## Annual Review Template

|  |
| --- |
| **Title: Ocean Country Partnership Programme** |
| **Programme Value £ (full life): £65m** | **Review date: July 2023-June 2024** |
| **Programme Code:**  | **Start date:** **June 2021** | **End date:** **March 2026** |

**Summary of Programme Performance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | **21/22** | **22/23** | **23/24** | **24/25** | **25/26** |  |  |  |
| Overall Output Score | **N/A** | **B** | **B** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Risk Rating  | **N/A** | **Medium** | **High** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DevTracker Link to Business Case:  | [DevTracker Programme GB-GOV-7-BPFOCPP (fcdo.gov.uk)](https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-7-BPFOCPP/summary) |
| DevTracker Link to results framework:  | [DevTracker Programme GB-GOV-7-BPFOCPP (fcdo.gov.uk)](https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-7-BPFOCPP/summary) |

**A: SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW**

**A1. Description of programme**

The Ocean Country Partnership Programme (OCPP) supports countries to manage the marine environment more sustainably and build the resilience of coastal communities, ocean economies, and livelihoods by strengthening marine science expertise, developing science-based policy and management tools, and creating educational resources. The programme forms part of the UK’s Blue Planet Fund (BPF), a £500 million portfolio of programmes supporting developing countries to protect the marine environment and reduce poverty.

The OCPP is a five-year (June 2021 — March 2026) primarily technical assistance programme with a budget of up to £65m. £55m is delivered through government-to-government bilateral partnerships with Official Development Assistance (ODA)-eligible countries, with £10m reserved for working through strategic partnerships.

The support through bilateral partnerships is delivered by three UK government Arm's Length Bodies (ALBs): Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas), Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), and Marine Management Organisation (MMO). Through these bilateral arrangements, the programme works to reduce poverty by building local and regional marine science capabilities to improve policymaking and address multiple marine environment challenges.

 The OCPP ALB work is demand-led, driven by scoping exercises to discuss needs with partner country stakeholders. Activities delivered by ALBs predominantly focus on capacity-building for partner governments, local universities, regional organisations, and civil society organisations to improve the delivery of applied scientific solutions. Partner country needs are identified according to one or more of three of the BPF’s themes — marine biodiversity, sustainable seafood, or marine pollution.

In addition, the OCPP also funds two multi-donor initiatives – the Global Ocean Accounts Partnership (GOAP) and Friends of Ocean Action (FOA), which support partner countries in the development of global public goods relevant to the programme’s objectives.

The Friends of Ocean Action (FOA) is a platform hosted by the World Economic Forum (WEF), in collaboration with the World Resources Institute (WRI). FOA delivers on two priority areas for the BPF and the OCPP: (1) improving the sustainability of blue food production, and (2) supporting developing countries to build sustainable ocean economies. There have been four distinct FOA projects that have received funding to date.

* *Blue Food Partnership (BFP) —* creating a global roadmap for sustainable aquaculture and implementing a pilot initiative in Ghana.
* *Blue Recovery Hubs (BRH) —* undertaking post COVID-19 situational analysis appraisals and accelerating sustainable blue economy strategies for Fiji and Samoa, with regional buy-in.
* *Sea Food Loss and Waste (SFLW)**—* formalising the establishment of an industry cluster with local industry players in Namibia to eliminate fish industry waste and develop guidelines to be applied globally.
* *Supply Chain Risk Tool (SCRT) project —* developing a data platform in partnership with Global Fishing Watch (GFW) to tackle Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing. The data platform was designed to enable actionable aggregation of multiple data sources, providing critical vessel-level information to inform companies’ risk assessment processes that can easily integrate into existing workflows.

The Global Ocean Accounts Partnership (GOAP) is a membership-driven partnership the Secretariat of which is hosted by the University of New South Wales (UNSW)bringing together governments, international organisations, and research institutions to build a global community of practice for ocean natural capital accounting to ensure the diverse values of the ocean are recognised in all decision-making about social and economic development. Within the OCPP, the GOAP programme supports countries to develop ocean accounting systems to inform decision-making on the sustainable and equitable use of marine resources, including overseeing a global expert panel to advance knowledge production and implementing ocean accounting in pilot countries. Ocean accounts can be used to inform future and existing ocean development projects, programmes, and activities including support to the development of sustainable livelihoods for coastal communities. To date, across the programme, a total of 19 countries have received support (bilaterally or through the strategic partnerships).

The OCPP also supports ad-hoc initiatives on a needs-only basis in several non-OCPP countries, including an oil spill emergency response programme in Peru, as well as a marine pollution emergency response and technical assistance initiative in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Marine Corridor (CMAR) in Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, and Costa Rica.

**A2. Summary supporting narrative for the overall score in this review**

The programme has scored a B for the 23/24 annual review period (reporting from July 2023 to June 2024). This follows a B for the 22/23 annual review period. This has been assessed through output and outcome scoring alongside findings from the recent interim evaluation. This year three outputs have scored B, two outputs scored A, and one output scored C. Five results have been reported towards the OCPP's outcome statement. Intermediate outcome reporting identifies progression in 16 areas of change pathways that could progress to outcome-level in the next two years. This represents a strong pipeline of work for the OCPP to drive forward to outcome-level change. Please refer to sections C and B2 for further details on output and outcome reporting respectively.

Overall, the OCPP presents potential to deliver some significant results, particularly from our strategic partners GOAP and FOA, who presented strongly throughout the interim evaluation undertaken in Q2 of this financial year (FY) (24/25). However, the OCPP continues to present a mixed picture of its progress towards intended impact and reported results at outcome level are not at the expected level at this stage of the programme. The interim evaluation has highlighted several areas which are holding the programme back. Limited in-country presence and limited focus on poverty alleviation, Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI), policy influence, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) resource and sustainability is dampening the ability for outputs to achieve outcome level change.

Due to scoring consecutive Bs and the findings highlighted within the interim evaluation, we will be placing the programme into a performance improvement plan to address a core set of persistent challenges for the programme. This includes ensuring poverty alleviation and GESI) is at the heart of the programme and that our approach to Sexually Exploitation and Abuse and Harassment SEAH Safeguarding is robust. This will seek to address the challenges set out above and align with the recommendations set out in Section A3. It will also seek to be proportionate to the remaining time left for the programme and funding levels for this programme in FY 25/26, which are being considered in the context of the Spending Review allocations.

**A3. Major lessons and recommendations for the year ahead**

To note: These recommendations are informed by the recent independent interim evaluation conducted by the programme MEL supplier. These recommendations will be incorporated within the performance improvement plan which will be developed following this annual review.

Key recommendations to deliver impact

1. **Lesson:** The programme has made limited progress on GESI and safeguarding considerations thus far as the pace and momentum is slow due to a lack of clear leadership, capacity and capability on these issues. GESI considerations and safeguarding must be mainstreamed in programme design and delivery.

**Recommendation(s):**

* 1. GESI baseline analysis and self-assessment of the OCPP’s delivery must be conducted as soon as possible, this should include identification of GESI and safeguarding risks and mitigations and stakeholder groups and engagement approaches. The result must be embedded into country workplans to ensure integration into bilaterial programme design and delivery.

**Lead(s):** Cefas, GOAP

**Deadline:** By end of FY 24/25 to ensure inclusion with final year of delivery (FY25/26)

* 1. All OCPP delivery partners must ensure they have access to adequate GESI and safeguarding capacity and capability to ensure compliance with Defra ODA safeguarding and GESI guidance, and the ability to achieve GESI sensitive by Dec 2025.

**Lead(s):** All OCPP delivery partners

**Deadline:** By March 2025

* 1. GESI output and indicators within the programme logframe should be refined and data disaggregated by sex, age, disability and geography.

**Lead(s):** NIRAS, Defra

 **Deadline:** GESI output and indicators reviewed by January 2025 (six months before due date of the next annual review). Data disaggregation within FY 25/26

* 1. Delivery partners must address the SEAH safeguarding risks identified through the SEAH safeguarding self-assessment and demonstrate how they will mitigate these risks.

 **Lead(s):** All OCPP delivery partners

 **Deadline:** By March 2025

1. **Lesson:** Poverty alleviation must be better integrated to achieve the intended impact on poverty. The geographical footprint of the programme is not well aligned with its poverty reduction ambitions and the skills profile of the delivery partners has been a constraint on integrating poverty reduction. The programme should carefully consider country and activity prioritisation in the remaining years of the programme

**Recommendation(s):**

* 1. Delivery partners must ensure they have access to development expertise to improve capacity and capability to integrate poverty alleviation into programme design and delivery.

**Lead(s):** All OCPP delivery partners

**Deadline:** By March 2025

* 1. ALB partners should write a narrative that articulates the link between the programme’s bilateral delivery to poverty alleviation.

**Lead(s):** ALB delivery partners

**Deadline:** By January 2025

* 1. Defra and OCPP programme leadership should consider exiting from bilateral partnership countries and/or activities. These criteria could include use of newly available evaluation and output data to inform decision-making about where the OCPP can deliver most impact and potential to impact on poverty reduction. Defra and OCPP programme leadership should then consider withdrawing from bilateral partnerships with countries and/or activities where output results are below expectations and/or where traction and engagement is difficult to deliver outputs and where there is limited poverty impact, to engender more focus and less fragmentation and maximise the impact of ALBs’ work. Any changes should consider the programme and country Theory of Change (ToC).

**Lead(s):** Cefas, Defra, NIRAS

**Deadline:** By March 2025

1. **Lesson:** The ALB-led bilateral partnerships have had limited strategic focus in their engagements with partner countries over what the programme delivers, at both a country and programme level. FOA and GOAP display a strong strategic focus in their engagements.

**Recommendation:**

* 1. The ALB’s strategic planning processes for bilateral partnerships need to better integrate the programme and country-level ToC. To strengthen effectiveness and encourage programme teams to aim towards the delivery of long-term change (including on poverty reduction) and a more strategic focus of their work, ALB programme teams need to start actively using the programme ToC in their programme planning and delivery. To ensure a more strategic engagement at country level, ALBs should use the country level ToCs (which are aligned to the OCPP programme level ToC) in their country planning and delivery.

**Lead(s):** ALB delivery partners

**Deadline:** By end of FY 24/25 to ensure consideration during final year of delivery (FY25/26)

1. **Lesson:** The lack of the bilateral programme’s in-country presence hampers the continuity of activities according to a majority of in-country and delivery partner stakeholders. While ALB visits can galvanise action in-country, as soon as they leave there is a loss of momentum leading to delays in implementation or a loss of direction for the partners.

**Recommendation:**

* + 1. ALB delivery partners to update delivery chain maps and assess whether they can improve their in-country presence e.g. through further use of in-country sub-contracting where appropriate.

Lead(s): ALB delivery partners

Deadline: By start of FY25/26

1. **Lesson:** For OCPP to achieve long-term impact, it will require interventions oriented towards policy change and reform. The programme does not focus enough on activities to achieve policy change and reform which is negatively affecting its ability to achieve long-term impact.

**Recommendation(s):**

* 1. ALB delivery partners need to plan what actions are needed to promote the adoption and use of their policy and guidance recommendations with partner governments and need to invest in and implement policy influencing activities to deliver policy change.

**Lead(s):** ALB delivery partners

**Deadline:** By end of FY 24/25 to ensure consideration during final year of delivery (FY25/26).

* 1. With elections planned in many partners countries in 2024, it is important that the OCPP engages with FCDO Posts and considers the relevance of Political Economy Analyses to assess the likelihood that the planned work will contribute to impact or whether planned programmes of work should be changed.

**Lead(s):** ALB delivery partners

**Deadline:** By end of FY 24/25 to ensure consideration during final year of delivery (FY25/26).

1. **Lesson:** Sustainability and transition planning is not prioritised and is left too late to be effective. GOAP and FOA have considered sustainability in more depth but could still improve. NIRAS have been commissioned by Defra to develop a transition tool to guide future transition planning. Better sustainability and transition planning will assist other and future programmes going forward and should help identify future learning needs, opportunities for future south-south collaboration and what resilience local communities can gain from these interventions.

**Recommendation(s)**:

* 1. Delivery partners must consider sustainability within all aspects of delivery planning and implementation.

**Lead(s):** All OCPP delivery partners

**Deadline:** ASAP

* 1. ALB delivery partners should develop transition plans for all bilaterial partnerships.

**Lead(s):** ALB delivery partners, Defra

**Deadline:** By the start of FY 25/26

Key recommendations to improve process

1. **Lesson:** The OCPP delivery partners should invest in resourcing MEL. Shortcomings in the OCPP delivery partner MEL systems have somewhat hampered the reporting of results and the assessment of effectiveness. This has limited the potential for monitoring data to be used to inform strategic planning

**Recommendation(s):**

1. ALB partners should ensure they have access to dedicated MEL resource e.g. via contracting, a new hire or the assignment of this role to existing team members.

**Lead(s):** ALB delivery partners

**Deadline:** By end of FY 24/25

1. Delivery Partner Programme Directors need to ensure delivery teams understand that MEL is foundational to the delivery of the programme and not supplemental.

**Lead(s):**  All OCPP delivery partners

**Deadline:** By end of FY 24/25

1. GOAP needs to explore ways of demonstrating evidence of use of ocean accounts in evidenced-based policy making, to remove constraints in GOAP’s reporting on use of ocean accounts into the OCPP logframe.

**Lead(s):** GOAP

**Deadline:** By March 2025

1. **Lesson:** Programme governance including decision-making, approvals and escalation need to be streamlined**.** Delays in approvals from Defra have reduced efficiency of programme delivery. The programme’s previous annual review acknowledged the need for faster turnaround times, progress has been made but has been slowed due to periods of limited staff resource and staff turnover. Though a delegated authority table is in place for ALB delivery, it has been utilised inconsistently. The interim evaluation has found the ALB annual work planning process to be reactive rather than strategic and 40% of ALB personnel interviewed felt the process was inefficient.

**Recommendation(s):**

1. Defra programme management should seek to respond to delivery partner queries and decision-making requests within a two-week response time.

**Lead(s):** Defra

**Deadline:** ASAP

1. Defra programme management should review the Defra-ALB MoU to ensure it is up to date, including the ALB delegated authority table to clarify roles, responsibilities and decision-making authority. ALB programme leadership should then ensure clear understanding across OCPP staff. Steers and messaging from Defra should be cascaded to delivery teams to ensure clear understanding.

**Leads(s):** Defra, Cefas, ALB Programme Directors

**Deadline:** By end of FY 25/26

1. ALB Tier One Delivery Partner Cefas should ensure there are appropriate escalation routes of risks, issues and approvals identified in country level cross theme meetings to Defra country leads.

**Lead(s):** Cefas

**Deadline:** End of January 2025

1. The ALB annual work planning process should be reviewed to increase efficiency and strategic focus. Aligning with lesson 3, recommendation 1.

**Lead(s):** Cefas

**Deadline:** By start of FY 25/26.

1. **Lesson:** Risks and issues management for the programme could be strengthened with more frequent forums for discussion. Current reporting structures allow for risks and issue monitoring but are infrequent, creating a risk that risks and issues will be unreported and unmitigated.

**Recommendation:**

* 1. Monthly risk meetings between delivery partners and Defra should be implemented immediately to improve the frequency of risks and issues reporting.

