



FFA

FORUM FISHERIES COMMITTEE

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH MEETING

Virtual

29 October 2021

Agenda Item:	6
Paper Number:	<i>FFC120-WP.04A Supplementary Paper</i>
Title:	Review of Country Service Level Agreements

Members will be aware of the CSLA Review Workshop held on 12 October 2021 at which members discussed issues identified as a result of an internal review conducted by the FFA Secretariat. The paper also included proposals for addressing the issues.

The Outcomes from the Workshop is attached as **Part 1** to this paper where members raised the following in discussions:

- Genuine partnership was essential to ensure a successful arrangement. Some agreed to change the title of the document to reflect that and others suggested that this was not necessary;
- Member's priorities/tasks needed to be aligned to national and regional strategic plans (including the FFA Strategic Plan and Business Plan) and reflected in the CSLAs;
- Noting the need to reduce the administrative burden, there was support for the development of an interactive tool to assist with the efficient development and biannual review of CSLAs;
- Clear M&E and Review processes was required to ensure the CSLAs continuous monitoring and progress;
- Support for broadening out the tasks to include all offshore fisheries priorities;
- On the duration of the CSLA, some suggested that it was not necessary to include a duration and others suggested that there is a 3-year duration;
- Agreement that Heads of Fisheries and an alternate be assigned as contact persons;
- Post-missions reports (following in-country work) needed to be circulated to respective members;
- CSLAs be signed-off by the Head of Fisheries rather than the Minister;
- Attachment A be an Implementation Plan with clear timeframes and resourcing requirements (including dedicated support at national and Secretariat levels); and
- Suggestion that the Status of CSLAs be a standing item at the FFC meeting.

As a result, the Secretariat has drawn up a Revised CSLA template (**Part 2**) with accompanying explanatory notes for consideration of Members.

Recommendations:

The Committee is invited to:

- i. **note** the Outcomes from the CSLA Review Workshop held on 12 October 2021 (Part 1); and

- ii. consider and **approve** the proposed revisions in the Revised CSLA template (Part 2).

Part I: CSLA Review Workshop Outcomes

CSLA Review Workshop

12 October 2021

Outcomes

1. Representatives from Australia, the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and the PNA Office met online on 12 October 2021 for the CSLA Review Workshop. Staff from the FFA Secretariat provided support to the meeting. The list of participants is appended as **Attachment A**.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

2. Tonga offered an opening prayer.
3. FFC Chair (DPS for Ministry of Fisheries Fiji, Ms Atelaite Rokosuka) opened the meeting and welcomed participants. She noted the importance of the CSLA process in ensuring that national priorities continue to be the driving force behind the work of the FFA. The Strategic Plan 2020-2025 advises of the need to reform the CSLA process to ensure it is strategic and useful.
4. DG thanked members for their participation and provided an overview of the Agenda (**Attachment B**).

Agenda Item 2: CSLA Review

5. In a brief overview, DG advised that the CSLA is a key planning tool that is part of the FFA cyclical process implementing the FFA Strategic Plan. A key outcome of the review is to ensure that the CSLA (or its successor) is fit for purpose, valuable and strategic for both members and the Secretariat. It is imperative that it best serves Members' needs. As it has always been intended, the CSLA is meant to be a partnership with member and Secretariat ownership. To ensure that the CSLA does not sit in isolation from members and the FFAs strategic plans, it is imperative that the linkages between national priorities and the FFA Strategic Plan are specified into the CSLA.
6. The Secretariat presented the CSLA Review paper highlighting that CSLAs resulted from an FFA Independent Review carried out in 2010. The development of CSLAs commenced in 2011 with 14 Members having signed CSLAs. However these have been largely sidelined as a planning document. In recent times, Members have raised at various FFC meetings that there is a need to reform the CSLA process. This is also noted in the FFA Strategic Plan which advised that the CSLA be

reformed to make it more strategic and useful. As a result of an internal review undertaken by the Secretariat, challenges and issues identified included the following:

- In order to elevate the CSLA relationship it is suggested that CSLAs be renamed as “Partnership Agreements”.
- To make it a more strategic document by linking the priorities and tasks to the national and regional strategic planning documents.
- Furthermore it was proposed that one Secretariat staff be assigned as the FFA contact person. At Member level, this is assigned to the Head of Fisheries and an Alternate. This will ensure the Head of Fisheries has oversight and the Alternate to monitor progress.
- To ease the administrative burden, it was proposed that an interactive tool be developed which will assist with the efficient development and review of CSLAs.
- In the absence of an M&E framework, it was proposed that this be developed and linked to the FFA MERLA process.
- It was recognised that there was no formal review mechanism and it is proposed that there be an annual review at the start of the year with a mid year review to enable tracking progress.
- It was proposed that CSLAs not have an expiry date noting that it was a living document as a key planning tool to ensure national priorities are incorporated into the FFA Sec planning processes.

