**Ocean Country Partnership Programme – Annual review 2021/2022**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title: Ocean Country Partnership Programme** | | |
| **Programme Value £ (full life): £65m** | | **Review date: July 2022** |
| **IATI Identifier:** GB-GOV-7-BPFOCPP | **AMP start date:** June 2021 | **AMP end date:** June 2022 |

**Summary of Programme Performance**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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) |

***"This Annual Review was written in July 2022 to reflect the delivery priorities and required compliance standards at the time. At publication [December 1st, 2022], some of these priorities and standards have changed. The Annual Review has been published in the form it was approved at the time and should be considered in context."***

Contents

[Section A – programme summary/overview 3](#_Toc117669025)

[A1. Programme Description 3](#_Toc117669026)

[A2. Supporting Narrative 3](#_Toc117669027)

[A3. Lessons learnt and recommendations 4](#_Toc117669028)

[Lessons learnt 4](#_Toc117669029)

[Recommendations 6](#_Toc117669030)

[Section B – progress review 9](#_Toc117669031)

[B1.1 Summary 9](#_Toc117669032)

[B1.2 Theory of Change 9](#_Toc117669033)

[B2. Assessment of whether programme is on track 10](#_Toc117669034)

[B3. Recommendation on whether programme should continue 11](#_Toc117669035)

[Section C – output assessment 12](#_Toc117669036)

[Outputs 12](#_Toc117669037)

[Section D – risks 17](#_Toc117669038)

[OCPP risks 17](#_Toc117669039)

[FOA & GOAP risks 19](#_Toc117669040)

[Section E – Programme management 20](#_Toc117669041)

[E1: Summary of Defra and delivery partner performance 20](#_Toc117669042)

[Defra programme team performance 20](#_Toc117669043)

[Delivery partner performance 20](#_Toc117669044)

[Joint areas for improvement 21](#_Toc117669045)

[E2: Value for money overview – led by economist 22](#_Toc117669046)

[Annex A – Theory of Change 23](#_Toc117669047)

[Annex B – Risk registers 24](#_Toc117669048)

# Section A – programme summary/overview

## A1. Programme Description

The Ocean Country Partnership Programme (OCPP) is a UK Government-led programme funded through Defra’s share of the £500 million Blue Planet Fund (BPF). The BPF is financed through the UK Official Development Assistance (ODA) budget and will support eligible countries to reduce poverty through sustainable management of their marine environment.

The OCPP is Defra’s primary technical assistance programme under the BPF. The programme provides technical assistance to coastal developing countries, prioritised according to a suite of poverty and environment indicators of relevance to the BPF. The OCPP enables countries to strengthen marine science expertise, develop science-based policy and management tools, and create educational resources for coastal communities. The OCPP is demand-led, meaning delivery partners work in partnership with country governments: activities focus on capacity building in local institutions, organisations, and communities.

The programme’s delivery partners – the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas), the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), referred to collectively as arms-length bodies (ALBs) – provide bilateral technical assistance on tackling marine pollution, developing sustainable seafood practices, and protecting and enhancing marine biodiversity. The OCPP also funds two multi-donor initiatives, the Global Ocean Accounts Partnership (GOAP) and Friends of Ocean Action (FOA), providing additional support to partner countries and developing global public goods relevant to the programme’s objectives. GOAP is a multistakeholder partnership hosted by the University of New South Wales that supports the development and maintenance of ocean natural capital accounts. FOA is a platform hosted by the World Economic Forum in collaboration with the World Resources Institute that brings together ocean leaders to encourage action and investment into sustainable ocean projects.

The OCPP launched in 2021-22 with a projected lifetime budget of £65m over 5 years, covering the five current delivery partners, with scope to bring in additional delivery partners to increase capacity in meeting programme ambitions and partner country needs. The UK has partnered with seven countries in the first year of the OCPP and is aiming to scale up to between 10 and 15 full country partnerships over the programme’s lifetime, as well as continuing to support the production and dissemination of strategic global public goods and smaller-scale pilot projects in additional countries.

## A2. Supporting Narrative

The OCPP delivered £7,383,506.26 of BPF this reporting year. Highlights include:

* The development of seven OCPP partnerships in Bangladesh, Belize, India, Maldives, South Africa, Sri Lanka, and Vanuatu.
* Integration of Commonwealth Litter Programme (CLiP) and One Health Aquaculture (OHA) under the OCPP.
* Emergency Response component developed and enacted to provide reactive support to Sri Lanka on the Xpress Pearl incident, by evaluating the impacts on the incident and initiate a long-term monitoring programme.
* Rapid scoping and needs assessment provided to Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Panama to support proposed expansion of the Eastern Tropical Pacific marine protected area.
* Successful OCPP delegation visits to Belize, Sri Lanka, and Maldives to formally launch the programme, which built relationships with and generated buy-in from ministers and senior officials from key ministries, and deepened understanding of local context.
* Successful technical visits to Belize, Maldives, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India and South Africa to either scope future work or deliver technical assistance activities e.g. OHA Pan African Workshop and Baited Remote Underwater Video systems (BRUV) training in the Maldives.
* Protected Areas Management Effectiveness (PAME) assessments shared with Maldives and Belize governments (published at a later date) and stakeholder mapping exercise delivered in Maldives.
* Progress towards all OCPP logframe outputs.
* Trial integration of GOAP and FOA as a joint programme received positively by the delivery partners, partner countries and the wider BPF team.
* GOAP publication of ocean accounts and ocean account development roadmaps for five pilot countries – Fiji, Viet Nam, Indonesia, Mozambique & South Africa.
* GOAP delivered their 3rd Global Dialogue event on ocean accounting.
* Establishment of a Blue Recovery Hub in Fiji by FOA.

The programme has been assessed through output scoring and qualitative assessment of what has been achieved (please refer to section C). There were no milestones or targets defined for Y1 of OCPP due to the demand-led nature of the programming and the need for extensive partnership scoping. Therefore, the programme has not been scored for FY 2021/22 but will be scored in all future annual reviews.