Lead(s): Defra, all OCPP delivery partners

Deadline: by January 2025

## B: THEORY OF CHANGE AND PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES

**B1. Summarise the programme’s** [**theory of change**](https://defra.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/t/Team569/EYKsnu69tPRGn-MDZaT7oTwBubyk9q4_JSeyjlktmKmhhg?e=qALZ5m)**, including any changes to outcome and impact indicators from the original business case.**

The OCPP Theory of Change (ToC) sets out the challenge affecting vulnerable coastal communities and their supporting ecosystems and the use of science to address this challenge:

* The ocean is negatively impacted by a breadth of human activities, endangering fragile environments and the livelihoods and wellbeing of vulnerable communities that rely on them.
* Partner country stakeholders often require increased capacity to generate and use scientific knowledge to inform robust policymaking and implement actions to address ocean pollution, biodiversity loss, access to sustainable seafood and the impacts of climate change.

The following constraints were identified:

1. Funding for research, resulting in knowledge and evidence gaps to support new policies.
2. Capacity levels for science, technology, and governance, including lack of physical resources and limited access to training.
3. Knowledge exchange of importance of healthy ocean ecosystems and local context.
4. Capabilities for effective evidence interpretation and policy response / implementation.
5. Competing priorities, particularly in lower income developing countries, that would deprioritise marine conservation, sustainable fisheries, and climate challenges for economic development in the near term, but leaving vulnerable communities worse off in the long term
6. Lack of clear and consistent economic arguments for the importance of conservation.

There are four pathways to change (causal pathways) for the OCPP:

1. Capacity building
2. Governance and regulation
3. Science, education and knowledge exchange
4. Value chain and market access improvements for seafood

The causal pathways demonstrate the linkages between the OCPP’s activities and inputs and the sequence necessary for creating the expected changes in marine science and management capacity and capabilities within partnership countries and regional or global partnerships. The outcome of the OCPP increasing the capacity and capability of partnership countries and regional/global partnerships is expected to result in effective and sustainable management of marine environments which will improve the livelihoods of coastal communities. The causal pathways are also the avenues in which the OCPP will address the identified constraints and problem statement. For example, through providing technical assistance on marine pollution, the OCPP should enact a positive change and increase a country’s capacity (i.e. resources) and capability (i.e. ability) to respond to marine pollution.

The change that is expected to occur along these pathways is not linear, nor does each pathway operate in isolation; they should collectively support each other and result in synergies. Technical assistance for marine pollution could involve both training in-country scientists and providing access to better datasets to support in-country work, while simultaneously working with country governments and ministries to strengthen policies around marine pollution. Cross-cutting these four causal pathways is the critical linkage of GESI and safeguarding that the OCPP intervention design must consider.

Evidence for the efficacy of these causal pathways is outlined within the programme Theory of Change narrative (annex C) and is linked with interdependent inputs (i.e. the activities or resources provided by the programme) that result in the OCPP’s outputs. The inputs for the OCPP include:

* Research and evidence
* Technical expertise
* Assets and equipment
* UK leadership
* Partner country government leadership
* Global and regional delivery
* Consultations, knowledge processes and participation from local communities.

At the intermediate outcome level, the OCPP will result in:

‘Improved policies and regulation with enhanced capabilities and inclusive governance in place to implement and enforce these’

To reach this intermediate outcome level, the programme must result in the following in partner country governments:

* improved capability to implement improved policies, regulations, and approaches for sustainable marine environment management and emergency response
* Implementation of improved policies, regulation frameworks, and approaches for sustainable marine environmental management & emergency response
* Community ownership and / or support from public-private partnerships for policies, regulations and practices that support effective management of the marine environment

The programme’s stated outcome is:

‘Partner country stakeholders take enhanced collaborative action to effectively and sustainably manage and protect their marine environments’

To reach that Outcome, the intervention must first result in the effective implementation of the following by partner countries:

* Improved policies and practices that protect and conserve marine environment effectively, with strengthened preparedness to respond to emergencies
* Effective enforcement of enhanced and inclusive regulations that protect and conserve marine environment
* Enhanced and inclusive community ownership, resourcing, and public-private partnerships and action [including scale up of successful innovations] to effectively manage their marine environment

The OCPP Theory of Change and logframe were refreshed by our MEL partner NIRAS, endorsed at the Dec 2023 Senior Management Board and approved by the programme Senior Reporting Officer (SRO). Changes were made to better align the ToC with the breath of work undertaken by the programme, include GESI indicators and ensure better integration of GESI into outcomes including ‘Increased effective and equitable representation and participation of coastal resources stakeholders in management’ (outcome indicator 4) and ‘Number of projects / planning and/or governance processes with increased inclusion of local people and their knowledge in decision making’ (intermediate outcome indicator 3).

The ToC and logframe will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis following the annual review to embed lessons learned from the OCPP’s delivery, results achieved, and emerging evidence from within and beyond the OCPP, and will consider where further amendments are required to ensure it remains valid. The next ToC and logframe review will focus on better embedding GESI and poverty alleviation and will take place between November 2024 and January 2025.

**B2. Describe where the programme is on/off track to contribute to the expected outcomes and impact. What action is planned in the year ahead?**

This is the first year that the programme has been able to report progress against outcome indicators. Reporting has shown a mixed picture, with some success towards translating outputs to outcomes, however, in other areas the programme has not yet achieved progress. The table below provides a summary of progress towards outcome and intermediate outcome level change. Intermediate outcome milestones and targets were not set as this level of reporting was included to capture the steps towards outcome level change, meaning targets would overlap with outcome targets.

**Outcome and Intermediate outcome reporting[[1]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **​** | **Indicator​** | **Programme Target (2026)​** | **Progress​****23-24​** |
| **Intermediate outcome****“**Improved policies and regulations and practices established with enhanced awareness, capabilities and inclusive governance in place to implement and enforce them**”**​ | Intermediate Outcome 1: Number of cases where there is evidence of uptake of policy recommendations or demonstration of practical improvements and / or uptake of sustainable practices by country stakeholders​ | No target​ | **7**​ |
| Intermediate Outcome 2: Extent to which partner countries have demonstrated change in 5 key dimensions of the policy process​ | No target​ | **9**​ |
| Intermediate Outcome 3: Number of projects / planning and/or governance processes with increased inclusion of local people and their knowledge in decision-making​ | Not reported this year​[[2]](#footnote-3) |
| **Outcome**​“Partner country stakeholders take action to effectively and sustainably manage and protect their marine environments” | Outcome 1: Number of partner countries where there is evidence of strengthened preparedness to respond to emergencies​ | 10 (ALBs)​ | **2**​ |
| Outcome 2: Number of improved policies, regulations and guidelines or recommended practices implemented​ | 11 (ALBs)​ | **2**​ |
| Outcome 3: Number countries where enforcement or monitoring activities are implemented and resourced.​ | 10 (ALBs)​ | **1**​ |
| Outcome 4: Increased effective and equitable representation and participation of coastal resources stakeholders in management ​ | Not reported this year​[[3]](#footnote-4) |

There are five results towards the OCPP's outcome statement. For outcome 1, significant progress has been made in Sri Lanka and Maldives with changes noted across more than one dimension of emergency response preparedness. Work has started in a further seven countries to establish baselines, with the baselines for Solomon Islands and Vanuatu completed in July 2024. There is still a substantial amount of work to be carried out to affect change in the remaining targeted countries before the end of the programme.

For outcome 2 this year, the programme has reported two areas of progress, one from the bilateral programme in Sri Lanka and the other from FOA with its Supply Chain Risk Tool project. In Sri Lanka, the OCPP has contributed to various bans on plastic products based on evidence sources such as the Marine Litter Database developed by the OCPP’s predecessor the Commonwealth Litter Programme (CLiP) and the OCPP support on beach and marine litter analysis. In addition, the OCPP has supported all multi-media campaigns to raise public awareness of these bans. It should be noted that the OCPP contribution to this change was found to be 'low' by the interim evaluation, as the government was already on the path to enacting the plastic bans. With the SCRT project, the use of the supply chain risk tool by five companies and use by enforcement agencies to assess the risk of IUU fishing within their supply chain and take action is considered to be an outcome-level change. ​

For outcome 3, the programme in Belize has contributed to the Department of Environment being able to monitor water quality and plastic pollution in seven rivers (previously only one) supporting implementation of the National Marine Litter Action Plan of 2020 and its capacity and capability to fulfil their delivery of the Ridge to Reef programme. The OCPP provided equipment and training to increase in-country capacity to conduct laboratory analyses on pollution. ​

Given the amount of time the programme has been in delivery, the reported results at outcome level are not at the expected level, particularly on GESI due to a lack of analysis to inform design of programme activities. This could be due to lack of strategic oversight and understanding by OCPP programme leadership about what the programme is delivering at an output level and how these outputs will be taken up by stakeholders to contribute to the OCPP's outcome level ambition. It could also be an indication of the programme's struggle to produce outputs in a timely manner that are adopted by stakeholders due to multiple factors, including ALB difficulties in gaining traction with certain government partners to agree and progress delivery, in-country governments’ limited capacity to engage with the programme, and staff turnover within government. For example, in Ghana the ALBs encountered difficulties progressing the biodiversity workstream out of scoping to implementation to produce MPA-related outputs during the first year of delivery, due to engagement and traction issues with government stakeholders. While the adoption of outputs by stakeholders is less within the control of the programme, the production and delivery of outputs is more within the control of the programme (although some external factors do exist such as government buy-in from partner countries)​.

The intermediate outcome reporting identifies progression in 16 areas of change pathways that could progress to outcome-level in the next two years. For intermediate outcome 1, seven areas of progress have been identified. ALBs have reported progress in Bangladesh, Belize, Maldives and Sri Lanka, where for example, the Sri Lanka Coral Reef Initiative has committed to take forward issues identified in three MPA assessments carried out by OCPP. FOA have reported three areas of progress, two globally, including the development of the Global Sustainable Aquaculture Roadmap, and one in Namibia, where the Namibian Ocean Cluster committed to bringing fish by-products to shore.

For intermediate outcome 2, nine areas of progress have been reported. GOAP has made progress in Indonesia where the Indonesia National Standard (SNI) for Ocean Accounting has been established. This aims to ensure economic valuation of marine ecosystems is incorporated in national economic planning and environmental governance. ​FOA made global progress, notably in Ghana and in Fiji, where the Fijian Government used statistics from the Fiji post COVID Appraisal Assessment reporting to prepare national budget allocations and put the National Aquaculture Bill up for parliamentary review. ALBs achieved progress in Belize, Maldives and Sri Lanka e.g.in Belize a National Maritime Transport Policy has been developed.

This represents a strong pipeline of work for the OCPP to drive forward to outcome-level change. The interim evaluation report supports these findings but noted that this conversion is not guaranteed. The programme needs to focus on converting the outputs delivered into outcome level change in the final two years to be able to meet its targets. Given the extent and breadth of the OCPP’s work, these targets do not seem too ambitious if attention is focused in the coming years. ​

An independent mid-term evaluation of the programme has been conducted and the final report received in September. Findings and recommendations from the evaluation have been utilised within this annual review. A thematic evaluation is planned within the next year and a final evaluation is due to be completed after the end of the programme in March 2026. These evaluations are critical to ensure learning is captured and be utilised throughout present and future ODA programming.

**B3. Justify whether the programme should continue, based on its own merits and in the context of the wider portfolio**

Overall, the OCPP is a useful and valued programme with potential to deliver some significant results, with strong potential evidenced already in the case of GOAP. Typically, our strategic partners GOAP and FOA have been able to provide evidence of results more strongly throughout programme monitoring and evaluation, including the recent interim evaluation. Our ALB partners have been less successful. The OCPP continues to present a mixed picture of its progress towards intended impact. Outputs and outcome reporting has shown a mixed picture, with some success in translating outputs to outcomes, however, in other areas the programme has not yet achieved progress due to a lack of in-country presence and insufficient focus on poverty alleviation, GESI, policy influence, MEL resources, and sustainability, in part due to the skills profile of delivery partners who lack development expertise. Our ALB partners have not consistently utilised the programme ToC and country-level ToCs effectively within their strategic planning processes, which has had an impact on the strategic focus, weakening the programme’s ability to deliver long-term change (including poverty reduction) and dampening its overall effectiveness. The programme has the opportunity to deliver outcome-level change If these issues are addressed promptly.

The programme will be placed on a performance improvement plan to tackle the programme’s persistent challenges. The plan will focus on the recommendations set out in this review and progress will be monitored closely to ensure the programme is delivering expected impact in year five.

**C.** *DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING*

To note when reviewing Section C:

* It was not possible to set 23/24 milestones as the new OCPP logframe was signed off at the Senior Management Board in December 2023. To ensure robustness in data collection, time was required to develop indicator reference sheets and conduct training and information sessions with delivery partners. This meant that milestones could not be set six months before the annual review as is required by the ODA operating manual. ​
* 23/24 milestones were calculated based on a threshold approach utilising 24/25 milestones, and this was agreed by Defra OCPP team, BPF MEL team, NIRAS MEL services and the ODA Hub. This approach was agreed on best judgement, but some subjectivity to the approach is acknowledged. (see milestone setting process and indicator mapping document, Annex A)
	+ The following thresholds have been applied
		- Flat milestones: remain the same each year
		- Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting: 70% of milestone = A; 60% of milestone = B
		- Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap: 60% of milestone = A; 50% of milestone = B
* 24/25 output milestones were not set for FOA as funding decisions for the year were still pending during the annual planning phase. Where possible, we have drawn on FOA planning docs to establish intended milestones.
* The revised logframe is going through a bedding-in period overlapping with this annual review. This has resulted in some new indicators having limited or no data reported.

**Output 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output Title**  | Partner country stakeholders have strengthened capacity and capability in marine science, management and governance  |
| Output number:  | 1 | Output Score:  | **A** |
| Impact weighting (%):  | 16.66 | Weighting revised since last annual review?  | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | **Description** | **Milestone(s) for this review** | **Progress**  |
| 1.1  | Participants report increased knowledge and capacity following training and /or mentoring*Caveat: 1.1 methods were used for the first time this year and only introduced in January. As such, proposed scores should be considered indicative rather than conclusive*. *Gender disaggregation not available during this annual review cycle due to the introduction of this indictor part way through the reporting year.* | Flat milestone: 80% | Overall: 95.9%, A ALB progress: 95.5%GOAP progress: 100% |
| 1.2 | Target organisations / institutions in partner countries have increased access to functioning marine scientific equipment and staff trained in its use*Caveat: 1.2 methods were used for the first time this year and only introduced in January. As such, proposed scores should be considered indicative rather than conclusive.* | 24/25 Milestone: Total:15ALBs:15GOAP: N/A23/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 10.560% (B): 9<60% (C) | Overall: 2, C ALB progress: 2GOAP progress: N/A |
| 1.3 | Number of individuals receiving TA support (ICF TA KPI 2) | 24/25 Milestone: Total:1820ALBs:1600GOAP:22023/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap)*60% (A): 109250% (B): 910<50% (C) | Overall: 1276\*, A ALB progress: 1022GOAP progress: 244FOA progress: 18Gender disaggregation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **No. individuals** | **% of total** |
| Female | 463 | 36 |
| Male | 582 | 46 |
| Not reported | 231 | 18 |
| **TOTAL** | 1276 | 100% |

 |
| 1.4 | Number of organisations receiving TA support (ICF TA KPI 2) | 24/25 Milestone: Total:155ALBs:120GOAP:3523/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap)*60% (A): 9350% (B): 77.5<50% (C) | Overall: 370\*, A ALB progress: 296GOAP progress: 46FOA progress: 52 |
| \* Adjusted for double counting so does not up add up to sum of delivery partner totals |

*Note: 23/24 reporting for FOA is taken from phase 3 plans and reporting. Milestones for FOA were not set for 24/25 because of pending funding decisions.*

**C1. Briefly describe the output’s activities and provide supporting narrative for the score.**

Output 1 and associated indicators seek to monitor the programmes progress towards partner country stakeholders having strengthened capacity and capability in marine science, management and governance. The programme has scored A in indicators 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 and has scored C in indicator 1.2. Overall, output 1 has scored a B.