7. The Chair reiterated the important role that each member plays in the process in terms of aligning and ensuring national priorities are the driving force for the work of FFA.

Agenda Item 3: Group Discussion Session 1-Making the CSLA more strategic

Task: Discuss how to make the CSLAs more valuable to members eg. what tasks should be included, how can these be kept relevant, how to make it more strategic etc

8. The following were noted in the Session 1 Group discussions (refer **Attachment C** for reports from the Group discussions):

- The groups agreed with the need to align the member’s priorities/tasks to national and regional strategic plans (including the FFA Strategic Plan and Business Plan). In this way the CSLAs are objective driven rather than task driven;
- There was general agreement with the need for genuine partnership to ensure a successful arrangement however a few members advised that there was no need to change the title of the document;
- Participants noted the need for the CSLAs to include details on resourcing requirements
- The groups discussed the need to reduce the administrative burden and supported the development of an interactive tool to assist with the efficient development and review of CSLAs.

- They noted the need for clear M&E and Review processes to ensure the CSLAs continued progress
- Two groups advised of their support for broadening out the tasks to include all offshore fisheries priorities.
- One group noted the need for realistic priorities to be included and suggested 2-3 priorities per section (Management, MCS etc) be specified to ensure they are achievable.

Agenda Item 4: Group Discussion Session 2-Improving the CSLA template

Task: Review the CSLA template areas of improvement eg. Document title, Duration, Contact persons, Review process etc

9. The following additional matters were noted in the group discussions:

- Duration: A few groups talked about having a 3 year agreement with some suggestions on this being flexible to mirror national planning or the FFA Strategic Plan timeframe;
- Contact persons: There was agreement that for members the Head of Fisheries and an alternate be assigned as contact persons. Two groups advised of the need for a team from the Secretariat (one representative from each Division) to be the FFA contact persons.
- Post missions reports (following in-country work) needs to be circulated to respective members;
- There was agreement with having a clear M&E process with the associated review processes to ensure the continued progress of CSLAs. There was also support voiced for the proposed biannual review process;
- There was general agreement that the CSLAs be signed-off by the Head of Fisheries rather than the minister;
- It was proposed that Attachment A be an Implementation Plan with clear timeframes and resourcing requirements;
- There was a suggestion that the Status of CSLAs be a standing item at the FFC meeting

10. In general discussion, members reiterated the need for resourcing requirements to be specified in CSLAs. They also noted the need to ensure integration of the CSLA into the FFA planning and budgeting processes. Reporting on national level expenditures will be useful for members to also inform donor funding reports.

Agenda Item 5: Wrap-Up and Next Steps

11. DG thanked delegates for their contributions and in her Wrap Up noted the following key points raised at the Workshop including:

- The development of the IT interactive tool which will assist in the development, review and monitoring of impacts;

- CSLAs will continued to be the driver of what members priorities are and will be an integral part of planning cycle;
- The need for resourcing requirement details to be reflected in the CSLAs
- Sign-off being at DG and Head of Fisheries levels
- There were mixed feedback on the need to change the title of the CSLA and can continue to be discussed
- There was also mixed feedback on the duration with some agreeing to an indefinite period and some to a fixed term.
- It was noted that Attachment A be changed to an Implementation Plan with timelines, by whom and associated budget

12. She advised that following the meeting, the Secretariat will distribute a draft Outcomes Paper for participants to consider. Once finalised this will be provided to FFC for consideration along with a revised draft CSLA template that the Secretariat will develop incorporating the feedback from this Workshop.

13. She thanked members for their valuable feedback and looked forward to a successful partnership required to ensure the success of the CSLA process.