## A3. Lessons learnt and recommendations

### Lessons learnt

1. **Bilateral engagement**: Engagement with partner countries demonstrated strong demand for this programme and despite operational challenges, for example due to Covid, the programme made significant progress in the first year and was well received across the board by partner countries.
2. **The demand-led approach**: The demand-led nature of the programme has generally been well received by partner country governments, aligning with best practice in this area and demonstrating an intent to form genuine partnerships. But the approach does raise some challenges which have tested several planning assumptions. For example, the cross-agency/ministry engagement required to generate an accurate assessment of in-country demand has often required significant time and resource, often more so than anticipated, with potential knock-on impacts in terms of delivering activities and ability to expand the programme. Whilst it’s been important to get the scoping process correct to ensure partner countries are aware of the nature of the support and capabilities available, and therefore asks are appropriate, there may be opportunities to be more propositional in future.
3. **Aligning with BPF and UK programming**: The OCPP has, in most of its partner countries, been the first BPF programme to operate and be introduced on a bilateral level. This has generally been an effective means of raising the profile of the BPF and unlocking traction and buy-in from priority countries. Demands in-country, however, often exceed the OCPP’s remit. Whilst a concerted effort was made to frame the OCPP offer around what is set out in the business case, it has sometimes proved challenging to balance this with the desire to be truly demand-led and to offer a holistic approach to marine management, especially in the absence of other bilateral BPF programmes. As those programmes are established in the next two years this pressure is expected to reduce, however it should continue to be monitored. This should also help ensure the OCPP delivers maximum impact and value for money, by focusing on its core unique selling points (USPs) around marine science and management and their application in policymaking.
4. **Streamlining portfolios**: As engagement with partner countries and delivery partners has increased, it has become increasingly clear that we should streamline the programme portfolio and themes. Originally the OCPP consisted of a bilateral component (delivered by Cefas, JNCC and MMO), with BPF funding to GOAP and FOA developed as separate business cases. These were then trialled as a joint programme with GOAP and FOA incorporated into OCPP, which has been viewed positively across the board by the delivery partners, partner countries and the wider BPF team. Benefits of the more integrated approach have included a clearer overall BPF offer to recipient countries and reduced internal management costs associated with managing a single, albeit larger, programme.
5. **Remote engagement**: Initial engagement with partner country governments was, in many cases, particularly challenging where travel was not possible, largely driven in the first year by Covid-19 related restrictions. As OCPP is both an ODA and environmentally focused programme there is clearly a particular obligation to ensure that travel is proportionate and represents value for money. The experience of seeking to introduce and roll out the programme remotely, however, particularly in the first half of the year when travel was largely impossible, has been that doing so at the outset is often ineffective, driven by logistical challenges, frequent poor internet connectivity in target countries, differing practices and expectations around remote meetings, and cultural expectations amongst partner countries.
6. **Country prioritisation**: Target countries were identified using a range of quantitative poverty and environmental indicators and in line with an exercise conducted across the whole of the BPF. But the experience of rolling-out and delivering the programme has demonstrated that other factors, such as the capacity of British Embassies/High Commissions, can also have a substantial impact on the programme’s potential in each country. Whilst the quantitative indicators remain a sound basis for further prioritisation as the OCPP expands, additional qualitative lenses should also be considered and continually assessed in light of further learning through delivery. This should include a focus on local political economy.
7. **Benefits of delivering through HMG**: Using UK government agencies as delivery partners has provided several important benefits and represented a genuine cross-government approach to delivery. Benefits include reinforcing the OCPP’s status as a government-to-government programme through engagement with counterpart agencies in partner countries and maximising the programme’s USP around marine science, management and regulation by drawing on the agencies’ world-class, often unique expertise.
8. **Programme governance:** This approach has, however, created some presentational, governance and management challenges due to the clearly demarcated donor-delivery partner relationship that would ordinarily be present within a bilateral ODA programme being more ambiguous. For example, partner countries have not always recognised the distinction between Defra and its agencies which has sometimes made communication challenging. We are working to identify solutions though some may just be a case of sustained, proactive management. Addressing management challenges is a priority (see recommendations).
9. **Target setting**: This is the first annual review of OCPP, with indicators reported against in the logframe without associated targets. Generating credible targets in the first year proved highly challenging given the stage and nature of the programme. Given the comparative maturity of the programme now an updated logframe that will include targets for the programme is currently under development by the Defra programme team in collaboration with delivery partners, due to be finalised by the end of the calendar year and reported on in future annual reviews. This will include output, outcome and impact level targets. As these elements are missing from the draft logframe here, longer narrative explanations of progress against outputs have been included. Given the demand-led and adaptive nature of OCPP, there is an expectation that logframe targets and indicators will change over time as understanding of in-country demand develops and new evidence and learning through delivery emerges. Such changes will be reported on in annual reviews.
10. **Financial reporting**: Ensuring we have accurate financial reporting from our delivery partners is an important component of effective grant management. During year 1 of delivery with FOA, it became clear that agreed milestones for progress reporting were not aligned with FOA’s internal financial reporting mechanism, this meant that Defra did not always receive final/audited financial information. This made it particularly tricky to understand the full extent of FOA’s financial position and underspend, and to make effective decisions on how to manage this.
11. **Evidence for payments**: During year 1 of delivery with FOA, payments were linked to evidence provided through progress meetings. Though this was an effective method of ensuring progress, an improvement would be to ensure we utilise a more comprehensive range of evidence for payments, for example utilising evidence of individual outputs (e.g. reports sent via email, links to websites, email update on a particular event). We should also work with FOA to ensure that there is an agreed timeline for outputs for each project.
12. **Technical communication**: Effective communication with stakeholders is key to successful programming. Due to the nature of the OCPP and its emphasis on science activities/deliverables are often highly technical. This was particularly the case for GOAP. Whilst GOAP’s deliverables were generally highly regarded by partner country governments, at times the language used when communicating them was relatively inaccessible, making communication to a wider audience challenging.
13. **Maximising impact**: There was occasionally a tension between overall priority geographies for the BPF/OCPP and specific *potential* priority geographies for discreet aspects of the programme. For example, GOAP presented Defra with the option of delivering an additional pilot in either Kenya or South Africa. Whilst GOAP’s advice was that South Africa would be preferable from an ocean accounting perspective, the eventual decision was to prioritise Kenya in order to align more closely with overall BPF priority geographies. This tension should continue to be monitored to ensure we are maximising impact of all activities whilst delivering on ministerially agreed priority geographies.