* 1. **– A.** Delivery partners have delivered training and mentoring across our ALB-led bilateral partnerships and GOAP pilot countries. In the sample of trainings assessed this year, 95.9% of participants in ALB led training/mentoring reported increased knowledge and capacity. 100% of participants in GOAP led training/mentoring reported increased knowledge and capacity.

In total, 124 training events were carried out by the OCPP delivery partners. Increase in knowledge was only assessed for 22 trainings total, of which represent 17% of all training events – this is not unexpected as this was a new indicator this year. 21 of these training events were held by ALBs and one by GOAP. In only one case did delivery partners report less than 100% of participants report increased knowledge. Caution should be applied in the interpretation of this result due to the limited reporting this year. Further work will be needed to ensure the robustness of this reporting in future years.

* 1. **- C.** Progress against this indicator has been limited this year, partially because this was a new indicator, introduced part way through the year. However, ALB partners have significantly under achieved against this target ALB partners reported two organisations, which sits below the threshold of nine required to meet expectations. Whilst indicator 1.2 counts the number of organisations provided with functioning equipment, it may take time once equipment is delivered to achieve the ‘fully functioning’ status. This indicator also assesses if partner staff have capacity/time to utilise the new equipment. For example, in Belize, the programme delivered microscope bundle-lenses and laptop to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security, and Enterprise but the ALBs reported that while staff are trained within the organisation, they do not have the time nor mandate to use the equipment.
	2. **- A.** Delivery partners have delivered technical assistance to individuals across our ALB-led bilateral partnerships and GOAP and FOA pilot countries. ALB partners reported 1022, GOAP 244 and FOA 18. The total reported is 1276 individuals. This indicator was disaggregated by Gender of the total 36% reported female, 46% male and 18% did not report. For example, ALB partners held an offshore MPA Framework and Roadmap workshop with government officials in Senegal and FOA provided training in Ghana to launch the Blue Food Programme initiative, bringing together various stakeholders to receive best practice information on sustainable seafood value chains.
	3. **- A.** Delivery partners have delivered technical assistance to organisations across our ALB-led bilateral partnerships and GOAP pilot countries. ALB partners reported 296, GOAP 46 and FOA 52. The total reported is 370. Organisation types include government departments and/or ministries and civil service; non-profit companies; private companies; and academia. For example, FOA in Samoa delivered a training workshop on opportunities to leverage the ocean economy for sustainable development to a variety of government ministries, a private foundation, and a private corporation.

Detailed output example for indicators 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4

**ALBs, Ghana:** In December 2023, the OCPP, represented by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and Marine Management Organisation (MMO), hosted a Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) capacity building workshop in Ghana. The workshop was delivered in partnership with Ghana’s Land Use and Spatial Planning Authority (LUSPA), Office of the President of Ghana, and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Ten different institutions/organisations from Ghana attended the workshops (36 attendees in total), whose objectives were to build capacity of stakeholders to contribute to MSP in Ghana and facilitate the sharing of evidence/data to support MSP in the country.​

Following their attendance of the capacity-building workshop, all participants who responded to the post-workshop survey (100% of 13 respondents) considered themselves as being either ‘very knowledgeable’ (76% of 13 respondents) or ‘knowledgeable’ (24% of 13 respondents) on MSP.​ When asked to describe how the capacity-building workshop had helped to further individual knowledge and understanding of MSP, the following common themes were identified from respondent answers:​

* Importance of stakeholder engagement​
* Increased knowledge of MSP processes ​
* Increased knowledge of why MSP is important​
* Lessons that can be learned learnt from other countries and experts​.

**Output 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output Title**  | Policy and regulatory recommendations proposed, and guidelines developed  |
| Output number:  | 2 | Output Score:  | **B** |
| Impact weighting (%):  | 16.66 | Weighting revised since last annual review?  | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | **Description** | **Milestone(s) for this review** | **Progress**  |
| 2.1  | Number of outputs (policy briefs, roadmaps, recommendations or guidelines) developed that contribute to sustainable management  | 24/25 Milestone: Total:70ALBs:50GOAP:2023/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 4960% (B): 42<60% (C) | Overall: 45, B ALB progress: 24GOAP progress: 18FOA progress: 3 |
| 2.2 | % of outputs developed that included inclusive consultation processes*Caveat: 2.2 methods were used for the first time this year and only introduced in January. As such, proposed scores should be considered indicative rather than conclusive.* | Flat milestone: 60% | Overall: 88%, A ALB progress: 83%GOAP progress: 100%FOA progress: 100% |

*Note: 23/24 reporting for FOA is taken from phase 3 plans and reporting. Milestones for FOA were not set for 24/25 because of pending funding decisions.*

**C1. Briefly describe the output’s activities and provide supporting narrative for the score.**

Output 2 and associated indicators seek to monitor the programmes progress towards providing policy and regulatory recommendations and guidelines to stakeholders. The programme has scored B in indicators 2.1 and A in indicator 2.2. Overall, output 2 has scored a B.

**2.1 – B.** Delivery partners have delivered policy briefs, roadmaps, recommendations or guidelines that contribute to sustainable management across our ALB-led bilateral partnerships and GOAP and FOA pilot countries. ALB partners reported 24, of which 15 were produced in Belize, one in Madagascar, five in the Maldives, two in Mozambique and one in Sri Lanka. GOAP 18 and FOA three. The total reported is 45. GOAP delivered 11 global outputs, such as the “Policy Brief: Sharing experiences and lessons learnt on Ocean Accounting in the Indian Ocean.” FOA delivered a global recommendations or guidelines output related to sustainable seafood: “A Call for Action to Combat IUU Fishing in the Pacific”.

**2.2 – A.** This indicator measures % of outputs reported in 2.1 that included inclusive consultation processes, a percentage target has been used as the programme produces a large range of outputs, some of which may not require, or are unsuitable for, consultation. ‘inclusive’ is defined as: An inclusive consultation process requires that key stakeholders (those that have interest or influence in the topic or area of focus for example, would be affected by policy proposals outlined in a policy brief) are identified and participate in the development of the output. Stakeholders are those groups or individuals who have a concern or interest in something. A wide range of stakeholders could include government, businesses, community members, NGOs for example. To note, this process does not relate to formal government consultations but rather the processes that OCPP teams undertake themselves in developing outputs.

In total, 17 out of 45 outputs (total number of outputs developed) were self-assessed by delivery partners using Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation. 83% of 12 outputs assessed by ALBs, 100% of the three outputs assessed by GOAP and 100% of the 2 outputs assessed by FOA self-reported as having included inclusive consultation processes respectively. Across the programme, 88% of the outputs accessed were considered to have been developed through an inclusive process. It is important to note that this new indicator was introduced this year, hence a limited sample of outputs were assessed.

Detailed example outputs for indicators 2.1 and 2.2

**FOA, Blue Food Partnership:** The Ghana aquaculture action plan sets out four key pathways for actions: responsible​ production; better livelihoods; healthy consumption; and a stronger enabling environment. The roadmap was developed with stakeholders of the 49 members of the BFP Ghana initiative, who were involved jointly in designing the action plan which the stakeholders are now delivering on.

​

**ALBs, Maldives:** The programme undertook a review of shark diving practices to support Fuvahmulah City Council and Maldives Ministry of Climate Change, Environment and Energy identify sustainable management options. Stakeholders from the community e.g., the dive industry on Fuvahmulah were interviewed in person to collect information and data to input into the review. The review provided these stakeholders with a platform to raise concerns and ideas for future management options. They were also given the opportunity to review the final output and raise any concerns with the content.

**Output 3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output Title**  | Enhanced education, awareness and exchange of scientific, technical knowledge and data in relevant topics |
| Output number:  | 3 | Output Score:  | **B** |
| Impact weighting (%):  | 16.66 | Weighting revised since last annual review?  | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | **Description** | **Milestone(s) for this review** | **Progress**  |
| 3.1  | Number of datasets or monitoring systems developed or improved; ocean accounts compiled; educational resources produced | 24/25 Milestone: Total:115ALBs:105GOAP:1023/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 80.560% (B): 69<60% (C) | Overall: 60, CALB progress: 37GOAP progress: 23 |
| 3.2 | Number of scholars who enrolled and % who achieved a qualification (Masters, PhD) in relevant topics | 24/25 Milestone: Total:155ALBs:120GOAP:3523/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap)*60% (A): 9350% (B): 77.5<50% (C) | Overall: 94, AALB progress: 94GOAP progress: Data not yet collected due to the late addition of GOAP into reporting requirements for this indicatorGender disaggregation:52% (49) of scholars enrolled this year were female48% (45) of scholars enrolled this year were male |
| 3.3 | Scientific papers, reports, strategies, tools and/or databases developed or published which are freely available | 24/25 Milestone: Total:30ALBs:20GOAP:1023/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 2160% (B): 18<60% (C) | Overall: 43, AALB progress: 8GOAP progress: 24FOA progress: 11 |

*Note: 23/24 reporting for FOA is taken from phase 3 plans and reporting. Milestones for FOA were not set for 24/25 because of pending funding decisions.*

**C1. Briefly describe the output’s activities and provide supporting narrative for the score.**

Output 3 and associated indicators seek to monitor the programmes progress towards providing enhanced education, awareness and exchange of scientific, technical knowledge and data in relevant topics. The programme has scored C in indicators 3.1 and A in indicators 3.2 and 3.3. Overall, output 3 has scored a B. While output indicator 3.1 and 3.3 both relate to resources produced by the programme, indicator 3.3 is distinct from 3.1 as outputs under 3.3 must be freely available. For example, an output delivered under indicator 3.1 might only remain within a government ministry.

**3.1 – C.** This indicator seeks to measure the number of datasets or monitoring systems developed or improved; ocean accounts compiled, and educational resources produced by delivery partners. ALB partners reported 37 and GOAP 23. The total reported is 60. The tables below present a breakdown of the data by resource type and by Delivery Partner. For example, in Sri Lanka the ALBs delivered a new technical assessment: “Sri Lanka Historic Imagery Analysis June 2023 – May 2024”, a monitoring system: “Oiled Wildlife Response Plan” and a climate change educational resource for primary and secondary schools within this reporting period. In the Solomon Islands the ALBs consulted government officials to provide areas of interest in remote sensing to produce a technical assessment on the Island's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and Honiara Port.

Data breakdown by resource type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Resource type**​** | Level of support**​** | Total**​** |
| Improved | New |
| Dataset​ | 20% (1)​ | 80% (4)​ | 100% (5)​ |
| Educational Resources​ | 11% (2)​ | 89% (16)​ | 100% (18)​ |
| Monitoring system​ | ​ | 100% (3)​ | 100% (3)​ |
| Ocean accounts​ | ​14% (3) | 86% (18)​ | 100% (21)​ |
| Technical assessments​ | ​ | 100% (13) | 100% (13)​ |
| Total​ | 5% (6)​ | 95% (54)​ | 100% (60)​ |

Data breakdown by Delivery Partner

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Delivery Partner | Level of support**​** | Total**​** |
| Improved | New |
| ALBs​ | 8% (3)​ | 92% (34)​ | 100% (37)​ |
| GOAP​ | ​13% (3)  | 87% (20)​ | 100% (23)​ |
| Total​ | 10% (6)​ | 90% (53)​ | 100% (59)​ |

**3.2 – A.** This indicator measures the number of scholars who enrolled and % who achieved a qualification (Masters, PhD) in relevant topics. ALB partners reported 94. Data was not collected for GOAP due to their late addition into reporting requirements for this indicator. The total reported is 94 enrolled, 0% qualified (this percentage is expected in increase in future years due to the time lag for gaining qualification). 52% (49) of scholars enrolled this year were female. 48% (45) of scholars enrolled this year were male. 91 students were enrolled in Masters courses, 2 students were funded to undertake the second year of their course and one student enrolled into a PhD. The table below displays the geographic spread of the OCPP scholars enrolled.

Examples of courses undertaken​

​

* MSc Marine Biology​
* Masters in Conservation Biology and Ecology​
* Masters in Engineering and Management of the Environment​
* MPhil Aquatic Resource Management

**3.3 – A.** This indicator measures scientific papers, reports, strategies, tools and/or databases developed or published which are freely available. ALB partners reported eight, GOAP 24 and FOA 11. The total reported is 43. For example, the ALBs in India published a pollution-focused scientific paper, “Interaction of climate change and marine pollution in Southern India: Implications for coastal zone management practices and policies”, which features several Indian authors and is freely available online[[4]](#footnote-5). They also conducted National Protected Areas System Management Effectiveness Evaluations for 14 MPAs on behalf of the Belize Fisheries Department, Ministry of Blue Economy and Disaster Risk Management, and MPA co-managers. The interim evaluation found that the average management effectiveness of the country's combined 14 MPAs and seven new High Protection for Biodiversity Zones (HBPZs) was 63.6%. This indicates that the inclusion of the newly established HBPZs in the assessment has reduced the overall management effectiveness ratings, as there are not yet management processes in place for these Marine Reserves. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) global benchmark is 67.7%. This data helps to strengthen Belize's capacity to manage their MPA networks. It further helps in-country stakeholders understand what is working well and what needs to improve as they seek to achieve the IUCN Green List standard.

**Output 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output Title**  | Active ocean-science related knowledge networks and partnerships (either UK – partner country or in-country coalitions) developed or supported by OCPP activities |
| Output number:  | 4 | Output Score:  | **A** |
| Impact weighting (%):  | 16.66 | Weighting revised since last annual review?  | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | **Description** | **Milestone(s) for this review** | **Progress**  |
| 4.1  | MoUs or similar agreement between OCPP and partner country stakeholders signed | 24/25 Milestone: Total:11ALBs:6GOAP:523/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 7.760% (B): 6.6<60% (C) | Overall: 14, A ALB progress: 4GOAP progress: 9FOA progress: 1 |
| 4.2 | Number of public- private sector partnerships or business clusters mobilised*Indicator primarily aimed at FOA.*  | 24/25 Milestone: Total:0ALBs: N/AGOAP: N/A23/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*No Milestone | Overall: 8, AALB progress: 6GOAP progress: N/AFOA progress: 2 |
| 4.3 | Number of in-country coalitions, governance structures, networks or task forces established, engaged or strengthened | 24/25 Milestone: Total:18ALBs:10GOAP:823/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap)*60% (A): 10.850% (B): 9<50% (C) | Overall: 28, AALB progress: 9GOAP progress: 13FOA progress: 6 |

*Note: 23/24 reporting for FOA is taken from phase 3 plans and reporting. Milestones for FOA were not set for 24/25 because of pending funding decisions.*

**C1. Briefly describe the output’s activities and provide supporting narrative for the score.**

Output 4 and associated indicators seek to monitor active ocean-science related knowledge networks and partnerships (either UK – partner country or in-country coalitions) developed or supported by OCPP activities. The programme has scored A in indicators 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. Overall, output 4 has scored an A. While originally this indicator was created to capture results specific to FOA and GOAP, the bilateral programme delivered 19 total outputs across all three indicators within Output 4, which is much greater than originally anticipated.