Agenda Item 6: Close of meeting

14. The Chair in closing thanked members for the valuable feedback provided on this important planning tool. She also thanked the Secretariat for continuing its pursuit of making the FFA a more effective and efficient organization. She looked forward to a reformed CSLA process that is fit for purpose, of added value and strategic.

Attachment A: List of Participants

AUSTRALIA

David	Power	1davidpower@gmail.com
-------	-------	-----------------------

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Naiten Bradley	Phillip Jr	bradley.phillip@norma.fm
----------------	------------	--------------------------

Youky	Susaia	Youky.susaia@norma.fm
-------	--------	-----------------------

FIJI

Atelaite	Rokosuka	avuibureta@gmail.com
----------	----------	----------------------

Jone	Amoe	amoe.jone@gmail.com
------	------	---------------------

Leba	Dranivesi	dranivesi.leba@gmail.com
------	-----------	--------------------------

Netani	Tavaga	tavaga.netani@gmail.com
--------	--------	-------------------------

Jyanti	Singh	singhjyanti13@gmail.com
--------	-------	-------------------------

Raijeli	Natadra	natadra1.raijeli@gmail.com
---------	---------	----------------------------

Shelvin	Chand	chand13.shelvin@gmail.com
---------	-------	---------------------------

Neomai	Ravitu	neomai.ravitu@govnet.gov.fj
--------	--------	-----------------------------

Epeli	Maisema	epelimaisema@gmail.com
-------	---------	------------------------

KIRIBATI

Norman	Kobure	koburen@mfmrd.gov.ki
--------	--------	----------------------

REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS

Berry	Muller	bmuller@mimra.com
-------	--------	-------------------

Laurence	Edwards	ledwards@mimra.com
----------	---------	--------------------

NAURU

Camalus	Reiyetsi	camalus.reiyetsi@gmail.com
---------	----------	----------------------------

Jasmina	Jones	jasminagiouba@gmail.com
---------	-------	-------------------------

Julian	Itsimaera	julian.itsimaera2016@gmail.com
--------	-----------	--------------------------------

NEW ZEALAND

Sarah	McAvinchey	sarah.mcavinchey@mfat.govt.nz
-------	------------	-------------------------------

NIUE

Josie	Tamate	josie.tamate@mail.gov.nu
-------	--------	--------------------------

PALAU

Kathleen	Sisior	utau.sisior@gmail.com
----------	--------	-----------------------

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Jerome	Tioti	jerome.tioti@gmail.com
--------	-------	------------------------

Josephine	Bade	joey.bade@gmail.com
-----------	------	---------------------

SAMOA

Magele Etuati	Ropeti	magele.ropeti@maf.gov.ws
---------------	--------	--------------------------

Desna	Solofa	desna@mfat.gov.ws
-------	--------	-------------------

Ueta	Faasili	ueta.faasili@maf.gov.ws
------	---------	-------------------------

Serafina	Ah Fook	serafina.ahfook@maf.gov.ws
----------	---------	----------------------------

Dorothy	Anetone	dorothy Janetone@mfat.gov.ws
---------	---------	------------------------------

TOKELAU

Feleti	Tulafono	ftulafono@gmail.com
--------	----------	---------------------

Stan	Crothers	stan.crothers@gmail.com
------	----------	-------------------------

Lesley	Gould	lesleykgould@gmail.com
--------	-------	------------------------

TONGA

Tuikolongahau	Halafihi	supi64t@gmail.com
---------------	----------	-------------------

Siolaá	Malimali	siolaamalimali@gmail.com
--------	----------	--------------------------

Mele	Atuekaho	meletoaatuekaho@gmail.com
------	----------	---------------------------

Pelalina	Faletau	pelalina.falatau@tongafish.gov.to
----------	---------	-----------------------------------

TUVALU

Michael	Batty	michaelb@tuvalufisheries.tv
---------	-------	-----------------------------

VANUATU

William	Naviti	wnaviti@vanuatu.gov.vu
---------	--------	------------------------

Garry	Preston	preston.garry@gmail.com
-------	---------	-------------------------

Christopher	Arthur	carthur@vanuatu.gov.vu
-------------	--------	------------------------

