including exports to the regional and international markets.

The fish from lakes Victoria, Albert, Kyoga, Edward and George are comprised mainly of the Nile perch (*Lates niloticus*), Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) and sardine like *Rastrineobola argentea* locally known as “Mukene”. There are other smaller Mukene-like fishes such as Muziri (*Neobora Bredae*), Ragogi (*Brasenus nus*) and Nkejje (haplochromines)¹ which make a significant proportion of the fishes landed mainly from L. Albert. These fish species are marketed domestically, regionally and internationally.

To ensure production of quality and safe products which fetch good prices, there is always need to strengthen the food/fish control function of the responsible mandated agencies of government so that they are able to monitor and inspect the operators to keep in compliance with the best practices. It is also necessary to develop the regulatory framework for the food/fish controls, provide guidance to fish operators on the best practices for complying with the required regulatory requirements; and to support an adequate infrastructure and facilities for handling, processing and marketing of the fish products.

The requirements for placing safe fish products on national, regional and international markets, present a big challenge especially in Uganda; where the fish value chain is characterized by many hygiene and sanitation issues and poor processing and handling techniques which impact on safety and quality of the products. These requirements in the past led to restrictions and bans of the fish exports from Uganda to the European Markets. The Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project was therefore aimed at addressing some of the fish quality assurance and safety concerns by improving inspection and certification services at both national and local governments; improvement of fish handling facilities; and promoting use of proper fish handling and processing methods as a means of achieving improved access to market and value of the products.

Alterations in the project plan and approach

The ET observed that three major alterations were made during the implementation of the project before the commissioning of the midterm review:

1. The major alteration was the introduction of FAL in BMU programme in training activities supported by the project. The ET views this as a major alteration from the training anticipated in the project document because it was of such a magnitude that FAL-in-BMUs activities now characterise and represent one of the QAFMP contributions in the perception of the local governments and BMUs, instead of quality assurance.

¹ Mukene, Muziri and Ragogi are local names

2. Another alteration noted by the ET is the substantial project support that was expended on supporting trainings in aquaculture production and management and support for the printing of the aquaculture production user manuals, which are outside the project arrangement. Both of these were undertaken through collaboration of stakeholders such as UNU, Makerere University, Kajjansi Aquaculture Research and Development Centre (KARDC), and USAID FISH Project.
3. The ET also noted that the DFR included other activities such as Review of the Fish (Quality Assurance) Rules and Fish (Aquaculture) Rules, and the development of the inspectors' guide for support by the project; which never appeared in the project document. The justification was that these activities were needed to supplement the quality assurance manual (covered in the project document) so that it effectively address new requirements imposed by markets such as EU; and to facilitate approval of Uganda's aquaculture imports by the EU. All these were being done to bring Uganda's quality assurance system in line with international requirements and best practices. The ET's view is that whenever a justified change is to be included in the project, the project document should be adjusted to reflect such which has not been the case.

1.3 Fisheries Sector in Uganda and QAFMP context

1.3.1 Fish production in Uganda

Uganda is endowed with enormous water resources comprising of lakes, rivers, valley dams and tanks, wetlands and water reservoirs which raise its potential for fisheries development. Eighteen percent (18%) of the country's surface area of 236040 Km² is estimated to be under water with most of the water bodies contributing to fish production in one way or the other. Most of the fish has been coming from the lakes and to a little extent, the rivers (especially the Nile). The contribution of aquaculture has been insignificant, but of recent has steadily increased (though still minimal) due to the introduction of commercial aquaculture.

A big proportion of the fish landed comes from Lakes; Victoria (surface area in Uganda is 86,850 Km²), Kyoga (2,700 Km²), Albert (surface area in Uganda 2846 Km²), Edward (2,300 Km²), George (250 Km²), and River Nile. The composition of fishes coming from the three major lakes (Victoria, Kyoga and Albert) has been changing over the years which are attributed to the fact that the three lakes are linked to one another by river Nile. The changes are believed to have been brought about by introduction of Nile Perch and Nile Tilapia in Lake Victoria and Lake Kyoga in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

Before the introduction of the two species and in the two decades that followed their introduction, the fish landings from the Lake Victoria and Kyoga were composed of indigenous fish - mainly dominated by the small fishes of the cyprinid family commonly known as haplochromines (locally known as *Nkejje*). Other fishes indigenous to the lakes include *Clarias gariepenus* - the African Cat fish (Mmale), *Labeo*, *Bagrus docmac*, *Barbus*, *Synodontis*, *Protopterus* (Mamba) and *Rastrineobola argentea* (locally know as Mukene or Omena) which were always present in the catches in significant quantities. As for Lake Albert, the fishes were dominated by the perch-like *Hydrocynus* (tiger fish – locally known as Engasi), *Alestes Baremose* (Angara), *Barbus*, *Bagrus docmac*, Electric fish (*Maripterus electricus*), and small fishes like *Neobora Bredae* (commonly known as Muziri), and *Brasenus nus* (commonly known as Ragogi), which appeared in the catches in more or less contrasting proportions.

Later, as a result of the introduction of Nile perch (*Lates niloticus*: Mputa); and Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*: Ngege) in Lake Victoria, there was an upsurge of Nile Perch and Tilapia production which dominated the landings in the years that followed in the 1980's and 1990s up to the mid 2000s when the catches of these fish began to decline. This increase in commercially viable large species led to the boom in the fisheries sector which saw an increase in the number of licensed fish processing factories from one (1) in 1987 to over seventeen (17) in 2005. The boom was mainly engineered by the growth in demand for the Victoria Nile perch in European Markets, where 73% of the processed fish were exported. There was also an increase in the demand for Nile Tilapia in the international markets. Other markets for Ugandan fish exports were/are: United States of America, Australia, Japan, Egypt, South Africa and the Middle East. The increase in catches of large fishes (Nile Perch and Tilapia) occurred when the proportion of most of the other species were reducing in landings, to

the extent that some of the fishes that used to appear in the catches in significant quantities could only appear as by-catches.

At the pick of the fish boom the fish catches from Lake Victoria and Kyoga (which used to produce multiple fish species), were dominated by three fishes *Rastrineobola argentea*, Nile perch and Nile Tilapia; but *Rastrineobola argentea* was appearing in less proportions. For Lake Albert, the catches were dominated by *Alestes baramose* (Angara), Nile Perch, Nile Tilapia; and *Rastrineobola argentea* (Mukene), though Mukene was always in less proportions. However, with the decline in Nile perch and Nile Tilapia in the lakes in the recent time², most small species i.e *Rastrineobola argentea* and Hapochromines in Lake Victoria and Kyoga; and *Neobora Bredae* (Muziri) and *Brasenus nus* (Ragogi) on lake Albert, which used to dominate the production in the lakes before the introduction of Nile perch and Nile tilapia, are on increase within the catches. It is estimated that the current composition of fish landings from Lake Albert for smaller fishes (*Rastrineobola argentea*; *Neobora Bredae*; *Brasenus nus*; and Hapochromines) is 30%; Nile perch and Nile Tilapia (20%); and the rest of the species found in lake Albert (*Hydrocynus*, *Alestes baramose*, *Barbus*, *Bagrus docmac* and others) (50%).

Lake Kyoga is an extensive net work of shallow open water areas fringed by papyrus swamp. Although the open water is estimate to cover 2700 Km² , it's swamp fringes which also produce fish extend to an extra surface area of about 2000 Km² . Records available at DFR indicate that more than a decade ago, Lake Kyoga accounted for 35% of Uganda's fish landings, second to Lake Victoria. The estimated total production for Lake Kyoga was 685,000 tons of fish in 2004. Lake Albert is shared by Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo, with a total surface area of 5,300 Km² of which 54% or 2862 Km² found in Uganda. DFR records indicate that the total annual production for Lake Albert was 628,000 tons in 2004.

1.3.2 Context for QAFMP on Lake Kyoga and Albert

Before the fish boom, apart from domestic trade that mainly included artisanal traders who used to hawk fish around from home to home and in the towns around the lakes, most of the fish was used for domestic (family) consumption mainly by the fishing communities around the lakes where it served as source of food and traditional medicine (especially for smaller fish species).

Following the entry into the European Union and other export markets, there was increased demand of fish especially Nile perch and Nile Tilapia both internationally and in the region. This happened at a time when the EU, then the largest fish export market for fish products from Uganda, imposed strict sanitary and hygiene conditions for all the fish exported from the region. Following three successive bans for export products from Uganda that characterized the late 1990's (1997-2000), Uganda instituted several food safety and quality assurance measures in the fisheries chain to safe guard the exports to Europe. Among the measures instituted was the gazetting of landing sites on Lake Victoria and establishing an inspection system to control safety and quality of fish coming from the gazetted landing sites. All factories that were processing fish for the

² The decline of Nile Perch and Tilapia is attributed to over fishing among other factors, due to high demand for export in international and regional markets.

EU market were expected to collect fish from the gazetted landing sites. The factories and landing sites were placed under the strict control of the central inspection services of the Department of Fisheries Resources.

To institute all these changes the Department of Fisheries Resources utilized funds that were coming from development partners such as the World Bank through the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Programme (Phase 1) [1997-2005] and the Implementation of Lake Victoria Fisheries Management Plan [2003-2010] of the European Union; and the Fisheries Development Project [2003-2010] of the Africa Development Bank. Most of the support provided by the above key development partners was expended on improving the quality assurance system for the products mainly coming from Lake Victoria and as such, many of the newly constructed landing sites are located on Lake Victoria.

However, when Nile perch and Nile Tilapia catches from Lake Victoria began to decline in the mid 2000s, there were increasing reports of smuggling of fish by the traders from Lake Albert and Lake Kyoga to the landing sites on Lake Victoria with a possibility of fish from those lakes entering the EU and other export markets. Also in view of the fact that most of the fish from the two lakes (Albert and Kyoga) were and are still destined to the regional countries including the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and South Sudan and sold widely on the local markets, there was growing concern for possible consumption of poor quality and/or unsafe products from those lakes by the local and regional consumers. This came at the back drop of little or no official interventions made by the Department of Fisheries Resources to address quality issues of fish in the two lake regions. Recognizing the likely trade barriers this scenario could cause on the access of fish to regional and international markets, as well as responding to the growing need to improve the safety and quality of fish consumed locally and in the region, the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries through the DFR contacted Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) for assistance regarding the improvement of the fish quality assurance system for fish from Lakes Kyoga and Albert.

Information within DFR indicates that ICEIDA had in the past provided substantial assistance to the Department of Fisheries Resources to improve the department's capacity for fish quality assurance. Such support included constructing and equipping the Uganda Fisheries Laboratory, training of key staff in various quality assurance activities and attending to occasional department's requests for, and meeting the recurrent expenditure on intermittent basis. Such recurrent support to DFR covered local inspection missions, conducting residue analysis for fish products and responding to critical reports of external inspections by the EU inspectors. The Department of Fisheries Resources therefore in collaboration with the Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) formulated the project "Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing" (2009–2013). The project was expected to be implemented specifically as an affirmative action for Lake Kyoga and Lake Albert regions to bring the quality assurance systems for the fish from these regions to the level that was already in place in the Lake Victoria region.

1.3.3 Policy Framework

The current fisheries policy on which the development of the fisheries sector in Uganda operates was approved by cabinet in 2004. The National Fisheries policy was developed to enable Uganda realise its national vision for the fisheries sector that is “*an ensured sustainable exploitation and culture of the fisheries resources at the highest possible levels, thereby maintaining fish availability for both present and future generation without degrading the environment.*” It is hoped that the vision will be realised by achieving the national fisheries sector goal which is “*To ensure increased and sustainable fish production and utilisation of properly managed capture fisheries, promoting aquaculture and reducing post harvest losses*”.

The fisheries policy identifies and defines 13 policy areas of national development focus that are essential for achievement of the fisheries sector goal. “Post harvest fish quality and value addition” and “Fish Marketing and Trade” are included in the thirteen policy areas as policy areas Number 10 and 11 respectively. Under policy statement No. 10, the National Policy states “Measures will be promoted to ensure that the quality, wholesomeness, safety for human consumption and value of harvested fish and fishery products is secured and/or enhanced” The policy statement Number 11 which covers Fish Marketing and Trade states that “Measures will be taken to attain sustainable increases in the value and volume of fish marketed for national consumption and export”.

1.3.4 Legal framework

The overall legislation governing fisheries related activities in Uganda is the Fish Act of 1964 (Cap. 197 of Laws of Uganda). The Act gives control authority to the government agency responsible for fisheries and provides for the control of fishing, fish conservation, the purchase, sale, marketing and processing of fish and matters related therewith. Under section 43 of the Fish Act, which provides for the minister to issue rules and regulations to regulate proper management of the fisheries in Uganda, subsidiary legislations have been issued that support the implementation and enforcement of the Fish Act. These include the Fish (Fishing) Rules 2011; the Fish (Beach Management Units) Rules 2003; the draft Fish and Aquaculture Products (Quality assurance) Rules, 2012 (amendment for the 2008 version), and the Fish (Aquaculture) Rules 2012 (amendment for the 2003 version). Both the Fish (Fishing) Rules 2011 and the Fish (Beach Management Unit) Rules 2003 have provisions that require fishers and fish handlers to ensure sanitary and hygiene management of the facilities and operations to safeguard fish from quality deterioration and ensure safe products.

The Fish and Aquaculture Products (Quality Assurance) Rules 2012 and Fish (Aquaculture) Rules 2012 being the most relevant in regulating safety and quality of the products, have been reviewed and are presently harmonized with the international food safety and quality assurance requirements. In order to effectively implement the provisions of these two sets of the Rules, respective manuals of standard operating procedures for inspection have been developed.

1.3.5 Institutional framework

The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) through the Department of Fisheries Resources holds the overall oversight responsibility and is the lead agency of government for fisheries management in Uganda. DFR is mandated to promote, guide and support sustainable fisheries development in collaboration with the public and private sector partners. DFR is therefore responsible for setting standards and enforcing regulations that control practices undertaken within the fisheries sector. The department continuously monitors the national fisheries standards and regulatory issues. The DFR is the (Central) Competent Authority (CCA/CA) responsible for quality assurance activities within the fisheries sector. The Department of Fisheries Resources (DFR) derives its official control authority from the Fish Act (Cap. 197) of the laws of Uganda), and rules and regulations made under the act. The mandate of the CCA for undertaking official controls for fish and fishery products are clearly spelt out in the Manual of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Fish and Aquaculture Inspection and Quality Assurance, 2012 and Manual of SOPs for Inspection of Aquaculture establishments (Chapter 2, in each case). These include statutory inspection and control of fish and fishery products and related activities; certification of fish and fishery products intended for export and local consumption; inspection of health conditions for the production and distribution of fishery products for human consumption and feed for feeding aqua cultured fish, including the inspection of hygiene, premises, equipment, and own checks in fish and fish feed processing establishments; and to regulate and control the use of chemical and medicinal products in aquaculture.

At the local government level, Uganda has since 1993 implemented a policy of decentralization in all sectors, whereby under the fisheries sub-sector the District-based Fisheries Officers are employed and facilitated by the local governments. The DFR therefore works closely with local governments and other partners such as the Beach Management Units, the industry association - Uganda Fish Processors and Exporters Association (UFPEA), and a range of other NGOs and development partners in collaborative management of the fisheries resources. The CCA has delegated powers to Local Government Fisheries Departments (LGFDD) in accordance with the Fish Act (Cap 197) and the Local Governments Act (Cap 243) of laws of Uganda) as fish inspection bodies responsible for the statutory inspection, certification and control of fish and fishery products in some of the areas under their jurisdiction. The officers working under the supervision of the District Fisheries Officers are expected to carry out routine inspection of fish landing sites for adherence to safety and quality requirements under the Fish Act as “authorised officers (designated fish inspectors)”. The CCA has powers under the Local Government Act, Section 98 to inspect local governments for adherence to the Fish Act.

The Beach Management Units (BMUs) are community fisheries management institutions, legally empowered and registered with the Department of Fisheries Resources. Fishers and other operators in the fisheries sector at the beach are required to be registered with BMUs in order to be allowed to work in fisheries. This is intended to promote equity of stakeholders and ensure that all stakeholders, including the traditionally marginalized and poorer segments within fishing communities, such as women and boat crew participate in decision-making. The Statutory Instrument, the Fish (Beach Management) Rules 2003, provides legal empowerment of BMUs in planning for development and management of the fisheries in partnership with local governments.

The BMUs, fisheries departments under the local and central governments, and are therefore partners in the management of fisheries resources, and as such, BMUs are delegated certain official control powers through community (BMU) fish inspectors.

1.3.6 Nature and Markets of fish products from Lakes Kyoga and Albert

In Uganda, fish trade is characterised by artisanal and industry processing which target both domestic and export markets. Fish for regional and domestic trade is mainly composed of whole fresh fish and artisanal processed (mainly sun dried, smoked and salted), while that for the international trade is dominated by fresh and frozen fillets. The majority of the artisanal operators are the ones supplying most of the fish placed on local and regional markets, and to some extent international markets. The scenarios in artisanal operations sometimes lead to poor quality products or products that may be unsafe for human consumption; which may potentially affect the demand of the products on local, regional and international markets.

Uganda's fish products generally have been successful in regional and international markets. There is a growing but competitive regional market for fishery products. Most of the fish traded are marketed in highly lucrative markets in DRC, Rwanda, South Sudan and Kenya and beyond. The integration of regional markets through EAC, COMESA, and IGAD is likely to result into increased competition, with the possibility of certain markets using safety, quality and standards as a means of protectionism in the liberalized regional markets. In addition regional integration has heightened awareness and consciousness of regional market authorities and consumers about safety, quality and standards issues. This means that in future, products coming from supply chains with questionable integrity may suffer rejection in the growing lucrative regional markets. Uganda's operators therefore ought to change the way they handle, prepare, and process fish in order to produce safe products for consumption and sustain their presence in the markets

The methods of fish handling, processing and marketing for different fish species in Uganda varies because of the diverse traditions and culture of fish handlers involved. On lake Albert: the fishing communities are mostly involved in the artisanal processing of four common products namely: sun drying of Mukene, Nkejje, Muziri and Ragogi for which products have a huge market in Kampala, and in the regional countries especially the DRC where they are used for human consumption and in animal feed industry. There is filleting, salting and sun drying of *Hydrocynus* and *Alestes* fillets where most of these products are highly demanded in the West Nile Region in Northern Uganda, DRC and South Sudan. There is also gutting and chilling of Nile Tilapia where the gutting is done immediately at the landing site and the fish is iced in trucks that ferry the fish mainly to Rwanda and DR Congo. The gutting is done to reduce spoilage because of the long periods the traders spend at the landing site waiting to purchase enough quantity of fish for sell, and long distances travelled to the markets. Apart from smoking of all the other species with exception of the small sized fish, and deep frying in some instances, the rest of the fish is traded fresh and sold using traditional hawking methods.

On Lake Kyoga there is sun drying of Mukene and Nkejje; smoking of Tilapia, Nile perch and other fishes, and also deep frying of the fish in some cases. Unlike on Lake Albert where the fresh landed tilapia is gutted, the Tilapia and Nile perch on Kyoga is chilled whole and transported in trucks to the factories and regional markets. The drying

of small fish of Mukene type on Kyoga is seasonal and occurs in the period September - January when it is said the catches are better.

Most of these methods lead to low quality fish sold because of the poor handling and processing practices which include among others: use of polluted water for cleaning, poor hygiene of fishing boats, mishandling of cleaning chemicals such as soap, physical contamination of fish with sand and earth material. Generally, there is a fast growing business for dried *Rastrineobola argentea* (Mukene), a small silver cyprinid fish, and other mukene-like fishes like Muziri and Ragogi; used as human food where they are served as fried snacks and normal stew, or as medicine and animal feed. These products have serious safety and quality issues since the majority of operators still consider drying on the sandy ground beneficial. Beneficial in a sense that the fish dried on the ground gains more weight as result of added sand, soil and other materials picked from the ground. This is a very serious problem common within the fishing villages. The practice does not only compromise the safety and quality of fish, but also is a form of cheating where the consumer buys not only poor quality products but also pays for the earth material added in the process.

1.3.7 Weaknesses in the Quality assurance system for Lake Kyoga and Albert

There is currently a weakness in the national inspection services which tend to concentrate on guaranteeing the safety of fish products mainly destined to the European Union markets; especially concentrated on Lake Victoria where the landing sites gazetted to receive the fish exported to Europe are located. In the so called “EU landing sites” the central competent authority has delegated some of its functions to local governments and some of the LG staffs have been designated by the CCA as fish inspectors. In addition some members of BMU executives in these landing sites have been given the requisite training, and have inspection responsibilities assigned to them by the designated inspectors. The BMU and the local government inspectors submit regular inspection reports to the CCA. As such, the existing processing plants are authorized to source fish for export from only the Lake Victoria region which is regulated.