**4.1 – A.** This indicator measures the number MoUs or similar agreement between OCPP and partner country stakeholders signed. ALB partners reported four, GOAP nine and FOA one. The total reported is 14. GOAP exceeded their milestones by establishing nine new similar agreements with partner countries, including four partnership agreements with globally based partners: Plymouth Marine Laboratory; Norwegian Institute for Water Research; Ocean Policy Research Institute of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation; and International Coral Reef Initiative.

**4.2 – A.** This indicator measures the number of public- private sector partnerships or business clusters mobilised. For the purposes of this indicator, mobilised was defined as a formal (written) agreement or commitments and declarations on shared objectives (that align with OCPPs objectives) and plan for action is in place because of OCPP support and engagement. ALBs did not set milestones for indicator 4.2 but have achieved six public-private sector partnerships in this reporting period and FOA two. This indicator is not relevant for GOAP. The total reported is eight. The ALBs in Belize established a private-public partnership with the Belize Recyclers and Waste Management Association. FOA established the Namibian Ocean Cluster which formally commits stakeholders to minimizing waste and maximizing socio-economic value from the fish harvested in the local fisheries sector. The founding members comprise leading Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certified hake fishing companies, including Embwinda, Hangana, Merlus, Novanam, Pereira, and Seawork. The initiative aligns with the global ‘100% fish’ movement[[5]](#footnote-6), initiated in Iceland, and also present in Alaska, New England, and Denmark.

**4.3 – A.** This indicator measures the number of in-country coalitions, governance structures, networks or task forces established, engaged or strengthened. ALB partners reported nine, GOAP 13 and FOA six. The total reported is 28. For example, the bilateral programme in Senegal has re-established a Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) Working Group with 21 in-country stakeholders, including government ministries and technical and financial partners. The bilateral programme in Belize established an Experts Assessment Group for the Green Listing task force; and strengthened a Sargassum task force. GOAP established a Community Fisheries Counsels (CCPs) Network of Inhambane Bay in Mozambique. The tables below show a breakdown of the data by type and by Delivery Partner.

 Data Breakdown by type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type**​** | Level of support**​** | Total**​** |
| Engaged​ | Established​ | Strengthened​ |
| In-country coalition​ | ​ | 83% (5)​ | 17% (1)​ | 100% (6)​ |
| Network​ | 11% (1)​ | 56% (5)​ | 33% (3)​ | 100% (9)​ |
| Task force​ | 7.5 % (1)​ | 76.5% (10)​ | 15% (2)​ | 100% (13)​ |
| Total​ | 7% (2)​ | 71.5 % (20)​ | 21.5% (6)​ | 100% (28)​ |

Data breakdown by Delivery Partner

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Delivery Partner**​** | Level of support**​** | Total**​** |
| Engaged​ | ​ | Established​ | Strengthened​ |
| ALBs​ | ​ | ​ | 56% (5)​ | 44% (4)​ | 100% (9)​ |
| FOA​ | ​ | ​ | 100% (6)​ | ​ | 100% (6)​ |
| GOAP​ | 15.5% (2)​ | ​ | 69% (9)​ | 15.5% (2)​ | 100% (13)​ |
| Total​ | 7% (2)​ | ​ | 71.5% (20)​ | 21.5% (6)​ | 28​ |

**Output 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output Title**  | Innovative initiatives piloted that support equitable market access and value chain improvement  |
| Output number:  | 5 | Output Score:  | **B** |
| Impact weighting (%):  | 16.66 | Weighting revised since last annual review?  | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | **Description** | **Milestone(s) for this review** | **Progress**  |
| 5.1  | Number of pilots designed and tested by stakeholder networks*Indicator primarily aimed at FOA. No funding has been provided to FOA in FY24/25 but will restart in FY 25/26* | 24/25 Milestone: Total:0ALBs: N/AGOAP: N/A23/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap)*No milestone | Overall: 3, B ALB progress: 0GOAP progress: 0 FOA progress: 3*Scoring based on the results of the FOA evaluation report produced February 2024* |
| 5.2 | Number of initiatives planned to take to scale that support value chain improvement and equitable market access*Indicator primarily aimed at FOA. No funding has been provided to FOA in FY24/25 but will restart in FY 25/26* | 24/25 Milestone: Total:0ALBs: N/AGOAP: N/A23/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with year-on-year overlap)*No milestone | Overall: 3, BALB progress: N/AGOAP progress: N/A FOA progress: 3*Scoring based on the results of the FOA evaluation report produced February 2024* |

*Note: 23/24 reporting for FOA is taken from phase 3 plans and reporting. Milestones for FOA were not set for 24/25 because of pending funding decisions.*

**C1. Briefly describe the output’s activities and provide supporting narrative for the score.**

Output 5 and associated indicators monitor innovative initiatives piloted that support equitable market access and value chain improvement. The programme has scored B in indicators 5.1 and 5.2. Overall, output 4 has scored a B. The indicators capture the work of FOA and is not applicable for ALBs and GOAP. No milestones were set by FOA due to the uncertainty of continued funding at the time of setting milestones. The scoring is based on the results of the FOA evaluation report produced in February 2024.

**5.1 – B.** This indicator measures the number of pilots designed and tested by stakeholder networks. FOA reported three. The total reported is 3. This Indicator is primarily aimed at FOA, no funding has been provided to FOA in FY24/25 but will restart in FY 25/26.

**5.2 – B.** This indicator measures the number of initiatives counted in indicator 5.1 that are planned to take to scale that support value chain improvement and equitable market access. FOA reported three. The total reported is three. This Indicator is primarily aimed at FOA, no funding has been provided to FOA in FY24/25 but will restart in FY 25/26.

The three pilots delivered by FOA that are designed and stakeholder tested (indicator 5.1) and planned to take to scale (indicator 5.2) include:

1. Namibian Ocean Cluster: Within this reporting period, the project established three R&D projects: 1) investigating the quantity and quality of collagen from fish skins, 2) an assessment of the liver oil production process and 3) market research into the opportunity of producing collagen and liver oil from hake.​
2. In Ghana, a needs assessment on monitoring fish disease developed by the Task Force on Fish Health & Data Quality Management, to provide insights into how the aquaculture industry addresses and monitors fish disease and suggesting improvements for future prevention.
3. In Ghana, the Business Development Plan for an annual Farmed Fish Festival will be carried forward by industry champions with the goal of delivering the first festival by the end of 2024.

**Output 6**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output Title**  | OCPP intervention design adequately considers gender, equity and social inclusion and safeguarding |
| Output number:  | 6 | Output Score:  | **C** |
| Impact weighting (%):  | 16.66 | Weighting revised since last annual review?  | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | **Description** | **Milestone(s) for this review** | **Progress**  |
| 6.1  | Number of scoping missions/reports that include detailed stakeholder mapping, GESI analysis and safeguarding risk assessment | 24/25 Milestone: Total:12ALBs:12GOAP: N/A23/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 8.460% (B): 7.2<60% (C) | Overall: 1, C ALB progress: 0GOAP progress: N/AFOA progress: 1 |
| 6.2 | Number of intervention plans that reflect GESI recommendations and safeguarding measures | 24/25 Milestone: Total:12ALBs:12GOAP: N/A23/24 thresholds *(Cumulative milestones with discrete reporting)*70% (A): 8.460% (B): 7.2<60% (C) | Overall: 1, C ALB progress: 0GOAP progress: N/AFOA progress: 1 |

**C1. Briefly describe the output’s activities and provide supporting narrative for the score.**

Output 6 and associated indicators monitor progress towards OCPP intervention design adequately considering gender, equity and social inclusion and safeguarding. The programme has scored C in indicators 6.1 and 6.2. Overall, output 6 has scored a C. It is important to note that this indicator was introduced during the report year and requires further defining to ensure its alignment with programme GESI strategy and agreed approaches. Pockets of GESI sensitivity/consideration were noted from certain countries/workstreams which, whilst they did not fit the definitions outlined in the programme indicator reference sheet, do provide examples of actioning on the requirements of GESI and putting it into action, which is commendable. Data gathered this year will be used to review and ensure better alignment in the coming year. A GESI action plan has been agreed with ALBs partners and work is underway to conduct GESI analysis to inform delivery and stakeholder engagement and identify GESI and SEAH safeguarding risks and mitigations.

**6.1 – C.** This indicator measures the number of scoping missions/reports that include either detailed stakeholder mapping, GESI analysis and safeguarding risk assessment or all three. ALB partners reported zero, GOAP N/A and FOA one. The total reported is one. GOAP’s scoring is reported as ‘N/A’ because the indicator was not created nor was relevant for GOAP programming during this reporting period. FOA in Ghana produced a situational analysis report, “Landscaping Analysis of Aquaculture in Ghana,” that included stakeholder mapping and provided a GESI analysis for vulnerable groups and included recommendations.

**6.2 – C.** This indicator measures the number of intervention plans that reflect GESI recommendations and safeguarding measures. ALB partners reported zero, GOAP N/A and FOA one. The total reported is one. In Ghana, FOA produced a workplan titled Blue Food Partnership Ghana Action Plan”, that included stakeholder mapping and addresses GESI.

Wider examples (did not fit the definitions outlined in our indicator reference sheet).

**FOA​, Supply Chain Risk Tool (SCRT):** incorporates stakeholder analysis and acknowledges gender and social inclusion in its Phase III Strategy (published Feb 2024). SCRT report that half of the Seafood Meta-coalition leads the project engaged were female (non-corroborated statement). ​

**ALBs, Belize:** The programme’s subcontractor, WREN, ensured GESDI (including diversity) was reflected in the Pilot Port(s) Waste Infrastructure Upgrade Feasibility Study (published June 2024). The study acknowledges that social and gender inclusivity should be ensured through inclusive planning processes that actively engage various stakeholders directly impacted by port infrastructure (p.28). The Action Plan features an explicit GESDI action item to assess ‘green job’ creation for GESDI-identified actors.

The National Maritime Transport Policy (June 2024) incorporates and acknowledges GESI aspects in the following ways: 1) as an explicit guiding principle of the policy; 2) the policy lists ‘Maritime Gender Equity’ under its Priority Areas and Action areas and identifies which stakeholders are responsible for completing the identified five action areas.

**ALBs, Maldives:** Currently the MPA Management Framework and MPA Management Planning Guide do promote inclusive participation as a way of empowerment, but there is no guidance, and there are no tools included in the frameworks to help achieve this at a local level. ​

**Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU):** The ACU scholarships programme has implemented an inclusive policy for scholars, for example providing funding to support disability and maternity costs on a case-by-case basis.

**C2. Describe any changes to outputs during the past year, and any planned changes as a result of this review.**

During the reporting period, the OCPP logframe was revised by the newly recruited MEL services partner along with the MEL working group (formed of representatives from each delivery partner). The revision required the development of new indicator reference sheets and assessment methodologies which were used to capture data from across the reporting year where possible. This revision, six months through the year had implications for how milestones were set and, where new indicators were introduced, and the ability of the programme to consistently report across the whole year.

Additionally, previous annual reviews highlighted the need for improved M&E capacity across the programme. This year, the MEL services partner has been working closely with delivery partners to build capacity and improve the quality of reporting. There has been a significant improvement in monitoring and reporting this year compared to previous reporting periods which has been demonstrated by the depth of insight on programme performance within this review.

The following revisions and changes will be considered by the programme in December 2024 (to ensure compliance with best practice guidance requiring logframe changes to be agreed at least six months before annual review);

* Milestone targets and end of programme targets for all output indicators will require review following this first round of data collection against the revised logframe to ensure they remain both ambitious and realistic, especially where year-on-year double counting is likely.
* Output weightings will need to be reconsidered given that FOA will not be reporting in the coming year and that Output 5 focuses primarily on the work of FOA.
* Output indicator 6 definitions and methodology need to be reviewed to strengthen the alignment between what is measured and programme GESI strategy.

**C3. Progress on recommendations from the previous annual review (if completed), lessons learned this year and recommendations for the year ahead**

**Recommendation 1: Results and OCPP Monitoring System**

The OCPP programme team should procure an external MEL supplier for the programme to refresh the OCPP’s MEL framework including ToC and logframe and revise and coordinate the monitoring system by the end of 2023. The supplier should also undertake an independent mid-term evaluation of the programme in 2024 and an end of programme evaluation in 2026 and deliver a learning and knowledge exchange plan.

***Progress:***

*(Complete)*

In July 2023, Defra procured NIRAS as an external MEL supplier for the programme. The revised MEL framework was approved by the OCPP Senior Management Board at the December 2023 board and an interim evaluation of the programme completed in September 2024. Plans are in place to deliver a learning and knowledge exchange plan and an end of programme evaluation. In January 2023 a case study evaluation of FOA was also completed by NIRAS.

The revised MEL framework better articulates the breadth of work delivered under the OCPP, better integrates poverty and GESI, has ensured alignment with BPF fund MEL and ICF reporting and has improved monitoring for the programme. However, as expected for any new framework, there is still work required to further refine the ToC and logframe to address feedback and learning from this annual review period. Though MEL capacity and capability has improved, ALB partners in particular still need to improve as outlined in lesson 6 in Section A3.

**Recommendation 2: Gender Equality and Social Inclusion and Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Sexual Harassment Safeguarding**.

The programme should meet the minimum standards (GESI sensitive) and test and strengthen compliance with the International Development Act (2002) including the International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014, as well as the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010) by the end of 2025.

***Progress:***

*(Partially met)*

The OCPP’s initial GESI status was assessed under ODA hub guidance in February 2024, identifying the programme as GESI unaware. Clear ambitions were set to achieve GESI-sensitive status (the minimum standard) by December 2025. A GESI action plan was in pace by the end of Q1 FY24/25, outlining a roadmap with specific measures to achieve the ambition. This has been further refined throughout the reporting period. We are working closely with delivery partners to drive progress and expect progress towards GESI sensitive to be made in time for reporting into the next annual review, ahead of our December 2025 deadline.

GESI has been embedded into the updated MEL framework, allowing for continuous monitoring of progress moving forward. Data disaggregation by gender has been integrated in some outcome indicators, however further efforts are needed to disaggregate all indicators and ensure full alignment with the Inclusive Data Charter. Gender disaggregation will be amended to Sex disaggregation in future reporting cycles.

As Tier 1 ALB partner, Cefas has hired a dedicated social science specialist in Q4 FY23/24 to begin scoping opportunities for GESI analysis across the portfolio to inform future OCPP programming, ensuring that gender and social inclusion are adequately addressed in future phases.

The updated MoU between Cefas and Defra, and MoU between Cefas and Tier 2 partners JNCC and MMO, reflect HMG’s safeguarding standards though this is yet to me signed by MMO. Additionally, grant agreements with GOAP and FOA incorporate these standards.

A SEAH risk assessment was completed in August 2024 for all ALB delivery partners, FOA, GOAP, and the Defra programme team. This assessment provided insights into the current safeguarding status of each delivery partner and identified risk mitigation steps to ensure robust protection against SEAH risks.

**Recommendation 3: OCPP Governance**

The OCPP governance structure needs to be strengthened to establish a new ALB Tier 1 partner who is more accountable for the governance and coordination of the remaining ALB delivery partners, whilst ensuring overall accountability and oversight remain with the programme SRO and Programme Reporting Officer (PRO). The following should be actioned by the end of 2023.