PNAO

Aketa	Taanga	aketa@pnatuna.com
-------	--------	-------------------

FFA

Manumatavai	Tupou-Roosen	manu.tupou-roosen@ffa.int
Matthew	Hooper	matt.hooper@ffa.int
Allan	Rahari	allan.rahari@ffa.int
Wetjens	Dimmlich	wetjens.dimmlich@ffa.int
Mesake	Nawari	mesake.nawari@ffa.int
Pio	Manoa	pio.manoa@ffa.int
Penny	Matautia	penny.matautia@ffa.int
Tony	Sullivan	tony.sullivan@ffa.int
Samantha	Mattila	samantha.mattila@ffa.int
Jacob	Raubani	jason.raubani@ffa.int
Philip	Lens	philip.lens@ffa.int
Patricia	Sachs-Cornish	patricia.sachs-cornish@ffa.int
Damian	Johnson	Damian.johnson@ffa.int
'Ana F.	Taholo	ana.taholo@ffa.int
Tevita	Tupou	tevita.tupou@ffa.int

Attachment B

CSLA Review Workshop, 12 October 2021

Time: 1300-1530hrs

Provisional Agenda-rev1

Program	Tentative time
1. Welcome and Introduction	1300-1305
2. CSLA Review (refer Att 2)	1305-1325
3. Group Discussion Session 1: Making the CSLA more strategic <i>Task: Discuss how to make the CSLAs more valuable to members eg. what tasks should be included, how can these be kept relevant, how to make it more strategic etc</i> Group report and discussion	1325-1355 1355-1415
4. Group Discussion Session 2: CSLA template <i>Task: Review the CSLA template areas of improvement eg. Document title, Duration, Contact persons, Review process etc</i> Group report and discussion	1415-1445 1445-1505
5. Wrap-Up and Next Steps	1505-1525
6. Close of meeting	1525-1530

Attachment C: Breakout Session Records

Group Discussion Session 1: Discuss how to make the CSLAs more valuable to members eg. what tasks should be included, how can these be kept relevant, how to make it more strategic etc			
Group 1: Fiji, Australia, Palau, Kiribati ● Implementation issues at national level often deters the progress of CSLAs. This due to the size of administrations so reducing the administrative burden was important. There was agreement on developing an interactive tool to reduce the admin burden. ● Agree with having two contact persons at national level. Head of Fisheries to have oversight with a 2nd person to monitor progress. ● Agree with the partnership approach ● Regular review process to ensure progress.	Group 2: Fiji, NZ, Niue, RMI, Tokelau, Samoa, Vanuatu ● CSLA needs to be operational but also high level. Therefore important to link to national, subregional and regional strategies ● CSLA has potential to strengthen relationship with FFA and members ● Do not consider CSLA as a partnership agreement. As a member of the FFA, already in partnership with FFA under the convention ● CSLA needs resourcing details specified ● Agree with the Head of Fisheries and alternate as contact persons.	Group 3: Tokelau, Fiji, FSM, PNG, Tonga ● There was a split with some members agreeing with the change in name and others not. An option mentioned is to keep these as CSLAs with the two way engagement captured in the agreement. ● Need to be aligned to national and regional strategies including the FFA Strategic Plan and Business Plan. Need to look at this on a programme level - what are the priorities for Countries, identify those priorities upfront, plan for delivery, including associated budget. ● It needs to be objective driven (rather than task	Group 4: Samoa, Fiji, Tuvalu, Nauru, Tokelau, NZ ● Important to ensure less burden especially for smaller admins, ● Need for regular review due to dynamic fisheries environment ● Account for the COVID environment ● Need for clear linkage to Strategic Plans ● Need for details on resourcing requirements ● Should be objective driven ● Need for clear contact persons at the Secretariat and support having a team with a representative from each Division to ensure ease of followup.