Following the fish shortages in the country, it is likely that fish from the Kyoga and Albert lakes could be gaining, or may gain entry into international fish exports chain but “purported” as coming from Lake Victoria. This presents a serious problem which necessitates similar interventions to be undertaken on other major lakes especially Kyoga and Albert. It should be noted that the local and regional market is increasingly becoming choosy, where it is reported that for instance dried Mukene fish that is contaminated with soil is being rejected in some markets or offered much lesser price as compared to the quality uncontaminated product. The functions and working of the inspection system from the centre down to BMU are already covered in the relevant Fish Rules and Manual of Fish and Aquaculture Inspection and Quality Assurance; where it is established as a national function of the inspection services, but not only for Lake Victoria fish fishery products.

Information from DFR and the districts point to some areas of concern in the existing fish quality assurance system especially on Lakes Kyoga and Albert which include: poor and inappropriate facilities and practices for capture, handling, drying, smoking, and

transportation of fish which contribute to quality deterioration and expose fish to unsafe conditions; failure by CCA to promote the use of, and enforcement of proper hygiene and sanitary practices within the fish supply chain; the lack of an inspection system for monitoring, checking and certifying the quality and safety of products supplied to the local and regional markets; failure of the CCA [and LGs] to monitor the hygiene and health conditions (facilities and practices) within the fish supply chain; poor quality of inspection services at local government level where inspection (if at all is done) is done by personnel with inadequate hands-on skills in quality assurance procedures; lack of prioritisation by central and local governments of fish quality and safety services on the two lakes which is reflected in poor sanitary facilities at the landing sites coupled with failure by the central government to incorporate the local government inspection structure of the central competent authority.

There are also persistent challenges common to all forms of artisanal fisheries in Uganda which affect the safety and quality of processed products. They include: use of rudimentary, un-cleanable wooden slabs or plastic sheets and vegetation placed on the ground in the open space to handle, and process the fish; drying of fish directly onto the ground where the fish picks sand, soil or other earth material; lack of adequate sanitation facilities such as potable water, toilet and storage facilities at the landing sites and within the fishing villages. The result of these poor handling and processing methods is the high post-harvest losses especially among the small-scale processors.

The above weaknesses clearly show that the lakes in Uganda where no intervention have been undertaken to ensure an established inspection system will continue to present a challenge in the fisheries sector and hence produce unsafe fish products for consumption which could attract export restrictions.

1.4 Purpose of Midterm Review

After three years of project implementation, ICEIDA in collaboration with the Department of Fisheries Resources contracted independent evaluators from Food Safety Associates Ltd, to undertake an external midterm evaluation of the project to establish the extent to which the project is likely to meet its goals, determine the challenges faced and how those challenges could be addressed in the remaining period of the project. In addition, this being the first project of this kind supported by ICEIDA in Uganda, the review was to come up with lessons learnt that could be used to guide ICEIDA's future interventions in the fisheries sector in Uganda. Specifically the midterm evaluation was aimed to achieve the following objectives:

- Examine the relevance of the project activities in relation to the government of Uganda policy goals concerning fish quality assurance and the cross-cutting issues related to environmental sustainability HIV/AIDS and gender equality in context of the broader GoU goal of poverty reduction
- Assess the efficiency in use of the financial and human resources available to the project to ensure value for money and resource optimisation specifically in the context of coherence and compatibility of the project with other government projects and programmes as well as other Icelandic or international development assistance programmes.
- Determine the effectiveness of the implementation of the project by examining the extent to which the project's objectives were achieved, taking into account their relative importance

- Establish the potential for sustainability of the impact of specific project interventions by assessing if the net benefits are likely to continue after the completion of the Icelandic assistance.
- ❖ *(See details in the terms of reference in Annex 1)*

1.5 Structure of the Report

The report has six main sections. The first Section covers the introduction and background, which give the context of the project, the purpose and scope of the MTR. The rest of the report covers the methodology, key findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned.

Section 2 presents the methodology used in undertaking the MTR focusing on the area of study, the sample population, types of data collected, sources of data, methods used in data collection and how the data was analysed and presented in this report.

Section 3 presents the summary of the key findings based on the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The key evaluation questions relevant to each evaluation criteria are addressed. Section 4 discusses the conclusions drawn from the findings.

Section 5 presents key actionable recommendations to ICEIDA, DFR, LGS and other donors. Section 6 closes by presenting lessons learned to help future project design and implementation strategy by ICEIDA and GoU. Other relevant information and references are appended to the report as annexes.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Preparation

The midterm evaluation of the QAFMP was carried out by a team of three experts from Food Safety Associates Ltd who brought to the assignment technical skills in fisheries management, fish quality assurance and inspection, monitoring and evaluation of multi-stakeholders and multi-issues programmes and projects, project coordination and project cycle management. The team also had rich experience of working on regional and international trade in agro/fish products and in the fisheries sector at the central and local government levels. Other experts were brought on board whenever specialised knowledge was required to provide support and advice to the team especially on issues of gender and community development and HIV/AIDs. For the field work, the team was joined by an experienced, highly skilled and knowledgeable Senior GoU official who represented the Department of Fisheries Resources and MAAIF, and participated as a member of the team for a significant portion of the assignment. He added a key public sector perspective to the team's analysis (See Acknowledgement at the beginning of the report).

The QAFMP evaluation was done through a participatory approach which sought the views and assessments of key stakeholders. The evaluation determined as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project outputs.

Upon commencement of the assignment, the ET reviewed key project documentation which included; the Project Identification document, the main project document, the project baseline survey report, respective progress reports, ICEIDA policy information, policy documents relevance to fisheries sector, activity reports and other documents produced by the project, and training materials generated by the project. Based on the information obtained from these documents and the evaluation questions that were to be answered, the team developed two checklist that highlighted issues to be discussed with the stakeholders. Separate checklists were developed for obtaining the view from ICEIDA (*see Annex 2*) and the project implementers at the national and local levels of government (*see Annex 3*)

2.2 Field work

At first the ET held consultative meeting with top officials of ICEIDA Uganda, that is, the ICEIDA Country Director and Programmes Director at ICEIDA country office in Kampala. The QAFMP Project Manager and the Project Coordinator were in attendance as well. This meeting served both as an inception and consultative meeting. Further fact finding meetings were held with the project staff at its Bugolobi office. The meetings were guided by a discussion schedule contained in respective checklists already mentioned above.

The team met with the Commissioner for Fisheries Resources and his key staff involved in the project implementation to discuss issues key to the evaluation from the Government of Uganda perspective and to get responses on issues raised by ICEIDA where government was required to clarify. Also the Commissioner was required to respond to the key questions already established in the checklist in Annex 3. Subsequently, on frequent occasions more in-depth follow up interviews were held with the key staff of the Department of fisheries Resources involved in implementation of

specific outputs of the project to clarify and elaborate on the issues raised with the Commissioner or as raised by stakeholders in the field.

The team had a scheduled meeting with the official in the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) manning the Agriculture Desk in that ministry, where fisheries sub-sector falls. The official is also a member of the QAFMP Supervisory Committee. This meeting was aimed to discuss the contribution of the MFPED to the project and the strategy of Government of Uganda (GoU) regarding counterpart funding as a way to sustain the project activities.

Follow up meetings or enquiries were made with all the respondents wherever and whenever need arose.

Before visiting the project districts, the Team Leader (TL) got an opportunity to participate in a scheduled project training seminar held in Jinja town where the entire key project implementing staff from all the project districts attended. Through this meeting the TL was able to further understand the project's activities in the districts. The TL also used this opportunity to explain the midterm evaluation plan and the approach to be used by the team, and to arrange with the district fisheries officers (DFOs) the schedule of the ET visits in their respective districts.

Thereafter, through trips to the Western, Northern and Eastern Project Districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga, the ET held discussions with key district officials and local government technical staff involved in implementation of the project. The team also visited project sites. Specifically, the ET verified and assessed the state of district fisheries offices at the district headquarters and improved fish landing facilities on lakes Albert and Kyoga established by the project.

In addition, the team visited in each of the nine project districts at least one or two BMUs where the BMU training supported by the project took place. The team's programme in the district was flexible and therefore it (ET) took time to meet as many people as possible and to visit any site that would be mentioned by the technical staff or members of community (whether supported by the project or not) that could be of interest to this evaluation. Such places included fish processing and drying centres, fish markets, landing sites and ice plants constructed by other projects (ADB) and looking at the fish crates and other fish handling tools (wheel barrows and fish handling forks) provided by other development partners like UNIDO.

At the district headquarters the team held in-depth discussions with the District Fisheries Officer (DFO) assisted by his/her fisheries officers (FOs) and other staff; the District Community Development Officer (DCDO) or the Community Development Officer (CDO) that participated in the project activities. The interviews with DFOs, FOs, DCDOs and CDOs focussed where applicable, mainly on issues elaborated in checklist in *Annex 3*.

Other district officials including; District LC V Chairmen, District LC Vice Chairmen, District Secretaries for Production, Chief Administrative Officers or the Deputy Chief Administrative Offices, District Production Coordinators and District Engineers (depending on their availability); were met by the ET to discuss mainly the project performance in the district, involvement of district in the management of project activities - especially monitoring of the construction, state of the project facilitates e.g.

landing sites and DFO's office, and strategy for management and sustainability of the project facilities.

Other officials met by ET, depending on availability, were the BMU leaders at the district level, the sub country chiefs, and LC III chairmen and their executives among others. The ET got an immense opportunity to capture the honest views of most of the officials in the districts concerning the successes, achievements and challenges faced by the project; but also to get their views on how to move forward, the findings of which are discussed in the findings section.

At the community level, the discussions were mainly held with the leadership of respective BMUs and the three facilitators who were trained by the project as Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) Trainers for BMU members. Depending on availability, the views of FAL learners within the BMUs were also sought. The enquiry mainly focussed on establishing whether women were included in the functional adult literacy training supported by the project either as facilitator or learners; whether the trainings actually took place, whether the training addressed their key concerns regarding fish quality assurance and fisheries, sustainability of the programme and BMU's comments and concerns about the project outputs which were of interest to them.

At the end of field work in the districts, the team held a meeting with the project manager and project coordinator at the projects office in Bugolobi, Kampala to validate the information obtained from the districts, before drafting a preliminary report of findings. Further consultative meeting were held with DFR and ICEIDA officials at ICEIDA office in Kampala, to clarify and harmonise with the team on the issues highlighted by the 1st draft of the report. Further, a second draft of the report was prepared, subjected to consultation of MAAIF-DFR and ICEIDA and reviewed before the final version of report was produced.

3.0 FINDINGS OF THE MIDTERM REVIEW

3.1 RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT

Overall, the ET found that the QAFMP development objective (goal) and project strategy is highly relevant to the Government of Uganda (GoU) national development framework, strategies and policies; ICEIDA mandate; and to a large extent it addressed the needs of the fish dependent communities that were targeted.

3.1.1 Relevance of QAFMP to GoU Policies

The project development objective as stated in the project document, which is “to reduce poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for the domestic, regional and export market as well as improving the livelihoods of fish dependent communities” was aligned to the country’s policy framework of poverty eradication action plan (PEAP) that emphasised poverty eradication as the overarching national development objective. QAFMP was aligned to PEAP Pillar No.2 on enhancing production, competitiveness and income. The project goal and development strategy have remained contextually relevant under the new policy context brought about by the National Development Plan (NDP) for which overarching objective intertwines economic growth and poverty eradication.

Under the current NDP (2010/2011-2014/2015) QAFMP is consistent with Uganda’s broad vision of “transforming Uganda’s society from a peasant to a modern and prosperous country in 30 years”. QAFMP immediate objective – “to increase volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets through reduction in post-harvest losses” is relevant to the NDP development strategy of promoting growth in export oriented industries. The project contributes to the agriculture sector (under which fisheries falls), which is identified by the NDP among the primary growth sectors; and to trade, that is among the growth complementary sectors. The NDP clearly lays strategies of how agriculture and trade sectors will contribute to the realization of its vision, which include, among others, to establish adequate infrastructure for improving value addition with emphasis placed on agro processing and ensuring compliance with safety and quality of standards to sustain export. Clearly this is an area where the project focuses.

At the sector level, QAFMP is aligned to the agriculture sector development strategy and investment plan (DSIP) 2010/11–2014/15. The DSIP development objective is to increase rural incomes, and improve house hold food and nutrition security. The immediate objectives of DSIP are to enhance sustainability of agriculture development (including fisheries) and sustain markets for primary and secondary agro food products among others. In addition the DSIP identifies fisheries sub-sector challenges to which QAFMP is making tremendous contribution. These include overexploitation of fish stocks; and compliance with increasingly demanding international quality and safety standards for traded food products; and inadequate infrastructure for value addition, processing, marketing, storage, and distribution. In addition access to market and value addition is one of the four key programmes for realization of agriculture sector DISP. Under this programme there are a number of sub programmes, but the ones where QAFMP is most relevant are on improved capacity for regulation and enforcement and

quality assurance, and increased participation of rural communities in value addition activities.

At sub sector level, QAFMP is in line with the National Fisheries Policy; and specifically policy areas No. 10 and 11 which promote measures to ensure quality, wholesomeness, safety of human consumption and value of harvested fish and fishery products; and achievement of increases in value and volume of fish marketed for consumption and export; respectively.

With regard to crosscutting issues, QAFMP mainstreams environment, gender and HIV/AIDS in line with Uganda's policies and strategies. Under the National Fisheries Policy all fisheries interventions are to ensure sustainable utilization of fisheries resources and ensure that fisheries investments do not degrade environment. This is also in line with the National Environmental Policy. The strategy for reducing the impact of HIV/AIDS on fishing communities and its implementation plan for 2005/6-2015/2016 lays a framework for incorporating HIV/AIDS in implementation of all interventions in the fisheries sector. The project activities are undertaken in areas and locations in fish communities identified by the HIV/AIDS strategy as key to the fight against the pandemic in fishing communities.

3.1.2 Relevance of the Project to ICEIDA's Mandate

The QAFMP is still aligned to Iceland's policy on development cooperation, and in particular the overarching objective of contributing to the fight against poverty and improved living conditions in least developed countries as enshrined in Act No.121/2008 of the Parliament of Iceland on the new Strategy for International Development cooperation for the period 2011-2014. Iceland's objective in its development cooperation is to support poverty eradication strategies of partner countries and to promote social and economic development. Gender equity and women empowerment and environment are among the areas of special emphasis in ICEIDA's development cooperation strategy. The QAFMP supports the fisheries sub-sector which is in line with priority areas supported by ICEIDA, and in particular, the promotion of sustainable management of natural resources.

3.1.3 Relevance of Project Design and Implementation Arrangements

(a) Project Identification and formulation

The project was initiated on request of the GoU (MAAIF-DFR) as a measure to improve quality assurance and inspection activities for fish and fish products on other lakes, which before were focussed mainly on Lake Victoria. The DFR was concerned that major quality assurance interventions were assisting improvement of fisheries activities only on Lake Victoria. The department had a dire need to address the quality assurance issues on lakes Albert and Kyoga; so as to enable fish caught from these lakes enter the export chain and benefit the communities involved.

The ET established that key stakeholders were consulted, including several district officials who were brought together to discuss the initial project plans. Modifications were made in the project depending on the views of the local government stakeholders. The project also supported DFR to carry out district visits to identify key needs and sensitise the stakeholders on the purpose of the project.

(b) Clarity and realism of the project intervention logic

The development objective of the project, which is “*to reduce poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for domestic, regional and export market as well as improving livelihoods of fish-dependent communities*”, is a clear statement of goal or intended impact of QAFMP. The project alone cannot achieve reduction of poverty and improved livelihoods among fishing communities but it will make a contribution towards the achievement of this goal together with other actors. The project goal is aligned to the broad policy goals of Uganda and the local needs of fishing communities.

The project immediate objective or purpose - “*to increase the volume of fish both in domestic and export markets through reduction in post-harvest losses*”- is broadly stated. The target area is too wide and the statement of purpose does not specify the performance target in terms of percentage increase in the volume of fish exports and percentage reduction in post harvest losses. Otherwise the increase in the volume of fish both in domestic and export markets is such huge task to be achieved through a 4 year project like QAFMP and will require sustained interventions by ICEIDA and other partners to realise it in the mid-to-long term period. Secondly the project purpose is not in tandem with the project focus; the aspect of “value addition” is missing in the statement of purpose yet it is clear from the activities that have been implemented that the project focuses more on value addition than on increasing volume of fish marketed.

The ET also found that there is limited coherence and linkage between the different outputs to logically contribute to the achievement of the project purpose and subsequently towards the realisation of the goal. The lack of coherence is largely caused by fragmentation of project outputs and activities first at the design stage of the log frame, and later as a result of uncoordinated alterations that were made during the course of project implementation - as explained in section 3.2 under project effectiveness.

In terms of horizontal logic the ET found out that the indicators identified in the log frame are appropriate for the development objectives, immediate objective and the outputs as stated. However, considering the above observation regarding formulation of the outputs, then some indicators for the outputs may be regarded as milestones to the actual outputs. The assumptions and risks taken to achieve the implied project outcomes are realistic, such as abundant fish stocks in the lakes and increased fish production from aquaculture, favourable government and donor policy, government’s commitment, and effective fisheries management that maintains or enhances fish.

The main weakness in the formulation of horizontal logic was lack of baseline data and performance targets for the indicators at the outcome and impact level. Hence the log frame matrix does not provide a complete project monitoring and evaluation framework as it should do.

3.1.4 Relevance of the project implementation arrangements

(a) Institutional arrangements, coordination and management

The Project Supervisory Committee (PSC), at the national level in Kampala, is responsible for overall policy direction of the project and provides overall decision support to the project management team. The PSC is currently composed of the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; Commissioner for Fisheries, a representative of Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; ICEIDA Country Director and ICEIA Programmes Director. The PSC meets every six months to review the project progress and approve annual work plans and budgets for the coming year. The PSC level is the point where there is policy interface between the two cooperating governments.

The routine coordination and management of the project at the national level is vested in the project management team (PMT) comprising of the ICEIDA project manager, who reports to the ICEIDA Programmes Director, and the DFR project coordinator, who reports to the Commissioner for Fisheries. The PMT is responsible for coordination of project implementation, supervision, monitoring and reporting. The members of the PMT are collectively responsible to the PSC and are accountable for project inputs and results. The project management at district level involves the district fisheries officer who coordinates the implementation of project activities in the district. The PMT, depending on the activities, constitute the supervisory and monitoring missions that visit the project areas to attend to any emerging issues obtaining on the ground.

It is evident that the project is managed in a centralised manner and the implementation arrangements are not aligned to the central and sub-national administration arrangements in Uganda. First, the composition of the PSC omits representation of local governments in the project area. Secondly, the communication from the project management team goes directly to the district fisheries officer, without the involvement of the Commissioner for fisheries and the CAO. This is likely to affect the local ownership of the project and eventually undermine accountability, follow-up of implementation and smooth takeover of processes after the close of the project. The ET has made recommendations geared at improving the communication link between the project management (PMT) and the districts whereby the roles of the Commissioner at DFR and the CAOs in districts are emphasised. However, in view of the remaining timeframe for the implementation of the project, it may not be feasible to reconstitute the PSC to bring on board representatives of local governments; but rather it could be taken as a lesson learned to improve the design of future projects.

(b) Project ownership

The ET investigated the extent to which counterparts are actively supporting the implementation of the project; and whether counterpart contributions and other inputs have been received from the Government (including districts) as compared to the project document work plan. There are efforts by different local governments to put in place structures to continue managing project facilities especially the constructed landing site facilities. The ET was informed that MAAIF is developing clear guidelines for managing these facilities which should facilitate this process. Establishment of project

management structures at the districts and an agreed framework for managing and sustaining project supported activities between the donor, DFR and district administrations (in form of an MoU) at the beginning of the project would have enhanced project ownership and assured that sustenance of the project activities. Nevertheless, at the DFR, LG and community level, the project is highly appreciated.

The ET established that the QAFMP has GoU counterpart funding released by the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development through the Project Code 10. The GoU counterpart funds are utilised by MAAIF to support other project related activities not met by the donor such as, payment of wages of staff recruited by MAAIF to support the project implementation and meeting some of the others costs incurred by DFR. The funds also support some of the DFR staff involved in facilitating the project work.

3.2 PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

3.2.1 Effectiveness of Coordination, Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

(a) Project coordination and management

The extent to which the national management and overall field coordination mechanisms of the project have been effective;

The project organisational approach is based on central coordination by the Project Supervisory Committee and the Project Management Team. At the implementation level some responsibilities are delegated to the districts, through the district fisheries offices. This approach has been effective in ensuring that coordination meetings are held, project activities are done as planned, supervisory missions are conducted, and progress reports are produced, reviewed and recommendations acted on. The operational requirements for the approval of activities and dispersal of budgeted funds for planned activities is always timely and does not delay implementation. The use of a project account operated by ICEIDA project manager and DFR project coordinator where the drawdown is made based on moderated monthly budget requests for specified activities allows considerable control while allowing flexibility to the implementers. However, the imperatives of the project support model meant that ICEIDA needed to have a more hands-on approach with regard to the micro-management of the project rather than focus on major policy outcomes.

(b) Monitoring and Evaluation

Whether monitoring and self-evaluation has been carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and objectives and using that information for project steering and adaptive management;

The ET found that the project management team (PMT), which was responsible for supervision and monitoring of project implementation, carried out field missions and produced biannual progress reports that indicate the outputs, activities implemented, challenges encountered and recommendations on practical issues. The PMT also indicated to the ET that for every activity implemented, the district officers or teams involved are required to produce an activity report. The bi-annual reports produced by PMT are discussed by Project Supervisory Committee (PSC). The PSC passes all the plans and any modifications on the project.