***Progress:***

*(Complete)*

To streamline governance and coordination, a Tier 1 MoU was signed between Defra and Cefas in October 2023, formalising the new partnership structure. Additionally, Cefas signed MoUs with JNCC and MMO, in October 2023, establishing a clear Tier 1 and Tier 2 governance framework.

The Senior Management Board’s Terms of Reference (ToR) were revised to ensure the board effectively fulfils its strategic function. The revised ToR was shared with the Board in June 2024 and finalised with minor amendments. As part of the updates to the ToR, new members were added, including the BPF Deputy Director and Tier 1 delivery partner representatives from NIRAS, GOAP, and FOA. A Defra Social Development Adviser was also appointed as a new advisor to the board.

In response to recommendations from the previous annual review regarding financial visibility and oversight and the BPF ICAI review, Defra Commercial completed a full review of ALB overheads under the OCPP in September 2024. The review identified challenges in assessing ALB costs and value for money due to a lack of transparency in financial reporting to date. However, the findings indicated that, when benchmarked against external market standards, ALBs appear to offer cost-effective solutions, despite higher overhead costs compared to core Defra. This outcome has afforded the Defra programme team confidence in the delivery costs associated with the programme.

**D: RISK**

**Overview of risk management**

The overall risk rating for the OCPP is **High**. Numerous challenges have, threaten to have, or are currently impacting upon operations and delivery of the programme. There are multiple risks which have exceeded the programme risk appetite and have been escalated to the programme SRO and Senior Management Board and into BPF escalation routes. All identified risks and issues have mitigation measures in place and a named owner and are monitored regularly.

Throughout year three, programme risks and issues have been recorded and monitored through the OCPP RAID log. For the bilateral component of the programme, ALBs and Defra have maintained separate RAID logs. During year three, risks and issues have been raised either on an ad hoc basis (via email or during country-specific cross ALB and Defra meeting), or during fortnightly cross-theme country partnership meetings. A quarterly Programme Management Board remains the formal board for highly scored, prevalent risks to be escalated to the Defra programme management team. Those highly scored risks that remain unresolved are then escalated to the Senior Management Board.

The ALB RAID log has been successfully kept up to date, with the three delivery partners pooling resource and feeding in, capturing risks and issues occurring within each country partnership, and those more high-level programme-wide risks specific to the ALBs activities. The OCPP Defra RAID log has been streamlined, all existing risks accounted for, mitigated risks closed, and irrelevant legacy information discarded. A monthly RAID review is now undertaken involving Defra OCPP team members. The RAID log has been brought into alignment with ODA Hub and BPF-level risk and issue reporting, providing greater clarity of the risk management process. The OCPP is in the process of integrating a SEAH risk register into the main project risk register.

A lack of explicit regular risks and issues forum between Defra and delivery partners, combined with independent RAID logs across the OCPP in year three has itself been identified as a risk. The lack of a regular and explicit forum, excluding the quarterly Programme Management Board for ALBs and progress updates from GOAP and FOA, means delivery partners and Defra do not have a dedicated regular session focussed on risk management, potentially missing the opportunity to raise and manage risks. A renewal of a monthly RAID meetings between delivery partners and Defra will be implemented immediately. Despite improvements already taken, we are keen to find ways to further improve risk management.

Risks are also recorded for the OCPP’s strategic partners, GOAP and FOA. Defra have requested that both organisations raise risks and issues in quarterly formal check-ins. FOA and GOAP have also previously raised risks and issues on an ad hoc basis. These are recorded on respective RAID logs for both projects.

The process for GOAP and FOA raising risks and issues remains relatively informal; this could lead to inadequate risk management. As such, both organisations are being consulted on the formalising of the reporting process for year four and onwards. The proposed reporting configuration is:

1. Request a monthly RAID refresh from both organisations via email.
2. Formally implement RAID log reviews as an agenda item within quarterly formal check-ins currently held with both organisations.
3. (if option b proves to be insufficient or impractical) Host monthly/quarterly risk and issue reviews to update existing and raise new risks and issues.

The programme would benefit from the mapping of assumptions and dependencies as this is currently not recorded formally, this will be implemented during the ongoing review of risk management processes for the programme.

Considering key risk areas, concerns have been raised regarding the OCPP’s capacity to demonstrate a coherent narrative of the link between programme activities and poverty alleviation. In response, reviews of the ToC and Logframe have been undertaken, to ensure a renewed focus and alignment to poverty alleviation through livelihoods and will be reviewed again to further improve alignment. NIRAS’ mid-term evaluation has provided lessons learnt and recommendations to ensure poverty alleviation is more appropriately considered, these are fully considered within this review.

The OCPP team have identified a risk which relates to safeguarding complaints not being handled appropriately for the ALB component of the programme due to the OCPP Tier 1 delivery partner Cefas lacking an explicit policy for safeguarding complaints. In response to this Cefas have been commissioned to implement new processes and training to address this gap and appointed a safeguarding lead. The OCPP programme team have undertaken a review of SEAH Safeguarding risks for the programme and support is being provided by the ODA hub to address ALB organisational safeguarding risks.

No fiduciary risks were present during Y3 of the programme. Fiduciary risks always retain a low-risk threshold, owing to the requirement for ODA programme to use public funds transparently. Defra’s three lines of defence system is used to provide assurance control against fiduciary risk – front-line teams are briefed on the realised and potential impacts of the any risk; such risks are then escalated to Defra’s ODA Hub to provide sight of the risk and issue.

Previously, the OCPP Y2 annual review expressed intent to monitor and track risk appetite. This has been partially implemented previously through a more focussed approach on setting target RAG ratings for risks and documenting the mitigating actions the programme should/must take to achieve those target RAG rating. In year three, risk appetite has fully considered, and risk thresholds implemented for the various risk categories within the programme. Programme risks that exceed the risk appetite will be elevated to the programmes SRO and considered for further escalation where appropriate. At the time of writing, final risk appetites are subject SRO approval.

**Year three Key OCPP Risks**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description**  | **Inherent Risk**  | **Mitigation actions**  | **Residual Risk**  | **Risk Appetite & Target RAG** |
| ODA requirements - poverty reduction: uncertainty around evidence provided by programme monitoring and evaluation that the OCPP is adequately resulting in poverty reduction | High | External consultant NIRAS mid-term evaluation findings inform strategy going forward to align the OCPP to poverty reduction requirements. A review of OCPP Logframe and ToC has been completed to consider livelihoods to bring programme into alignment with poverty reduction requirements, further refinements expected. The OCPP Poverty Narrative distributed by Cefas, illustrating and reinforcing links between sustainable ocean management and poverty reduction. |  High | Open |
| Multiple RAID logs across the programme: the RAID process is currently fragmented across Defra and delivery partners, and lacks an explicit forum to raise risks and issues and establish responsibility, leading to a lack of coherence cross-programme | High  | Discussions underway between the OCPP and its delivery partners on best practice for reporting and managing risks and issues going forward. A visualisation of the risk management process and RAID log has been produced to illustrate the ideal reporting structure of issues and risks. |  High | Cautious |
| Changes to ALB delivery recommended by ICAI’s 2023 BPF review may not be realised by end of OCPP programming |  High | In May 2024, BPF recruited resources devoted to addressing ICAI recommendations. A BPF portfolio management plan has been produced planning how recommendations will be addressed across programmes. Regular updates on ICAI compliance to be provided by the OCPP. A commercial review of ALB overhead spend has been complete. Plans for next ICAI audit in progress through on going meetings | Medium | Cautious |
| Safeguarding complaints will not be handled appropriately by ALBs due to lack of explicit policy  |  High | Safeguarding language has been included in partnership MoU and will inform Cefas’s organisational policy. ALBs have been tasked to implement processes and training for employees to address safeguarding gap. ALBs have completed an assessment on safeguarding status. The ODA Hub is undertaking a review of Safeguarding across Defra ODA programmes to identify gaps. Safeguarding issues have been signposted through ongoing work between ODA Hub and the ALBs. |  Medium | Minimalist |

**Year three Key OCPP Issues**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue Description** | **Priority** | **Severity** | **Mitigating Action** |
| Lack of GESI analysis for the OCPP. ODA Hub found OCPP to be “GESI unaware”, similar findings by ICAI. | High | Medium | Independent MEL evaluator NIRAS recruited. Cefas have recruited a social scientist to lead on GESI across ALB partners and has started working to ensure GESI is embedded across delivery. Defra programme team seeking to contract additional GESI expertise to support coordination of GESI across programme delivery partners. |
| Lack of Political Economy analysis has led to limited knowledge of the PE situation in individual partnerships. | High | High | Recommendation to address included within this annual review. Cefas to ensure adequate PE analysis across bilateral partnerships.  |
| Underdeveloped transition strategy | High | High | Independent MEL evaluator NIRAS has been tasked with developing case studies of South Africa and India transition approaches to draw out lessons learned and to develop a tool to aid future transition planning. |

**E: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT:** **DELIVERY, COMMERCIAL & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

**Summarise the performance of partners and Defra, notably on commercial and financial issues.**

**Delivery Partners**

*Programme Management:*

Programme management across delivery partners for this annual review period has been good. ALB partners have ensured regular Programme Management Boards to provide programme updates. Senior Management Boards have also been held regularly with attendance across all delivery partners, FCDO, BPF and ODA hub colleagues, ensuring strategic oversight. Strategy days have also been utilised to deep dive into specific topics, risk and issues. An area for improvement is to ensure meeting notes and actions are captured accurately and distributed promptly and that structures are in place to monitor progress of actions between meetings and escalate if required. ALB partners are very engaged in programme management and respond swiftly to questions and requests. GOAP and FOA programme reporting is of a high standard, which regular informal and formal progress meetings to update on delivery, financials and risks and issues. They are responsive and adaptive to change, requests and steers. The interim evaluation has presented the programme’s strategic partners favourably.

There have been some delays to delivery caused in part by lengthy Defra approvals (covered under Defra heading below), however, the interim evaluation has also found that ALB annual work planning processes have been described by delivery team members as ‘reactive’ and activity-based, rather than ‘strategic’ in nature. According to ALB personnel surveyed, 40 percent of ALB personnel interviewed through this evaluation feel the annual work planning process has not been efficient to date. To improve, strategic planning processes need to better integrate the programme and country-level ToC to encourage delivery of long-term change. GOAP and FOA are very clear in their planning, can articulate their strategic impact and provide a good level of detail regarding deliverables.

To further improve delays, the ALB delegated authority table should be reviewed to clarify roles and responsibilities. ALB programme leadership must then ensure that OCPP staff have a clear understanding of these roles. ALB partners should establish appropriate escalation routes for risks, issues, and approvals identified in country-level cross-theme meetings to Defra country leads, minimising the need for Defra staff to attend these meetings. Cefas needs to ensure that messages from Defra are effectively communicated to the delivery teams, so they know who has the authority to make decisions.

The programme is still challenged by integration of GESI and poverty alleviation into delivery. Cefas have hired a social scientist to lead on embedding GESI throughout bilateral partnership activity design and delivery and have developed a paper articulating the link between the OCPP delivery and poverty alleviation. Further Development and MEL capacity and capability is required by ALB partners to address these issues.

*Financial performance:*

*Arms-Length Bodies*

During year three, the OCPP's ALB delivery partners reported underspend to their planned budgets. Due to successful adaptive programming, this underspend was significantly lower than in previous years. The underspend is attributed to the bilateral nature of the ALB delivery of the OCPP, which is dependent on the capacity and commitment of partner countries. Lower-than-expected spend performance resulted from slow in-country engagement and the termination of certain activities based on strategic evaluations. ALBs have reported spend to Defra on a quarterly basis, highlighting financial forecasts and risks, and proposed strategies which have adjusted activities and reduced underspend.

Financial transparency could be enhanced through better harmonisation between milestone reports and budget trackers. Currently, budget trackers focus on country-level expenditure, while milestone reports are based on logframe outputs across countries. An outcome of the ALB overhead review is ALB partners will develop new, aligned financial reporting framework that ensures consistency across the delivery partners, enhancing clarity and alignment for Defra.

*Friends of Ocean Action*

During year three, FOA and Defra worked closely together to monitor spending risks and identify potential solutions. FOA provided Defra with spend updates through quarterly formal and informal check-ins throughout the year and milestone reports that aligned with budget categories with expenditure. FOA reported a small underspend which was attributed to the Seafood Loss and Waste and Supply Chain Risk projects, where there were reported delays in subcontracting and reduced travel expenses.

Due to delays in engagement with subcontracting and the opportunity to enhance project impact through participation in key international conferences, FOA was granted a one-month no-cost extension to ensure the completion of all final deliverables. During this extension, FOA repurposed project funds to reduce the overall underspend. The outcomes of the no-cost extension were achieved outside the FY23/24 reporting period, as the extension occurred at the end of the financial year, and the final Q4 payment was not accrued to FY23/24 but instead paid in FY24/25.

*Global Ocean Accounts Partnership*

During year three, GOAP have provided regular updates at scheduled progress meetings and addressed comments and responded to clarifications from Defra in a timely manner. GOAP has fulfilled all reporting requirements including providing breakdown by expenditure category, but there is opportunity for Defra to further improve oversight of the GOAP programme spend by identifying a more detailed breakdown, and request GOAP to report on this, whilst maintaining the flexibility of GOAP to deploy funds within the purposes of the grant. It is recommended that Defra work with GOAP to provide a breakdown on spend by budget line, allowing Defra and GOAP to collaboratively monitor spending risks and continue to appropriately manage spend.

**Defra**

Efficiency has been compromised by lengthy delays in approvals from Defra. GOAP and FOA would have benefited from quicker turnaround times for sub-contracting and grant approval requests, ensuring stability in their grant funding. The interim evaluation noted that implementing partners had to develop mitigating strategies to address this issue. The previous annual review of the programme emphasised the need for faster turnaround times. Although some progress has been made, it has been slowed by limited staff resources and staff turnover.

Despite the existence of a delegated authority table for ALB delivery, its use has been inconsistent. The interim evaluation noted a lack of consistent SRO oversight and delegated authority in decision making for the programme.

**E2. Assess the VfM of this output compared to the proposition in the Business Case, based on performance over the past year**

**E2.1 VfM Overview**

As detailed in the output scoring above, evidence from the OCPP logframe suggests that the programme is performing moderately below expectations, scoring two As, three Bs and one C. This indicates that the programme may need to do more to be on track to achieve good VfM.

The assessment below first considers the VfM modelling undertaken at the Full Business Case stage, and whether the current evidence suggests that the programme is on course to meet the forecasts. There is then an analysis of the four Es (Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Equity), to form a more complete picture of programme performance against VfM. Finally, recommendations are provided for the next 12 months, to help ensure the OCPP can improve upon its VfM performance in future years.

The assessment finds some mixed results with respect to VfM performance. As will be seen in section E2.2, there is currently insufficient data against impacts to carry out a full analysis of the monetary benefits delivered to date, but the qualitative assessment of the four Es shows that improvements can be made across the programme to improve VfM. This is noted particularly regarding efficiency. The conclusion reached at this annual review is that more can be done to improve the VfM delivered by the OCPP, but more data is needed until we can quantify the performance to date and have a clear picture of the VfM achieved.

