

# Review of mid-term evaluation of FIFG 2000-2006

Presentation at

« Steering Towards 2007-2103: What  
Financial Support for the Common  
Fisheries policy and Coastal Zone  
Development »

27-29 May 2004 – Bundoran, Co. Donegal  
Ireland

# Structure of presentation

- ❑ Introduction
- ❑ Financial progress of FIFG-financed programs
- ❑ Use of the FIFG funds – key observations
- ❑ Outputs, results and impacts of FIFG-funded programmes
- ❑ Programme management
- ❑ Efficiency of the measures
- ❑ Horizontal objectives
- ❑ Key recommendations

# Introduction

- ❑ London Economics commissioned to undertake review of mid-term evaluations of FIFG 2000-2006.
- ❑ Individual quality assessment of mid-term evaluation and synthesis of findings
- ❑ Altogether, 49 mid-term evaluations were reviewed

# Financial progress of FIFG-financed programs

## □ Out of 49 programs:

- Only 9 rated as good - meeting or exceeding financial targets
- 8 are somewhat behind target – significant amount of activity occurred but programme did not meet financial target
- 25 are well behind target – only a limited volume of activity occurred
- 7 are problematic – very low level of activity, if any

## □ Generally spending much further behind target than commitments

# Financial progress of FIFG-financed programs

## □ Administrative reasons

- Delayed start
- Problems with availability of national/regional co-financing
- Inconsistency between program and fishery characteristics
- Lengthy and complex administrative procedures
- Lack of promotion among stakeholders

## □ Systemic reasons

- Weak financial state of sector
- Declining natural resources and uncertain future
- Fragmented industry

# Use of FIFG funds – key observations

- ❑ Fishing fleet renewal and modernisation –take-up varies
- ❑ Aquaculture – low take-up, some exceptions
- ❑ Processing and marketing – generally low take-up but again exceptions
- ❑ Fishing ports facilities – take-up varies, appears to depend on capacity of local authorities
- ❑ Cross-cutting, sector wide-activities – very low take up
- ❑ Technical assistance – generally high take-up rate

# Outputs, results and impacts of EIFG-funded programmes

- ❑ Mid-term evaluations focus primarily on outputs – very little details on programme results and impacts
- ❑ Even output information is too limited to draw firm conclusions
- ❑ But, number of cases noted deficient data collection and monitoring
- ❑ Also, in a number of cases, suggestions for more relevant indicators

# Programme management

- ❑ In general, programme management is viewed as efficient and effective
- ❑ But, in a number of cases, programmes could benefit from strengthening of administration (capacity and/or resources)
- ❑ Also, in a number of cases, programmes are very bureaucratic and/or project and payments cycles are very long

# Efficiency of the FIFG-funded measures

- ❑ Very few mid-term evaluations address efficiency of measures – programmes are too young
- ❑ Moreover, those that do suffer from lack of proper benchmarks and comparable cross-country information
- ❑ Also, two views of efficiency:
  - Standard: cost per expected result or impact
  - Alternative: cost of administration of programme

# Horizontal objectives

## ❑ Sustainable development

- Many mid-term evaluations note tensions between various FIG objectives (for example, adjustment of fishing effort vs. fleet renewal and modernisation)
- No clear overall conclusions emerge so far

## ❑ Equal opportunity

- No significant contribution – marginal positive impact of some measures

## ❑ Social inclusion and rural development

- Only very rarely addressed

# Key recommendations

- ❑ **Better promotion to boost take-up**
  - Assumes that demand exists, is doubtful in some cases
- ❑ **Address administrative impediments**
  - Simplification and shortening of project approval cycle, acceleration of payments procedures
- ❑ **Improvements to data collection and monitoring systems**
- ❑ **Strengthening of administrative management of programs**

# Key recommendations

- ❑ Better support of potential project sponsors through technical assistance
- ❑ Re-allocations of funds away from low take-up measures