The ET finds that quarterly reporting as opposed to bi-annual reporting system is efficient in keeping every one informed on the project. The official from Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) indicated that the project activities are under reported. She wished that the activities implemented by counterpart funding could also be reported. Although there had been official communication by Permanent Secretary of MAAIF to his counterpart in MFPED regarding the nomination of MFPED official responsible for QAFMP monitoring in the ministry, the changes in officials assigned to this role by MFPED has resulted in the information gaps. For instance the MFPED official interviewed by the ET felt that her ministry had not been formally involved so as to undertake their own monitoring of the project activities as done for other projects.

The ET also found that there was no mechanism for monitoring the indicators at outcome level to determine if the project was on course to contribute to the anticipated impact. Both at national (DFR) and LG levels, there seemed not to be any organised process to obtain on regular basis accurate data on the quantities and value of fish marketed both in local and regional markets. This could be due to the fact that inspection activities which would facilitate collection of the data on regular basis from gazetted landing sites and other fish establishments are not extended to Lakes Albert and Kyoga. In absence of such data, it is difficult to track the performance of projects like QAFMP in contributing to the volume and value of marketed fish. It is important that the project management team establishes a mechanism, either by working with DFR and/or LG to collect this data on regular basis. The DFR normally develops estimates for fish coming from different lakes and these could be the basis for determining baseline information at the beginning of the project.

3.2.2 Progress against the targets

The extent to which the project objectives have been achieved was examined using an effectiveness assessment tool based on indicator data collected and analysed by the ET, from the available records. The findings are based on the analysis of data at the outputs level, are summarised in the table below:

*Effectiveness Assessment Tool**

Monitoring & Evaluation Indicators	Target	Achieved	%
Project Outputs/Activities			
<i>Output 1 & 2. 15 National fish inspectors and 20 District inspectors trained as district and/or BMU trainers; and 150 BMU's from prioritised districts around lake Albert and Kyoga received extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance</i>			
• Number of National Fish Inspectors trained as trainers of trainers (TOT)	15	8	53
• Number of District Fish Inspectors Trained as ToT	20	36	180
• Number of BMUs (institutions) that have received training (FAL in BMU)	150	200	133
• Number of BMU Facilitators (males and females) trained (FAL in BMU)	450	639	142
<i>Output 3. The national fish inspector's offices and documentation /Rapid Alert System centre renovated, furnished and equipped.</i>			
• Number of offices renovated, furnished and equipped	1	1	100
• Number of functional documentation and rapid alert centres established	1	0	0
<i>Output 4. Nine District fisheries offices refurbished and equipped with transport and inspection means</i>			

• Number of district fisheries offices refurbished and equipped with transport and inspection means	9	8	89
<i>Output 5. Seven fisheries service centres furnished (two of type (A) landing sites in Kalangala and five of type (B) in Bulisa, Soroti, Amolatar, Nakasongola and Kamuli districts) including one motor cycle each.</i>			
• Number of fisheries service centres established with Furniture sets, computers, printers, internet cards, solar power	7	0	0.0
<i>Output 6. Quality Assurance manual for CA prepared for the fisheries inspection services.</i>			
• Number of Quality Assurance manuals for Competent Authority prepared	1	1	100
• Number of Other Quality Assurance support Rules/Manuals/Guidelines prepared or reviewed	4	4	100
<i>Output 7. 60 lake districts and 1802 community fish inspectors refreshed in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures and Regional 3 cooperation meetings/study tours attended by 10 inspectors per year</i>			
• Number of fish inspectors at district level that received refresher courses	60	57	95
• Number of fish inspectors at community/BMU level that received refresher courses	180	0	0
• Number of inspectors supported to attend regional tours/meetings	50	2	04
<i>Output 8. Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities in at least 20 fishing villages.</i>			
• Number of fishing villages equipped with clean water and sanitation facilities	20	6	30
<i>Output 9. 16 national and 40 district fish inspectors trained in ICT and Information Management</i>			
• Number of national inspectors trained in ICT and information management	16	8	50
• Number of LG inspectors trained in ICT and information management	40	16	40
<i>Output 10. Fisheries inspection database functional (one at central with focal points in each of the 11 districts including Kalangala)</i>			
• Number of Fisheries Inspection Database functional at central level	1	1	100
• Number of districts with functional fish inspection databases	10	0	0
<i>Output 11. Code of practice for fish farms prepared and 10 aquaculture inspectors and 100 farmers trained.</i>			
• Operational COP for fish farms produced	1	1	100
• Number of Aquaculture Inspectors trained	10	0	0
• No. of aquaculture inspectors and farmers trained and adopting COP standards	100	0	0
<i>Output 12. Preparation of Code of Practice for artisanal fish processing</i>			
• Operational COP for artisanal fish processing	1	1	100
<i>Output 13. Project coordination, monitoring and evaluation effectively managed.</i>			
• Number of Project Progress reports prepared (Bi-annual and Annual Reports)	10	6	60
• Number of PSC review meetings held	10	6	60
• Number of project midterm review and terminal evaluation conducted	2	1	50

* Logframe Reporting on output is included in Appendix 1

3.2.3 Project outputs

Output 1 & 2: National fish inspectors (15) and District inspectors (20) trained as district and/or BMU trainers; and BMUs (150) from prioritized districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga received extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance

Overall, 8 national inspectors were trained as TOT for FAL in BMU compared to the target of 15 for the 5 years, which is 53% performance rate. It was however established that the target of 15 national trainers was based on the staffing establishment of DFR approved by the Public Service of Uganda, but only 8 positions were filled, which indicated that all available staff at DFR were actually trained. At the district level, 36 officials were trained as trainers compared to the target of 20 trainers, which represents 180% effectiveness. These included 4 people from each of the project districts who included the District Fisheries Officer, 2 fisheries staff and the Community Development officer. The specific details of the training and the staffs of specific districts that participated are included in *annex 4a*

Following the training of national and LG trainers, they in turn trained 639 FAL-BMU facilitators from 200 BMUs; (68 BMUs on Lake Albert and 132 on Lake Kyoga) compared to the original target of 450 facilitators from 150 BMUs. In terms of numbers, the training of BMU facilitators and the coverage of BMUs has so far exceeded the 5 year project target, at 142% and 133% respectively. The specific details of the training including the numbers of FAL facilitators trained and details of FAL training delivered among the BMUs by the trained facilitators in the project districts are included in *Annex 4b*

However the ET discovered that the training conducted was FAL in BMU and not “extensive training in quality assurance and fisheries” which was the focus of the output. The training of trainers’ course was developed in collaboration with MGLSD, and a private consultancy firm (LAGE) was engaged to conduct the training of trainers of trainers for FAL in BMU comprising of national inspectors, District Fisheries Officers and other local government staff such as Community Development Officers. The training manuals used covered a wide range of issues such as: a) embedded literacy for BMUs, b) orientation to the work of BMUs, c) planning and budgeting by the BMUs, d) financial management by BMUs and e) BMU in Fish Quality Assurance. The training manual had very limited content on fish quality assurance and fisheries issues, estimated at less than 5% and 20% respectively³. The ET also established that the district ToTs extended the FAL curriculum to include topics on vulnerable people i.e. people with disabilities, presentations on government programmes, SACCOs, environment, NUSAF, public health, NAADs, and poverty eradication, among others, which further diverted the implementation of the output’s core focus of “extensive training in fisheries and fish quality assurance”

The trainers of trainers’ course, as designed, was therefore not the appropriate training necessary to impart to national and local government fish inspectors skills for organising extensive training in quality assurance and fisheries to local government fish inspectors

³ *The percentages were determined by examining and counting the number of pages of all the training materials that were relevant to the training envisaged in the output i.e. extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance”*

and BMU members that was expected in the project. Consequently the training delivered was limited in providing quality assurance knowledge and practical skills to the community to improve the quality of fish landed.

There were a number of challenges associated with conducting FAL classes which affected its effectiveness: these include apathy among learners, inadequate mobilisation of learners to attend classes, and demands by the trained facilitators for allowances to continue providing their time and skills which are not met by the BMUs or districts; among several challenges. Other challenges include the following:

- BMU leaders shunned attending the FAL classes which set a bad example to the rest of the community
- In some of the districts, the training was done during political campaigns and it was reported that political candidates were giving out incentives like money for people to come and attend their campaigns; and therefore most potential learners preferred to attend rallies where money was and other incentives were given as opposed to FAL classes where no incentive was in place
- Many of the fisher folks are migratory in nature (i.e. do not stay in one place for significant period of time), therefore in most cases the learners kept changing which would make it difficult for the FAL facilitators to consistently follow the preset curriculum.
- The initial mobilisation techniques used were poor and unsustainable (i.e. claimed that failure to train would lead to denial from accessing the lake). When this came to pass, many learners started dropping out.
- The FAL facilitators were initially interested but lost interest later on – they would only be motivated to operate during supervisory missions and would immediately stop whenever the supervisors left the area.
- The enrolment was low right from the beginning with an average of 18% [30-45 trainers per class in a community of about 170- 380 targeted learners] per training, and the fall out rate was high.

In all of the BMUs visited, the attendance by the community learners, as was confirmed by the ET through the review of attendance lists was very low , i.e. it ranged between 6% to 18% in most of the BMUs (of the targeted learners in the communities). In all the BMUs visited, the training had stopped by the time of the evaluation mission (April 2012) with majority of cases having held their last training by January 2012.

Output 3: Renovating, refurbishing, furnishing and equipping the national fish inspector's office at ice plant in Bugolobi; and establishing a documentation and rapid alert system centre

The project supported the renovation and furnishing of the office for the inspection services located at the Bugolobi Ice Plant in Kampala and equipped Central CA with computers and vehicles. This was intended to provide an enabling working environment and to facilitate the inspectors to perform their inspection function to enable the CA fulfill its inspection mandate which contributes to the project purpose. These facilities are relevant to the implementation of fisheries management activities, quality assurance and inspection services at the national level. The provided capacity directly impacts on the quality of fish produced through provision of timely, effective and efficient inspections for landing sites, factories and entire supply chain. However, the project implementation team wished for a plan or strategy to be put in place by DFR to maintain the office and other facilities provided by the project. The details of ET findings on this output are presented in *annex 4c*

Output 4: District offices (9) constructed, furnished and equipped with transport and inspection means

The ET visited all the nine district fisheries offices and was able to verify that in the six districts of Hoima, Bulisa, Nebbi, Nakasongola, Amolatar, and Buyende, new district fisheries offices were constructed by the project. The two districts of Apac and Soroti were renovated. The constructed/renovated offices were furnished with furniture and provided with some office equipment and a motorcycle to facilitate the district fisheries staff with transport. The specific details on the state of the offices constructed or renovated, the furniture and office equipment provided by the project in each of the project districts are included in *Annex 4d*

The offices and transport provided by the project will facilitate the district fisheries staff to undertake adequate and efficient management and inspection services to contribute to quality of fish produced in the districts. The construction of district offices with an installed solar power system has increased the DFO's office's efficiency and effectiveness. The ET has noted that the new DFO office has particularly raised the profile of the district fisheries office in the district administration.

However, the managing and sustainability of the project supported facilities and equipment provided by the project is not well understood by some of the districts. It is particularly important to note that already in some districts the DFOs were not using some of the facilities availed through the project support such as computer, desks, office cabinets and internet because of minor faults or failure to subscribe to the internet service providers. The major issue of consideration is the maintenance and running costs of motorcycle, and repair of IT equipment.

Output 5: Seven fisheries service centres furnished (two of type (A)2 at landing sites in Kalangala and five of type (B)3 in Buliisa, Soroti, Amolatar, Nakasongola and Kamuli districts) including 1 motor cycle each.

The Project Management Team and the Commissioner for Fisheries indicated that the service centers that were anticipated to be furnished by the QAFMP were the fish inspectors' offices located at landing sites which were constructed in different locations of various districts by another project the "Fisheries Development Project"[FDP] funded

by the African Development Bank. Apparently, it was realized at the time of QAFMP conception that furnishing of these offices were not previously budgeted under the FDP and therefore DFR wished to have these offices furnished using support from QAFMP. A visit to two services centres by ET located in Nakasongola and Serere districts indicated that they are still not handed over to the DFR or the end users. Some of the centres still lacked some important facilities needed to operate. There seemed not to be any collaborative arrangement between the FDP of ADB and QAFMP of ICEIDA as regards implementation of this activity. Hence no progress had been registered on this at the time of midterm evaluation. Given that the project is remaining with short time frame the commitment of the project on this output may need a rethink.

Output 6: Quality Assurance Manual for CA prepared for the fisheries inspection services

The ET established that two QA manuals were prepared by reviewing the pre-existing ones. During the time of evaluation, the draft manuals were still undergoing the normal official government editorial process before printing and distribution to the stakeholders. Under this output other unplanned, but crucial documents needed for implementation of QA manuals, were in addition supported by the project. In all the support under this output covered:

- Review of the Fish (Quality assurance) Rules 1998 as amended in 2008 to incorporate aquaculture products control
- Review of the Fish (Aquaculture) Rules 2003 to bring it in line with modern food safety control and management
- Review of the Manual of Standard Operating Procedures (Technical) for Fish Quality Assurance and Inspection of 2008 to include new changes in the respective Rules indicated above
- Review of the Manual of Standard Operating Procedures (Technical) for Inspection and verification of Aquaculture establishments and practices to incorporate the new changes in Aquaculture Rules indicated above
- Development of Fish Inspectors' Guide –which lays down administrative and operational procedures followed by inspectors in doing their inspection work

This output is relevant to ensuring proper functioning of the inspection services that guide operators in application of best practices for fish quality assurance which should be in line with regulatory requirements. Proper inspection and quality assurance guidelines are needed to ensure that inspectors do their job professionally, and follow recommended technical standards that meet the regulatory requirements. These guidelines are crucial for inspectors when judging non complying fish establishments and fish operators. In addition, the Fish Rules, the review of which the project supported, are of importance to the regulatory control of quality assurance activities. The standardised manuals are prepared to give guidance in inspection but also to fishery operators on production of fish in accordance to the regulatory requirements. The manuals provide proper technical guidance on the enforcement of the Fish Rules

Output 7: 60 lake districts inspectors and 180 community fish inspectors refreshed in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures and Regional cooperation meetings/study tours attended by 10 inspectors per year

The project progress reports indicated that 57 fish inspectors were trained in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures; which indicates a good level of effectiveness given that the project target was 60 fish inspectors. The details of the number of officers trained and the nature of training were as summarised in *Annex 4e*

The ET found that the training of district inspectors in “quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures” is in line with the focus of this output and that it will positively impact on the work of the participants in appreciation of quality assurance related matters. However, the depth and content of the training was inadequate to prepare the trainees for practical inspection and certification activities. Some DFOs and FOs interviewed by ET indicated that the training that was given was inadequate to prepare them as inspectors because the time of two weeks was too short to complete the required theoretical and practical content of the curriculum on quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures.

The LGs expressed the need to review the course content to cover all the quality assurance issues, and inspection and certification procedures necessary to prepare their staff as fish inspectors. In addition the trained officials were not designated as fish inspectors so that they are able to put in practice the skills that they acquired through training. There was a wide concern as to why LG fisheries officers were not being designated and empowered by the national inspection services to adequately institute inspection systems for fish products in the districts in accordance to the Fisheries Rules. This view is supported by most DFOs, Production Coordinators and CAOs who feel that failure to inspect fish handling facilities had led to deterioration of quality of fish on the markets.

The major constraint holding back effective application and transfer of knowledge acquired by staff trained in as fish inspectors is that the training is not accompanied by an established inspection system in the districts and landing sites where the trainees work. Without such a system in place, the ET observed that some of the trainees have since forgotten what they learnt.

At the community level, it was established that the training of community inspectors had not taken off at all. As regards regional meetings/study tours, only 2 DFR officials (Commissioner for Fisheries and one official) were supported by the project to attend an aquaculture meeting held in Mombasa, Kenya.

Other Trainings Supported by the Project

The ET established that two additional trainings were supported under the project. The first training was in quality assurance and inspection for national inspectors, district staff (majority from Lake Victoria districts), and some quality assurance staff from selected factories around Lake Victoria, which was organised by collaboration of the MATIS, a consultancy firm in Iceland, United Nations University (UNU) of Iceland, Fisheries Training Institute in Uganda, and Makerere University. The training lasted for 9 days and covered topics in quality assurance, food safety and inspection. The ET found that the training covered aspects of fish quality assurance that contribute to the project purpose, and the skills got by the trainees will go a long way to improve the participants’ knowledge and understanding of quality assurance for fish. However the

training course was not coherent with the project purpose and target, because participants from lakes Kyoga and Albert regions were not included.

The second training supported by the project was the aquaculture management training course organised by Makerere University department of Biological Sciences, Holar University College of Iceland and Kajjansi Aquaculture Research and Development Centre. The training was attended by 33 participants and it covered aquaculture production, fish hatchery management, fish health, and fish farm economics, among others. The aquaculture course focussed on general aquaculture production and management as opposed to fish safety and quality assurance issues. However, the interlinked nature of quality and safety and production issues especially in aquaculture enables the training to contribute to some extent, to the quality of fish produced from aquaculture. The training was a means for empowering aquaculture operators to increase production of quality fish. The collaborative arrangement through which the training was organised and executed enables QAFMP to maintain a net work of partners in the country that would enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of its support to the fisheries sector in the country. However, this training course was also not in focus with the project purpose and target because participants from the target areas were not included and only 1 out of 33 (0.3%) participants was a potential fish inspector. The content of the aquaculture training mainly helped the practicing farmers, extension staff and aquaculture researchers and managers as opposed to inspectors.

There are also efficiency-related concerns of implementing unplanned activities, such as the training course in aquaculture production and management, using project budget. Although the training may have impact on quality of the produced fish, the aquaculture production and management emphasis minimises the course impact on improvement of fish quality assurance systems. Also implementation of the training courses when they were not budgeted under the project, definitely affected the delivery of other project planned outputs and consequently the efficiency of the project to realise the expected impact; since substantial amount of resources were channelled into the running of these unplanned courses.

Output 8: Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities in at least 20 fish landing sites

The ET established that only 6 out of the 20 clean water and sanitation facilities planned in the project document have so far been constructed which represents 30% effectiveness. The landing sites have been developed in the locations shown in the table below:

Table showing Names and Location of completed Fish Landing Sites

S/N	Landing Site	District	Sub-county	Remarks
1	Wanseko	Bullisa	Buliisa	Work in progress
2	Kayei	Apac	Akokoro	Operational
3	Bangladesh	Amolartar	Namasale	Operational
4	Mugarama	Serere	Labori	Work in progress
5	Iyingo	Buyende	Kagulu	Work in progress
6	Ntoroko	Ntoroko	Kanaala	Operational

The ET was informed that underestimation of the infrastructure-related budget in the project by DFR, which was wrongly premised on a different facility owned by one of private sector players in Uganda, was the main reason for this variation. The ET was also informed that the budget provision in the project document can not suffice to construct clean water and sanitation facilities at all the 20 landing sites but this output target has not been formally revised. Even if the funds were sufficient the implementation of this output was delayed by the slow processes in securing land in some district. In one district (Buyende), the ET observed that the delays were caused by the contractor. The detailed findings of the ET regarding the nature and state of the clean water and sanitation facilities installed at fish landing facilities by the project and any associated issues are contained in *Annex 4f*.

With regard to the functionality of the clean water and sanitation facilities at landing sites, where they had been completed, the ET established that this intervention was effective in ensuring that the fish landed are delivered safely into the markets. However, these facilities are hampered by delays in putting in force the operation and maintenance mechanism, with clear roles and responsibilities for the local governments, fisheries officers and BMUs to ensure their proper utilisation. It was observed that the landing facility at Ntoroko was not being used properly and it was at risk of being run down by the operators under the watchful eyes of the district fisheries staff. In addition, this output which focuses at providing clean water and improved sanitation facilities for safe handling of landed fish for improved quality, is challenged by lack or shortage of ice. The ET established from the field that ice suppliers for fish traders fetching fish from some of the landing sites, especially on the northern side of Lake Kyoga, were using their influence by sometimes hoarding the ice to determine the daily price and volumes of marketed fish.

The ET observed that the “one-fits-all” design for clean water and sanitation facilities established on landing sites on Lake Kyoga and Albert was not effective in addressing all the quality and hygiene issues. Most of the fish consignments handled through the landing facilities at Wanseko and Ntoroko have first to be gutted before being loaded on to the ice trucks for transport to the markets in Rwanda and DR Congo. However, the facility designs do not have provisions to cater for the operational procedure of gutting. It was also observed that in some areas facilities other than those designed by the project were highly needed, for instance the stakeholders in Nebbi district prioritised provision of clean water and improvement of sanitation facilities at Panyamur port market, as opposed to fish landing site. Panyamur port market in away serves as a landing site in a sense that the fish destined to Northern Uganda and West Nile Regions as well as Eastern DRC and Southern Sudan are landed there. In addition, the district and BMU leaders felt that majority of fish operators involved in artisanal fish handling, processing and trade may not benefit from the project support as they would require technologies suited for their activities. The ET noted that in Hoima there was a strong case for improving facilities for handling and processing of the small fish which would benefit women and other marginalised groups.