**E2.2 VfM Modelling and Cost-Effectiveness**

The forecasted monetary benefits of the OCPP were most recently updated at the Full Business Case in 2023. Analysis found that the programme was likely to produce a Net Present Value (NPV) of **£80m-£344m**, with an overall Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) of 2.9-9.0. The monetised benefits included:

* Reduction in marine plastic pollution
	+ Reduction in mismanaged waste due to improved monitoring and Marine Litter Action Plans (MLAPs)
* Increased protection of marine habitats
	+ Ecosystem service benefits per hectare of protected marine habitat
	+ Includes coastal resilience, provisioning services such as fisheries and other raw materials, tourism or recreational benefits, and carbon regulation benefits
* Improved quality of aquaculture
	+ Health benefits of improved aquaculture, approximated by the retail price of production as an indicator of income that could be used to improve livelihoods

And the un-monetised benefits include:

* Impact of improved waste management on households
* Improved distributional benefits
* Additional benefits per pound of spend from addressing more than one BPF theme in a programme
* Knock-on effects of reduced marine pollution on aquaculture health and MPAs.

The model assumes five-10 years for full benefits to materialise, with these benefits accruing over 30 years. Evidence from this annual review suggests that more needs to be done to ensure strong VfM is delivered, but given the long-term nature of the impacts, more time and data is needed before we can undertake a full appraisal of the monetary benefits achieved by the OCPP to date. The BPF Evidence and Analysis Team will aim to carry out this analysis ahead of the next annual review in 2025.The analysis will use an ecosystem services valuation approach, based on available data collected for Impact Indicator 1: “Area of marine ecosystems protected, enhanced or under sustainable management due to BPF finance (BPF KPI 6)”.

As the BCR modelling is driven by impact data (which as noted is not available at present), it is difficult to say with certainty where the programme currently lies with respect to the forecasted BCR range. However, given the performance of the programme against key targets and aspects of VfM as discussed below and in the output scoring, it is likely that the programme currently sits towards the lower end of the forecasted BCR range in the Full Business Case.

**E2.3 Four Es Assessment**

The assessment of the four Es below goes into more detail around each aspect of VfM. Key progress in the last 12 months towards delivering against the four Es are summarised in the bullet points under each section.

Much of the information below is drawn from the OCPP Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) conducted by NIRAS in Summer 2024. Some of the key findings with regards to VfM include:

* **Finding 10:** A range of factors have led to delays in the OCPP implementation, reducing the efficiency of programme delivery. These include: lengthy delays in approvals (Defra) and procurement and planning (ALBs); ALB inexperience in sustainable development contexts; unclear communications and branding across the bilateral programme; and lack of a bilateral programme in-country presence.
* **Finding 14:** There have been several challenges to VfM notably in relation to economy and efficiency. Nonetheless, good practice examples are emerging that can potentially drive stronger VfM going forward.
* **Finding 15:** The OCPP is already delivering results that, in time, are likely to deliver significant benefits. However, there is not enough evidence to conclude at this stage whether these have generated returns above and beyond the amount spent.
* **Finding 16:** The level of effective implementation of the OCPP varies across target countries and across delivery partners, but sufficient evidence exists that OCPP will make significant contributions to outcome level change.

The findings present a mixed picture of VfM, but also highlight that there is good potential for the OCPP to achieve its targeted results and outcomes.

**Economy (are we buying at the right price?)**

Economy considers whether the inputs required for a project are being procured at the best price.

* As a technical assistance programme the key cost drivers for the OCPP were staff costs, secretariat costs, technical assistance, and overheads.
* The structure of the OCPP – working with Defra ALBs as delivery partners – was designed to ensure economy of spend, as these ALBs have policies and procedures in place to manage HMG funding. However, as seen elsewhere in this review, there have been issues with ALBs affecting the efficiency of and effectiveness of the programme delivery as a whole.
* Due to the lack of transparency in financial reporting, the review of ALB overheads determined it was difficult to make an overall assessment on value for money. ALBs appear to offer a cost-effective option when compared to the external commercial market, despite the high overhead costs in comparison to core Defra. ALBs have been asked to develop a new aligned financial reporting framework that will enhance understanding of ALB costs moving forward,
* The MTE found that programme procurement experienced delays and was implemented at a slower pace than expected. This is anticipated to pick up in the coming financial year, with big-ticket items reportedly ready to go. However, given the delays in implementation, this is likely to have increased costs

**Efficiency (are we spending well?)**

Efficiency relates to how inputs can be turned into desired outputs. The desired outputs for this annual review are summarised above in the output scoring section.

* By building on the achievements of the Commonwealth Litter Programme (CLiP), the OCPP has been able to efficiently ‘springboard’ off existing initiatives and relationships to expand the marine pollution work, and delivery other thematic areas in those countries
* Programme decisions in 2023 helped to improve efficiency (through streamlining processes and reducing the time and cost burden) in several areas:
	+ New ALB working groups (for Travel; Communications; Risk Assumptions Issues and Dependencies (RAID); and MEL) were established
	+ The assignation of Cefas as the Tier 1 Delivery Partner in October 2023 has led to improved efficiency in both planning and delivery
	+ Defra’ steer to ALBs to reduce travel has led to improved coordination and efficiency of in-country visits among ALBs, with delivery partners implementing joint trips (with multiple objectives) and on occasion representing one another at the country-level
* The use of in-country and local partners has facilitated efficient delivery, hoping to reduce the cost per in-country programme activity
	+ FOA has made considerable use of international and local consultants and organisations to co-deliver programme activities
	+ WEF and WRI staff state that during a project they are in-country only a few times, and that local consultants were crucial for keeping the projects on track
	+ GOAP mobilises technical expertise from its secretariat and UNSW when needed, but it also has several strategies to engage local support
* Programme spend was found to have been slow for ALBs during the first three years of programme delivery but is anticipated to pick up speed in the coming months. Spend is still below full utilisation of available funds for the next two financial years, however
	+ As the programme is well past the halfway mark, in terms of time lapsed, spending performance will need to improve, particularly for ALBs. Feedback from interviewees from the Interim Evaluation indicated that the lower-than-expected performance was to do with slow in-country engagements and responses, as well as several big-ticket procurement items being finalised only recently, which will be reflected in the coming periods
	+ Even if spend is fully utilised, this does not necessarily mean that good VfM will be achieved. As noted in section A, sufficient prioritisation of sustainability by ALB delivery partners, or issues with integration of poverty alleviation to achieve desired impacts, will need to be addressed to ensure the spend being utilised represents VfM
* The MTE found differing results for efficiency for ALBs and strategic delivery partners
	+ **ALBs:** Local partner and delivery team member perceive the OCPP implementation by the ALBs as slow and inefficient (particularly in Ghana, Mozambique and Belize) with long periods of time between scoping and the start of activities, and delays to delivery on agreed workstreams. According to the latest activity tracker from FY 23/24, 24 percent of the activities were terminated, while seven percent were delayed. A further seven percent of the activities had yet to start. The reasons for termination are wide-ranging
	+ **Strategic Delivery Partners:** The quarterly reports of the strategic partners show they have consistently delivered as planned. On a few occasions the launching of activities were slightly postponed (e.g., to coincide with international conferences or other events). These changes were made with the approval of Defra. A key outcome for GOAP is to advance ocean accounts, including the piloting of actions in six new countries, all of which are on track.
* Several factors were identified in the MTE that hindered efficiency in delivery. These were:
	+ Delays in approvals, procurement and planning
	+ ALB inexperience in international development contexts
	+ Unclear communications and branding across ALBs
	+ Lack of a bilateral programme in-country presence
	+ Inefficient governance arrangements

**Effectiveness (are we spending wisely?)**

Effectiveness refers to the ability of funding to deliver the selection of outputs most likely to result in the desired outcomes (and impacts).

* Results from the OCPP logframe indicate that the programme is performing averagely against expectations. More information is needed on outcomes and impacts before a full VfM analysis can be undertaken, but performance against outputs suggests that more may need to be done to ensure VfM is being achieved as forecasted. See the recommendations section below for suggested actions to take in the next 12 months to improve on VfM performance
* As with efficiency above, the MTE found a mixed picture for effectiveness, stating in Finding 8 that ALBs are delivering outputs and activities below their planned levels, while strategic partners FOA and GOAP are consistently delivering against their milestones
* The OCPP's progress towards its intended impact remains inconsistent. The reported results at the outcome level have not met expectations at this stage of the programme, due to the factors examined within this annual review. Despite this, results to date show that the direction of travel to intermediate outcome and outcome change is generally good (including the policy aspects of Intermediate Outcomes, for example), and it can be expected that the intermediate outcome level changes already achieved may, given time, graduate to outcome level changes
* Of the delivery partners, GOAP demonstrates, at this point, the greatest potential to deliver transformational change
	+ GOAP has also been demonstrating potential to deliver a strong contribution to impact indicator #1, “Area of marine ecosystems protected, enhanced or under sustainable management due to BPF finance (BPF KPI 6)”
	+ FOA has the most direct link to improvements in livelihoods and wellbeing, whereas for the other components of the OCPP, livelihood and well-being impacts are more indirect

**Equity (are we spending fairly?)**

Equity assesses the degree to which the results of the intervention - both positive and negative - are equitably distributed, with consideration of different vulnerable groups in the population such as women and girls, those whose livelihoods are most at risk, and the young and elderly.

* Finding 5 of the MTE highlights that the programme has paid limited attention to GESI considerations thus far.
	+ Although there are plans afoot to address this critical gap, the pace and momentum behind addressing this critical gap is somewhat slow and there is a lack of clear leadership on this issue.
* The OCPP programme was assessed as GESI unaware in an assessment conducted by the ODA Hub, which is a significant failing for a programme three years into implementation. This was also reported by the ICAI review of the BPF, and the delivery partners (including FOA and GOAP), are taking steps to address these critical oversights
	+ These steps include Cefas hiring a GESI lead to lead GESI implementation across ALBs, and furthering dialogue with delivery partners, including GESI analysis for the programme
* Additional steps to address these issues are being taken by Defra and the ALB programme leadership, (though it should be noted that FOA and GOAP have not received any guidance from Defra):
	+ A safeguarding session was delivered to ALB programme leadership by ODA Hub in April 2024
	+ A broad GESI action plan from Defra was communicated to the ALB delivery partners at the ALB Planning Days in January 2024
	+ Safeguarding training has been introduced by Cefas, the Tier One delivery partner, and there are required online trainings that are available for programme teams to attend
	+ The Cefas Tier 1 delivery partner has recruited a GESI Expert as of May 2024. Similarly, FOA has hired a GESI consultant
* While GESI has been embedded into the new ToC and logframe for the programme, at this junction it is not yet possible to measure the socio-economic impacts of the programme as these considerations have not been embedded into its design

**E2.4 Recommendations**

The assessment above, drawing from the OCPP Mid-Term Evaluation, has identified several recommendations for the next 12 months with regards to VfM. It is important that the recommendations from this annual review and the Mid-Term Evaluation are implemented, to ensure the OCPP achieves the strongest possible VfM in the remaining years of the programme.

* **Improve MEL systems across delivery partners:** The interim evaluation team experienced first-hand the under-investment in MEL by the OCPP’s delivery partners, especially the ALBs. A dedicated MEL specialist in each delivery partner is recommended. With the refreshed ToC and finalised logframe, as well as the roll out of the MEL Hub for delivery partners to report data, we expect that this will address the shortcomings in the OCPP’s MEL systems which has hampered the reporting of results and therefore an assessment of effectiveness. Effective MEL systems also help hold performance accountable, strengthening the likelihood of achieving good VfM
* **Greater integration of the Theory of Change:** To strengthen effectiveness and encourage programme teams to aim towards the delivery of long-term change (including on poverty reduction) and a more strategic focus of their work,programme teams need to start actively using the theory of change in their programme planning and delivery. To ensure a more strategic engagement at country level, ALBs should use the country level Theories of Change
* **Develop a set of KPIs for VfM monitoring:** One of the recommendations from the MTE is that Defra should work with delivery partners to agree a set of KPIs for VfM monitoring, which delivery partners should report on in their progress reporting to Defra. VfM case studies should also be prepared to demonstrate benefit to cost comparisons. The process of choosing the set of KPIs has been started, and suggestions will be drawn from existing BPF/ODA programmes to help understand methodologies and increase the level of comparability between programmes
* **Faster response times to Delivery Partner queries:** Another MTE recommendation is for Defra programme management to seek to respond in a timelier manner to DP queries and apply faster decision-making on programmatic requests from partners. This would help speed up the spending performance. For reference, other programmes use a two-week response time for decisions/requests
* **Re-assess the geographical focus of the OCPP:** Some of the ALB and strategic partners interviewed felt that the OCPP is very fragmented geographically and is thematically too broad in scope, arguing a greater focus would benefit the quality of programme delivery and the attainment of outcomes
* **Undertake GESI reviews and embed GESI more effectively:** ALB partners should undertake a GESI review and analysis of the OCPP’s delivery and activities in each partner country, to embed GESI considerations into OCPP design. Delays on this will mean that GESI will be absent from programme delivery in FY 2024/25 which would be a missed opportunity. The MTE noted some confusion on who is driving the GESI aspect of the programme – this will need to be formalised, so GESI is effectively embedded across the OCPP, helping to move the programme up the continuum towards being GESI Sensitive and beyond

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date of last narrative financial report |  | Date of last audited annual statement |  |

**ANNEX A – Annual review threshold approach**

|  |
| --- |
| Year Three annual review process for the Ocean Country Partnership Programme (OCPP) |
| 1. Date: 24 May 2024
 |

**Background**

During Year 3 (Y3) of the OCPP, the NIRAS MEL team were recruited to support MEL system strengthening across the programming. In the first phase (August to December 2023) work has included a full review of the programme ToC and logframe and development of a MEL framework. From January 2024 onwards, the MEL team have been rolling out the strategy, working with delivery partners to building MEL capacity and developing tools and reporting processes to support effective monitoring of the programme (more detail outlined in section 1.1).

**The issue:** As a result of the MEL strategy revision, the programme logframe has been changed mid-year and targets have not been set for Y3 in the new logframe. The Arms-Length Bodies (ALBs) delivery partners have not been routinely collecting data against the old logframe. This presents a challenge for progress scoring in the Y3 annual review (due August 2024). This document outlines a proposed scoring approach for the Y3 annual review, based on our understanding of best practice in this circumstance.

**MEL systems update**

**MEL framework review: August – December 2023**

* OCPP ToC and logframe revised by all delivery partners and approved by Defra SRO in December 2023.
* Output indicator milestones for Y4 (July 24 – June 25) have been drafted by the programme directors in March 2024 during annual planning (ALBs and GOAP – FOA have not been included pending funding decisions). Final targets (for the end of the programme – Year 5, end 2026) will be produced shortly.
* Outcome targets (for the end of the programme) have been drafted for most outcomes.

**MEL system rollout: January – June 2024**

* The OCPP MEL team have been working with each country team (ALBs) to provide training on logframes and ToCs; review country-level ToCs and map programme indicators to be reported.
* The OCPP MEL team have developed indicator reference sheets and monitoring methods to support programme reporting
* Six weeks of open house sessions held twice a week have been held to support delivery partners in understanding reporting requirements and on specific tools.

**Best practice recommendations for annual review**

The following section sets out our understanding of best practice for a robust programme annual review.