### Recommendations

1. **Retain demand-led approach but seek opportunities in a more propositional manner:**​ The OCPP should retain its demand-led approach and continue to emphasise engagement with partner governments and wider in-country stakeholders. Opportunities should be sought, however, to be more propositional in terms of activities and interventions once assessments of demand have been established and can inform those propositions. This should increase efficiency and allow the programme to deliver greater impact by responding to in-country demands more quickly and leveraging the expertise of delivery partners and partner countries to the greatest extent.
2. **Seek opportunities to support other BPF programme through OCPP bilateral engagements, travel, meetings and connections**: As more BPF programmes come online opportunities should be sought to use OCPP engagements, including travel, remote meetings and connections established through the programme, for the benefit of BPF programmes, as well as wider UK initiatives. This should increase the coherence of the UK offer to partner countries, help alleviate issues associated with in-country demand exceeding the OCPP’s scope and have wider efficiency benefits. There is also a need to ensure engagement is timed appropriately with that through wider BPF and other UK programmes, particularly when engaging regionally.
3. **Contextual review within the BPF portfolio** ​: As more BPF programmes come online the OCPP should be reviewed within the context of the wider BPF portfolio to ensure that there is coherence at the fund level and clear additionality for each programme. This should take place by the end of the 22/23 UK financial year, with recommendations implemented and reported on in the next annual review.
4. **Permanent integration of FOA & GOAP**​: The integration of GOAP and FOA into the OCPP should be made permanent and further opportunities to align their approaches with the bilateral component of the programme identified. For example, country prioritisation for pilot projects should be informed by OCPP partnerships and wider geographic priorities, and opportunities should be sought to disseminate knowledge products produced by GOAP and FOA in OCPP partner countries.
5. **Dedicated MEL provider to be brought in by start of FY23/24**​: A dedicated monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) provider for the programme should be appointed and managed by Defra. Whilst the Defra programme team and delivery partners have made progress on MEL planning, the number of different delivery partners, country partnerships and components of the programme indicate the need for a dedicated MEL provider with responsibility across the different elements of the programme. This should be in place by the start of the 23/24 UK financial year.
6. **Clearer governance between Defra as donor and agencies as delivery partners**: The bilateral component of the OCPP should continue to include delivery through UK government agencies given their unique expertise in marine science and management and the traction this has already generated with several partner countries, but with a clearer distinction between Defra as the donor and agencies as delivery partners. These include the governance structure and mechanism for providing funding, which should more closely follow the intended approach where funding is closely tied to delivery of pre-agreed milestones. This aim was initially challenging due to the desire of the programme to be genuinely demand-led by partner countries, but should be possible as the programme matures, assessments of demand are conducted and relationships with partner countries established. This should also speed up decision-making by facilitating more delegated authority.There should also be stronger coordination between the programme’s ALB delivery partners, including a dedicated senior oversight role sitting within a pre-agreed ALB but with responsibility across all 3. This role should be reflected in that ALB’s annual workplan.
7. **Broaden UK science expertise offer**: Opportunities should be sought to expand the programme to include broader scientific expertise besides that held by the current delivery partners, for example via academic institutions leading and providing specific expertise on a demand-driven basis. Expertise from other UK institutions could be utilised to support country priorities, in partnership with local institutions (see below).
8. **Greater emphasis on local/in-country delivery**: As the programme expands, more emphasis should be placed on delivery through local/in-country organisations. In-country institutions should be equal or lead partners, to help address power imbalances, drive equitable partnerships and enhance local ownership of the programme. Organisations delivering on the bilateral component of the programme including UK government agencies should set a target for local delivery as a proportion of their budget for the programme. This should be developed and agreed by the end of the current UK financial year and reported on in future annual reviews of the programme.
9. **Clearer financial reporting, alongside a timeline for output and outcome monitoring**: To ensure we have a current and approved financial picture for FOA we should align our quarterly reporting schedule with FOA’s financial reporting schedule. This will allow for more effective decision making on underspend (already in place for Y2). FOA should ensure Defra are aware of any financial issues, including underspend, as soon as possible. Defra should also work with FOA to agree a timeline of outputs for each project, outputs should be sent to Defra with an explanation of relevant activities and intended outcomes. Outputs should be utilised by Defra as evidence for scheduled payments.
10. **Collaborative country selection**: To ensure effective communication we encourage GOAP to consider using more accessible language, particularly when communicating technical outputs to a wide audience. Defra and GOAP should undertake a robust analysis to carefully select countries for delivery and work together to reach an agreed consensus on developing partnerships. The Defra programme team will work closely with GOAP and Defra’s commercial team to ensure that deadlines are met and to prevent delays to delivery.

# Section B – progress review

## B1.1 Summary

Over the past year OCPP has been in its inception phase, testing approaches, developing the delivery model for scale up of the programme, and learning from early scoping and delivery of activities in a suite of countries which the programme inherited from one of its predecessors, the Commonwealth Litter Programme (CLiP), which worked in partnership with 7 countries across the Commonwealth between 2018 and 2021 to identify solutions to challenges associated with marine litter. The programme has provided additional support to partner countries and funded the development and dissemination of global public goods through GOAP and FOA.

Progress has been achieved in establishing the programme and preparing it to scale up over time and meet its objectives. An OCPP programme management team has been established, consisting of 5 full-time members of staff drawn from the Defra international marine team in London. The wider Defra international marine team, the FCDO BPF team and British Embassies and High Commissions overseas in partner countries provide additional support.

Scoping for the bilateral component delivered by Cefas, JNCC and MMO took place in Bangladesh, Belize, India, Maldives, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Vanuatu, with additional smaller-scale pilot projects delivered through GOAP and/or FOA in Fiji, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, and Vietnam. Scoping varied by country, largely due to differing capacities to meet or engage virtually, often exacerbated by Covid-19 related travel restrictions which changed substantially during the year, as well as the impact this had on partner governments’ priorities and ability to engage. In 3 countries – Belize, Maldives and Sri Lanka – Defra and delivery partners were able to visit towards the end of the year, undertaking in-person introductory meetings with ministries and stakeholders, generating buy-in and increasing the effectiveness of subsequent virtual engagement and scoping. In Bangladesh, India, South Africa and Vanuatu, engagement and scoping were entirely remote.

In all partner countries scoping focussed on the development of a country workplan, agreed between Defra and the partner government, and a higher-level Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to be formally signed between the UK and the partner government.


## B1.2 Theory of Change

The OCPP Theory of Change (ToC) underwent a refresh in June 2022 (Figure 1, below) to reflect the developments in programme delivery during the first year. The refresh was undertaken in collaboration with delivery partners to strengthen the MEL component of the OCPP. Key changes included:

* Intermediate outcomes added to better reflect the length of time required to observe change
* More detailed context and challenges section to reflect learnings from delivery and changing political context in certain countries (summarised in Figure 1 below)
* Impact statement simplified and improved to align with the ambition and timescale of the programme

The ToC will continue to be updated and refined throughout the life of the programme, to reflect continued learning from delivery.

Full size ToC in annex A.