Output 9: National fish inspectors (16) and 40 district fish inspectors trained in ICT and information management

At the national level, 8 fish inspectors were trained in ICT skills out of the target of 16, representing 50% effectiveness. Given that 8 officials were the only inspectors available for training at the national level the project performance was highly satisfactory. At the district level, 16 officials were trained out of the target of 40 staff representing 40% effectiveness, which was less than half of the project target. The training at the district level focused on District Fisheries Officers (DFOs) and one fisheries officer. The details of district personnel and content of the ICT training they received in all the project districts are included in *Annex 4f*. It was noted that the new project districts of Serere, Buyende, and Ntoroko have ICT skills gaps because when the training took place they were still part of Soroti, Kamuli and Bundibugyo districts respectively.

In terms of utilisation of the training skills acquired, it was established from some national level inspectors interviewed that the training in ICT coupled with the IT equipment provided by the QAFMP, especially the laptops, have greatly improved the official reporting by the fish inspectors of the inspection results. The IT skills acquired are also essential in the utilisation and maintenance of the fisheries database developed at the Department of Fisheries Resources in Entebbe. However, for the district level inspectors, the IT skills have simply improved their efficiency in undertaking normal fisheries management functions, since the inspection activities have not been implemented in the project districts. In order for the IT skills to be effectively utilised by local government officials in improving the quality of fish, it needs to be accompanied with the related inspection mandates and installation of the related fisheries databases so as to enable the trained inspectors use them in ensuring the quality assurance of fish products.

Output 10: Fisheries inspection database functional (one at central with focal points in each of the 11 districts including Kalangala)

The Interviews with the PMT and key staff of DFR indicated that the fisheries database was developed and installed on computers at DFR headquarters in Entebbe by a consultant hired by the project. The database handles mainly fish data from landing sites and factories exporting fish abroad which are based on Lake Victoria fisheries. It does not handle data on fish products coming from artisanal processing, or locally and regionally marketed fish, or fish from other lakes apart from Lake Victoria. The ET learnt that two data entrants have been hired by DFR on full time basis and the database is fully operational. The ET was informed by the PMT and district fisheries officers that the database was not yet installed on the computers at the district level, or modified to accommodate district level fish data. They indicated that it is unlikely that the database will be extended to the project districts unless the national inspection services currently undertaken by the DFR and local government inspectors in the lake Victoria region is extended to Lake Kyoga and Albert regions.

Output 11: Code of practice for fish farms prepared and 10 aquaculture inspectors and 100 farmers trained

A code of good practice (CoP) for safety and quality assurance in aquaculture has been developed and by the time of evaluation, it was awaiting printing. The CoP was developed by consultants who undertook field work and consulted major commercial fish farmers, fish seed producers and fish feed producers. The project supported two national consultative workshops for technical experts and stakeholders who reviewed

and validated the final draft. The CoP will guide the fish farm producers in meeting local and international requirements. It recommends practices that are in line with the new Fish and Aquaculture Products (Quality Assurance) Rules 2012, and Fish (Aquaculture) Rules 2012 as reviewed by the project (see output 6). The current code is however general and can be used as a source of information and temperate for future development of specific guidelines for improving quality of fish among specific categories of aquaculture operators in different settings. The ET was informed by PMT that no training for aquaculture inspectors and farmers in the usage of the developed CoPs has been done yet.

Output 12: Code of Practice for artisanal fish processing prepared

The code of practice for quality and safety assurance in artisanal fisheries was produced by the project and the final draft of the code is awaiting printing by DFR. The draft code was also developed by a consultant and further discussed and approved by technical experts and stakeholders in national consultative workshops supported by the project. The code is also general and was developed basing on the products from Lake Victoria. It will need to be reviewed to develop specific guidelines covering products, practices and operators on Lake Kyoga and Albert.

3.2.3 Cross-Cutting Issues

(a) Gender

The fisheries sub-sector in Uganda plays an important role in employing women where most of them, according to the baseline survey conducted by QAFMP, are involved as boat owners, fish processors and traders as well as in other non fisheries-related income generating activities such as restaurant operations. Women's income from fish processing and other post harvest operations contributes to the improved standards of living of their families and communities. In spite of this, the involvement of women in fisheries resources management and professional associations or bodies related to fisheries sector is limited. This is so, because the cultures and traditions in fishing communities (and indeed in the African society) view women as a weak gender. In addition, since women engage mainly in on-shore activities, there is a patriarchal cultural belief that such shore-based fisheries activities are not as important as compared to fishing. The ET assessed the extent gender issues were mainstreamed in the implementation of the project, and the findings outlined below:

Under the capacity building interventions, the ET established that 8 inspectors at national level were trained as district or BMU trainers under the project. Out of the 8, one (1) was a woman and 7 were men. At the LG level, the project trained 36 officers as trainers of trainers. They included of district fisheries officers (DFOs), other fisheries officers (FOs) and community development officers (CDOs) from each of the project districts. It was noted that only 3 were women, 2 were community development officers and 1 was a fisheries officer. As regards the refresher training of inspectors in fish quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures under output 7, the majority of staff that participated were men. The same applied to the training in ICT under output 9, with exception of one national inspector. At the community level, the ET established that the participation of women during the FAL in BMU classes was satisfactory. In Ntoroko district it was found that in an average class of 30 learners, 13 were women and

17 were men. The details of findings and assessment regarding gender considerations in the project outputs and implementation are summarised in *Annex 4h*.

The ET established that the project management team made effort to ensure that at least a third of women were selected for training as trainers of trainers but the targets were not achieved because the majority of fisheries officials in the project districts and the DRF were men. The problem of gender imbalance in inspection services is part of a general national challenge that affects science based professional fields like fisheries. To address this challenge would require a national strategy to promote education of women in science subjects in institutions of higher learning coupled with affirmative action aimed at recruiting more women in the fisheries public service delivery system by the public service of Uganda.

At the local level, ET found that the training may positively impact on some of the women, although stronger impact would have been realised if the focus in the training was given to the enhancement of skills of trainees aimed at improving safety, quality of fish in processing, handling, smoking and trade.

The ET also investigated whether the infrastructure and facilities established at landing sites had a visible impact on poor women's livelihoods. The reality on the ground was that the project interventions focused on supporting cold chain fresh fish products which benefit mostly fishers, large scale fish traders, and factory owners the majority of whom are men. The intervention focusing on improving technologies and practices of operators in post harvest fisheries activities would have had a greater impact on women. In order to increase the involvement of women in fisheries activities both in private and public sector; national and local government; and at the community level, a strategy for mainstreaming gender issues in the fisheries sector needs to be developed. This idea was highly supported by the Commissioner for Fisheries and it could be considered for ICEIDA's future interventions in the fisheries sector.

(b) HIV/AIDS

The ET found the packaging of FAL training was effective in mainstreaming HIV/AIDS issues. According to most FAL learners interviewed, messages on HIV/AIDS were provided directly to the trainees by FAL in BMU facilitators during the training. These FAL facilitators were trained at the district level by specialists who included the district medical officers. They were also given information on on-going strategies and programs to combat HIV/AIDS by government and other development partners. Also included in the messages provided to the FAL facilitators were: other messages on public health, sanitation, communicable diseases, nutrition, etc which were also relayed in FAL sessions. These messages are said to impact the community in positive ways regarding the combating of the HIV/AIDS; and would be helpful to the people infected and affected by HIV/AIDS.

(c) Environment

The effectiveness of QAFMP in addressing the environmental concerns is visible in the FAL trainings conducted in the BMUs, among others. The district environment officers in most of the project districts were involved in the training of BMU FAL facilitators to explain the best environmental strategies for conserving the fisheries resources by the

fishing communities; and the kind of support government is providing to the communities to manage their environment.

In addition, though limited in the depth of content, FAL training curriculum contained some fisheries resource management and fisheries regulations and enforcement messages; where facilitators in their BMU classes passed on these messages to community members. In addition, FAL training covered areas like hygiene and sanitation and public and community health, all of which impact on environment safety.

Under the construction of clean water and sanitation facilities at fish landing sites in output 8, environment impact assessment studies were conducted and mitigation measures in the reports were included in the designs for constructions undertaken.

3.2.5 Project Outcomes and impacts

The ET noted that it was too early to assess the impacts of the project because some of the planned outputs, particularly the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at landing sites was still work in progress, which constituted only 30% of the original target. There was also a limitation because of lack of data, particularly at the level of outcome indicators (volume and value of fish marketed and rates of post-harvest losses). The baseline data and performance targets at the level of outcome and impacts were not included in the project Log frame. The ET also established the project management and implementers did not collect and maintain the outcome indicator tracking data, largely because the fish quality inspection services linking the project districts to the DFR data base has not been operationalised.

The above findings notwithstanding, the ET found that the project has delivered benefits to the institutions and the community, particularly as a result of capacity building interventions, which have the potential to significantly contribute to the project impact of reduced poverty and improved livelihoods of the fish dependent communities in the project area. Qualitative data collected shows some pointers to the likely impacts of the project particularly the increase in the prices of fish at some of the improved landing sites. However, the data collected was not sufficient for the ET to attribute the price increases to the project interventions directly. Other factors could be at play such as the short fall in supply.

The following outputs were assessed as having the potential to contribute to the project outcomes with varying degrees:

- The project components under outputs 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 will contribute to varying extents in the achievement of the project outcomes and contribute to realisation of the project impact of reducing poverty and improving the people's livelihoods through improved quality of fish and fishery products.
- The immediate benefits to the community are likely to accrue from the improvement of water and sanitation facilities of landing sites through construction and operationalisation of fish handling infrastructure and facilities under output 8. However, the high cost and the resulting modifications in budget may not make it possible to achieve the target of 20 landing sites that were planned for improvement. The ET observed that in some areas facilities other than those designed by the project were highly needed to have a greater impact on quality and safety of the products going to the market. For instance improvement of facilities at Panyamur fish port in Nebbi district, as opposed to landing facilities, would have a greater impact on a wider scale.

- The implementation of extensive training of fish inspectors and BMUs in fish quality assurance planned under outputs 1 and 2 would equally have delivered immediate benefits to the community to realise greater impact on reduction of poverty and improvement of livelihoods through improved production and marketing of quality fish and fishery products. However, the introduction of Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) in BMU training approach affected the delivery of this output and significant changes will need to be made in its implementation if its intended outcomes are to be realised.
- Some benefits of the project are also likely to be realised through the implementation of output 4, the construction and refurbishment of the district fisheries offices in all districts, but some districts new like Ntoroko and Serere have not benefited from these facilities, which limits the effectiveness of this output in those areas.
- There are no possible mechanisms in place for implementation of output 5.

Unintended impacts

- Notwithstanding the limitations of introducing FAL in BMU, the approach was an effective entry point into the BMUs. All local governments appreciated the contribution of FAL in providing an entry point to BMUs to extend other government programmes and to bring civility to the fisher communities. These programmes include NAADs, SACCOS and others. They were not necessarily related to fish quality but they have the potential to create synergies with the QAFMP to improve the livelihoods of the target population.

3.3 PROJECT EFFICIENCY

Project efficiency was assessed in terms of how economically the resources of the project were utilised to deliver the planned outputs and results. The ICEIDA pledged to provide an overall budget of USD 3,411,369 for the five years to implement the activities and deliver the outputs and outcomes in the project document. By the end of the 3rd year (2011) USD 2,526,099 had been released and spent, representing 74% disbursement and absorption rate. Overall, ICEIDA was efficient in ensuring timely disbursement of the required funds for the implementation of project activities and even exceeded its commitment for the three years by USD 327,192. Based on the original commitment of USD 2,200,907 (65%) by the end of 2011, it actually disbursed 2,528,099 (74%), as per details of expenditure against budget shown in the table below:

Expenditure Analysis QAFMP 2008 – 2013

Year	Budget USD	Actual USD	%
2008	175.915	99.825	57
2009	541.369	688.210	127
2010	638.831	643.353	101
2011	844.792	1.096.711	130
2012	659.615	0	0
2013	550.846	0	0
Total	3.411.369	2.528.099	74

Budget Allocation Efficiency

The original budget allocations and ranking in the project document indicated that the top five outputs were refresher training for fish inspectors; installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at landing sites; construction, refurbishing and equipping of district fisheries offices; training of BMUs; and construction of infrastructure and equipping of the CA inspection office. The budget prioritisation at the design stage reflected the outputs that were considered important to produce the project outcome as indicated in the table below:

Table showing budget allocation ranking at design stage (Figures in '000 Uganda Shillings)

Rank	Code	Outputs	Budget	%
A	13	Project Management	2.629.025	36.1
B		Direct Costs		
1	7	Refresher training for fish inspectors	1.099.000	15.1
2	8	Clean water and sanitation facilities at 20 fishing villages	1.020.000	14.0
3	4	Construction/refurbishing and equipping district offices	660.700	9.1
4	1& 2	Training of Trainers and Running BMU courses targeting 150 BMUs	545.500	7.5
5	3	Renovation and equipping CA & Inspection Services	539.500	7.4
6	5	Buying and Installing Assets for Landing Sites	246.000	3.4
7	6	Preparation of QA Manual for CA Inspection services	164.000	2.2
8	9	Training courses on ICT & information mgt for national & district staff	150.000	2.1
9	10	Maintenance of fish inspection database	130.000	1.8
10	11	Preparation of Code of Practice for fish farms and training	68.000	0.9
11	12	Preparation of Code of Practice for artisan fish processing	38.000	0.5
		Total	7.289.725	100

It was observed that the budget allocation to project direct costs targeting the beneficiaries at the institutional and community level represented 64% while project management costs (indirect costs) accounted for 36%. The ET found the ratio between project indirect costs to direct costs (36%:63%) to be high. The ET was informed that the project management component lumped together significant provisions of direct operational costs such fuel and allowances, purchase of project vehicles, project evaluation costs (midterm and final evaluation) and government contribution (in kind). These in a way created a distortion that needs to be revised to give a correct picture.

Budget Expenditure efficiency

As regards budget expenditure, the ET found that the project had almost exhausted its budget allocation for project management (indirect costs) by the time of evaluation. However, this should be understood in light of the scenario already explained above where most of the provisions for project management allocations covered operational costs such fuel and allowances, purchase of project vehicles, project evaluation costs (midterm and final evaluation) and government contribution (in kind), which creates a distorted picture. Overall the ratio of direct cost to indirect costs of the project of 36:64 that was established during budget allocations at the project design stage was maintained in the project budget expenditure. The ET also noted that overall expenditure on the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at the landing sites

which ranked as the 3rd most important output in terms of budget allocation at the design stage shot up from the 16% budget allocation to 20% in budget expenditure which now ranks 2nd. This occurred even when its implementation stands at 6 out of 20 landing sites for which the facilities are completed which represents 30% effectiveness. The review established this was achieved at higher costs compared to what was provided in the original budget. The entire budget of 1.02 billion shillings which was earmarked for the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at 20 fish landing sites, has practically been exceeded on the construction at only 6 landing sites that have so far been completed (about 1.259 billion). The ET found that this problem was largely a result of interplay of two factors, namely the inflationary pressure, which increased the prices of nearly all procured items and materials, coupled with gross under costing of the activities/outputs at the outset of the project. The increase in prices affected other outputs as well, which also explains the exhaustion of the budget allocated to project management by the time of evaluation already mentioned. Given the contribution of this output to the intended benefits and impact of the project, the variance that has occurred between the budget allocation and budget expenditure is clearly justified, and would show value for money when clean water and sanitation facilities at these landing sites are utilised to increase quality and value of fish. More so, the factors leading to the increased expenditure above allocated levels, as explained above, were beyond the control of the Project Management Team.

The ET however, notes that budget expenditure on outputs 1 and 2 on Training of Trainers and BMUs overshoot its budget allocation level to 16% against the allocation level of 7.5%. This is against the fact that the FAL approach used was not in focus with the intended project target i.e extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance. Although there are some of the unintended benefits accrued from FAL training to BMUs which will to a certain extent contribute to the goal of the project, increasing expenditure in other outputs other than these would have had more impact to the improvement of quality of fish. The budget expenditure for outputs is summarised in the table below.

Table showing Expenditure per output (Figures in '000 Uganda Shillings

Ran	S/n	Detail	Expenditur	%
A	13	Project Management	2.063.127	36
		Total Indirect Costs	2.063.127	36
B		Direct Costs		
1	8	Clean water and sanitation facilities at 20 fishing sites	1.130.441	20
2	1&	Running BMU courses targeting 150 BMU's	914.309	16
3	4	Construction/refurbishing and equipping district offices	528.836	9
4	3	Renovation and equipping CA & Inspection Services	469.740	8
5	7	Refresher training for fish inspectors	178.160	3
6	11	Preperation of Code of Practice for fish farms and training	166.765	3
7	10	Maintanance of fish inspection database	116.271	2
8	6	Prepararion of QA Mannual for CA Inspection services	79.685	1
9	12	Preperation of Code of Practice for artisenal fish processing	55.876	1
10	9	Training courses on ICT & information mgt for n'nal & district	16.406	0
11	5	Buying and Installing Assets for Landing Sites	0	0
		Total Direct Costs	3.656.489	64
		Total (by end of 2011)	5.719.615	10

Synergies and collaboration with other agencies

The measures that were put in place by the project to ensure efficient utilisation of resources and to ensure that the project operated at the least cost to produce greater benefits and results included the following:

- Using existing Government structures at the sub-county, district and national level to coordinate, supervise and monitor the implementation QAFMP project activities without creating parallel project structures, was a major cost saving strategy.
- QAFMP complemented the support of the USAID FISH project which concluded its work in 2008; and collaborates with United Nations University (UNU) of Fisheries, Holar University College and MATIS, a consultancy based in Iceland, Department of Biological Sciences in Makerere University, Kajjansi Aquaculture Research and Development Centre of the National Fisheries Resources Research Institute, and individual farms such as Source of the Nile (SON) to support important activities that were initiated, but not completed, by the USAID Fish Project.
- The QAFMP has close collaborative linkages with Ministry of Gender, Labour, and Community Development where officers in that ministry participated in the FAL programme implementation. At district level, there is close collaboration of the project with district departments specialised in HIV/AIDs, Community Development, Environment, Public Health, and Agriculture Advisory Services.
- In Ntoroko District, QAFMP collaborated with the Local government's Livelihoods Support Programme (LGLSP) - a GoU project that supports FAL in communities. This project had already introduced FAL classes in BMUs and QAFMP had to collaborate to take the process to more BMUs.

Other cost-effective measures

There is consensus among the project stakeholders (DFR and district leadership) that the flexible system of co-management of the project through the ICEIDA project Manager and GoU coordinator worked perfectly well for QAFMP as opposed to the management of the project through the government system because it reduces bureaucratic delays characteristic of GoU systems. It is also cost effective since the management structure is lean and it results in quick actions. The role of ICEIDA in supporting the project Engineer and quick procurement processes is mainly considered useful in quick setting up of better infrastructure and assuring the quality of work.

However, ICEIDA indicated that the organisation was keen on implementing a gradual system that will enable them to comply with the standards agreed through the Paris Declaration of 2005 and the Accra Agenda of Action of 2008 regarding donor aid effectiveness.

3.4 SUSTAINABILITY

The assessment of sustainability focused on determining the likelihood of continued services and benefits from QAFMP in the districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga in event of withdrawal of external support from ICEIDA. The stakeholders interviewed gave mixed reactions. Some stakeholders were confident of the continuity of the project outputs and they cited the following supporting evidence:

- The project is anchored within government structures and development plans at national (MAAIF, DFR) and sub-national levels (Districts and Sub-counties) hence

there is a likelihood that some of the operation and maintenance (O&M) costs will be catered for in their recurrent budgets.

- There has been extensive investment in the capacity building interventions which have strengthened the government, local government and community institutions and the human resource capacity, especially the skills training, and provision of office facilities, equipment and tools. Given that the key implementing partners/actors are mainly government employees the project services and benefits are likely to be sustained.
- The primary beneficiaries who are the fishing community are organised in BMU structures that have the legal mandate to co-manage fisheries resources in their own localities and have defined sources of revenue to finance and sustain some project activities at the fish landing sites. The potential for these community institutions to sustain the benefits is high and they are being given the capacity in form of training and facilities.
- There is evidence on the ground to support the above potentials such as replacement of stolen solar panels, raising money to support FAL in BMU classes, active participation of LG officials in project activities.
- In order to ensure sustainability of facilities, some districts have devised efforts to manage them through the BMU structure. Some of the BMUs have introduced user fees to enable them maintain the facilities. For instance in Kayei, Apac, the BMU had introduced a user fee of 3000/= for vehicles receiving fish weighed and cleaned through the improved landing facility. Some districts have identified funding mechanisms aimed at ensuring the maintenance of the facilities. Such funding mechanisms include: a 25% remittance by Sub County to BMUs, and introduction of other user-related charges and fines to cater for the improved management of the facilities.
- The ET has been informed that MAAIF through DFR is developing guidelines on how to manage the landing facilities.