* We should use the most recently approved logframe to report on in an annual review.
	+ Using the old logframe is not advised because whatever was relevant in the old logframe will have transferred to the new one, and whatever was not relevant has not been included the new logframe.
	+ In addition, the MEL framework, including the logframe, has been socialised with delivery partners and country teams over the last few months. The OCPP MEL team have introduced the MEL tools and reporting processes to delivery partners. To ask delivery partners to report on the old logframe in the next few months, and then ask them to report into the new one for the following year, would introduce confusion.

**Proposed Approach**

**For the Y3 annual review, we report the *progress* OCPP has made towards the Year 4 (Y4) milestones that have been set in the new logframe.**

*As far as possible, data will be collated against all current logframe indicators for the entire reporting period. It is understood that there may be some gaps in data where new indicators have been introduced.*

This is the preferred option for the following reasons;

**24/25 Milestone setting process**

* 24/25 output milestones were set based on activities planned in that year
* In general, they do not represent the cumulative results of previous years
* However, for Type 3 indicators (see below), there is likely overlap between units counted in Y3 and Y4.
* It supports integration of the new MEL framework into programme operations
* Reduces the risk of poor performance against the new logframe due to lack of data for reporting (as teams have not been capturing data against the new indicators a significant proportion of the year)
* Reduces the risk of inaccurate milestone / target setting for Y3
* Ensures we are not agreeing Y3 targets while the data is coming in (i.e. aligning targets to actuals before the reporting date)
* It is less burdensome on the Programme Director’s/programme team’s time.

For this option, we propose a threshold-based scoring system for the Y3 annual review. The new OCPP logframe includes three types of indicator / milestone at output level which would require slightly different threshold approaches. The approach to scoring each type will need to be consistent across the three types of indicators reflected on the logframe per the below table. To ensure consistency, **we will set Y3 performance thresholds against the Y4 milestones.** For example, an indicator achieving 50% of Y4 milestone in Y3 would be a ‘B’; 60% would be an ‘A.’ All thresholds would be discussed and agreed with Defra prior to the reporting/data collection period. The proposed thresholds are as follows, with further explanation below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of indicator / milestone** | **Proposed thresholds** |
| Type 1: Flat targets, which don’t change over time | As set by indicator (e.g. 80% of participants) |
| Type 2: Cumulative targets with discreet, per annum milestones | 60% of Y4 target = B, 70% of Y4 target = A |
| Type 3: Cumulative targets with the potential for overlap or double counting across  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A |

* **Type 1: The flat targets, which don’t change over time.**
	+ - Example - output indicator 1.1 (‘participants report increased knowledge’): we would measure 80% of all participants, whether that 80% is from a sample of 1,600 or a sample of 10 participants. Other flat targets include: 2.2 (‘% of outputs’).
		- **Annual review scoring:** to assess progress against these, we can use the thresholds (e.g. %) already set in the logframe. If we find in Y3 that we are below the threshold, we recommend that the target is reviewed and adjusted in subsequent years if agreed the threshold/target is too high.
		- **Proposed Y3 scoring threshold**: as set per indicator.
* **Type 2: Cumulative targets with discreet, per annum milestones**
	+ - Milestones are based on activities carried out within a specific year with no potential for duplication, double counting or overlap with previous or subsequent years.
		- Example - output indicators capturing the delivery of specific products such as 2.1 (‘number of outputs’); 3.1 (‘number of datasets’); 3.4 (‘Scientific papers, reports...’); 4.1 (‘number of MoUs’); 4.3 (‘number of in-country coalitions’).
		- Y4 milestones have been set based on estimated activities within that year (24/25). Reporting progress towards these milestones in Y3 decreases the risk of not achieving Y4 milestones which can be raised following the annual review to demonstrate increased ambition if required.
		- Given that Y3 milestones are likely to be like Y4 estimates, annual review scoring would be based on a higher threshold than existing cumulative targets.
		- Following Y3 reporting, Y4 targets would require updating to aggregate Y3 results with Y4 projections to create a cumulative milestone and of programme target.
		- **Proposed Y3 scoring threshold**: 60% of Y4 target = B, 70% of Y4 target = A
* **Type 3: Cumulative targets with the potential for overlap or double counting across**
	+ - Activities such as training may include the same participants year-on-year, hence cumulative targets must take this into account.
		- Examples include output indicator 1.3 (‘number of individuals receiving TA’); 1.4 (‘number of organisations supported with TA’).
		- Annual review scoring thresholds would consider the fact that Y3 results *contribute* to the Y4 milestone.
		- Following Y3 reporting, Y4 milestones may require a % increase to represent the additional, new results to be achieved in this year. For example, new trainees who had not been engaged in Y3.
		- **Proposed Y3 scoring threshold**: 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A

**OCPP Indicator reporting**

**July 23 – June 24 mapping**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator**  | **Included in previous logframe**  | **Previous logframe milestone**  | **Type of milestone (updated logframe)**  | **Assumed data availability for reporting 23/24** 1 = Full data set expected 2 = Partial availability 3 = Unlikely to report against this indicator  | **Proposed annual review reporting threshold**  |
| OP1.1 Participants report increased knowledge and capacity following training and /or mentoring  | Outcome 2  | None  | Flat  | **2:** although this was previously an indicator in the logframe, it is not clear that these data have been routinely collected  | As per indicator  |
| OP1.2 Target organisations / institutions in partner countries have increased access to functioning marine scientific equipment and staff trained in its use  |   |   | Cumulative: discrete annual  | **3:** Currently experiencing difficulties accessing asset register data + teams would need to carry out new assessments for all equipment  | 60% of Y4 target = B, 70% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP1.3 Number of individuals receiving TA support   | Output 1.1 Output 5.2  | 171 – ALBs 1 – ALBs??  | Cumulative: year-on-year overlap  | **1:** Technically, data should be available to report against this indicator as it is in the previous logframe. However, will not be able to report to ICF standard  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP1.4 Number of organisations receiving TA support   | Output 1.2  Output 2.2  | 25 – ALBs 7 - ALBs  | Cumulative: year-on-year overlap  | **1:** Technically, data should be available to report against this indicator as it is in the previous logframe. However, will not be able to report to ICF standard  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP2.1 Number of outputs (policy briefs, roadmaps, recommendations or guidelines) developed that contribute to sustainable management   | Output 1.3 ?  | 15 - ALBs  | Cumulative: discrete annual  | **1:** Teams should be able to access and compile this information + it was in the previous logframe  | 60% of Y4 target = B, 70% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP2.2 % of outputs developed that included inclusive consultation processes  |   |   | Flat  | **2:** Potential to test the monitoring tool for this output but unlikely to report full dataset  | As per indicator  |
| OP3.1 Number of datasets or monitoring systems developed or improved; ocean accounts compiled; educational resources produced  | Output 3.3  | 19 – ALBs 9 - FOA  | Cumulative: discrete annual  | **1:** Technically, data should be available to report against this indicator as it is in the previous logframe.  | 60% of Y4 target = B, 70% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP3.2 Number of scholars who enrolled and % who achieved a qualification (Masters, PhD) in relevant topics  | Output 3.4  | 24 - ALBs  | Cumulative: year-on-year overlap  | **1:** Data should be easily accessible for this indicator, and it was in the previous logframe  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP3.3 Scientific papers, reports, strategies, tools and/or databases developed or published which are freely available  | Output 5.3  | ALBs = 14 FOA= 5 (or 11)  | Cumulative: discrete annual  | **1:** Data should be easily accessible for this indicator, and it was in the previous logframe  | 60% of Y4 target = B, 70% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP4.1 MoUs or similar agreement between OCPP and partner country stakeholders signed  | Output 4.1  | 10 – ALBs 6 - Defra  | Cumulative: discrete annual   | **1:** Data should be easily accessible for this indicator, and it was in the previous logframe  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP4.2 Number of public- private sector partnerships or business clusters mobilised  |   |   | Cumulative: discrete annual   | **1:** Data should be accessible for this indicator (mainly FOA reporting)  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP4.3 Number of in-country coalitions, governance structures, networks or task forces established, engaged or strengthened  | Output 3.1  | 28 – ALBs 2 - FOA  | Cumulative: year-on-year overlap  | **1:** Data should be easily accessible for this indicator, and it was in the previous logframe  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP5.1 Number of pilots designed and tested by stakeholder networks  |   |   | Cumulative: year-on-year overlap  | **1:** Data should be accessible for this indicator (mainly FOA reporting)  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP5.2 Number of initiatives planned to take to scale that support value chain improvement and equitable market access  |   |   | Cumulative: year-on-year overlap  | **1:** Data should be accessible for this indicator (mainly FOA reporting)  | 50% of Y4 target = B, 60% of Y4 target = A  |
| OP6.1 Number of scoping missions/reports that include detailed stakeholder mapping, GESI analysis and safeguarding risk assessment  |   |   | Cumulative: discrete annual  | **3:** The definition and scope of this indicator is now under discussion   |   |
| OP6.2 Number of intervention plans that reflect GESI recommendations and safeguarding measures  |   |   | Cumulative: discrete annual  | **3:** The definition and scope of this indicator is now under discussion  |   |

**ANNEX B – OCPP Theory of Change**



**ANNEX C – OCPP Theory of Change Narrative**

**Overarching objectives of the OCPP**

The OCPP seeks to improve marine science capacity and capabilities across the three themes: biodiversity, seafood and pollution. It recognises the ocean supports the global population’s economic, social, and environmental needs, with over three billion people depending on marine and coastal biodiversity for their livelihoods.[[6]](#footnote-7) Careful management of the ocean is therefore a key feature of a sustainable future and ocean science is crucial to understand and monitor the ocean, predict its health status and support sustainable and equitable marine decision-making.[[7]](#footnote-8)

The OCPP expands on the TA methodology delivered through the Commonwealth Litter Programme, that aims to increase knowledge and capacity of stakeholders to tackle marine challenges through science-based policy and education.[[8]](#footnote-9) The OCPP enables partnership countries to strengthen marine science expertise, develop science-based policy and management tools, and create educational resources for coastal communities. The programme is intended to be demand-led, with the bilateral Delivery Partners working in collaboration with partner countries to create bespoke delivery plans for TA tailored to need. For FOA and GOAP, this reflects the programme’s understanding that local ownership for TA programmes is essential in order to ensure success.[[9]](#footnote-10) Furthermore, the programme’s activities of capacity building and/or providing technical assistance are aligned to the outcomes of the BPF: Marine Protected Areas, International and large-scale fisheries, Solid waste and other forms of marine pollution, Illegal Unregulated and Unreported fishing, sustainable aquaculture.

**OCPP Outcome and Intermediate Outcome level changes**

The programme’s stated Outcome is:

‘Partner country stakeholders take enhanced collaborative action to effectively and sustainably manage and protect their marine environments’

To reach that Outcome, the intervention must first result in the implementation of the following:

Improved policies and practices that protect and conserve marine environment effectively implemented by partner countries, with strengthened preparedness to respond to emergencies

Enhanced and inclusive regulations that protect and conserve marine environment effectively enforced by partner countries

Enhanced and inclusive community ownership, resourcing, and public-private partnerships and action [including scale up of successful innovations] to effectively manage their marine environment

At the Intermediate Outcome level, which is more in control of the programme to influence, the OCPP will result in:

‘Improved policies and regulation with enhanced capabilities and inclusive governance in place to implement and enforce these’

To reach this Intermediate Outcome level, the programme must result in the uptake/adoption of:

Partner country governments have the necessary human and organisational capabilities to implement improved policies, regulations, and approaches for sustainable marine environment management and emergency response

Partner country governments have improved policies, regulation frameworks, and approaches for sustainable marine environmental management & emergency response

Community ownership and / or support from public-private partnerships for policies, regulations and practices that support effective management of the marine environment

**Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion within the marine environment and OCPP**

Marginalised groups such as women, girls and indigenous people across OCPP societies have specific coastal-marine resource knowledge, capabilities, needs, and priorities that are linked to marine resource uses. Historically, the work and contributions of women, indigenous groups and workers in the informal sectors have been routinely ignored or underestimated in coastal and marine research, management and policymaking.[[10]](#footnote-11) Consequently, there is increasing societal pressure to promote, mainstream and sustain integrated, gender-transformative, participatory approaches to coastal-marine science and management and development. What is largely absent from these calls is practical guidance and the tools for materialising the gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) needs within programmes like the OCPP and bridging existing inequities in their management, technical and scientific roles.

Gender equality is defined here as the state of being equal in status, rights and opportunities, and of being valued equally, regardless of sex or gender identity and/or expression. Gender equality is part of a broader goal to ensure no one is left behind and that everybody – irrespective of their age, disability, race, religion, ethnicity, location, sexual orientation, gender identity or any other characteristic – enjoys equal opportunities, human rights and development outcomes.

There are several UK policies that promote and protect gender equality: the Equality Act 2010 provides the legal framework to protect the rights of individuals and advance equal opportunity for all; and more recently, the FCDO published the International Women and Girls Strategy 2023-2030, which contains five principles guiding its approach to ensure that no one is left behind and recognises the extreme challenges for those facing multiple dimensions of disadvantage.[[11]](#footnote-12) Besides national constitutions upholding equal rights for women and men, there are several internationally binding agreements (e.g., CEDAW[[12]](#footnote-13), ILO[[13]](#footnote-14) articles, etc.) to which all countries are signatories, while the voluntary and SDG# 5[[14]](#footnote-15) aims to achieve gender equality and empower women and girls.

The revised ToC presented within this narrative is aligned with the UK’s policies promoting gender equality. Each of the three OCPP thematic areas will require context-specific applications of GESI. The OCPP should look to empower, or strengthen women and girls’ knowledge and decision-making, improve their access to resources, build their capabilities and increase their economic, social and political opportunitieswithin the context of the programme’s reach.

**Problem Statement and Constraints**

The problem statement of a ToC sets out the issues, challenges, or problems that the intervention intends to address, and the constraints to addressing that problem. For the OCPP, the following Problem Statement has been identified:

* The oceans are negatively impacted by a breadth of human activities, endangering fragile environments and the livelihoods and wellbeing of vulnerable communities that rely on them.
* Partner country stakeholders often require increased capacity to generate and use scientific knowledge to inform robust policymaking and implement actions to address ocean pollution, biodiversity loss, access to sustainable seafood and the impacts of climate change.

The following constraints were identified:

1. Funding for research, resulting in knowledge and evidence gaps to support new policies.
2. Capacity levels for science, technology, and governance, including lack of physical resources and limited access to training.
3. Knowledge exchange of importance of healthy ocean ecosystems and local context.
4. Capabilities for effective evidence interpretation and policy response / implementation.
5. Competing priorities, particularly in lower income developing countries, that would deprioritise marine conservation, sustainable fisheries, and climate challenges for economic development in the near term, but leaving vulnerable communities worse off in the long term.
6. Lack of clear and consistent economic arguments for the importance of conservation.

**Causal Pathways**

There are four pathways to change (causal pathways) for the OCPP:

1. Capacity building
2. Governance and regulation
3. Science, education and knowledge exchange
4. Value chain and market access improvements for seafood

The causal pathways demonstrate the linkages between OCPP’s activities and inputs and the sequence necessary for creating the expected changes in marine science and management capacity and capabilities within partnership countries and regional or global partnerships. The outcome of OCPP increasing the capacity and capability of partnership countries and regional/global partnerships is expected to result in effective and sustainable management of marine environments. The causal pathways are also the avenues in which OCPP will address the identified constraints and problem statement. For example, through providing technical assistance on marine pollution, the OCPP should enact a positive change and increase a country’s capacity (i.e. resources) and capability (i.e. ability) to respond to marine pollution. The change that is expected to occur along these pathways is not linear, nor does each pathway operate in isolation; they should collectively support each other and result in synergies. Technical assistance for marine pollution could involve both training in-country scientists and providing access to better datasets to support in-country work, while simultaneously working with country governments and ministries to strengthen policies around marine pollution. Cross-cutting these four causal pathways is the critical linkage of GESI and safeguarding that the OCPP intervention design must consider.

