
COMMUNITY-LED COASTAL MANAGEMENT IN THE GULF OF MOTTOMA PROJECT

Management Response to Mid-term Review conducted in December 2016

Evaluation commissioned by	Steering Committee of the CLCMGoMP
Evaluators	Zau Lunn, Victoria Garcia
Response prepared by	Peter Schmidt
Place and Date	Yangon, 28. February 2017
File Name	170228 clcmgomp mr to mtr

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. General appreciation of the review	2
3. Discussion of recommendations.....	3
3.1. Recommendations related to strategic orientation and leadership	3
3.2. Recommendations referring to Project Structure	5

1. Introduction

The Steering Committee of the Community-led Coastal Management of the Gulf of Mottoma Project (CLCMGoMP) mandated in November 2016 the consultant Mr. Zau Lunn and Mrs. Victoria Garcia to conduct an ‘early’ process focused mid-term review (MTR), originally planned for 2017. The review report was acknowledged and discussed at the Steering Committee Meeting held on January 13th, 2017. The implementing consortium Helvetas, IUCN and NAG was requested to prepare a Management Response to the MTR.

A “Management Response is a brief document. It limits itself to a few of the most pertinent issues and gives a strategic orientation for the future. Typically it has the following content:

- *General appreciation of the review and of the correctness and usefulness of the results.*
- *Definite statements of acceptance or rejection of the report as such, and its specific conclusions and recommendations. In the case of recommendations that are rejected or will be implemented later, it is necessary to explain the reasons why.*
- *Decisions and corrective measures with assigned responsibilities. Whenever possible, a timetable for the implementation is added.”* (Source: PCMi, NADEL/SDC, Module 5).

2. General appreciation of the review

The Consortium considers the MTR overall as having been a timely exercise with useful results, in particular with regard to management related matters.

The MTR team has been asked to focus on 1) strategy and impact logic, 2) the cooperation of the consortium partners and 3) whether the project is on track to reach its impact and objectives. While the review covers the first two aspects well the Consortium would have appreciated to see more reflections on the context and challenging livelihood situations with regard to the third focus area.

The MTR rightly highlighted areas of improvement when it comes to the conceptual and shared understanding of the project (“brain”) and a common vision of the project (“spirit”).

The MTR makes three key observations:

1. Lack of a shared vision
2. Lack of a Theory of Change
3. Lack of coordination among the three Outcomes respectively responsible organisations for the three Outcomes.

While the Consortium shares this view (fully for point 1 and 3, partially for point 2), the Consortium is of the opinion that the MTR rather describes symptoms than causes. The review does not sufficiently

reflect on the project design. In the view of the Consortium, the project is highly complex in its design and ambitions. The review also does not discuss the process, which contributed to the equally complex organisational set-up of the project. Sometimes it is the bidding process with all its merits that stimulates fairly diverse organisations to form a consortium. This can be in the long run rewarding. In the short run it means that different views and experiences meet and need to be united towards a common goal. In the CLCMGoMP development and research worlds are united, the conservationists' and livelihood development perspectives meet and international organisations are brought together with local NGO under one umbrella. To unite the representatives of these world views to work towards one common objective requires first of all time and secondly personal interaction. Perhaps the MTR did not sufficiently acknowledge that the Main Phase I just lasted a bit more than a year (including a complete change of region/state government officials in May 2016) at the moment of the review, and that perhaps other collaboration modalities would have better leveraged the partners' areas of contribution and expertise in such a diverse and complex project context and framework.

3. Discussion of recommendations

The Consortium faces difficulties to fully grasp the logic of two extensive sets of recommendations. Anyhow, the tables below provide the Consortium's response to the provided recommendations.

3.1. Recommendations related to strategic orientation and leadership

Recommendation A	To hire a Project Director or Strategic Coordinator and Leader ensuring strategic coordination and leadership: the "brain" and "spirit" of the project	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	Decision in the Steering Committee in January 2017 to hire a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA)		
Follow-up actions	Recruitment as soon as possible		
Deadline	Advertisement launched in January 2017	Responsibility	Helvetas

Recommendation B	Organizational workshop among partners for project cohesion	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	This is ongoing and the level of interaction increased in 2017. A key moment in this respect is the participatory planning process for Phase II.		
Follow-up actions	Design planning process for Phase II, hire a lead consultant		
Deadline	Ongoing and Planning Phase II in September 2017	Responsibility	Project Manager (PM), CTA, Helvetas