However, some findings from the field visits and interviews with some stakeholders showed that there are concerns arising from weaknesses the project design and implementation arrangement's that are likely to undermine sustainability of the project services and benefits:

- The project lacks a clear exit strategy/plan in the event that ICEIDA withdraws the support after 2013.
- The sustainability of outputs 1 and 2 where FAL in BMU approach is used potentially low. It was established that the BMU trainings had already stopped, in some areas.
- The participation of the formal government structures at the level of DFR and District and other local governments is not well elaborated. Though the project structure (PMT and PSC) are working well, the LGs and BMUs perceived project ownership to be with DFR and ICEIDA mainly because of their lack of representation in PSC and owing to the top down approach adopted in the project implementation

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

The project has extended services and provided facilities to areas that have for many years been neglected due to emphasis on Lake Victoria. These areas have concentrations of the poor who earn their livelihoods from various fish-related activities. The ET concludes that the project was well conceived to address an imbalance in service delivery in the area of quality assurance which previously tended to concentrate on Lake Victoria when other Lake systems suffered obvious quality challenges, yet they contributed significant quantities to fish on the market including exports to the regional and international markets.

The project is relevant to all the priorities, strategies, and policies of GoU and is in coherence with GoI and ICEIDA's priorities, strategies and policies. The stakeholders were well informed and consulted at the beginning of the project;

However, the formulation of the project narrative was not adequate. The project immediate objective (purpose) is too broad as if it is itself a goal; the outputs are fragmented and not coherent with the immediate objective (purpose). The project documents lacked the narration of outcomes. This might have had affect on the clarity of implementation of outputs especially the trainings under output 1, 2 and 7.

The ET has concluded that the delivery of current Outputs 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are on schedule and will contribute to a greater extent to the project purpose of increase in the value and volume of fish marketed in both domestic and export markets through reduction of post harvest losses; and consequently contribute to reduction of poverty and improved livelihoods of fish dependent communities through improved safety and quality of marketed fish; as envisaged in the project document. The ET also found that most of these outputs will be sustainable.

There are immediate benefits to the community expected be accrued from the delivery of output 1 & 2 on extensive training of BMUs/fishing communities in fish quality assurance, Output 7 on training of local government and BMU inspectors in fish quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures; and output 8 on installation of clean water and sanitation facilities at the landing site. With regard to output 1&2 there are significant changes that need to occur in the implementation of the training activities to bring them in focus of the project purpose so that they deliver greater benefits to the target population.

As for the training activities conducted through output 7 on: training of local government and community inspectors in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures changes will have to be made in the packaging of the training themes, the training coverage to include all the inspection staff and BMUs inspectors in the targeted districts, and the content and the time the training is to take; to ensure that the training courses delivered are adequate to prepare local government and BMU inspectors to undertake quality assurance and inspection activities as required by the Fish and Aquaculture (Quality assurance) Rules and Standard Operating Procedures for Fish Quality Assurance and Inspections. Given the importance such training to establishment of fully functioning quality assurance and inspection system for fish and fishery

products from the landing sites all through the handling, processing and marketing chains; this output will require priority and to focus more on providing local government inspectors and BMU inspectors with the user knowledge and practical skills for undertaking quality assurance and fish inspections in accordance to the Rules.

Regarding installation of clean water and sanitation facilities, the improvement of these fish handling facilities will extend the benefits to more communities and create wider impact to the fish dependent communities if the number of facilities envisaged in the project (20) were to be installed. However, due to a number of factors including the fluctuation of prices and cost estimates, fewer facilities will be installed by the project than planned.

In addition, the project immediate benefits have been acknowledged by the beneficiaries of activities implemented through Output 4, that is, the construction and refurbishment of the district fisheries office. However, the newly created districts by their nature need these offices, yet they are not yet constructed. This should be a matter of priority to the project. It is the ET's considered view that there are no possibilities and mechanisms in place for implementation of output 5 on furnishing landing sites constructed with funding from ADB.

In terms of overall project performance, the ET concludes that QAFMP is on track to contribute to the achievement of the project's immediate objective (purpose) of increasing the value and volume of fish in both domestic and export markets through reduction of post harvest losses, which will in turn contribute to realisation of the development objective (goal) of reduction of poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for domestic, regional and export market and improving the livelihoods of fish dependent communities. This is largely because the delivery of most of the project's outputs was on track, and they contribute to achievement of the purpose and goal. However, given the relative importance of outputs 1 & 2, as well as output 8, the project would realise greater benefits if the BMU trainings are focused on fish quality improvement skills and knowledge and the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities sites is increased to cover more landing sites, within the limits of available funding and time.

Since the current project area (10 districts) in all covers about half of the entire Lake Kyoga and Lake Albert regions, future extension of the project to other areas would be crucial to improvement of the quality of fish from the two lakes, and increasing the contribution of fish to incomes and livelihoods. The current project phase provides working experience and lessons for scaling up this intervention to other locations in the current project area and all the other districts riparian to the two lakes.

It is unlikely that current project will finalise the existing activities within the remaining one year. It would be necessary to extend the current project for an extra 6-12 months to finalise the pending major activities that will impact on the achievement of the project goal. If a 2nd phase of the project is to be supported by ICEIDA, the extended period of the current phase would then provide an opportunity for formulation of the new project.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Recommendations to DFR and ICEIDA

1. The project narrative (log frame) should be reviewed to harmonise the goal, purpose and outputs. ET has suggested a new log frame. (Appendix 2)
2. There is need to extend the current project to utilise the project remaining funds for activities that are key to expanding the impacts of the project within the remaining time frame. Such activities would include:
 - Training for fish handlers, fish driers, fish processors, fish traders etc (current Output 2) aimed at enhancing their skills of fish operators to produce quality and safe fish and fishery products (as opposed to FAL)
 - Construct and furnish district fisheries offices in Ntoroko and Serere district (current Output 4)
 - Support the introduction of inspection activities in all the project districts through, introduction of regulatory activities, training, mentoring and dissemination of the following in Lake Kyoga/Albert districts (Output 6):
 - Fish (Quality Assurance) and Aquaculture (Rules),
 - Manual of Standard Operating Procedures,
 - Fish inspectors' guide
 - Organise refresher hands-on training courses for district fisheries staff to train and refresh them on the quality assurance, inspection and certification of fish as established by the Rules and SOPs. (current Output 7)
 - Through output 8 “Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities in at least 20 fish landing sites”:
 - Review the project target for the development of improved fish handling facilities based on the projected resource envelope and focus the interventions by responding to the emerging needs of the target beneficiaries, particularly women and other groups involved in artisanal fish processing and marketing
 - Provide clean water and sanitation facilities at Panyimur port market in Nebbi district which serves largely as a port for landing fish destined to West Nile and Northern Uganda, as well as Eastern DRC and Southern Sudan. This should be done in response to the dire need of these facilities as demonstrated by the District and Local leadership as witnessed by ET.
 - Improve facilities for artisanal fish handling and processing at the landing sites in Hoima district
 - Provide IT equipment and train the staff in Ntoroko, and Serere in ICT (current Output 9)
 - Support development of specific simplified guidelines of fish safety and quality assurance for fish feed producers, and fish farm (grow out producers), in quality assurance – training for aquaculture operators should be arranged through fish farm associations (current Output 11). Also support the training of local government fisheries staff in quality assurance, inspection and certification of aquaculture based on SOPs and Rules

- Support development of product specific simplified guidelines for operators involved in handling of *Mukene* and other small fish, filleting and sun drying of fish, smoking, fresh fish trade, fish packaging, fish storage etc; These guidelines should be used for training the artisanal fish operators in output 2 (under current Output 12). Also support the development of national standards for mukene products and the regulations for controlling safety and quality in artisanal operations (regulations to cover criteria for gazetted landing sites handling regional and locally marketed products)
3. After the end of the project consider another phase that should be scaled up to the other districts on Lakes Kyoga and Albert, as a form of exit strategy. The entire intervention under 2nd phase (including the specific activities) could cover the areas identified for support in the various sections of the report including supporting model facilities for handling, processing and marketing of fish by artisanal operators
 4. Drop and expunge entire Output 5 from the project document.

5.2 Recommendations to the Department of Fisheries

1. Extend national inspection activities to cover fishery products from the Lakes Kyoga and Albert
2. Develop and disseminate the guidelines for the maintenance of clean water and sanitation facilities installed at the landing sites.
3. Implement a monitoring mechanism for the indicators at outcome level

5.3 District Local Governments

1. Nominate a committee chaired by the CAO or his representative to oversee the activities of the QAFMP in the districts.
2. Put in place mechanisms for the management of the clean water and sanitation facilities at the landing sites.
3. Support fisheries staff to initiate and maintain inspection and surveillance of the health conditions in the fish supply chain.
4. Put in place effective mechanisms for sustaining all the QAFMP supported activities and facilities.

5.4 Recommendations to Project management Team

1. Improve on the reporting of the project activities and report every quarter.
2. Liaise with the Commissioner for Fisheries and CAOs to streamline handing over and commissioning of the project supported facilities in the districts.
3. Improve the coordination with the relevant officers of MFPED to ensure full involvement of the MFPED in monitoring of the project activities as is case with similar projects.
4. Implement a monitoring mechanism for the indicators at outcome level.

5.5 ICEIDA and other donors

- Future interventions in the Lake Kyoga and Albert regions should support small artisanal operators who handle, process, and market the largest proportion of the landed fish. The support could come in form of development of feasible model facilities and

technologies for improving the quality and value of dried and processed fish, and providing improved facilities for drying, salting, smoking, processing, packaging, storage, and marketing. Such interventions should be preceded by a comprehensive value chain analysis to understand the artisanal post harvest operations and the specific needs of handlers, driers, processors and traders. The facilities to be supported should come from priority lists generated through a participatory needs assessment where the voices of weaker players e.g. women who dominate post harvest artisanal sub-sector, are heard.

6.0 LESSONS LEARNED

1. Log frame

When the project document is not properly developed, with clearly articulated outcomes and objectives, it affects the clarity of the project during implementation and the coherence of project outputs. This may affect the manner in which the project achieves what it is set out to accomplish

2. Value chain analysis to determine appropriate support to operators

When a project is meant to establish facilities that improve processes in the value chain of a commodity like fish in locations of different agro-ecological zones or in the regions of different social-economic and social cultural set ups; it is important, first to carry out a value chain analysis to ensure that facilities to be provided will address the needs of majority of the operators.

3. Feasibility/suitability studies for new facilities

Likewise, even when the value chain analysis is undertaken and facilities suited to benefit categories of operators are determined; a feasibility/suitability study for each facility is necessary to ensure that the facility is fit for the purpose in accordance with the practices of the end users. It is important to note that a single design does not cater for the differences in socio-economic and social cultural set-ups, which could minimise the benefits that the communities accrue from the project.

4. Change of project focus

Even if an approach to delivery of a service has been tested, used and succeeded in one area under a project with a different purpose (e.g. FAL in BMUs), it is not wise to introduce that approach in another project, since it may contradict the purpose and affect the contribution of the project outputs to the intended impact.

5. Training materials in local languages

When developing information and material for training, sensitisation and or publicity on any programme in local languages; care must be taken to ensure that generalisation of similar dialects is avoided, as in most cases the so called similar dialects may after all be the same. For instance, although Alur are said to speak Luo language, materials developed in Langi could not be understood by the Alur. In such situations, the local languages should be accompanied with materials in English to facilitate interpretation where language gap exists.

6. Project planning for two different lakes

The fisheries of Lake Kyoga and that for Lake Albert are different. The communities of the two lakes are also different especially considering Lake Albert as a trans-national lake (shared by Uganda and DR Congo). This means the value chains; the nature of the operators, the nature of products, and the market niche for the products, are different. This variation should always be considered when planning deliverables that impact on the fisher communities

7. Involvement of local governments in project decision making

Because of the differences in the operations of central and local governments, It is important to include the representatives of local governments on the Project Steering Committee to avoid a top down decision mechanisms where the centre decides on matters that affect the districts, yet the districts are the beneficiaries of the project, who will have to ensure sustainability of the activities. Decisions made at the centre could lack local practicability which could affect the implementation of the project activities

8. Memorandum of Understanding

At the very beginning of the project of this nature, It is important for the parties to the project implementation to sign a memorandum of understanding detailing the responsibility of each party in implementation and obligations to sustaining the project outputs and activities.

Appendix 1: Selected Sources of Background Information

- Support to Quality Assurance Fish Marketing Project (QAFMP). Main Project Document.
- Half Yearly Project progress reports 2009-2011
- Baseline Survey Report for QAFMP 2009
- A report of ICEIDA-UNU-FTP “Aquaculture Management Course in Uganda” 11th-18th September 2011, at Kajjansi ARDC
- A parliamentary strategy for Iceland’s International Development Cooperation 2011-2014
- Strategy for Iceland’s International Development Cooperation, 2012-06-01
- Training material developed by the QAFMP: Trainers manual – Embedded Literacies for Beach Management Units, Book 1: Orientation to the work of BMUs; Book 2: Planning and Budgeting by BMUs; Book 3: Financial Management for BMUs; etc and sensitisation/awareness charts
- National Development Plan for Uganda 2010/11-2014/15
- Agriculture Sector Development strategy and investment Plan 2010/11-2014/15
- National Fisheries Policy of 2004
- Provisional Fisheries Sector Strategic Plan
- MAAF-DFR Strategy for reducing the impact of HIV/AIDs on Fishing Communities of 2005
- MAAIF-DRF Implementation and Financing Plan for the Strategy to reduce the Impact of HIV/AIDs on Fishing Communities
- Rules, Manuals, Guide and Codes of practices reviewed or developed with the support of the QAFMP

Appendix 2: Reporting on the Log frame for QAFMP

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Means of Verification (MOVs)	Progress made in 2012
Development Objective Improved livelihoods of people in fish dependent communities	- Income and livelihood indices of households in fish dependent communities	-Household survey reports on livelihoods	Too early to evaluate (Analysis in the main text of the report)
Immediate Objective To increase volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets through reduction in post harvest losses	- Amount of fish (in tons) and value in UGX and/or US\$ marketed fresh - Percentage reduction of post harvest fish losses.	-Records on post harvest loss and volume of marketed fish	No data Some visible improvements seen in prices of fish increased where improved landing sites are established due to demand
Outputs			
1. 15 national fish inspectors and 20 district inspectors trained as district-and/or BMU trainers.	- Number of fish inspectors trained as TOT - Quality of training by TOT to BMU	- TOT reports -Progress reports	8 national inspectors and 36 district Fisheries Officers and CDOs trained as Trainers of Trainers (TOTs) in FAL (not Fisheries and Quality Assurance) Important to note: This FAL training is different from the training planned under this output
2. 150 BMU's from prioritized districts around lake Albert and Kyoga received extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance. Training should follow "Guidelines for Beach Management Units in Uganda" July 2003	- Number of BMU who have received training in fisheries quality assurance. - Number of BMU adopting and implementing quality assurance regulations and requirements	-Activity reports -Progress reports	A total of 639 FAL facilitators from 200 BMUs (68 on Lake Albert and 132 on lake Kyoga) were trained in mainly Functional Adult Literacy. 6-18% of BMU members received training in FAL Important to note: The training was not extensive fisheries and quality assurance as planned in the project document but basically FAL It was not possible to evaluate the adoption and implementation of QA regulation by BMUs. But most sampled BMUs did not know the existence of the regulations
3. The national fish inspector's offices and documentation/Rapid Alert System centre renovated, furnished and equipped.	- Renovate, furnished and equipped fish inspectors office/Rapid alert system centre or building	-Construction completion report	National fish inspectors' office renovated at Bugolobi (Ice plant); Provided with Inspection Kits, Office furniture, and two vehicles. No Rapid Alert system has been established or implemented yet. 10 inspectors were provided with laptop computers.
4. Nine district fisheries offices refurbished and equipped with transport and	- Number of district fisheries offices refurbished and equipped with	- Field reports -Construction reports	6 New district fisheries offices constructed in Hoima, Biliisa, Nebbi, Nakasongola, Amolartar, and Buyende. District fisheries offices in Soroti and Apac were renovated. All of these including Bundibujjo were

inspection means ¹ .	transport and inspection means		supplied with office equipment (furniture and computers and accessories) and a motorcycle.
5. Seven fisheries service centres furnished (two of type (A) landing sites in Kalangala and five of type (B) in Buliisa, Soroti, Amolatar, Nakasongola and Kamuli districts) including one motor cycle each.	- Number of fisheries service centres established with Furniture sets, computers, printers, internet cards, solar power	-Progress reports	No progress is visible on implementation of this output
6. Quality Assurance manual for CA prepared for the fisheries inspection services.	- Quality Assurance manual	- QA Manual	Under the output: One Set of two Fish Rules (i.e. Fish and Aquaculture (Quality Assurance) Rules and Fish (Aquaculture) Rules were Reviewed. Two Manuals of Standard Operating procedure [SOPs] (i.e SOPs for Fish and Aquaculture Inspection and Quality Assurance; and SOPs for inspection of Aquaculture establishments and production. Also an Inspectors' guide was developed
7. 60 lake districts and 1802 community fish inspectors refreshed in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures and Regional ³ cooperation meetings/study tours attended by 10 inspectors per year	- Number of fish inspectors (at district and community) have received refresher courses - Number of regional tours/meetings attended	-Course brochures/ syllabuses -Training reports	Refresher training in quality assurance inspection certification procedures was carried out for 57 fisheries staff. The trained inspectors also participated in field training visits to Landing sites and factories based on fisheries of Lake Victoria. No members of BMUs have been Trained. 2 people supported to attend aquaculture meeting in Mombasa; No regional tours supported
8. Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities ⁴ in at least 20 fishing villages.	- Number of fishing villages equipped with clean water and sanitation facilities	-Progress reports -	Improved fresh fish handling facilities (for weighing, cleaning and loading) were established at 6 landing sites of Wanseko in Buliisa, Kayei in Apac, Bangradesh in Amolartar, Mugarama in Serere, Iyingo in Buyende, and Kanala in Ntoroko Districts
9. 16 national and 40 district fish inspectors trained in ICT and Information Management	- Number of inspectors trained in ICT and information management	- TOT reports -Progress reports	8 national inspectors were trained and 16 district fisheries staff and 8 DFR staff were trained in ICT.
10. Fisheries inspection database functional (one at central with focal points in each of the 11 districts including Kalangala)	- Number of districts with functional fish inspection database	-Progress reports	A ICT consultancy firm was contracted to set up fisheries data base, work was completed. 2 new data entrants have been recruited and trained in the usage of the data base No district has a functioning data base installed yet. The database handles fish exports from Lake Victoria only
11. Code of practice for fish farms prepared and 10 aquaculture inspectors and 100 farmers trained.	- Operational COP for fish farms - No. of	-Progress reports	A Code of good practice for quality assurance in aquaculture has been developed, awaiting publication. No reports of training of inspectors and farmers in use of the code of practice.

	aquaculture inspectors and farmers trained and adopting COP standards	- Training reports	
12. Preparation of Code of Practice for artisanal fish processing	- Operational COP for artisanal fish processing - No. of artisanal fish processors trained and adopting COP standards	- Meetings/study tour reports	Code of practice for quality assurance in artisanal fisheries has been developed; and awaiting publication.
13. Project management.	Number of scoping studies, baseline survey, monitoring missions, reports, completed. Number of review meetings	Reports, Minutes of the meetings	Baseline survey conducted; several supervisory missions undertaken, PSC meeting held and project progress reports produced.
14. Cross Cutting Issues have been taken in to account writing this document; HIV/AIDS in Fishing Communities/ Gender equality and empowerment of women in fishing communities/ Environmental sustainability in fisheries	-Number of women participating in project outcome - Training programs input - Number of sanitations facilities constructed	- Progress reports - Training reports	This has been catered for in BMU training where at least one out of the 3 FAL facilitators trained as trainers for BMU members were women. HIV and environment were also included in the training messages given during FAL classes. Developing of landing sites was done after Environmental Impact Assessment Studies 6 landing sites provided with improved sanitation facilities;

Appendix 3: Proposed QAFMP Intervention Logical Framework

Intervention logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of verification
Development Goal: To reduce poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for domestic, regional and export market as well as improving livelihoods of fish-dependent communities in targeted locations of the country	Poverty among fishing communities in the 9 project districts reduced by 25% 2014. The quality and safety of fish for domestic, regional and export markets meeting the required standards by	<i>Poverty indices</i> <i>Fisheries export data</i> <i>Donor Evaluation mission reports</i>