• There was some agreement with broadening and expanding the focus on all offshore fisheries-related Member priorities/needs. • Agree with the need for developing a dedicated M & E process. The interactive tool will also assist with the efficiency of the M&E processes. • There was support for CSLAs having no expiry date. This to ensure it is a living document that takes account of the changing fisheries environment.	• Should be flexible to allow for the Minister or Head of Fisheries to sign CSLAs. • Agree to broadening out priorities to offshore fisheries • CSLA needs to be integrated into the planning and budgeting process. • Duration - may need to align with FFA strategic plan duration	oriented) and align to national priorities. Also build in the idea of development. • Useful to have individual's identified within the FFA Sec and Member Countries for CSLAs so that administrations can be directed to the right people more quickly and easily, and so that engagement for the FFA Sec improves (i.e. more responsive communication both ways).	
Group Discussion Session 2: Review the CSLA template areas of improvement eg. Document title, Duration, Contact persons, Review process etc			
Group 1: Fiji, Australia, Palau, Kiribati • Suggestion to include an additional column to the tables in attachment A to indicate timelines. This will allow better clarity and	Group 2: Fiji, NZ, Niue, RMI, Tokelau, Samoa, Vanuatu • Title- need to continue as Service level agreement • Duration- three years but reviewed and updated annually. The results of the annual review should feed	Group 3: Tokelau, Fiji, FSM, PNG, Tonga • Title: Issue with the concept of 'partnership'. How FFA Sec would be a partner in delivering. Still see engagement as necessary and need to better	Group 4: Samoa, Fiji, Tuvalu, Nauru, Tokelau, NZ • Change name to Country Partnership Framework since it is not binding: Emphasis has been on partnership - as countries determine their priorities

coordination across different support agencies. • The Annex be changed to an Implementation Plan. • Support for post-mission reports to be shared with the member concerned and also be incorporated into the M&E process. • There was agreement with having a clear M&E process with the associated review processes to ensure the continued progress of CSLAs • There was also support for the proposed biannual review process.	into the FFA budget and planning process • Contact person- remains at officials level (Head of Fisheries) and an alternate person at the national level • Review process: • M&E to focus on impacts to members, • How this is linked to the accountability process and • Resourcing: • to identify resources to support implementation of members priorities • Need dedicated person at the national level to follow up as well as dedicated person at FFA • IT tool- if this tool can also gather information on institutional knowledge to address staff turnovers and need for continuity. • Want to see the idea to explore the option of building M&E into the IT tool	understand how the template will be used and fed in FFA processes. • Contact: Head of Fisheries as 'main' contact but nominated second as the first point of contact. Mirror at FFA Secretariat with DG as main and then a responsible staff member. • Duration: 3 year might work better for planning, different times might be better for different members, could be one item open for individual agreement to align with own internal planning cycles. • Review: Also allow the periodic adjustment also subject to available resources as well as to changes in prioritisation of issues. • Change review requirements to a more formal annual process. In-	and FFA supports implementation noting that FFA cannot do it alone and countries must be party and partner to it • Process too slow and too formal so need a quicker process with a formal discussion with the Director of fisheries; • Suggested it be a working document signed off by the Director of Fisheries; • be good to have a shorter period than 5 years; • Scope seems to be alright; • Annual review but not a very formal process prob quarterly; • On the task: should only highlight 2 or 3 things to be completed over the next couple of years from each Division • Reference made to national level planning documents • CSLA standing item to FFC
--	--	--	---

	● Link between offshore and coastal fisheries- this will be country specific but need to know what other partners are doing in the space of coastal fisheries	country reviews may be difficult to implement and manage. Question over mandate of FFA staff in-country to conduct these. ● The review of a CSLA should be country specific based on the needs of the respective country and for FFA to be more effective in conducting its tasks diligently. ● Tasks: List of suggested tasks is useful but Tasks need more flexibility, open to tasks not detailed under these sections. ● A big gap is that there is no budget associated with the template - suggest including to improve the template.	
--	---	--	--

Part II: Revised SLA Template

Partnership~~Service Level~~ Agreement¹

on

Offshore Fisheries²

between

(Member Country)

and

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency

*Signed on behalf of the **(Member Country)** Government*

by

*Minister for XXX (or **Head of Fisheries³**)*

.....

and

Director-General FFA

.....

Signed and Dated this.....day of.....20xx

¹ Note 1

² Note 2

³ Note 9a

1. Duration of the Agreement

This agreement is for a period of **three (3) years⁴** subject to an annual review and periodic adjustment in accordance with changes in prioritisation of issues.