**Figure 1 – OCPP theory of change (June 2022)**

## B2. Assessment of whether programme is on track

Year 1 of the OCPP focused on establishing country partnerships, with a strong emphasis on being demand-led. This meant that in the first year when relationships were established with priority countries and scoping assessments of demand were conducted it was highly challenging to set targets for delivery of activities, as doing so would’ve required the programme to be more prescriptive than the model set out in the business case. A recommendation of this annual review is that opportunities should be sought to be more propositional in terms of delivery, which should help mitigate this, as should maturity of the programme over time. Therefore, targets should be set in the logframe for outputs and outcomes and reported on in all future annual reviews.

There are still some higher-level aspects on which assessments of whether the programme is on track can be made:

* Transition of all Commonwealth Litter Programme (CLiP) programmes into OCPP, which should help ensure sustainability of previous UK programming under CLiP;
* Important bilateral relationships and stakeholder networks strengthened in Bangladesh, Belize, India, Maldives, Sri Lanka and Vanuatu;
* Comprehensive country work plans tailored to host government priorities developed for Belize, Maldives and Sri Lanka (countries which the programme was able to visit);
* Portfolio of activities proposed for delivery in line with host government priorities identified for all countries, with remote delivery taking place in most;
* Country prioritization exercise completed to allow the programme to expand to meet its ambition of 10-15 full country partnerships over its lifetime, with early priorities identified for Year 2 (Ghana, Mozambique and Senegal);
* Implementation of exit strategy for South Africa, a CLiP legacy country through which OCPP initially funded remote delivery of some continuing activities.

FOA and GOAP were initially set up as separate work-streams before being integrated into OCPP. As part of the integration GOAP and FOA provided information against the OCPP logframe outputs and indicators. In Y1 GOAP and FOA also each had an agreed set of milestones to be delivered which were monitored through a separate management process. Both FOA and GOAP generally delivered all pre-agreed milestones on time, within budget and to a good standard (see Section C).

## B3. Recommendation on whether programme should continue

Overall, our assessment of progress against outputs during the first year of implementation of OCPP is positive. All outputs have been reported against, progress has been made under every indicator and important progress has been made in setting up the programme and establishing a platform for future delivery. As the business case did not define specific targets for year 1 it is not possible to provide ratings against individual outputs, and therefore we have not been able to score the programme overall this year. Instead, we have included a qualitative description of progress against each output. We remain confident that OCPP is on track to deliver against its intended outcomes over its lifetime, given the strong foundations that have been laid through our early partnerships.

# Section C – output assessment

## Outputs

1. Increased marine scientific and/or technical capacity in partner countries
2. Improved regulation and/or governance of the marine environment in partner countries
3. Enhanced education and exchange of knowledge in relation to marine management in partner countries
4. Productive partnerships between the UK and priority coastal developing countries
5. Marine ecosystems more effectively valued, through increased knowledge of global public goods

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Title** | Increased marine scientific and/or technical capacity in partner countries | | | |
| Output number: | | 1 | Output Score: | N/A |
| Impact weighting (%): | | 22.5% | Weighting revised since last AR: | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| 1.1 | Key individuals in partner countries trained in marine and fisheries science, marine management and/or monitoring, disaggregated by gender | 0 | N/A | * 68 (39M/29F, 43% female) - ALBs * 14 (10M/4F, 29% female) - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 82 (40% female) - TOTAL |
| 1.2 | Key institutions in partner countries provided with increased access to and/or trained in the use of marine scientific equipment, infrastructure and/or data | 0 | N/A | * 14 - ALBs * 12 - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 26 - TOTAL |
| 1.3 | Scientific papers, reports, and/or databases developed and/or published by partner countries with support from the OCPP. (% of papers, reports etc. with female collaborators) | 0 | N/A | * 17 (30% female) - ALBs * 6(100% female) - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 23 - TOTAL |

Key points:

* ALBs and GOAP provided results against output 1, progress has been made towards increasing marine scientific and/or technical skills in OCPP countries. FOA were not expected to report results here as it is not their expertise, therefore this is not a negative.
* Types of activities undertaken to reach this output included water quality workshops in **India**, beach litter monitoring training in **Sri Lanka** and quality control training for bivalve molluscs given in **Bangladesh**.
* Gender disaggregation was good, however more women could have been targeted as part of the activities. This is something we will build into milestones for future years.

Recommendations for improvement:

* Recommendation 6 will support the improvement of gender targets, which will be embedded into some milestones.
* Recommendation 1 will help increase the opportunities for increased marine science and technical capacity outputs, by being more propositional in the approach should reduce the amount of time taken to achieve all three indicators.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Title** | Improved regulation and/or governance of the marine environment in partner countries | | | |
| Output number: | | 2 | Output Score: | N/A |
| Impact weighting (%): | | 22.5% | Weighting revised since last AR: | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| 2.1 | New or strengthened policies, strategies and/or regulations, in place as a result of OCPP activities that contribute to sustainable management of the marine environment | 0 | N/A | * 0 - ALBs * 3 - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 3 - TOTAL |
| 2.2 | Key institutions in partner countries provided with training in control, enforcement and/or monitoring of marine policies and/or regulations | 0 | N/A | * 0 - ALBs * 12 - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 12- TOTAL |
| 2.3 | Projects, planning and/or governance processes established due to OCPP with inclusion of local people and knowledge in decision making to sustainably manage the marine environment | 0 | N/A | * 0 - ALBs * 5 - GOAP * 1 - FOA * 6 - TOTALS |

Key points:

* ALBs reported no results for this output, which shows a gap. The time required for implementation is likely to be a contributing factor, we would expect to see an improvement in these results as the programme develops.
* GOAP had success and reported results for all three indicators. GOAP have been able to have influence through ocean accounting, for example in **Fiji** the National Ocean Policy considers the value of the ocean resources and in **Indonesia** the Vision and Direction of the 2005-2025 National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJP) has seen the government emphasise the importance of natural resources for the country’s economy.
* FOA had minimal input for this output, however did contribute through their process of engagement with government and stakeholders in **Fiji** in the establishment of a Blue Recovery Hub.