Evidence for the efficacy of these causal pathways is linked with interdependent inputs (i.e. the activities or resources provided by the programme) that result in the OCPP’s outputs. The inputs for OCPP include:

* ODA funding
* Research and evidence
* Technical expertise
* Assets and equipment
* UK leadership
* Partner country government leadership
* Global and regional delivery
* Consultations, knowledge processes and participation from local communities.

The evidence provided in the section below underpins each of the four causal pathways and provides rationale for how these pathways leverage the inputs that result in outputs. This evidence shows how the causal pathways are plausible mechanisms to deliver envisaged results.

**Capacity building:**

This pathway enables and develops capacity and capability in scientific knowledge and the provision of scientific equipment and assets. Training and technical assistance (TA) supports partner country stakeholders in sustainable marine ecosystem science, management, and impact monitoring (including the provision of and training in the use of scientific equipment, infrastructure, and data). The capacity building is delivered to, or in partnership with, key institutions across partner countries. For example, in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and Belize the OCPP has supported the set up or capacity building of researchers/scientists of laboratories. Individuals at a senior or decision-making level within partner country ministries are also trained in marine science and/or management. OCPP funds and delivers both proactive and reactive emergency response capacity building, training and the provision of equipment for multiple countries within its portfolio to respond to marine pollution incidents. The emergency response work involves an element of reactive work and is therefore dependent upon the occurrence.

**Capacity building examples across themes**

**Marine pollution:** Reactive emergency response, laboratory training, waste management workshops, training in statistical modelling

**Biodiversity:** Development and delivery of Marine Protected Area (MPA) training programmes. IUU enforcement training

**Sustainable seafood:** Compliance and enforcement training; fisheries management training.

Capacity building through the delivery of Technical Assistance is one potential mechanism to catalyse change on a wider scale.[[15]](#footnote-16) The OCPP further expands on the proven Technical Assistance methodology demonstrated by the CLiP programme, which provided long-term, collaborative capacity building and technical assistance that supported CLiP countries to become regional centres of expertise.[[16]](#footnote-17) Under GOAP, OCPP supports the delivery of convening and capacity building activities that will build a global community of practice for ocean accounting, including: capacity building Q&A sessions for interested ocean accounting pilot projects, global and regional dialogues on ocean accounting, and consultations with other projects and initiatives supported by the BPF.

Capacity building activities should follow recommendations from the Kunming-Montreal Biodiversity Framework[[17]](#footnote-18) for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and they must be participatory. Science often misses the value of integrating gendered and indigenous knowledge systems in marine resources management. Indeed, participatory, gender transformative approaches have proven to be effective in marine environmental management contexts[[18]](#footnote-19).

**Governance & regulation**

This pathway supports the development and implementation of evidence-informed, locally relevant policy and regulations in partner countries.For the OCPP, this could include establishing frameworks with partner countries, either with a formal agreement such as an MoU, or developing less binding strategies and plans, depending on the socio-political context of the country. Within a country, the OCPP helps national or regional ministries and governments establish policies or frameworks focused on Marine Spatial Planning workplans; Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME) assessment frameworks; Smart MPA Management Plans, and the establishment of thematic-specific implementation roadmaps. For example, in Ghana the OCPP has established a draft Marine Spatial Plan (2023-2025) with relevant Ghanian Ministries. This also covers developing integrated models and approaches for sustainable ecosystem management and emergency response preparedness, including natural capital accounting, models for inclusive local marine ecosystem governance and spatial planning, national and local planning and budgeting, as well as ecosystem-based adaptation measures.

By providing donor funding, Technical Assistance, and establishing relationships (be it bilaterally with partner governments/ministries, or through strategic/multilateral partnerships as delivered by GOAP and FOA), the OCPP equips partner countries with tools to improve and inform policy and governance. The support is also catalyst to protect the marine environment and realise connected benefits of food security, sustainable incomes and climate resilience in coastal communities.[[19]](#footnote-20)  The CLiP programme was found to be an essential channel for effective soft diplomacy and resulted in five partner countries signing MoUs with the UK to tackle specific marine issues.[[20]](#footnote-21) The OCPP, through funding GOAP, is enabling the development of ocean accounts that help decision makers track whether investments are building ocean wealth for future generations. All six of GOAP’s pilot countries are in the process of scoping, establishing, and/or drafting national ocean account plans with ministries, governing bodies or institutions involved in ocean accounting.[[21]](#footnote-22) For example, GOAP’s pilot in Vietnam has provided input into the country’s input into the drafting of Viet Nam’s Blue Economy Model to 2030.[[22]](#footnote-23)

**Governance & Regulation examples across themes**

**Marine pollution:** Best practice guidance; State of the Environment report

**Biodiversity:** Marine spatial planning framework and guidance, MPA management plans

**Sustainable seafood:** Gov to gov support on fish health; fishery assessment support

FOA focuses on building partnerships and commitments to act on the opportunities and testing of solutions through its pilot projects. For example, through its implementation of the Blue Recovery Hubs in Fiji and Samoa have gathered support across different government agencies and have opened opportunities to scale up the concept of the Blue Recovery Hubs through regional institutions such as the Pacific Islands Forum.[[23]](#footnote-24)

Change at the policy and governance level is a complex and non-linear process, and highly dependent on context. Securing buy-in and ownership at the community and local level is essential for policies and regulations to be adhered to and implemented. Therefore, participatory approaches at the community level for OCPP are critical. There are many examples of community-level stewardship of natural resources, where people’s connection to their surrounding landscapes and seascapes fosters care and this has resulted in unique cultural practices and resource management[[24]](#footnote-25) [[25]](#footnote-26). The inclusion of evidence from gendered, indigenous and local knowledge from coastal-marine the communities within the partner countries is crucial to ensure that planning, decision-making, as well as policy and regulatory changes can be implemented and sustained. Without inclusion at the grass roots level and understanding of the social and gender differentiations, policy changes made from the top down are at risk from not obtaining ownership from the communities whose lives are most affected by unsustainable practices, weak management, decision- and policymaking.

**Science, education & knowledge exchange**

This pathway develops partnerships and engagements that enable science, education and knowledge exchange across multiple levels of stakeholders. The OCPP establishes, and/or strengthens ocean science-related networks between individuals, organisations (including universities), and ministries within partner countries, and between partner countries. This could be on Marine Spatial Planning, marine pollution and litter, or specific marine science and biodiversity thematic areas. Within a few OCPP partner countries (for example, Bangladesh) the programme funds direct scientific education input into universities.

**Science, education & knowledge exchange examples across themes**

**Marine pollution:** Microplastic laboratories; water quality assessments; marine litter action plan development

**Biodiversity:** MPA communication & awareness raising; marine habitat mapping; ecological data collection and management support

**Sustainable seafood:** Industry improvement assessments; feasibility studies.

A prominent delivery of the programme is the funding of scholarships for MSc and PhD in partner countries to increase the capability of skilled and trained personnel who can provide science-based knowledge as a basis for decision-making. The scholarships are also to enable personnel able to develop new technologies, methodologies and products through research and innovation. Scholarships funded by the OCPP are managed by the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU). The scheme allows scholars to remain within the region to study, addressing challenges with capacity building and has allowed early career researchers to access advanced education opportunities. The scholars are drawn from government ministries, the national university and industry. The aim is that all will take their learning back to their communities and previous/new positions to enhance the region’s collective knowledge base in marine protection.

The programme establishes and works in partnership with countries, and also private-public groups and regional bodies, to deliver activities that are agreed and desired by the country or group. Local ownership or support for TA programmes is essential for the OCPP to be effective: where the recipient country is the active party in identifying and selecting TA, the prospects of success are much higher. [[26]](#footnote-27)

The OCPP also works to increase awareness of issues of sustainable marine management at the community-level through engagement in knowledge sharing and community action events. For example, education and outreach events could be with fisherfolk within coastal communities on abandoned, lost or discarded fishing gear (ALDFG) to understand what fisherfolk believe will be the most successful in reducing the drivers on marine pollution (Ghana). The pathway aims to ensure relevant data and evidence are available to inform policy change and also behaviour change. The CLiP programme produced numerous locally generated scientific papers that led to local scientists gaining international exposure, which influenced local governments to recognise scientific evidence to inform policy change. The programme also resulted in the behaviour change of local communities through the programme’s knowledge exchange efforts.[[27]](#footnote-28) The OCPP has so far published 23 scientific papers or reports as a result of support delivered in OCPP partner countries. The OCPP’s support of GOAP specifically targets the co-creation of knowledge products that support the development of globally accepted and standardised ocean accounting practices. The programme has supported the publication of international analysis and reporting on state-of-the-art ocean accounting for:

Publication of revised guidance on ocean accounting for sustainable development

Creation of a global ocean asset data package for ocean accounts that will provide global access to existing datasets along with guidance on how to use them

Publication of guidelines for BPF projects on ocean data and reporting

Technical issue papers that address unresolved methodological challenges concerning ocean accounting.[[28]](#footnote-29)

FOA’s model of convening and developing public-private-science partnerships to catalyse pilots is based on the success and results of its sister-funded programme, Global Plastic Action Partnership (GPAP). Since GPAP’s launch in 2018, it has secured a commitment by Indonesia to reduce 70% of mismanaged waste by 2025 and a commitment by Vietnam to reduce marine plastic waste by 75% by 2030, amongst others.[[29]](#footnote-30)

Similarly, GOAP’s ability to generate evidence and facilitate pilots in ocean accounting has resulted in positive country feedback from Indonesia, which highlights how initial work in ocean accounting has facilitated coordination and inter-ministry approaches to manage the marine environment.[[30]](#footnote-31)

**Value chain and market access**

This pathway develops relationship and innovative pilots to test for sustainable and equitable ocean management through GOAP and FOA.

**Value chain and market access examples across themes**

**Marine pollution:** NA

**Biodiversity:** NA

**Sustainable seafood:** Development of seaweed cultivation; solutions for maximising seafood by-product use; Global Sustainable Aquaculture roadmap

Market demand is a key driver of change within the seafood sector and companies that demand sustainable[[31]](#footnote-32) value chains can have a significant impact on the health of the world’s oceans, while protecting of millions of livelihoods, fostering the development of more sustainable capture fisheries and CBD-compliant aquaculture by encouraging better fisheries governance and adopting good fishing and fish-farming practices[[32]](#footnote-33). While there are many flaws in today’s sustainable seafood value chains[[33]](#footnote-34), those companies that are engaged to produce, process and/or retail marine commodities are committed to sustainability metrics and human wellbeing are those that hold the key to build successful businesses that help reduce some of the intrinsic risks to seafood production and supply.

OCPP supports four FOA projects to develop impactful solutions that address some of the most pressing concerns of ocean sustainability, ranging from the full utilization of fish to make progress on reducing global seafood waste, supporting the increasing role of aquaculture to meet seafood demand, developing tools and partnerships to combat IUU fishing, and supporting developing countries in their ocean related post COVID-19 economic recovery plans. Reducing seafood loss and waste is critical to addressing nutrition and food security for a growing population within planetary boundaries.[[34]](#footnote-35) FOA’s Seafood Loss and Waste project is being piloted in Namibia and addresses the ethical imperative to use the whole fish, or 100% of seafood. This project has had an initial focus on seafood loss in Namibian hake fisheries and explores how to ensure that the value of seafood by-products, such as scales, frames, heads, and viscera, is efficiently and effectively captured and repurposed in economically viable and market-appropriate ways.

The evidence to support FOA’s projects is founded on FOA’s previously evidenced work. FOA championed the WEF’s Tuna 2020 Traceability Declaration, which mandates that by 2020 all tuna products should be fully traceable and come from socially and environmentally responsible sources. Through the launch of the Global Tuna Alliance (GTA) (a FOA initiative), FOA secured commitment to the declaration from key international supermarket and retailer brands including Tesco, Waitrose, Sainsburys, Asda, M&S, Harrods and many others.

At the heart of this conceptual approach is the need to develop a Sustainable Seafood Policy (SSP) for seafood buyers, retailers, processors and fisherfolk to embark on an incremental process that leads to more responsible fishing economies. Integrating women and marginalised groups into the decision-making processes of the marine environment, particularly in sustainable aquaculture, enabling equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities to marine resources as well as promoting safe workplaces especially in the seafood industry is paramount. It requires engaging the private sector, women and other marginalised groups and market actors to develop market linkages for ‘producing certifiable sustainable seafood value chains[[35]](#footnote-36).

**Assumptions and Risks**

There are some critical assumptions that must hold for the envisaged changes in these five pathways to be realised in practice. The below assumptions cover the cross-cutting elements of GESI, VfM, and the integration of GOAP/FOA.

Activities to Outputs

Governments and stakeholders willing to engage OCPP and are committed to protecting the marine environment

Delivery partners, UK Marine Science and policy community and the centres of excellence and stakeholders, have capacity to engage with the programme

Majority of required datasets are made available for composition of ocean accounts

Integrated coordination supports learning, adaptation and minimises duplication of work between Delivery Partners

Outputs to Intermediate Outcome

Delivery of pathways and activities are effectively tailored to local contexts [FOA/GOAP: green; ALB: amber]

Capacity, capability and evidence generated through the programme effectively translate into policy and management change [GOAP/FOA: green; ALB: amber]

Programme delivery adheres to Do No Harm principles, Safeguarding Principles and signed Frameworks [red for all]

HMG funding and priorities continue to support improvements in the marine environment and ocean economies [green]

Assumptions are formulated adequately to ensure that they can help drive adaptive management principles that promote the systematic capture of lessons and related adjustments in the pathway toward achieving the OCPP’s objectives. [amber]

All OCPP interventions are coherent with UK and partner country international agreements (e.g. CBD, ILO, CEDAW) to which all parties are signatories’ policies [green]

Intermediate Outcomes to Outcomes

Communities, including women and marginalised groups, have the adequate social and economic incentives and motivations to build ownership and engage in action to improve stewardship of the marine environment and comply with improved management of the marine environment

Public-private funding and innovations in financing are available to support implementation of improved policy, regulatory framework, and improvement in the sustainable ocean economies in partner countries [green FOA and GOAP; ALBs amber]

Interventions are targeting marginalised groups, including the poorest, and women and girls [red]

Outcome to Impact

Inclusive and empowered governance of the marine environment translates into benefits for coastal communities [insufficient evidence to assess whether these are holding]

Policy and management changes leads to livelihood and environmental (e.g., biodiversity resilience-building) benefits for direct and wider beneficiaries

Effective integration with and additionality to other BPF and other donor programmes

Co-benefits with wider BPF outcomes on critical marine habitats, small-scale fisheries and sustainable aquaculture that is coherent with the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international agreements.

Significant crises during the programme create a gap or shift that distract from OCPP’s prioritisation within partner countries’

VfM

The OCPP has a coordinated and coherent delivery so that the value it creates is more than the sum of its parts.
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