2. Scope of the Agreement

This ~~Partnership Service Level~~ Agreement (~~SLA~~) (hereafter referred to as “the Agreement”) was developed by FFA in partnership with (Member X). While the ~~Agreement SLA~~ is not binding as a formal legal document, it is designed to provide guidance to FFA and the member country on the offshore fisheries priorities that emanate from national and strategic plans including what tasks have to be done and the sharing of responsibilities. For the purpose of this ~~Agreement SLA~~ ‘offshore’ is defined as the waters beyond the Territorial Waters of (member country)⁵

The Agreement will also act to facilitate delivery of offshore fisheries outputs (including services provided by the Secretariat) in a coordinated manner. In doing so, it will assist members, the Secretariat and other offshore fisheries stakeholders to achieve the specific outcomes that they have enumerated in national and regional strategic plans including the:

- (list of relevant national and regional strategies⁶)

The tasks to be undertaken, ~~and~~ indicative timeframes and ~~resourcing requirements⁷ milestones~~ have been ~~mutually agreed on by developed cooperatively between the~~ (Member Country) and the Secretariat.

The contact persons assume mutual responsibility and accountability for progressing the tasks described in this service agreement.

Services delivered by the Secretariat will be done so in accordance with the FFC approved Annual Work Plan and Budget.

3. Contact Persons⁸

Contact Officers:

FFA –(details)

Member Country – (details)

4. Duties of the Contact Persons⁹

⁴ Note 8

⁵ Note 2

⁶ Note 3

⁷ Note 9b

⁸ Note 4

⁹ Note 4

The 1st Member Country contact person (Head of Fisheries), will be responsible for the:

- oversight of the Agreement to ensure its regular review, updating and progress
- endorsing any revisions agreed upon with the FFA
- endorsement of the Agreement as required

The 2nd Member Country contact person will be responsible for the:

- the regular review of the Agreement as set out below.
- joint monthly reporting, with FFA Contact Person, on progress (including M&E)
- regular contact with the FFA Contact Person

The FFA Contact Person will be responsible for:

- oversight of the Agreement including its development and regular review
- joint monthly reporting on progress (including M&E)
- reporting to the annual FFC on the progress of Partnership Agreements

5. Linkage to Strategic Plans¹⁰

The linkage of national and regional strategies to the offshore priorities identified below are shown on **Attachment A**.

4.6. Standard FFA tasks to be completed

The standard tasks to be completed under the Agreement shall be implemented across all FFA member countries. It should be noted that these tasks only relate to national level work and do not change the meetings, training courses and other programmes at the regional level.

a. (List of standard FFA tasks)

5.7. Specific ~~offshore priorities~~ tasks to be completed for (Member X)

The following specific ~~priorities~~ tasks have been identified and agreed to by the two parties as priority issues for (Member X):

FFA related priorities:

Management related Tasks

b. (Any specific Management tasks)

MCS related Tasks

a. (Any specific MCS tasks)

Development related tasks

¹⁰ Note 3

a. (Any specific Development tasks)

Other offshore priorities:

a.

6-8. Implementation Plan¹¹ Specific Activities

The activities to be taken under specific national ~~priorities~~~~tasks~~ identified above are detailed in an Implementation Plan (**Attachment B**). This ~~Implementation Plan~~~~work p~~ identifies the ~~activities~~~~tasks~~ to be undertaken under each ~~Priority~~~~activity~~ and provides a breakdown of who is responsible for each task to be completed along with indicative timelines for completion of each activity and resourcing requirements.

Attachment BA is the “living” part of the Agreement and it should be updated as each task is progressed to include the next phase of that task or new priorities identified. It should also be updated when a task is completed or becomes superfluous to **(Member Country’s)** current needs. Amendment of Attachment **BA** does not require re-signing of this ~~Agreement~~~~SLA~~.

Post-mission-meeting reports¹² and post-meeting follow-up

~~PA post-mission-country visit~~ reports prepared by FFA staff following in-country work that will be is prepared by the FFA staff member will be saved on the Agreement IT system for access by the member concerned for distribution to their Divisional Directors. The report shall clearly specify the outcomes of the visit; provide an update on the progress on standard tasks and recommendations for future in country work. The post-~~mission-visit~~ report should also contain an action list that details follow up work required to progress tasks with **(Member Country)**.

The ~~FFA~~~~contact officers~~ will be responsible for providing regular updates to their respective management teams and will FFA executive team to ensure the progress of priorities and all follow up on actions to beare completed, or at least progressed if completion is not possible.

Annual Member Report on Progress¹³

The FFA Contact person will work with member contact persons to prepare a Report to FFC on the progress of Partnership Agreements. This will allow members to Member is encouraged to provide an annual update on progress against this Agreement to FFC. The purpose of the member report is to allow members to share experiences with the aim of improving the efficiency of FFA’s in country work agreed under the Agreement. Discussions about national developments will also be relevant to continued deliberations on matters such as data sharing.