Recommendations for improvement:

* Recommendation 8 will support indicator 2.3, by targeting delivery through local/in-country organisations.
* Lesson 5 is likely to be directly related to the lack of data from the ALB reporting. Lesson 5 will be addressed through the development of a partnership scoping framework, which will formalise the way we scope in any new partnership and ensure efficient and timely intervention.
* In some partner countries lesson 6 is likely to be linked to the lack of progress on output 2. This will be addressed through exploring an in-country resourcing mechanism to support OCPP partnerships and in-country coordination, these could be placed in high commissions or embassies to reduce pressure on post.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Title** | Enhanced education and exchange of knowledge in relation to marine management in partner countries | | | |
| Output number: | | 3 | Output Score: | N/A |
| Impact weighting (%): | | 22.5% | Weighting revised since last AR: | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| 3.1 | Ocean science-related networks between two or more individuals and/or organisations are established or strengthened.  - within partner countries  - between partner countries | 0 | N/A | * 1 - ALBs * 8 - GOAP * 3 - FOA * 12 -TOTAL |
| 3.2 | Number of local people engaged in community events in sustainable management of the marine environment (e.g. beach cleans, citizen science activities, community exhibitions). [disaggregated by gender] | 0 | N/A | * 4826 (4633M/193F, 4% female) - ALBs * 250 (135M/115F, 46% female) - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 5076 (6% female) - TOTAL |
| 3.3 | Number of sustainable marine management educational resources and/or communication products disseminated | 0 | N/A | * 1 - ALBs * No data reported by GOAP * 11 - FOA * 12 - TOTAL |
| 3.4 | Number of scholars trained to achieve a qualification in topics relevant to sustainable management of the marine environment, disaggregated by country, qualification type (Masters, PhD), gender | 0 | N/A | * 5 (4M/1F, 20% female) - ALBs * 15 (9M/6F, 40% female) - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 20 (35% female) - TOTAL |

Key points:

* Education and knowledge exchange is a key component of the OCPP enabling pathways, the results show good success towards reaching outputs in this area. The OCPP has been designed to emphasise an exchange in knowledge, not just a transfer of UK scientific knowledge but also learning from the partner country.
* ALBs were able sub-contract to in country delivery partners to reach a large number of the local community, for example in **Sri Lanka** Zindhu Maritime Services delivered Abandoned, Lost and otherwise Disregarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG) workshops to approximately 3000 people in the fishing community.
* GOAP were able to utilise a global partner to work across two regions, working with UN ESCAP to organise an Ocean Accounts training for the **Asia-Pacific** and organised an Ocean Accounts Seminar with Madras School of Economics and the Australian Government as part of the programme ‘Building an Australia-India (and Indo-Pacific) community of practice on ocean accounting.

Recommendations for improvement:

* The MoU signed between Cefas and the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) will directly contribute to indicator 3.4. The MoU provides the mechanism for sub-contracting ACU to develop and administer OCPP specific masters and PhD qualifications with national universities in our partner countries.
* Lesson 9 will support increased ambition of output 3 (as well as others), this will be addressed through output, outcome and impact targets in the logframe for reporting from Y2 of the programme.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Title** | Productive partnerships between the UK and priority coastal developing countries | | | |
| Output number: | | 4 | Output Score: | N/A |
| Impact weighting (%): | | 10% | Weighting revised since last AR: | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator(s)** | | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| 4.1 | OCPP MoUs or similar agreement between the UK government and partner country governments signed | 0 | N/A | * 0 - ALBs * N/A - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 0 - TOTAL |
| 4.2 | Number of OCPP workplans active and agreed by partner country governments or local institutions | 0 | N/A | * 6 - ALBs * 5 - GOAP * No data reported by FOA * 11 - TOTAL |

Key points:

* Buy-in from governments is instrumental to how we work with OCPP partner countries through a demand-led process. It is positive ALBs have engaged with a high proportion of partner governments through the OCPP workplans. The focus moving into Y2 needs to be on formalising the MoUs or similar agreements with partner governments, in many countries the absence of an agreement can limit delivery or even restrict it all together.
* FOA and GOAP did not report into 4.1 during the first year as they were initially developed as separate projects, however will report into this in future.
* GOAP have supported this output through the publication of ocean account development roadmaps for five pilot countries – **Fiji, Viet Nam, Indonesia, Mozambique** & **South Africa**.

Recommendations for improvement:

* Will continue to prioritise country MoUs, working closely with FCDO in post and partner governments.

**Additional FOA and GOAP assessment**

As part of the trial integration GOAP and FOA provided information against the OCPP logframe outputs and indicators, which has all been captured in the above. The OCPP logframe was updated to support reporting by FOA and GOAP, however the logframe represents the programme as a whole and therefore does not fully detail each component of delivery. There are some indicators which have limited relevance to FOA and GOAP, which are therefore not expected to score highly against them.

In Y1 GOAP and FOA also had an agreed set of BPF milestones to delivered against, monitored and summarised through a separate management process. Provided below is an insight into how both delivery partners have performed against their previously agreed BPF milestones.

GOAP

* GOAP have delivered the milestones on time and on budget, had positive country feedback, commitments from other donors and successfully disbursed an expanded budget. All of that suggest that GOAP are a partner offering efficient delivery and value for money
* GOAP have received positive feedback from pilot countries and ocean accounting has had impacts beyond governments and provided stakeholders with key information on the importance of marine habitats and ecosystems
* GOAP have overdelivered on two activities; they were successful in implementing ocean accounting activities in five pilot countries, working flexibly and at pace to add Kenya as the sixth at no additional cost to Defra and publishing seven, instead of six, technical papers

FOA

* FOA successfully delivered agreed Year 1 projects and have leveraged this progress into future proposals
* FOA provided clear and informative updates during our informal and formal progress meetings, proving opportunities to ask questions and provide feedback

**Overall scoring**

Through the output level assessment, it is clear that some improvements will be required to fully achieve the logframe outcomes within the timeframe of the programme. The recommendations of this annual review should help to ensure this. In its first year the programme has, however, made good progress towards its outputs, particularly outputs 1 and 3. Recognising that year 1 was an inception phase for the programme, in which some key improvements have already been implemented such as the integration of FOA and GOAP, it is unsurprising that progress towards some outputs and outcomes has been limited. Additionally, a number of important developments for the programme linked to its inception are not captured by the logframe outputs but will be integral to the OCPP’s success. In particular:

* Establishment of strong bilateral relationships with 7 partner country governments, and numerous wider in-country stakeholders
* Agreements between Defra and five delivery partners for the programme
* Development of an OCPP governance structure, including a Programme Management Board and Senior Management Board
* The creation of a collaborative programme management team, from across five delivery partners and Defra.

These should be factored into the overall assessment of the programme alongside the initial logframe outputs and wider progress achieved across all delivery partners. Despite this, however, the lack of quantitative logframe targets for year 1, a product of the early stage of the programme and its demand-led nature, means it is not scored in this review. Scoring will take place in all future annual reviews and will include quantitative assessment of achievement towards targets set against logframe indicators.