		2014.	
Purpose: To increase the value and volume of fish both in domestic and export markets through reduction in post-harvest losses in the targeted locations in the country.		Volume of fish traded to major local, regional and international markets (from the L.Albert and Kyoga) increased by 50% Prices and value of fish increased	<i>Fisheries trade data</i> <i>Fisheries reports</i>
Main Objective: To establish improve the quality assurance systems for fish and fishery from Lake Kyoga and Albert.			
Outcome 1: National, local government and BMUs inspectors given requisite knowledge; and are able to implement effective quality assurance and inspection systems to improve the quality of fish landed”	Output 1.1 Knowledge and skills of local government staff and key members of the fisher folk community in areas of fisheries and fish quality assurance increased, and practical skills for implementing quality assurance, inspection and certification activities for fish and fishery products imparted to them. <u>Activities</u> 1. Organise a 3 weeks hands-on training course in inspection and certification procedures for district inspectors in collaboration with qualified experts. Use the Inspectors’ Guide and manuals of SOPs as basis for training local fish inspectors on Lakes Kyoga and Albert on the requirements of inspection services based on the new fish inspection guidelines. 2. Organize an extensive 4 weeks refresher training course in the areas of fisheries and quality assurance for district inspectors, in collaboration with Fisheries Training Institute and MUK-Food Science Department. 3. Organize product-focused skills trainings in quality assurance on Lake Albert and on Lake Kyoga for selected artisanal fish operators. Use simple guidelines developed in output 4 in the delivery of specific participatory learning to equip operators with necessary quality assurance skills. 4. Support district-based training seminars for BMU inspectors in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures facilitated by trained district inspectors. 5. Organise study tours for key district inspectors from project districts to landing sites on Lake Victoria in Uganda and the region to learn from their counterparts regarding inspection practice. 6. Support exposure study tours for fish traders especially handling <i>Mukene</i> to Mwanza fish	The skills of fisheries staff and fish operators and BMUS in quality assurance increased from the Baseline period (2009) Number of trained LG staff and BMU in quality assurance, inspection and certification of fish and fishery products Quality and number of inspection reports improved from the baseline 2009	<i>Training reports</i> <i>Inspection report</i>

	<p>market reported to produce the best product for the regional markets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Train the aquaculture operators along the entire aquaculture production and value chain using the simple guidelines developed. 8. Train more aquaculture inspectors at national and local government levels in quality assurance and inspection of aquaculture sector. 9. Conduct ICT Training for the district staff in Serere, Ntoroko and Buyende. 		
<p>Outcome 2:</p> <p>A national inspection service able to operate effectively and efficiently with extension inspection coverage to all the project districts</p>	<p>Output 2.1:</p> <p>Facilities, tools and equipment for enabling proper functioning of fish inspection services at the CCA and local governments provided.</p> <p><u>Activities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construct, refurbish and equip district fisheries offices in the new Project districts of Ntoroko and Serere. 2. Expand the fisheries database at DFR to include data for fish consumed and marketed locally and in the region. The data should also cover all forms of processed products from lakes Kyoga and Albert. 3. Provide the fisheries database to all the districts around lakes Kyoga and Albert. 	<p>Number of facilities, tools and equipment for enabling fish inspection services at the CCA and local governments provided</p> <p>Number of districts using the data bases</p> <p>Strategy developed</p>	<p><i>Project procurement records</i></p> <p><i>CCA and district inventory or store records</i></p> <p><i>Inspection reports</i></p>
<p>Outcome 3:</p> <p>Better quality and safe products coming from the supply and value chains</p>	<p>Output 3.1:</p> <p>Facilities and techniques for ensuring quality of fish along the fish supply, value and distribution chain improved.</p> <p><u>Activities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide clean water and sanitation facilities at Panyamur fish port market in Nebbi District 2. Specifically evaluate the new request from Hoima district for installing clean water and sanitation facilities at another location basing on the claims of availability of land for development of the facilities. 3. Review the project target for the installation of clean water and sanitation facilities based on the projected resource envelope and with possibility of focus the interventions by responding to the emerging needs of the target beneficiaries, particularly women and other groups involved in artisanal fish processing and marketing 4. Improve facilities for artisanal fish handling and processing at the landing sites in Hoima district 5. Develop and disseminate guidelines to districts and BMUs for setting up management systems for maintaining the newly installed clean water and sanitation facilities; and sensitise the district and BMUs on their usage. 	<p>Number of improved facilities</p> <p>Number of new techniques introduced and facilities supported along the fish supply, value and distribution chain</p>	<p><i>Reports</i></p>

<p>Outcome 4:</p> <p>Operators in the chain able to comply with international markets requirements</p>	<p>Output 4.1:</p> <p>Regulatory requirements for fishery products reviewed to harmonise with international best practices and procedures and guidelines for complying with the requirements produced and implemented.</p> <p><u>Activities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide simple quality assurance guidelines for all operators to improve the quality of fish products. 2. Develop standards for small fishery products such as Mukene in collaboration with UNBS. 3. Develop regulations for controlling operations in the post harvest artisanal fisheries subsector (to cover gazettement of landing sites handling the fish that is destined to local and regional markets) 4. Sensitise fish processors on the requirements for exporting aquaculture products. 5. Develop criteria for gazettement and regulating landing sites for fish destined to local and regional markets. 6. Review the existing COPs for Aquaculture and use it to develop simplified guidelines for all categories of the target aquaculture operators especially in the Albert and Kyoga regions. Simple guidelines should be specific to cover safety and quality assurance issues that affect fish farmers; fish seed producers and fish feed producers) 	<p>Rules, manuals, guidelines, reviewed or developed,</p> <p><i>Increase in compliance levels of operators</i></p>	<p><i>Third party inspection reports</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation reports</i></p>
<p>Outcome 5:</p>	<p>Output 5.1:</p> <p>Project well managed and all the stakeholders coordinated to ensure delivery and sustainability of project outputs.</p> <p><u>Activities</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formalise the involvement of the MFPED in monitoring of project activities in line with normal government procedures for similar projects. 2. Drop and expunge Output 5 on the furnishing of offices at the landing sites constructed by ADB-FDP, from the project document. 3. Report project implementation activities quarterly. Include in the reports all project funded activities even those outside the scope of the project document. 4. If possible review the composition of members on the projects steering committee to include person from the Local governments in the project 	<p>Revised project log frame</p> <p>Improved communication with, participation and of project stakeholders</p> <p>Sustainability of the project</p>	<p><i>Revised project document</i></p> <p><i>Monitoring reports</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation reports</i></p>

	<p>districts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Distribute aquaculture manuals produced by the USAID-Fish Project and printed by QAFMP to the DFR and local governments 6. Liaise with the office of the CF and communicate official position regarding launching/commissioning of newly constructed facilities in the districts. 7. Drafting MoUs to spell out the responsibilities of DFR/MAAIF, ICEIDA and the LGs in the project implementation and ensuring sustainability of project activities 8. Encourage all districts to appoint a 3-5 persons management committee for QAFMP 9. Develop a mechanism where all the project implementation issues from the Local Governments are communicated to the Commissioner Fisheries who passes them on to the Project Implementation Unit for action, and those communications to the district are channelled through the CAO and then to DFO to improve information flow and flow up. 10. Institute and support mechanisms for collecting data for M&E especially the monitoring of outcome indicators eg, quantity of fish marketed, value of fish, post harvest losses etc. 		
--	---	--	--

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for evaluation

1. Background

The Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) has been supporting the quality assurance of fisheries products in Uganda since 2001 with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Department of fisheries Resources as its main partner.

The current cooperation between ICEIDA and the Government of Uganda in the fisheries sub-sector focuses on strengthening economic growth through improving the quality and safety of fish for the domestic, regional and export market as well as improving the livelihoods of fish dependent communities.

The project that the current cooperation is realized through is the Quality Assurance for Fish Quality Project (QAFMP) operational from 2009 to the end of 2013. The QAFMP aims at improving the livelihoods of people in fish dependent communities. This is to be accomplished by increasing the volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets through reduction in post harvest losses. This project is operating in ten districts; Ntoroko (instead of Bundibugyo in the original PD), Hoima, Buliisa, Nebbi on Lake Albert and Nakasongola, Apac, Amolatar, Soroti, Serere (after being split from Soroti) and Buyende (replacing Kamuli) on Lake Kyoga.

The objective of this consultancy is to perform an external mid-term project review to ascertain if the main, as well as the specific objectives of the project were reached, what lessons, both positive and challenges, can be learned from the implementation of the project so far and how these lessons can be utilized to ensure that the QAFMP addresses its objectives and achieves its goals in the most efficient manner.

2. Project Summary

Country: Uganda

Sector: Fisheries

Executing Agencies: Government of Uganda (GoU) through the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).

Government of Iceland (GoI) through the Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA).

Project Title: Support to Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project - QAFMP

Project Period: 01.04.2009 – 31.12.2013

Total Estimated Cost: USD 3.925.237

Donor: ICEIDA

Tentative ICEIDA contribution: USD 3.411.369/ 87%

Tentative GoU/Partner contribution: USD 513.867/ 13%

Scope of the Project

The overall objective of the Project is to reduce poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for the domestic, regional and export market as well as improving the livelihoods of fish dependent communities.

The immediate objective is to increase volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets through reduction in post harvest losses.

The following outputs are expected to be reached through the Project activities:

- 15 national fish inspectors and 20 district inspectors trained as district- and/or BMU trainers.
- 150 BMU's from prioritized districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga received extensive training in fisheries and quality assurance
- The national fish inspector's offices and documentation/Rapid Alert System centre refurbished, furnished and equipped at the Ice Plant in Bugolobi.
- Nine district fisheries offices constructed, refurbished and equipped with transport and inspection means. TOR QAFMP Mid-Term 4
- Seven fisheries service centres furnished two of type (A) at landing sites in Kalangala and five type (B) in Bulisa Soroti, Amolatar, Nakasongola and Kamuli districts including, 1 motor cycle each.
- Quality Assurance manual for CA prepared for the fisheries inspection services.
- 60 lake districts inspectors and 180 community fish inspectors refreshed in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures and Regional cooperation meetings/study tours attended by 10 inspectors per year
- Establishment of selected clean water and sanitation facilities in at least 20 fishing landing sites.
- 16 national and 40 district fish inspectors trained in ICT and Information Management
- Fisheries inspection database functional (one at central with focal points in each of the 11 districts including Kalangala)
- Code of practice for fish farms prepared and 10 aquaculture inspectors and 100 farmers trained.
- Code of Practice for artisanal fish processing Prepared.

3. Reasons for the Review

The Project Supervisory Committee (PSC) will develop the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation and the midterm review to be approved by ICEIDA and MAAIF. The mid-term review will consider the level of success for the project and provide advice for the implementers. The midterm review and end of project evaluation shall be

undertaken by an independent team of experts from outside the project area, hired by ICEIDA in consultation with MAAIF.

4. Scope and focus of the review

The scope of the review is the first half of project implementation, from 2009 to 2011. The area under study are the designated districts around Lake Albert and Lake Kyoga where project activities have been taking place, as well as the central competent authority and other participating institutions. The main users of the findings of the end of project evaluation will be the Partners and other stakeholders.

5. Issues to be studied

The external mid-term review should document the degree and the manner in which the Project has been:

Relevant: Examining relevance in relation to:

- Government of Uganda (GoU) policy goals concerning poverty alleviation.
- GoU policy goals regarding quality assurance.
- Cross-cutting issues related to environmental sustainability, HIV/AIDS and gender equality as stated in GoU policies.

Efficient: Assessment of the use of financial and human resources available to the Project. Of importance in this context is also to examine the coherence and complementarities between different government projects and programs, and also coherence with other Icelandic or international development assistance programs in Uganda.

Effective: Examining the extent to which the Project's objectives were achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Sustainable: Assessing if net benefits are likely to continue after the completion of the assistance. Sustainability of the institutions may be examined in terms of their absorption and retention capacity of the expertise developed under the Project.

6. Methodological comments

The mid-term review team should make use of appropriate empirical methods such as interviews, focus groups, and data /literature surveys to collect data, which will be analyzed using well specified judgment criteria and suitably defined qualitative and quantitative indicators. The mid-term review team is expected to conduct interviews with all key personnel involved with the planning, implementing and monitoring & evaluation of the Project.

The external Review team will have full access to all relevant document, Policy papers and relevant reports from the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), the relevant District Local Governments and ICEIDA, as well as progress and financial reports, minutes of meetings of the Project Supervisory Committee (PSC), Project Management Team (PMT) and Project Implementation Team (PIT). The external mid-term review should use information documented in earlier (progress) reports together with data collected in this review to measure the outcomes. The external

midterm review report should describe and assess the intervention logic (Logical Framework Matrix) and distinguish between findings at the different levels: inputs, activities, outcomes and impacts.

The review shall be conducted in accordance with the prevailing Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards.

7. External Review team

The external review team will be comprised of a qualified fisheries expert with established international experience, who is the team leader, and one or more national expert/experts in M&E and implementation of development projects.

Members of the external review team are expected to have relevant academic qualifications and evaluation experience. In addition, the external review team should cover the following competencies:

- a. Substantive experience in development programming including evaluation experience in fisheries;
- b. Expertise in institutional development, policy and decentralization issues in Uganda;
- c. Advanced university degree in fisheries sciences, fisheries management, natural resource management, fisheries economics, quality assurance or related disciplines;
- d. Extensive knowledge of key issues relating to the development of the fisheries sector in Uganda and relevant experience working on fisheries related issues in a developing country.

8. Budget and deliverables

The project is budgeted with a maximum input of a team leader of six weeks, to be delivered over a period of maximum ten weeks. The national team of experts are expected to have a maximum input of six weeks, over a period no longer than ten weeks, thereof a minimum of two weeks in the field. The Deliverables in the consultancy consist of following activities and outputs:

Activity 1: Preparation and inception report.

Activity 2: Field work focusing on recipients and deliverables on Lakes Albert and Kyoga.

Activity 3: Interviews with main partners and stakeholders.

Output 1: An inception report detailing the method and process of the review.

Output 2: 1st draft report for distribution to main partners. Focus on preliminary results of fieldwork.

Output 3: Presentation of draft report and partner feedback.

Output 4: Draft final report for feedback. The feedback will include comments on structure, facts, content and conclusions.

Output 5: Presentation of 2nd draft of final report to key stakeholders for validation and comment

Output 6: Final External Review Report

All presentations and reports are to be submitted in electronic format in accordance with the deadlines set in the time-schedule.

The Partners, ICEIDA and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), retain the rights with respect to all distribution, dissemination and publication of the deliverables.

Key stakeholders include the partners as well as district, cooperating institution and BMU representatives.

9. Time schedule

Prior to commencing with this assignment, the external review team shall prepare a work plan to be approved by the Partners.

10. List of Documents

- Project document and Plan of operation 2009
- Addressing Gender within BMU training memo
- Budgets 2008-2011
- Baseline study
- Mid-term reviews, annual reports and log frame indicators 2008-2011
- Progress reports 2009-2011
- QAFMP BMU training reports

Annex 2: Project Evaluation Questions discussed with ICEIDA as a donor.

- a. Basing on the project implementation so far, are there any concerns related to the project design that ICEIDA as the donor has and if so, how differently should the design have been?
- b. Have there been changes in the ICEIDA International Development Assistance policy since the start of this project to which may require realignment of this project. If yes, which areas?
- c. As a development partners, would you consider the project to be on course to achieve or meet ICEIDA's development assistance objectives anticipated at the time of design?
- d. Are there any project funding challenges; is the ICEIDA budget allocation adequate? Is GoU contribution forth coming? Are there likely to be funding gaps? Is there a contingency budget to address any shortfalls?

- e. Is ICEIDA satisfied with the management structure designed for project implementation? If not how differently should it have been managed (staffing, capability of stakeholders, information flow etc)
- f. Is ICEIDA satisfied with the institutional arrangement for project implementation (stakeholders' roles).
 - o Ministry of Finance,
 - o MAAIF - Department of fisheries resources
 - o Local Governments etc
- g. Are there any challenges in the management of the project that ICEIDA would wish to see improvements?, eg in areas such as:
 - o Flow of funds
 - o Utilization of funds by stakeholders – absorption capacity
 - o Accountability issues
 - o Pace of project implementation
 - o Stakeholders involvement
 - o Project staff etc
- h. As donors what are your impressions about this project in meeting its intended objectives and meeting its goals?
- i. How do you intend to measure the impact of this project after its closure?
- j. Is ICEIDA working in synergy with other donors in supporting implementation of programmes it funds? e.g. sharing information, collaboration, co-funding etc
- k. If so, how has this project utilized these synergies or how could it utilize those synergies
- l. Are there any modifications that ICEIDA has already noted as required in the project implementation after this Mid-term Evaluation?
- m. Does ICEIDA have specific areas in the fisheries and other sectors in Uganda where future development support will go? What linkage would such interventions have with this project?

Annex 3: Evaluation Questions discussed with project implementers

Project conception

- a. What was the problem/issues that the project conception was expected to address (issues of concern in the fisheries sector)
- b. Which stakeholders were affected by the problem/issues that the project was expected to address?
- c. Was the approach used in the project to resolve the problems/issues the most appropriate/could there have been other approaches
- d. How and why were the project sites and beneficiaries (project areas: districts, sub countries, landing sites, BMUs etc) selected
- e. On what basis were stakeholders (implementing institutions (DFR, Local governments, BMUs etc) selected;

Project Design and formulation

- a. Was the goal “Strengthening economic growth through improvement of quality and safety for fish placed on local, regional and international markets?” designed for the project in line with the problem/issues in the fisheries sector that the project was meant to address?
- b. Were the objectives adequate to realize the goal of the project?

Objectives:

1. Overall objective is to reduce poverty among fishing communities through improved quality and safety of fish for domestic, regional and export market as well as improve livelihoods of fish dependent communities.
2. Immediate objective is to increase the volume of fish both in domestic and export market through reduction of post harvest losses

The project narrative

As a result of the project implementation fish is anticipated to increase in volume and fetch better prices leading to increased revenue from fish oriented businesses and improve livelihoods of fish dependent communities.

- a. What was the level of stakeholder’s consultation during the project formulation?
- b. How was baseline survey useful in project formulation and design?
- c. To what extent was the needs assessment study utilized during the project implementation
- d. The donor has indicated that the budget for infrastructure was under estimated, how could this have arisen?
- e. In both project design and implementation were the following commonly challenging issues addressed?

- Smooth flow of funds (especially concerning procedural and bureaucratic delays)
- Stakeholder involvement
- Staff availability and support
- Information dissemination
- Project awareness within the various institutions through which the activities are being implemented

Project execution

- a. What is the status of project implementation? In terms of each of the outputs that the project set out to achieve (achievements, successes, issues, challenges and suggested way forward)
 - 15 CCA inspectors and 20 LG inspectors trained as trainers for BMU in fisheries and quality assurance
 - 150 BMUs from targeted districts around lake Kyoga and Albert trained in fisheries and quality assurance
 - Office of CCA at Bugolobi Ice plant refurbished, furnished and equipped
 - 9 District offices constructed, furnished and equipped with transport and inspection means
 - 7 Fish landing sites (2 type A in Kalangala, and 5 type B in Buliisa, Soroti, Amolatar, Nakasongola, and Kamuli) furnished and given motorcycle each
 - Quality assurance manual prepared for the fisheries inspection services
 - 60 District lake inspectors and 180 community fish inspectors given refresher courses in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures, and 10 inspectors per year, facilitated to attend regional cooperation meetings/study tours
 - Clean water and sanitation facilities installed at 20 selected landing sites
 - 16 CCA inspectors and 40 district inspectors trained in ICT and information management
 - A functional data base established at the CCA with focal points in each of the 11 project districts including Kampala
 - Code of practice for fish farms prepared and 10 aquaculture inspectors and 100 fish farmers trained
 - Code of practice for artisanal fish processing prepared.
- b. Would you say that the project is on track to achieve its main goal considering its closure in next year (2013)?

- c. What are the roles of different stakeholders DFR, Local Government (districts and sub counties) BMUs etc, in implementing the different project activities?

Project Implementation/Management structure

- a. What is the structure of the project implementation? In respect of:
 - o Project coordination arrangements between DFR and Key beneficiaries in the field) and also between DFR, Project Steering committee, Project management Unit and Donor
 - o Process of approval and reporting mechanisms
 - o Composition and working mechanism of the Project Steering Committee
- b. How are technical and financial decisions made? (Between the Project Steering Committee and Project management and ICEIDA)
- c. Are decisions of different stakeholders and PSC respected by project management and donor?
- d. What are the strengths of the current project implementation structure?
- e. Are there any challenges/problems experienced during project implementation because of this structure?
- f. What would you wish to be changed in order to resolve the problems within the project implementation structure?

Budget and finances

- a. Are there any budget/finance related challenges/issues hindering project progress? And how do you wish them addressed?
 - o Work plan development and approval difficulties in DFR and PSC
 - o Challenges related to approval by ICEIDA
 - o Adequacy of funds
 - o Bureaucracy in government or ICEIDA
 - o Project funds utilization by the implementing stakeholders
 - o Stakeholder's participation in budgeting and planning
 - o Support from Project Steering Committee accountability for funds
- b. Is there any other challenge regarding budget and finance not mentioned above? Give details
- c. Provide the project expenditure summary in relation to the agreed project budget to the evaluation team

Project Sustainability Plans

- a. What plans do you have in place to ensure sustainability of the project efforts? Discuss where possible, per output.
- b. How does the project intend to formalize hand over of the project infrastructures installed to stakeholders
- c. What plans are there in the local governments and DFR to sustain ably manage the installed infrastructure installed by the project
- d. What will happen to project assets such as vehicles, office, etc after the project ending?
- e. What plans are there to manage the information generated during the project? Bearing in mind that some of the information and data generated will be of value to DFR and other stakeholders and also during the post project evaluation which could be 5 years after the project closure; and also by other development partners who may want to be fund similar work in future

Cross-cutting issues

- a. Gender and environment issues as mentioned by ICEIDA the donor are crucial in the evaluation of this project by the Icelandic government, as well HIV/AIDS to the government of Uganda. How is the project addressing these cross-cutting issues?
- b. Are there any unintended positive and negative impacts to the community not involved in the project and/or environment?