¹¹ Note 9b

¹² Note 9c

¹³ Note 9d

9. Review of the Agreement¹⁴

This Agreement, and specifically the tasks to be undertaken described in Attachment B shall be reviewed biannually as follows:

i. Formal Agreement Review: undertaken in Jan/Feb between the FFA DG and the Head of Fisheries, other Contact Persons and relevant staff from both the Secretariat and (Member Country) to ensure objectives, tasks and timeframes are being attained or are on target. Any revisions to the priorities will be finalised into a revised Agreement signed by the DG and either the Head of Fisheries or Minister.

ii. Midyear Review: undertaken in Jul/Aug between the Contact Persons to consider amongst other things the progress of priorities, issues and how the issues can be addressed. The timing of this will enable its feedback to inform the Revised AWPB process.

~~This Agreement, and specifically the tasks to be undertaken described in Attachment A shall be informally reviewed during each in-country visit, or at any other time that the contact officer requests, particularly for a significant emergent issue that needs to take priority for delivery. A formal review of the Agreement shall be undertaken annually to ensure objectives, tasks and timeframes are being attained or are on target to being met~~

7.10. Monitoring and Evaluation¹⁵ Individual Performance

The M&E Framework for this Agreement (attached as Attachment C) will be linked to the Secretariat MERLA process. The Contact Persons will be responsible for the regular updating of the Partnership Agreement M&E Framework through the IT System.

The FFA Manager Human Resources will contact the **(Member Country)** contact officer to obtain a report on the performance of individual FFA officers and contractors at the conclusion of each visit, or annually. The Secretariat will use these reports to assist in the assessment process during individual performance evaluations.

8.11. Obligations arising from the Agreement on (Member Country)

The **(Member Country)** Contact Officer should assign a nominated in-country staff member as the direct liaison with FFA staff on the agreed national tasks. This ensures that someone is assigned by the national fisheries authority of **(Member Country)** to work with FFA in progressing the various national activities.

¹⁴ Note 7

¹⁵ Note 6

Co-operation should extend to the provision of a workspace for the FFA contact person and basic office facilities such as printing and photocopying. Meeting rooms and workshop venues to progress in country work should also be made available when reasonably requested by visiting FFA staff.

LINKAGE TO NATIONAL AND REGIONAL STRATEGIC PLANS

National Strategies/Strategic Outcomes	Medium term outcomes	Short term outcomes	Priorities	Reference to Regional Strategy

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN¹⁶**FFA Priorities****National Priority Management Tasks identified for (Member Country)**

National Management Priorities	FFA to undertake		Member to undertake	
	(to include timeline)	Resourcing requirement	(to include timeline)	Resourcing requirement

National Priority MCS Tasks identified for (Member Country)

National MCS priorities	FFA to undertake		Member to undertake	
	(to include timeline)	Resourcing requirement	(to include timeline)	Resourcing requirement

National Priority Development Tasks identified for (Member Country)

¹⁶ Note 9b

National Development priorities	FFA to undertake		Member to undertake	
	(to include timeline)	Resourcing requirement	(to include timeline)	Resourcing requirement

Other Offshore Priorities:

Offshore Priorities	Whom to undertake	Member to undertake
	(to include timeline and resourcing requirement)	(to include timeline and resourcing requirement)
	•	•
	•	•

M&E Framework¹⁷

Priority	FFA Strategic Outcome	FFA Short term or Medium Term Outcomes	FFA High Output	Key Indicator	Methodology/ Data sources	Target	Baseline information

Risk Matrix

Risk category & Description	Potential Impact	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Profile	Proposed Risk Management	Responsibility