# Section D – risks

## OCPP risks

All risks are recorded and managed via the OCPP RAID register. The OCPP RAID register was developed in the latter half of the first year, previously only risk was recorded via a standalone register, now risks, issues, assumptions and dependencies have been brought together to strengthen and organise the records.

The RAID register is continually updated and reviewed and discussed at the OCPP Programme Management Board (PMB). High-level risks and issues can be subsequently escalated to the quarterly OCPP Senior Management Board (SMB) or to wider BPF or Defra governance processes.

OCPP is also subject to Blue Planet Fund risk management, which includes quarterly reporting through the BPF Programme Board and Defra-FCDO Joint Management Board.

Risks with greatest impact on the programme can be found in table 1.

**Table 1.** Ocean Country Partnership Programme risks

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description** | **Risk Category** | **Impact** | **Likelihood** | **RAG Status** | **Mitigating action(s)** | **Risk level over the last year** | **Status** |
| **Due to:** The ongoing global Covid-19 pandemic. **There is a risk that:** Restrictions may be in brought in place that limit delivery in-country, as well as staff having a heightened chance of infection on visits. **Resulting in:** Delays/disruption to delivery in country | External | High | Medium | **12** | Take extra precautions (lateral flow tests, preparation for potential quarantine) when undertaking international visits. Closely monitor changing guidelines in partner countries. | Stayed the same | Open |
| **Due to:** unpredictable sign off processes and longer than anticipated development times for country MoUs.  **There's a risk that:** Our ability to spend and deliver is compromised. (e.g., MoUs may be required for in-country staff in some countries) | Strategic / Business | High | High | **16** |  | Increased | Open |
| **Due to**: changing in-country contexts (e.g. political, social, economic)  **There is a risk that**: The programme's ability to engage with partner governments and deliver on the ground will be compromised. **Which will result in**: An inability to delivery work and increased underspend. | Strategic / Business | High | Medium | **12** | Close Communication with post, bringing in overseas post to boost capacity in-country and help localise delivery.  Ahead of engagement with countries we will map out possible issues, events and risks in partnering, and plan accordingly.  As part of country prioritisation process we will take into account risk of operating in countries in selecting potential partner countries. | Increased | Open |
| **Due to:** Change in partner country priorities  **There is risk that:** Governments and stakeholders stop engaging with or deprioritise OCPP themes  **Which will result in:** difficulty in meeting OCPP ambitions and impact | Fiduciary | High | Low | **8** | Country prioritisation to inform decisions on which countries to engage with. Consideration of country alignments with UK marine environment ambitions, look for evidence of commitment to addressing specific OCPP issues.  Partnerships will be supported by MoUs, that outline the type of engagement we will deliver. | Stayed the same | Open |
| **Due to:** The relatively novel approach of focusing on science to build capacity as a method of ODA delivery  **There is a risk that:** it will be difficult to directly attribute every £ to specific poverty reduction outcomes  **Which will result in:** Inability to effectively capture full impact of the programme | Fiduciary | Low | Medium | **6** | Building in strong M&E offer as part of programme delivery. Through the existing CLiP programme we will build on existing evaluations to develop indicators to effectively capture impact. | Stayed the same | Open |

Full current risk register can be found in annex B.

## FOA & GOAP risks

FOA and GOAP have their own individual project risk registers, as the trial integration into the OCPP is yet to fully combine all project management functions. As per the recommendations of this annual review, FOA and GOAP will be fully integrated into OCPP. This integration will include developing and combining FOA and GOAP risks, issues, assumptions and dependencies into the OCPP RAID register. Wider governance processes also need to be taken into account when considering risk, to ensure risks and issues are managed and escalated appropriately. Therefore, the integration of FOA and GOAP into OCPP’s management board structure will be developed further with this in mind.

There are high level OCPP risks which FOA and GOAP are also subject to, for example:

* Covid-19
* Changing in-country contexts (e.g. political, social, economic)

Full risk registers for both projects can be found in annex B.

# Section E – Programme management

## E1: Summary of Defra and delivery partner performance

The focus of much of the work over the past year has been the establishment and operationalisation of OCPP, meaning that much of the work has been ongoing and is not captured by the programme’s output indicators.

### Defra programme team performance

An important enabling achievement has been the establishment of the core Defra programme management team, with 5 FTE in place in London, alongside establishing important relationships with wider HMG stakeholders involved in the programme, particularly FCDO Embassies and High Commissions. Strong working relationships have been established between the programme management and delivery partner teams, through daily communications and regular update emails, calls and discussions. Programme management tools and systems have been put in place including activity trackers, risk and issue monitoring systems, and a suite of workplans at different levels (e.g. delivery partner workplans, country workplans etc). Relationships with embassy colleagues and understanding of the local context in Belize, Maldives and Sri Lanka has further been strengthened by country visits, with further visits to a range of partner countries planned in year 2 alongside continued remote engagement.

Various factors created a degree of uncertainty during the first year of the programme, not least the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, the one-year government Spending Review during the 21/22 UK financial year, and the difficult of remotely engaging with some partner countries, posing challenges for the programme’s management. Whilst delivery partners were generally appreciative of the collaborative approach taken by Defra and recognised the challenges associated with establishing a complex, relatively novel programme at pace, there was also a general sense that the programme management structure had become relatively complex and resource intensive, with knock-on effects in terms of ability to make decisions at pace and sign-off delivery partner activities on the iterative basis that the demand-led model necessitated.

Resource constraints within the BPF team also impacted OCPP delivery and management, resulting in capacity constraints, especially during the first half of the year. Integration of FOA and GOAP into the programme should reduce the resource intensity of its management due to savings associated with not managing them as separate programmes. Further opportunities should also be sought to align the programme management structure with the approach set out in the business case as the programme matures.

### Delivery partner performance

#### Finance and reporting

GOAP were strong and compliant on reporting. During Y1 FOA’s financial reporting was not aligned with our scheduled progress meetings which lead to further clarification being required. The grant window during this reporting period was offset due to the late establishment of the grant agreements, so in both cases activity was reported by phases rather than by quarter. FOA were able to deliver additional activities and absorb further funding, spending above the £1m initially budgeted for the 21/22 UK financial year. GOAP spent the £1m allocated to them, though were able to deliver additional activities due to currency fluctuations.

Reporting was more challenging for Cefas, JNCC and MMO due to a combination of the differing mechanism of funding (MoU, rather than a grant agreement) and the less propositional, more demand-led nature of their component of the programme making forecasting more challenging. The UK agency-led component of the programme ultimately underspent by around £1.4m for the 21/22 UK financial year, with this absorbed by the wider BPF portfolio.