Project monitoring

- a. How do you monitor the implementation of the project activities? (Meeting, workshops, monitoring visits, telephone calls, e-mail questionnaires etc)
- b. What is the nature of reporting mechanisms (monthly, quarterly, biannually, annually etc)?
- c. How are the reports utilized in the coordination and management of routine and administrative work of the project?
- d. What feedback mechanisms exist between the Project Implementation team and stakeholder (reports, reviews, publications or surveys)?
- e. Are the project documents such as reports, reviews, minutes, survey reports accessible and to whom?

Project collaboration

- a. Does the project have collaborators at national and local government level (co-funding, information sharing, co-implementers, common strategy, government ministries and departments donors implementing related programmes etc)?
- b. How is information shared with collaborators and project stakeholders?

Annex 4: Summary Tables of MTR Findings (Additional Data)

Annex 4a Details of district officials trained under “Output 1: National fish inspectors (15) and 20 district inspectors trained as district and/or BMU trainers

District	Findings
Nakasongola	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>The DFO and some staff were trained in FAL facilitation methods by the project staff. These latter trained the FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p>
Apac	<p>4 district officers trained as TOT</p> <p>The DFO, Community Development Officer and 2 fisheries officers trained in two phases each for 5-days in Jinja as Trainers of Trainers (ToT)</p>
Bullisa	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>The DFO, Community Development Officer and 2 fisheries officers trained in two phases each for 5-days in Jinja as Trainers of Trainers (ToT)</p>
Hoima	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>The DFO, Community Development Officer and 2 fisheries officers trained in two phases each for 5-days in Jinja as Trainers of Trainers (ToT)</p>
Nebbi	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>The DFO, Community Development Officer and 2 fisheries officers trained in two phases each for 5-days in Jinja as Trainers of Trainers (ToT).</p>
Buyende	<p>4 district staff were trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>Four (4) district staff were identified in the larger Kamuli District. They included DFO, 2 other fisheries staff and CDO.</p>
Ntoroko	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>The TOT training was conducted when Ntoroko district was still part of Bundibujjo. These were trained to train FAL facilitators. The training took place in Jinja. Only one of the trained TOTs is currently under Ntoroko.</p>
Amolotar	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs</p> <p>The DFO, Community Development Officer and 2 fisheries officers trained in two phases each for 5-days in Jinja as Trainers of Trainers (ToT)..</p>
Serere	<p>4 district staff trained in FAL facilitation methods as TOTs to train FAL facilitators from the BMUs.</p> <p>The project started when the district was still under Soroti.</p> <p>It was the Soroti DFO and two fisheries officers (including the current DFO in Serere) and one Community Development officer were trained in the Trainers of Trainers (ToT) and literacy skills.</p>

	The Soroti DFO (has retired) but informed staff and district leadership about the literacy related project. The trained officers went to create awareness in the community and asked the community (BMUs) to select 3 FAL facilitators.
--	---

Annex 4b: Number of facilitators trained and details of FAL training delivered among the BMUs in the project districts

District	Findings
Nakasongola	<p>Overall 60 facilitators were trained. 3 facilitators from each of the 20 BMUs. The trained facilitators were expected to go back and begin FAL classes in their communities. About 200 people at the BMU were targeted by the facilitators for the FAL classes.</p> <p>The training conducted focussed on FAL and covered numeracy, reading, writing, functioning of BMUs, business skills, finance management, planning and budgeting, sanitation, community public health, environment, HIV, gender, poverty issues, implementation of government programmes among others with limited coverage of fisheries and quality assurance issues.</p>
Apac	<p>Overall 78 TOT facilitators were trained; 3 from each of the selected 26 BMUs</p> <p>The criteria for selecting BMU facilitators to train was at least one woman and 3 men</p> <p>Training of the FAL facilitators was in 2 phases (one 13 BMUs and other 12 BMUs).</p> <p>The attendance of FAL class was approximately 45 learners over 5 training sessions were organised by the facilitators</p> <p>The TOT at the district were monitored and guided by the QAFMP facilitators from Kampala.</p> <p>The TOT facilitators were given information materials in the local language, chalk, markers, flip charts, chalk boards to use during their classes.</p> <p>The BMU facilitators' undertook training of BMU members under supervision of DFO, CDOs, and local fisheries officers.</p>
Bullisa	<p>Overall 32 facilitators were trained; 3 from each of the selected BMUs</p> <p>The facilitators were chosen to undertake FAL classes in two categories i.e. beginners and advanced group. Most of the beginners were women majority of whom have low education</p> <p>Trainings were centred on issues like adult literacy, numeracy, basic accounting and a limited aspect on the good fish harvesting and handling practices e.g. the use of proper gear, good fish drying and packaging methods etc.</p> <p>Classes were conducted in Alur, Swahili and Lunyoro-kitara since these are the main dialects used by the majority of the target fisherfolk communities.</p> <p>There is a conflict among the target recipients as to the language that is most suited to be used during the BMU trainings (each community seems to be lobbying for the trainings to be conducted in their respective dialects).</p>
Hoima	<p>Overall 68 facilitators were trained</p> <p>There is a conflict among the target recipients as to the language that is most</p>

	<p>suites to be used during the BMU trainings (each community seems to be lobbying for the trainings to be conducted in their respective dialects).</p> <p>The facilitators at the BMU level are not members of the BMU committee leadership. This has led to conflicts especially since some of the facilitators have expressed desire to contest for the leadership of the BMU visited (this was very evident in Kiryamboga landing site).</p>
Nebbi	<p>Overall 88 facilitators were trained; 3 from each of the selected BMUs</p> <p>In spite of the above mentioned, there was no tangible evidence that the TOT training actually took place, since the sampled BMU facilitators (at Panyimur landing site) claimed that they were yet to receive their respective training certificates.</p> <p>The training materials are in Langi and Swahili yet the majority of the target recipients actually understand Alur and hence cannot effectively comprehend the trainings if the current versions are used.</p> <p>The chosen females in case of this particular landing site have dropped out of the BMU facilitators program due to other commitments e.g. marital demands.</p>
Buyende	<p>Overall 88 facilitators were trained</p> <p>Although the selection of the facilitators occurred when the Buyende was under Kamuli district, by the time of the training Buyende district had separated from Kamuli.</p> <p>In total there were 35 women and 53 men who were trained.</p> <p>The enrolment was from the beginning poor at an average of 18% [30-45 trainers per class in a community of about 170- 380 targeted learners] per training and the fall out rate was high</p>
Ntoroko	<p>Overall 24 facilitators were trained 3 people were selected from each of the 8 landing sites.</p> <p>The training was done in Fort Portal (Rwenzori Travellers Inn) and majority of the trainees were men. The training lasted two weeks.</p>
Amolotar	<p>Overall 121 facilitators were trained.</p> <p>The trained facilitators were given teaching materials to run FAL classes in their respective BMUs. The FAL facilitators said they were trained in leadership, business skills, planning and budgeting, other poverty issues and community development as well as fish quality assurance and other fisheries activities. After training the FAL facilitators came back and sought assistance from BMU and LC leadership to assist in community mobilisation.</p> <p>The attendance at the sampled BMU in Bangladesh ranged between 16-41 learners per session in the BMU community of about 700 potential learners.</p>
Soroti/Serere	<p>Overall 82 facilitators were trained, 3 people (two males and 1 female). Training was for 7 days at Soroti Church of Uganda Centre.</p> <p>In two sampled BMUs no female was selected. The training covered numeracy, writing and reading, fish handling, fish hygiene, and sanitation, PMU leadership etc. The training was delivered by district facilitators and some facilitators from Kampala. Three classes so far had been conducted at the sampled BMU and the attendance was between 18-27 learners of the targeted number of learners of about 200 learners. There was evidence of support for the FAL training by the</p>

	<p>LC 1 and BMU leadership.</p> <p>However, Serere district has a serious shortage of staff due to the transition process; therefore frequent interfaces with the facilitators to guide them on how to attract learners is a challenge. Out of the trained officers, 2 officers (DFO and CDO) are in Serere district. The CDO trained by the project is posted at the Sub County and currently there is need to bring the district community officer on board if the FAL in BMU is to be sustained by bringing them under main stream FAL.</p>
--	--

Annex 4c: Deliverables regarding the renovation, refurbishing, furnishing and equipping of the national fish inspector’s office at ice plant in Bugolobi; and establishing a documentation and rapid alert system centre

Activity	Findings
Renovation and refurbishing the inspectors office as one sub activity	<p>The inspection office was renovated by the project. The renovation exercise including painting, replacing windows and reworking the floor with terrazzo.</p> <p>The office premises were also connected to internet. The project bought filing cabinets for safe custody of inspection document files, and instant testing kits to facilitate the sampling and testing during the execution of the inspection activities.</p> <p>In addition, the project procured two double cabin pick trucks (Toyota Hillux) and a saloon car which is currently being used by the staff of the Department of Fisheries Resources and project, to implement the department and project project work.</p>
Establishing a rapid alert system and an information centre with internet based information sharing system to facilitate the rapid flow of information between the headquarters of the national inspection services at the Department of Fisheries Resources and the outpost inspection authorities in the local governments.	<p>As regards the second part of the output, 10 laptop computers (Model HP 6730b) were bought and distributed to all the national inspectors (8).</p> <p>Later the project budget was reviewed and the rapid alert system as part of the information centre that was to be established for the inspection services was removed from the budget as not being of high priority to the department of fisheries resources.</p>

Annex 4d: Nature and status of the district offices constructed/renovated, furniture and office equipment and transport means provided by the QAFMP to the project districts

District	Findings
Nakasongola	<p>One two-roomed building unit for housing district fisheries office constructed and furnished with a table, three chairs, filing cabinet, computer, printer and accessories. According to DFO the table is short and according and seems to lack an extension for holding the computer and the printer. This is the same for all the districts around Lake Kyoga.</p> <p>The engraving of the equipment was done in Kampala and one of the chairs is labelled with label for another district. This was noted with one of the chairs in Nakasongola. The project also provided an internet modem and Motorcycle</p>

Apac	<p>District fisheries office renovated and furnished. The project supported Installation of lighting, fixing of door locks and painting of the office</p> <p>In addition the project provided office furniture including: table and 2 office chairs; Computer, printer and accessories, internet modem, and Motor cycle</p> <p>The DFO's office chair was not available and the DFO did not have knowledge as to whether the chair was delivered. There could be possibility that the chair was delivered and thereafter grabbed by one of the district executives (the DFO promised to find out and get back to ET, and by time of writing this report, he had not).</p>
Bullisa	<p>A new district fisheries office constructed and furnished. Also provided is computer and accessories and internet modem, and a motorcycle.</p> <p>The office does not have functional cabinets and some chairs are missing. The computer lacked basic operating software programs, and was not functioning.</p> <p>There seems to be an appreciation by the district that the solar powered newly constructed office has helped in solving the challenge of not having enough office space, and providing the district administration with the highly needed energy to facilitate office business.</p>
Hoima	<p>District fisheries office constructed and solar powered. Technical handover was done on 2nd September 2011 to the DFO, ACAO, CFO and other officials but commissioning has not been done. Office equipment were delivered, but some in bits and pieces where some of the components were missing and therefore cannot be used e.g. filing cabinets and DFO's chair. The district office is provided with a chain link security fence. Also the project provided motorcycle.. The DFO expected the new office to come with the provision of a store and toilet. The district leadership is happy with the project regarding the provision of office and solar power. The district has indicated that they would wish the project to support them with a boat and motor boat engine to facilitate them access some of the landing sites that are not easily reachable by land</p>
Nebbi	<p>District fisheries office constructed and furnished.</p> <p>The solar powered newly constructed office is always used by other district staff especially during load shedding hours.</p> <p>The DFO and Production Coordinator indicated need for support regarding vehicle, boat and motor board engine to facilitate the inspection missions for fisheries staff in hard-to-reach landing sites</p>
Buyende	<p>District fisheries office constructed and furnished with Solar power. The district was provided with motorcycle and internet modem as well.</p> <p>However, the solar system that was provided cannot run a computer with the printer at the same time. However the project team pointed to the possibility of overload by several district staff using the office.</p> <p>According to DFO, the problem was reported to the project engineer and no official communication has been received.</p> <p>Meanwhile the district is planning to upgrade the solar system. The DFO and CAO say the funds have been identified and the issue is being handled through the district procurement system. The local government was also planning to organise an official commissioning</p>

	ceremony for the district fisheries office which is already being utilised.
Ntoroko	<p>The project did not construct a district fisheries office in Ntoroko.</p> <p>Only the computer and furniture were provided to Bundibujjo who have retained them.</p> <p>The district however has been provided with the Motorcycle which is being utilised by the fisheries technical staff.</p> <p>At the time the office was to be constructed, the district lacked the land. However, by the time of the evaluation, the district had acquired land and was hopeful that the project would construct the office before its end. The district leadership was anxious about this as would help them to address the space problem for seating their staff.</p> <p>The district is in dire need of office space given that it is operating in borrowed premises of a primary school.</p> <p>The district has indicated that they would wish the project to support them with a boat and motor boat engine to facilitate them access some of the landing sites that are not easily reachable by land.</p>
Amolotar	District fisheries office constructed and furnished. All the other equipment and items as provided in other districts were also provided
Serere	<p>The project renovated the district fisheries office in Soroti and furnished it with furniture and IT Equipment, and a motorcycle before Serere separated from Soroti.</p> <p>Currently the Serere district doesn't have any office for the fisheries staff and as the case with most of the newly established districts suffers acute shortage of office space for its staff.</p> <p>The furniture, equipment and motorcycle were retained by Soroti.</p> <p>Serere was at first not recognised as one of the project districts (Serere has 26 BMUs and Soroti retained only 2 BMUs after the separation). Serere was later officially recognised as a project district.</p>

Annex 4e: The number of trained officials and the nature of training received as obtained from district fisheries officers concerning the training in quality assurance, inspection and certification envisaged under output 7:

District	Findings
Nakasongola	<p>Fisheries assistants at sub county level attended a 5-day training in quality assurance (fish handling and inspection) in Soroti. The BMUs inspectors have not been trained in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures.</p> <p>The training involved lectures and field visits to landing sites and 2 factories in Jinja and Entebbe.</p> <p>The district has complemented the quality assurance efforts by the project, by establishing demonstration exercises on processing, handling and hygiene. Using the district budgets, there are plans to renovate the fish handling slabs previously constructed at some landing sites.</p> <p>The district has provided trays, wheel barrows, forked spades to improve the handling of fish at the landing site. The funds for distribution of these materials as well as</p>

	sensitisation of the communities on use of the items were provided by the project.
Apac	9 inspectors were trained in three batches some in Mukono and others in Soroti. The DFO seems not to remember the content of the training but thinks it was related to fish handling.
Bullisa	Available evidence suggests that no such training envisaged in this particular output was attended by fisheries staff currently service in Buliisa
Hoima	Available evidence suggests no progress was realised in this particular output as far as Hoima district is concerned.
Nebbi	<p>The DFO in Nebbi is new and was not yet in office when the training is said to have taken place. No one could remember the number of trainees although one fisheries officer (In charge of Pakwach sub county) indicated that he received a 5day fisheries inspector's refresher course in April 2009 on fish handling and inspection techniques, BMU management, mandatory requirements, fish quality assurance rules etc. He seemed to suggest that he was the only one in Nebbi who attended.</p> <p>The trainee got a certificate but is yet to receive an identity card designating him as an inspector, for which they were promised during the training.</p>
Buyende	<p>6 district technical staff from the then Kamuli District were trained in fish quality assurance in Soroti. The training was conducted in two batches.</p> <p>Most of the trained were sub county staff in the current Buyende.</p>
Ntoroko	This particular training has not been received by the staff currently serving in Ntoroko district
Amolotar	<p>6 local government technical staff were provided with in-service training on fish handling, fish preservation, processing and inspection. The training was conducted in Soroti with field visits in Jinja, Entebbe and a landing site at Katosi .</p> <p>The in-service training was conducted in two lots where DFOs were in one lot and other technical fisheries staff in other lot. The training was rather general and the details of inspection and certification were not adequately covered. The training also covered other fisheries activities like fisheries regulation and enforcement and co-management. According to DFO more intensive training focussed on inspection, certification and quality assurance control activities is necessary. He suggests 2-3 months or even longer to support people undertake diploma and Msc in these areas.</p>
Serere	The DFO indicated that such training if at all took place might have benefited staff currently retained by Soroti District. No community inspectors were trained in quality assurance, inspection and certification procedures.

Annex 4f: Findings regarding the clean water and sanitation facilities established by the project in the respective landing sites in the districts

District	Findings
Nakasongola	No facility was provided by the project in the district
Apac	<p>One clean water and sanitation facility was constructed at Kayei landing site and commissioned on November 23, 2011 and handed over to the community. It comprises of a: Weighing area, Fish cleaning slabs, Potable water (tank and associated piping work) , Changing rooms and toilets for male and female respectively, A solar system for powering water pump and lighting, water pump, and garbage skip</p> <p>By the time of the Evaluation, the facility was being utilized.</p> <p>The ET noted the following issues</p> <p>The facility had developed cracks and the steps leading to the boat landing jetty were already broken up with overgrown grass. In the discussion with the CAO, he indicated that he would send the district engineer to renovate the broken area using district resources.</p> <p>The solar panels were stolen but according to the community the culprits were apprehended and the panels are serving as exhibits in courts of law.. The BMUs have bought a new panel to replace the stolen panel. The BMU has assigned someone to keep the security of the facility.</p> <p>The BMUs have imposed a user/packing charge of Sh. 3000 per truck which they hope to utilise for ensuring management and sustaining the facility.</p> <p>The ET latter was informed by the district leadership of the intention by the district to officially tender the facility to the BMUs. The ET view is that there is need for training of BMU executives on maintenance of these facilities.</p> <p>The ET was informed by the DFR/MAAIF officials that guidelines for managing the facilities are being developed. It is hoped that such guidelines will facilitate that training.</p> <p>The CAO wondered why an MoU was not signed at the beginning of the project with MAAIF and ICEIDA to spell out the responsibility of each party.</p> <p>The CAO and other district leaders wished the project could support other cold chain facilities like small scale ice makers, fish cool boxes for bicycle traders, packaging, and storage facilities for fish. This, they indicated, should be backed with an inspection system for fish at landing sites and in fish markets..</p>
Bullisa	<p>A similar facility was established at Wanseko in Buliisa. By the time of the evaluation, the contractor in Bullisa was making final touches on the facility. Most of the work looked complete and the workers were mainly painting and doing the clean-up activities on the facility. The DFO and the BMU officials were expecting commissioning of the landing facility in a week's time from the time when the ET's field visit was conducted. The DFO indicated that facilities for filleting and gutting are also needed since most of the wet fish coming from most landings are first gutted or some filleted. The community members wished that other facilities for drying and processing of fish should be considered for support since the majority are involved in those activities.</p>

Hoima	<p>No clean water and sanitation facility was installed in landing sites in hoima.</p> <p>This is because the same land had squatters who demanded for compensation and resettlement. Plans are underway to identify and gazette a new site that will be free of wrangles for the construction of the above mentioned landing site.</p> <p>There <i>are</i> no clean water and sanitation facilities at the landing sites in Hoima district despite fishing being a major activity</p> <p>At the time of Midterm review, there was cholera outbreak among the communities which emphasizes the need for clean water and sanitation facilities at landing sites in Hoima. The DFO and Production coordinator wanted to know if Hoima’s opportunity for establishment of improved landing site still existed. They indicated that the district was ready to identify another free land suitable for the clean water and sanitation facility.</p>
Nebbi	<p>The ET was told by DFO and CAO representative that instead of providing clean water and sanitation facilities at landing site the district wished the project to improve the facilities at Panyamur port which serves both as a landing centre for fish destined to Northern Uganda, West Nile, DRC and South Sudan, and as a market as well. A visit to the nearby landing site by ET indicate that the landing site in Panyimur Abok is artisanal in nature and lacks the basic amenities like clean water, jetties etc.</p> <p>The port also is host of several fish processing and drying activities. The majority of the processors and sundriers are women, who skin and fillet the fish on the ground and dry them on dirty materials on loose half raised poorly constructed wooden tables/racks. The racks are few and provide limited space as compared to the fish being dried resulting in longer drying periods, which results in of spoilage. The entire premises are unhygienic. As for the market, the stalls are few, dirty and old. There is a dire need for improvement of these fish handling and processing facilities at Panyamur port.</p>
Buyende	<p>A clean water and sanitation facility was constructed at Iyingo Fish Landing site and is yet to be given to the community for use.</p> <p>It was reported by BMUs, DFO and Technical staff at Iyingo landing site and CAO that the contractor’s (Ibhacon Services) work is not up to the required standard. The construction delayed over the planned period and when work resumed after the Commissioner of Fisheries office’s intervention its quality still did not improve.</p> <p>Some of faults the community mentioned about the facility to the ET were:</p> <p>All other lights are not working apart from the ones in the toilet</p> <p>The landscaping of the compound is not complete and grass not yet planted</p> <p>Terrazzo in the toilet was patched in some areas and missing in others</p> <p>The mirrors on hand wash basin are already worn out and not reflecting</p> <p>The community is concerned that the design of the facility left out important components, such as a place where other people not being served can stand and wait or shade for use by the facility users during rain or intense sunshine (This issue was also raised in other districts where such facilities as pre-existing Uniports for fisheries office do not exist)</p> <p>The solar system does not work properly which affects the water supply system (This</p>