¹⁷ Note 6

Explanatory Note on Changes to Revised CSLA Template

Secretariat Internal Review Proposal	Relevant advice from CSLA Review Workshop	Secretariat Comments	Proposed Change to template
1. Change title to “Partnership Agreement” to reflect the active partnership required to ensure the success of the SLA process.	There was mixed advice on changing the name with those agreeing to leave the name as is and those supporting the change.	As there was mixed feedback on this, the Secretariat proposes that FFC considers the change of title to reflect from the outset the partnership required to ensure the success of the arrangement. The consultative processes being incorporated into the revised CSLA will further ensure that the partnership is enduring.	Change title to “Partnership Agreement”
2. Tasks broadened to include all offshore fisheries related priorities.	There was agreement noted on the value (not only to the FFA and members but also to donors) of broadening the focus of the Agreements to include all offshore fisheries priorities and related inshore fisheries priorities.	Changes incorporated in the template reflected in: - Title - Scope - Etc Notably, offshore is defined as all waters beyond the territorial waters of (member country x)	Change title to Agreement on “Offshore Fisheries” and reflect offshore fisheries throughout including the breakdown of priorities/tasks in FFA related and other offshore related priorities
3. Need for clear linkage to national and regional strategies	Members agreed with the need to clearly articulate in the SLA the linkages between the specified priorities and fisheries strategies, both national and regional.	Changes have been incorporated to reflect the linkage to national and regional strategies.	The list of relevant strategic plans, from which the priorities are drawn, will be reflected in the Section 1 Scope. A new section 6 (Linkage to Strategic Plan) refers to a table (Attachment A) which will identify clearly the relevant strategies and its linkage to priorities.
4. Dedicated staff as contact	There was agreement with the	A single contact person will be	The Contact Persons are shown

persons including the Head of Fisheries and 2nd Contact as the Member Contact persons. For the FFA a dedicated staff be the FFA Contact Person.	need for the Head of Fisheries and a 2nd contact from the members as the Member Contacts. From the Secretariat there was a suggestion that the contact persons include a representative from each of the Divisions.	assigned from the FFA and responsible for oversight over all Agreements. A group email contact will be setup for the FFA contact person whose recipients will include designated representatives from each of the technical divisions and the legal team.	in a new Section 3 with the specific duties reflected in Section 4.
5. Reducing the administrative burden: an interactive IT tool be developed to make the development and review of the Agreements as efficient as possible.	Members agreed with the need and value of an interactive IT tool to manage the administration of the Agreements.	The Secretariat is in discussions with the IT team on the development of this system.	No changes required in template.
6. No structured M&E process in place	Members agreed with the need for a structured M&E process including its incorporation to the FFA MERLA Framework.	The Secretariat will ensure the M&E Framework outlined in the Partnership Agreement is integrated with the FFA MERLA Framework. The development of the IT tool will ensure this M&E process is both efficient and timely.	A new Section 10 Monitoring and Evaluation refers to Attachment C being the M&E Framework (this includes a Risk Matrix) . It is expected that this table will be completed during the biannual reviews.
7. No structured review process in place	Members agreed with the need for a structured review process including the proposed biannual review process.	The Secretariat maintains that a formal review be undertaken at the start of the year (during Jan/Feb) with the Head of Fisheries and an informal review be undertaken by the Contact Persons during Jul/Aug. Notably the reviews will inform the development of the AWPB and Revised AWPB.	Section 9 Review of the Agreement has been updated to reflect this biannual review process.

8. Duration of the Agreement: It is proposed that the Agreement be effective indefinitely	More members seemed in agreement with the Agreements being effective for 3 years as a realistic timeframe for the identification and delivery of priorities.	The concern with the duration was that some SLAs were not renewed and expired before the priorities were addressed. However, the three year timeframe with a structured review process will ensure the Agreements will continue to be renewed and remain effective indefinitely.	Section 1 reflects the agreement being effective for three (3) years.
9. Other changes proposed at CSLA Review Workshop			
a. Flexibility on signing of Agreement: Members agreed that the Agreements are signed by the Minister or the Head of Fisheries.		The Secretariat agrees with this proposal.	This is reflected on the cover page (on which the signatures are placed).
b. Implementation Plan: Members agreed that an Implementation Plan be attached with details not only on the activities required to address the priority but also with indicative timeframes and resourcing requirements.		The Secretariat agrees with this and the details on the resourcing requirement will further assist with the development of the AWPB.	Section 9 is relabeled Implementation Plan and refers to this being attached as Attachment B.
c. Sharing of post-mission reports with relevant members.		The Secretariat agrees and will develop the IT tool to enable the saving and access to these reports.	This is reflected in Section 9.
d. Annual Report on Progress to FFC		The Secretariat agrees and will have the FFA Contact Person oversee the development of this Report in consultation with the Member Contact persons.	This is reflected in Section 9