#### Communication

Delivery partner colleagues across the board were honest, transparent and accessible. Governance and programme management meetings were always prioritised, prepared for and approached professionally and openly. Time for discussion for certain aspects of programme management tended to be deprioritised (e.g. longer-term risk management and horizon-scanning) due to time pressures, a joint area of improvement for Defra and delivery partners.

GOAP communicated well, answered all questions, gave detailed quarterly reports with comprehensive annexes evidencing spend. They were patient and embraced strategic steers from Defra.

FOA communicated well, were quick to respond and were able to adjust projects to reflect feedback and steers. Communication could have been improved in regard to future project proposals, making sure information is clear, and links to outcomes and impact. Financial risks could have been reported earlier to ensure appropriate mitigations are in place.

#### Conduct and cooperation

Delivery partners across the board were generally highly professional and passionate about their work. Cooperation was strong throughout, with all delivery partners prepared and willing to engage in the wider Blue Planet Fund and providing valuable input and contributions aimed at enhancing strategic alignment across the different component of the programme, increasing impact and generating efficiencies.

### Joint areas for improvement

Joint areas for improvement are closely associated with this annual review’s overall recommendations for the programme.

* **Increased focus on longer-term, cross-cutting aspects of the programme** during management meetings, such as risks and horizon-scanning.
* **Stronger integration of the different components of the programme**. For example, common governance and MEL structures for all delivery partners.
* **Increased join-up and collaboration with wider BPF programmes** as they come online. For example, joint country visits and alignment of country work plans.
* **Clearer funding model between Defra and UK government agencies** where payment is more closely tied to delivery of pre-agreed milestones.
* **Shift more day-to-day management responsibilities from Defra to ALBs**,with Defra OCPP team taking a more strategic role for example in terms of alignment with other BPF programmes and engagement with partner governments (linked to recommendation 6).
* **Clearer timeframes for decision-making around budgets and delivery partner activities**, for example sign-off of country plans at the beginning of the financial year with subsequent changes via exception.

## E2: Value for money overview – led by economist

Given the lifetime of OCPP is just one year, it is expected that successes associated with the Year 1 investment can only be presented at the output/outcome level rather than impact level. In the OCPP Business Case (2021) it was assumed that benefits would begin to materialise between 2-5 years, and full benefits between 5-10 years (dependant on the thematic strand: Pollution, OHA or MPA). Therefore, we should only start to report on impact indicators from the mid-point to end-point of the investment lifetime (at least 5 years). Analysis carried for the Business Case detailed in Annex C.

Based on the evidence summarised in section B2 and section C, we are confident that the programme is on track for delivery.

The analysis included in the Business Case estimated that our £55m investment could result in the partial Present Value Benefits of £123m - £388m, Present Value Costs of £43m, a Net Present Value of £80m-£344m and an overall Benefit Cost Ratio of 2.9-9.0. The range represents the sensitivities in the assumed value of ecosystem service benefits associated with marine plastic, the range of assumed programme effectiveness and the range of potential baseline habitat loss, in addition to adjustments for optimism bias.

Across the piece, these benefit cost ratios will depend on effective engagement of countries, as well as using this improved capacity for the effective management of the issues in question: marine pollution, aquaculture and MPAs. These benefit cost ratios should be considered an illustrative, partial assessment of the benefits associated with the OCPP programme. **Until the programme is operating and an evaluation conducted there remains substantial uncertainty with the BCR and the NPVs.**

In the GOAP Yr2-4 Business case (2022) it was found that through an investment of £2.4 million to GOAP would lead to a partial benefit-cost ratio of 2.4 and a partial net present value of £3.2m. This £2.4m figure reflects the partial investment that will be directed towards action specific to establishing and mainstreaming ocean accounting in pilot countries, rather than wider supporting actions. It is expected that investment funds of £200k will be used for the initial establishment of ocean accounts in a pilot country, whilst £100k goes towards subsequent mainstreaming. This additional £100k, that goes towards mainstreaming ocean accounts ensures the full stream of benefits, outlined in the GOAP Theory of Change, are realised.

In the FOA business case it was evidenced these types of projects are likely to support VfM measured quantitatively: detailed analysis by the High Level Panel of the evidence for conservation of mangroves, decarbonisation of shipping, ocean food production and offshore renewable energy rollout all have shown significant BCRs of between 3:1 and 12:1.

# Annex A – Theory of Change

**Activity and output summary**

Utilising UK scientific/ technical and policy expertise, combined with the wider Blue Planet Fund portfolio, OCPP will work with partner country priorities and initiatives to deliver capacity building, covering:

**Increased scientific/ technical assistance**

1. Training in marine and fisheries science, management and monitoring

2. Providing access to and training in use of scientific equipment, infrastructure and data

3. Emergency technical assistance to support marine disaster response, and strengthening long-term disaster preparedness

**Improved regulation/ governance**

4. Supporting adoption of natural capital accounting for the marine environment

5. Strengthening marine management, monitoring and enforcement capacities

6. Strengthening regulatory frameworks, policies and plans for the marine environment

7. Supporting inclusive and sustainable marine governance

8. Supporting marine spatial planning to strengthen integrated management

**Education & knowledge exchange (governments, agencies, communities, private sector)**

9. Strategic environmental assessments, needs assessments, and scoping of requirements for support

10. Networks and collaboration between partner countries and sectors to facilitate knowledge sharing, collaboration and innovation

11. Improving seafood value chains and market access (including OHA approach)

Outcomes

Marine pollution

Stronger waste management systems and reduced solid waste and other forms of pollution entering the marine environment through move towards circular economy

IUU

IUU fishing activities are more effectively monitored, deterred and eliminated in partner countries, helping to minimise international enablers of IUU fishing

Large scale fisheries

Stronger management of regional and national fisheries and aquaculture to deliver sustainable fish stocks and healthy marine ecosystems; provide alternative livelihood; and reduce overfishing

MPAs

Countries are more willing and able to establish and manage marine protected areas and other effective conservation measures within national waters. They implement them sustainably, effectively and inclusively, also considering transboundary activities

**Ocean Country Partnership Programme: a £65m, five-year bilateral overseas development assistance programme helping partner countries effectively manage human activities that impact the marine environment and ensuring that all their citizens can benefit from its long term sustainable use.**