	<p>claim came up in other districts as well)</p> <p>The BMU are already concerned about the security of the facility and have hired guards to keep the place secure. The BMUs plan to charge a user fee for managing the facility when it is subsequently handed over to them.</p> <p>The community was also concerned that the facility has not been handed over to them for use; however, the DFO indicated that the district is waiting first to have an on-site meeting with the contractor to agree on the remaining work and time frame for completion.</p> <p>The Community has a dire need for clean water and had wished the capacity of the solar pump was enhanced and a larger water tank provided to supply the nearby community (This is case for other districts as well)</p> <p>It is the view of the ET that the Project Management Team and the contractor visit the site with the district to iron out these issues; so that the facility can be handed to the community for use before it is run down.</p> <p>The community also expressed a need for ice making machine and hoped that a small ice maker would have been provided within the facility design (Same issue was raised in Apac)</p>
Ntoroko	<p>One clean water and sanitation facility has been constructed at Ntoroko - Kanala landing site. The project support to the landing site comprises of a shallow water well, solar powered water pump, a water tank, water borne toilet, a sheltered fish cleaning slab, a packing/loading lot, renovation of pre-existing unipots serving as offices for BMU and fisheries staff, and a chain link fence with a gate (This is a similar design for all the districts). Although the construction was being monitored by the district engineer, the contractor had some issues, which the district complained about and the contractor was able to sort them out.</p> <p>There are personnel who are ensuring security of the facility.</p> <p>At the time of the evaluation, the facility was in use, having been handed over to the sub county leadership by the contractor in presence of PMT. The LC V chairman had after learning that the facility was complete made a directive that all the fish sold to trucks be landed through the facility.</p> <p>All the trucks that ferry fish were all directed to do so at the Ntoroko facility. Because the fish trucks spend a long period on the landing site collecting fish and given the long distances to markets in Rwanda and DR Congo, the fish traders have first to gut the fish (especially tilapia which is commonly bought from this landing site) and chill it in trucks to reduce spoilage.</p> <p>By the time of the evaluation, the ET found that the facility was being used for purposes not exactly as was intended. The facility was being used for gutting of fish yet it was only designed to serve as a facility for landing, weighing, cleaning, and loading of the fish on the transport trucks. The ET found six fish collection trucks which were packed in the parking lot with ice on-board some with fish others waiting for fish.</p> <p>All the fish loaded on to the trucks are gutted using the two small fish slabs. The space, the drainage system, the sewage system, the capacity of water supply, all cannot match the activity of gutting at the facility. More so, the facility does not have provisions for solid waste material such offal and gut contents. Gutting would have required a facility</p>

	<p>designed as a primary processing unit – say a slaughterer house. The slaughter (gutting) operations have attracted a large herd of marabou stocks that swam the area to feed on the fish offal and the gut contents which are thrown around. This could soon result in serious public health related problems.</p> <p>These issues will certainly reverse the benefits that were expected to be accrued by the community from the facility.</p> <p>As a result of the facility misuse and overcapacity; the ET established that:</p> <p>Water dispensing pipes and taps on the fish washing slabs have already been broken or removed</p> <p>The waste water drainage system is already blocked and waste water pours directly onto the floor making the whole place untidy, unsanitary and generally hygienically unsafe</p> <p>The parking lot is used over its capacity. It was noted by the ET that the parking lot was poorly designed and wrongly constructed with poor finishing which results in the stagnation of any waste water from the trucks because it cannot drain easily and could be a public health problem.</p> <p>Also the levelling of the parking lot is in such a way that ice water in parked trucks cannot drain and therefore foreign objects like bricks, stones and timber cuttings are used to lift up the trucks in slanting positions so that the water in trucks can drain easily. This further damages the parking lot.</p> <p>There were some structural problems already observed by MBUs on the facility.</p> <p>The BMU says that they were left out in the monitoring of the facility construction. They indicate that the contractor did not use materials recommended standard which they attribute as resulting in breaking of water pipes (The ET contested this assertion), collapsing of the chain link fence by wind, giving way of edges of the steps leading to the landing area among others. They hope that the contractor liability period may have not expired so that he can be contacted to repair the facility.</p> <p>The facility seems to be mismanaged as the fisheries staff and the BMU seemed to lack the basic quality assurance skills to guide the operators to keep the facility in hygienic state. The laxity by the BMUs in their management responsibility has led to fish traders to take up the entire facility and running it down as they watch.</p> <p>DFR should urge the DFO to ensure that this mismanagement of the facility stops. The DFO and the technical staff at the landing facility showed high level of ineptness and reluctance to guide operators in maintenance of the facility.</p> <p>The district and the community wish QAFMP to provide a slaughterhouse at the facility for gutting of the fish. The ET finds this a realist request given the circumstances observed.</p>
Amolotar	<p>Samilar facility was established at Muwanga- Bangladesh landing site in Amolartar. There was also a management challenge for the clean water and sanitation facility. As in Apac, one of the Solar Panels had been stolen. The culprits were apprehended and the court case is in court and the panels shall remain as exhibits. However, the BMUs had replaced the panel themselves and were still looking for resources to have it re-installed. The district fisheries office was making plans to partner with the Uganda Police to provide adequate security for the facilities at the landing site. The community indicated</p>

	<p>that all the doors for the building structure that accommodates toilets and dressing rooms were not shutting or were faulty. The BMUs were of the opinion that if the liability period given to the contract has not expired; he could be recalled to fix the fault.</p> <p>At the time of the evaluation three trucks were receiving fresh fish from the facility. The BMUs charge Shs. 2000 per truck to manage the facility. However, they were considering requiring each fisher whose fish lands and is sold through the facility to surrender one fish to facilitate management of the facility. The district leadership indicated to the ET that they have developed a management plan for sustaining all such facilities received from cooperation of development partners but were being challenged with financing of the plan. The district was working with the sub county and the BMUs to ensure that the facilities provided by QAFMP are properly managed. The CAO representative wished if there was an official agreement with project partners to determine the contribution of each party.</p>
Serere	<p>A clean water and sanitation facility was developed at Mugarama landing site located in Labori subcounty in Serere.</p> <p>The district and the community were fully consulted and are happy with the place where the facility is sited.</p> <p>The site is provided with the entire infrastructure as was provided to other similar facilities established by the project in other districts.</p> <p>At the time of the evaluation the contractor was making final touches to finish the few cleanup works.</p> <p>The community appeared to be fully working with the contractor and the BMUs, LCs both at village and sub county were behind and supportive of the project and appreciative of the works of the contractor. The district engineer was monitoring the construction and there was a full-time district clerk of works who was working on the site with the contractor.</p> <p>The BMU working with the sub county leadership are already concerned about the security of the landing facility and are in discussion on means of ensuring sustainability and management of the facility.</p> <p>The district wished that the ice making plant which is apparently not installed at the landing site was included and suggested that the ICEIDA project should where possible provide support for an ice plant installation.</p> <p>The BMUs were working with the Sub county local government to take up the security of the facility as soon as the contractor hands it over. They have already among themselves agreed on the maintenance and management of the facility. One of the sources of funds for maintenance and management being considered is the 25% revenue remittance by the sub county to the BMUs. There were also plans to introduce a user-charge to cater for management of the facility.</p>

Annex 4g: The district staffs trained and the content of ICT training supported by QAFMP in the project districts

District	Findings
Nakasongola	2 district fisheries officers were trained(The DFO and one Assistant Fisheries officer) The content of the ICT training given was mainly introduction to computers, basic computing, and use of basic computer applications
Apac	1 district fish inspector trained The DFO was trained in use of computers.
Bullisa	1 district fish inspector trained and 2 fisheries officers Training that was given to the district officers during the handover of the computers for the DFO office
Hoima	District fisheries officer and 1 fisheries officer trained
Nebbi	2 fisheries officers trained
Buyende	2 fisheries officers in the original Kamuli District were trained in the use of computers. One of the trained personnel stayed in Kamuli district, the other is now Buyende
Ntoroko	2 fisheries officers were trained in ICT, Of the trained officers one remained in Bundibujjo and one is Ntoroko district
Amolotar	2 fisheries officers were trained in ICT (including the District Fisheries Officer)
Serere	None reported to have been trained 2 trained were retained by Soroti

Annex 4h: Findings and assessment of ET on the effective of the project implementation regarding gender issues

Output	Findings
<p><i>Training</i></p> <p><i>Output 1, where the project trained national and district inspectors as district or BMU trainers (ToT for FAL).</i></p>	<p>The ET established that out of the 8 inspectors at national level trained as district or BMU trainers; one (1) was a woman. And of the 36 officers from local governments trained report indicated only 3 were women.</p> <p>The ET was not able to determine the gender status of CDOs in all the 9 project districts and establish why fewer women CDOs (3 out of 9) than men attended the training.</p>
<p><i>Output 2; where BMUs from project districts around Lake Albert and Kyoga were trained in FAL</i></p>	<p>From each of the 200 BMUs which participated, three (3) facilitators were expected to participate in training as TOT level 2, one of whom was expected to be female.</p> <p>However the ET was informed that some of the BMUs in Serere, Nebbi and Nakasongola districts did not send women facilitators for training.</p> <p>Reasons given were because married women fail to secure permission from their husbands to attend a residential training for long periods (It was 7 day training). In the case of lactating mothers they feared to come with children not to inconvenience other colleagues.</p> <p>The ET learnt that in some of the districts like Apac where lactating mothers were selected as facilitators, the organizers arranged and provided baby-sitting facilities.</p> <p>Based on smaller size of BMU members interviewed (12 BMUs) more women abandoned FAL classes than men. The reason given was that most women did not have time for mobilisation, planning and teaching.</p> <p>Also interviews with FAL trainers indicated that women were not conversant with the messages they trained in, which they were expected to relay to community members during BMU FAL classes.</p> <p>As regards, the packaging and content of the FAL messages, the ET found the packaging appropriate for non-educated groups in the community majority of which tend to be women. The awareness charts and the teaching guidelines, as well as the mode of teaching, were all well suited for low educated members the majority of whom are women. .</p> <p>The ET found that the majority of fisheries staff in the project districts is men. The few women who participated were CDOs.</p>
<p><i>Output 7, where lake district inspectors were refreshed and community inspectors were to be trained in quality assurance inspection and certification procedures</i></p>	<p>The ET did not establish the numbers and gender of the trainees for the training that took place under this output because of lack of reports and institutional memory of the same, since it was said to have taken place a while back in 2009. However, respondents in the local governments who indicated that they were involved in such training as trainees were all men.</p>

<p><i>Output 9, where national and district fish inspectors were trained by the project in ICT and information management</i></p>	<p>At national level out of 10 inspectors trained, one was a woman. Similarly the participation of women in this training from Local Governments was limited. Because this training targeted national level fish inspectors and fisheries officers at local government levels, the participation of women had to be limited due to the few women recruited in fisheries sector. This problem cuts across all science fields.</p>
<p><i>Consideration of women needs during the designing of the fisheries facilities and infrastructure supported by the project</i></p>	<p>The ET observed that women who are the majority operators in the drying and salting of the small fish like <i>Mukene</i>; Smoking, salting, and marketing of other fish like <i>Tilapia</i>, <i>Alestes</i>, <i>Hydrocynus</i>, Nile perch..., etc. did not have their needs met in the established design of the landing sites which are best suited for mainly fishers, majority of whom are men.</p>
<p><i>Gender considerations and benefits of women from the Quality Assurance Inspection manuals and Code of Good Practice for Quality Assurance</i></p>	<p>The manuals produced either support quality assurance or aquaculture related activities which in Uganda are both on-shore activities which women are heavily involved in.</p>
<p><i>Gender consideration and women benefits from the fish inspection data base being established at DFR and local government.</i></p>	<p>The fish inspection data base being established at DFR only covers fish from landing sites gazetted for fish export to Europe and is only restricted to lake Victoria. Majority of women are involved in trade of the fish destined to local and regional markets.</p> <p>The data base has no information on the fish that is destined to local and regional markets such as data on: boat owners by gender, and gender segregated data for fish mongers, fishers as well as processors, handlers, traders which would be of interest to majority of women in fisheries.</p>

Annex 5: Persons Consulted During Evaluation Mission

ICEIDA

1. Mr Gisli Palsson – ICEIDA Country Director
2. Mr. Arni Helgi Helgason - ICEIDA Programmes Director
3. Mr. James Sekatawa, QAFMP Project Manager
4. Ms. Maria Nandago, ICEDIA Senior Programme officer
5. QAFMP Project Engineer
6. Mr. Ben Twikirize – ICEIDA Senior Project Officer (M&E)

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES RESOURCES

1. Mr. Jackson Wandaya, Acting Commissioner Fisheries (CF)
2. Mr. Alfred Akankwasa, Project Coordinator (PMU)
3. Dr. John Bosco Ahimbisibwe, Senior Fisheries Inspector
4. Mr Paul Omanyi, Senior Fisheries Inspector Officer
5. Dr. Rhoda Tumwebaze, Assistant Commissioner

MINISTRY OF FINANCE PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1. Ms Gorretti Kajumba Imikit, Agriculture Desk Officer
2. Ms Teddy Alako, Assistant Agriculture Desk Office

DISTRICTS

HOIMA

1. Mr. Kajara Leonard (Deputy CAO)
2. Dr. Kajura Charles (District Production Officer)
3. Mr. Mwesigwa James (District Fisheries Officer)
4. Mr. Byaruhanga Godfrey Fisheries Officer and ToT
5. Mr. Juma Basemera – Fisheries Junior staff
6. Mr. Clever Oringi -Vice Chairman Mbegu BMU
7. Mr. Akugizibwe Wilson – Mbegu BMU Committee Member
8. Mr. Johnson Lutaro Mbegu BMU facilitate
9. Mr. Thomas Ocoki – Mbegu BMU facilitator
10. Mr. Emmanuel Tekwo - Kiryamboga BMU facilitator
11. Mr. Gilbert Mpeirwe – Chairman Kiryamboga BMU
12. Mr. Samuel Victor – Former Chairman Kiryamboga BMU

BULIISA

1. Mr. Businge Moses (LC V Vice Chairman)
2. Mr. Philip Ngongaha Kutegeka (DFO)
3. Ms Madina Namwaya FAL facilitator Wanseko BMU
4. Mr. Julius Kiiza – Chairman Wanseko BMU
5. Mr. Nibert Tumusiime – Vice Chairman Wanseko BMU
6. Mr. Jesper Godgrey – Committee member Wanseko BMU

NEBBI

7. Mr. Ahimbisibwe Nathan (Assistant CAO)
8. Mr. Nyakuni Leonard (DFO)
9. Mr. Peter Komakech (FO-Pakwach Subcounty)
10. Mr. Alfred Ngyerto - FAL facilitator Panyimur Abok BMU
11. Mr. Faustin Anyang – Fisheries Officer
12. Mr. Philliams Opio – Chairman Panyumur Abok BMU
13. Mr. Charles Oketi Wengi – FAL facilitator Panyimur Abok BMU
14. Mr. James Atyeko – Panyimur Abok BMU Committee member
15. Mr. Justine Opentho – Panyimur Abok BMU Committee member
16. NAKASONGOLA DISTRICT
17. Mr. David Nsamba - DFO and Ag Production Coordinator
18. Mr. Mark Tivu - Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
19. Mr. Khalid Amaku – BMU Chairman at Kibuye Landing site
20. Mr. Leonard Sedinda – Kibuye BMU information Secretary
21. Mr. Johnson Murinde – General Secretary for BMU and FAL facilitator
22. Ben Bosco – FAL facilitator and Former MBU Committee member
23. Mr. George Amoru – Former BMU Committee member

APAC DISTRICT

1. Mr. Winfred Mega – DFO
2. Dr. Ongu James – District Production Coordinator
3. Mr. Basil Okello – District Secretary for Production
4. Mr. Andrew Leru – Chief Administrative Officer
5. Mr. Herbert Ogwal – District BMU Charman
6. Mr. James Obira – Assistant Fisheries Officer (Akokoro subcounty) also in charge of Kayei Landing site
7. Mr. David Zairo Chairman Kayei BMU
8. Mr. William Ogowor – FAL BMU facilitator at Kayei
9. Mr. Moses Obote – Committee member for Kayei BMU/in coming Chairman for MBU
10. Ms. Jane Abak – BMU member at Kayei

AMOLATOR DISTRICT

1. Mr. Otunga Anthony District Fisheries Officer
2. Mr. Michael Ayangau Okwi - Assistant Fisheries Officer
3. Ms. Catherine Owor – Ag. District Community Development Officer
4. Mr. Denis Ojok – Principal Assistant Secretary (rep of the CAO)
5. Mr. Peter Orebe – Chairman Manyanga – Bangladesh BMU
6. Mr. Thomas Okello – FAL Facilitator Musoma – Bangladesh BMU
7. Mr. Tonny Odur – FAL facilitator for Musoma- Bangladesh
8. Mr. Frank Salongo Kizito – Committee Member Musoma BMU
9. Mr. Richard Obonyo – Committee Member Musoma BMU
10. Mr. Bonny Onyango – Committee Member Musoma BMU

SERERE DISTRICT

1. Mr. Ochengere Ismael - Chief Administrative officer
2. Ms. Atim Christine – Assistant Fisheries Officer
3. Mr. Achibu Ekwilu J.P – District Fisheries Officer

4. Mr. Ssali Michael – Site Engineer (Lokika Enterprises Ltd hired to construct landing facility)
 5. Mr. Tenya Asuman – Ag. GISO Labori Subcounty
 6. Mr. Okirya Robert – Chairman BMU Mugarara, in Aaraapoo parish, Labori subcounty
 7. Mr. John Joseph Otim – LC III Chairman Labori Subcounty
 8. Mr. Etiu John Moses - Secretary for Finance Labori Subcounty
 9. Mr. Ogabe Daniel - Aaraapoo Parish Chief
 10. Mr. Mohammad Kakonge – LC I Chairman Mugarama A Village
 11. Mr. Milton Onyamen – BMU chairman in Labori subcounty
 12. Mr. Emmanuel Elocu BMU Committee Member Mugarama BMU
 13. Mr. John Engwau – Secretary Mugarama BMU
- Mr. Ibanda Jaffery – BMU data collector/FAL facilitator
 Mr. Donald Ogwang – Former Chairman Mugarama BMU
 Mr. Robert Otidu – General secretary LCIII Labori Subcounty
 Mr. Okwi Simon – Chairman Kagwara BMU at Kagwara landing site, Kadunguru subcounty, Kasiro County

BUYENDE DISTRICT

1. Mr. John Muwadi - District Fisheries Officer
2. Mr. Francis Waiswa – Community Development Officer (Project trained T.o.T)
3. Dr. Fredrick Kaggwa – Ag. District Production Coordinator
4. Mr. Richard Warubi – Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
5. Ms. Florence Namalili – District Secretary for Production
6. Mr. Anthony Mzee – Chairman LC I Iyingo Landing site/village
7. Mr. Gerald Mutalya – Chairman Iyingo BMU
8. Mr. Sande Muwonge – Committee Member Iyingo BMU
9. Mr. Moses Namala – Treasurer Iyingo BMU
10. Mr. Robert Batwawula – LC I Kasozi Village
11. Mr. Joseph Gabale – Committee Member Iyingo BMU
12. Mr. Joram Oerien – Assistant Fisheries Officer Kagulu Sub county
13. Mr. Michael Waiswa Alire – Councilor Kagulu Subcounty
14. Mr. Michael Naku – Committee member Iyingo BMU
15. Mr. Moses Ngobi – Committee Member Iyingo BMU

NTOROKO DISTRICT

1. Mr. Selevester Kizza – Deputy Chief administrative officer
2. Mr. Zephania Kule – Assistant Fisheries Officer
3. Dr. Tadeo Barwogeza, District NAADs Coordinator
4. Mr. Timothy Kyamanywa – LC V Chairman
5. Mr. Justus Musoke – Vice Chairman LC V
6. Mr. Herbert Kamuhanda – District Environment Officer
7. Mr. Eric Kiiza – District Fisheries Officer
8. Mr. Ivan Busobozi – Community Development Officer Ntoroko Subcounty
9. Mr. Adolf Kahuma – District Engineer
10. Mr. David Kor – BMU Charman Ntoroko-Kanala
11. Ms. Margaret Komuntale – Committee Member Ntoroko-Kanala BMU
12. Mr. Friday Chotum – FAL Facilitator Ntoroko-Kanala BMU