Recommendation C	Strategic workshop among Consortium partners and stakeholders to clarify the Coastal/Ramsar Management plans	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	The intention of the recommendation is accepted. But the action is preferably combined with recommendation B. All three partners were represented and contribute to the second consultation for the GOM management plan that IUCN is coordinating. The management plan will integrate results from all three outcomes.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline		Responsibility	

Recommendation D	Strategic Feedback mechanism	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	The consortium fails to understand this recommendation.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline		Responsibility	

Recommendation E	The Organizational workshop among partners for project cohesion	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	The consortium is of the opinion that this is the same as recommendation B (and C)		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline		Responsibility	

Recommendation F	Strengthening Governance process (at VDC level)	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	This is anyhow ongoing. The respective activities are integrated in the Yearly Plan of Operation.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline	Ongoing	Responsibility	PM

Recommendation G	Assure that communication strategy is maximize	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no Partially
Discussion	There are two levels of communication, internal and external; the process is ongoing with internal and external training, workshops and activities organized.		
Follow-up actions	Ensure audience appropriate information and resource materials are available in different formats related to the project, and specific 'advocacy' topics such as small scale fisher rights; illegal fishing; Ramsar; NRM; access to services and pro-poor credit options etc.		
Deadline	Ongoing	Responsibility	Based on Outcome; project PM and Communication Officer coordinate/consolidate;

Recommendation H	Assure that manuals and guidelines are strategically designed	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	The consortium is of the opinion that manuals and guidelines "are strategically designed by senior management partners and validated with project team and if necessary with other stakeholders". In this sense the Consortium agrees to the recommendation but does not see need for acting differently.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline		Responsibility	

Recommendation I	Year Operation Plan (YOP): revise activities, assure flexibility, include capacity building	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	The consortium believes that the Yearly Plan of Operation is used to revise activities, provides sufficient flexibility and includes capacity building for project staff.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline	Ongoing	Responsibility	PM

3.2. Recommendations referring to Project Structure

Recommendation A	IUCN senior manager should be in country	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
------------------	--	----------	---

Discussion	The Steering Committee in January 2017 decided to place a 50% International Ramsar Advisor based in Mawlamyine in the project.		
Follow-up actions	The Advisor has already been identified, terms of references have been finalized and a consultancy contract prepared to quickly bring person on board.		
Deadline	February 2017	Responsibility	IUCN
Recommendation B	The participation of BANCA should be revised	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	The Steering Committee decided to invite BANCA as a “permanent Invitee” to its meetings. A staff retreat including BANCA representatives took already place in February 2017. IUCN has extended BANCA’s contract to continue a range of Ramsar-related field activities in 2017.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline	February 2017	Responsibility	Helvetas, IUCN, PM
Recommendation C	Finalize the Theory of Change (ToC)	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no Partially
Discussion	Theory of change has already been elaborated and introduced during the inception and early on in the Main Phase 1		
Follow-up actions	Ensure cohesive awareness and understanding among project team and partners/ stakeholders, especially in case these are new. To this end a staff retreat took place already in February 2017.		
Deadline	Ongoing	Responsibility	PM and Consortium
Recommendation D	Support the development of the Communication Strategy	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	This is in the consortium’s perception the same as recommendation G in the first set of recommendations.		
Follow-up actions			
Deadline		Responsibility	
Recommendation E	Coordination guidelines should be elaborated	Accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Discussion	This is in the consortium’s perception the same as recommendation H in the first set of recommendations		
Follow-up actions			

Deadline		Responsibility	
----------	--	----------------	--

Recommendation	Workshop to Analyse the Management at PIU level	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
----------------	---	----------	---

Discussion	This will be an early task for the to be recruited CTA.		
------------	---	--	--

Follow-up actions			
-------------------	--	--	--

Deadline	July 2017	Responsibility	CTA / PM
----------	-----------	----------------	----------

Recommendation	Capacity building of project staff	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
----------------	------------------------------------	----------	---

Discussion	Capacity building of staff is an ongoing matter integrated into the human resources management processes of the Consortium partners (annual staff appraisal, joint identification of capacity building measures, team retreats, thematic workshops etc.). The CTA will have a coaching role not only for the PM but for the whole local team.		
------------	---	--	--

Follow-up actions			
-------------------	--	--	--

Deadline	Ongoing	Responsibility	Consortium partners, CTA / PM
----------	---------	----------------	-------------------------------

Recommendation H	Building capacities of Government	Accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes / <input type="checkbox"/> no
------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	---

Discussion	This is an integral part of the entire project approach		
------------	---	--	--

Follow-up actions			
-------------------	--	--	--

Deadline	Ongoing	Responsibility	PM
----------	---------	----------------	----