**Intermediate outcomes**

1. Improved policies, plans, and management of human activities in the marine environment at national, sub-national and community levels
2. Improved regulation and protection of the marine environment, including through MPAs
3. Marine ecosystem services more effectively valued, protected and enhanced, including through marine natural capital accounting
4. Increased capability and capacity to control and enforce marine policies, including combatting IUU fishing
5. Improved monitoring data and knowledge of the marine environment
6. Stakeholders – particularly local communities – are empowered to actively participate in sustainable management of the marine environment
7. Increased national capability and capacity to respond to marine environmental emergencies
8. Management of human activities in the marine environment is better integrated across sectors and government departments

Context/ Challenges

* Increasing threats to coastal states from unsustainable use of their marine environment, climate impacts and environmental hazards
* Limited capacity of many governments in low-to-middle income countries to monitor and regulate human activities in the marine environment
* Full value of marine ecosystems often not accounted for in national or local decision making
* Decision making over marine resource use is often inequitable and does not include all stakeholders
* Public and private investment into sustainable management of the ocean is insufficient and sometimes poorly targeted
* Limited knowledge sharing between different groups about the ocean and how best to govern it (e.g., local knowledge missing from donor understanding; marine science not shared at local levels)



# Annex B – Risk registers

Table 1. OCPP RAID register – risk tab

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Risk Description** | **Risk Category** | **Impact Rating** | **Likelihood** | **RAG Status (Inherent)** | **Mitigating action(s), action completion dates and action owner(s)** | **Status** | **Date Last Reviewed** | **Current Impact Rating** | **Current Likelihood** | **RAG Status (Current)** |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** Civil Service recruitment controls to reduce head count. **There is a risk that:** Core Defra and the ALBs could see a reduction in the number of staff who are working on the OCPP. **Which will result in:** An impact on programme delivery due to a lack of a capacity. | People | High | High | **16** | **Action**: Bring in overseas posts as soon as possible who don't come under Civil Service headcount and can help streamline in-country delivery. **Owner:** Defra programme team, **Completion Date**: TBC | Open |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cross-Cutting (predominantly Sri Lanka) | **Due to**: changing in-country contexts (e.g. political, social, economic)  **There is a risk that**: The programme's ability to engage with partner governments and deliver on the ground will be compromised. **Which will result in**: An inability to delivery work and increased underspend. | Strategic / Business | High | Medium | **12** | **Action(s):** Close Communication with post, bringing in overseas post to boost capacity in-country and help localise delivery. | Open |  | Medium | Medium | 9 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** Organisation cyber security. **There is a risk that:** Delivery partners and Defra may have different approaches to risks posed by countries therefore impeding what IT equipment can be taken to the country and access to online resources such as email and SharePoint **Which will result in:** Reduced capacity to work in country | Operational | High | Medium | **12** | **Action(s):** Review all potential countries with each organisation’s cyber security team Investigate other means to bypass local networks (e.g. Sat comms) | Open |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** BHC duty of care limitations **There is a risk that:** Delivery partners and Defra may have different levels of support from BHC whilst in country, according to their duty of care. (For example Bangladesh BHC duty of care only provided for Defra and Cefas) **Which will result in:** a situation where partnership delegation is unintentionally split as a result of differing treatment whilst in country (especially in emergency situations). | Operational | High | High | **16** | **Action(s):** Defra to check with existing countries and new partnerships that all delivery partners would be covered by BHC duty of careIf delivery partners not covered (e.g. MMO & Cefas for Bangladesh) enquire with post process to include all delivery partners on MOU- and initiate process.  If travel essential to countries where duty of care does not cover all delivery partners then ensure risk assessments are updated and alternative support is provided | Open |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** The ongoing global Covid-19 pandemic. **There is a risk that:** Restrictions may be in brought in place that limit delivery in-country, as well as staff having a heightened chance of infection on visits. **Which will result in:** Delays/disruption to delivery in country | External | High | Medium | **12** | **Action(s):** Take extra precautions (lateral flow tests, preparation for potential quarantine) when undertaking international visits. Closely monitor changing guidelines in partner countries. | Open |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** unpredictable sign off processes and longer than anticipated development times for country MoUs.  **There's a risk that: O**ur ability to spend and deliver is compromised. (e.g. MoUs may be required for in-country staff in some countries) | Strategic / Business | High | High | **16** |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** The increased scope and ambition of the programme not being matched by commensurate increase in resource. **There is a risk that:** The delivery of some partnerships will be compromised. | People | Medium | High | **12** | **Action(s):** Procuring new delivery partner for new sustainable seafood work. | Open | 26/08/2022 | Medium | Medium | 9 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** BPF programmes coming on-line in the same countries in which we have partnerships (and vice versa). **There is a risk that: T**he UK offer under the Blue Planet Fund becomes fragmented​. | Operational | Medium | Medium | **9** |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Cross-Cutting | **Due to:** The nature of technical assistance and difficulty attributing its impact in partner countries. **There is a risk that:** We do not fully capture/account for the benefits of the programme. | Strategic / Business | Medium | Medium | **9** |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

Table 2. FOA risk register

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description** | **Risk Category** | **Impact** | **Likelihood** | **RAG Status** | **Mitigating action(s), action completion dates and action owner(s)** | **Status** | **Date Last Reviewed** | **Need to be escalated?** |
| Due to: The compressed timeline for business case approval There is a risk that: any delays to any steps of the timeline will cause a delayed investment start date (particularly risky are the drafting, commercial approval, and SCS clearances) Which will result in: potentially jeopardising FOA's ability to deliver, and potentially a reputational risk for Defra. | Strategic / Business | Medium | Medium | **9** | 12/02: advance notice of the BC timeline was sent to ODA finance and commercial. Note: no reply yet from commercial. | Closed | 22/02/2021 | No |
| Due to: our plan to wait until the next JMB meeting to share the FOA proposal with the JMB There is a risk that: The JMB could want to significantly alter aspects of the investment, such as the activities that the UK funds Which will result in: likely delays to the BC clearance process, resulting in a delayed investment start date | Strategic / Business | Medium | Low | **6** | The likelihood of this risk is perceived as low, so it has been accepted as a risk, given the alternative (to send the FOA proposal for clearance to the JMB via correspondence) is not seen as desirable. | Closed | 22/02/2021 | No |
| Due to: FOA not yet having finalised their indicator framework, or sent us the list of activities There is a risk that: we will have less time to actually draft the business case Which will result in: delaying the BC clearance timeline | Strategic / Business | Medium | High | **12** | Working with FOA team, sending regular reminders for the documentation. | Closed | 26/02/2021 | No |
| Due to: the late investment start date (July) and the need to spend all funding within the FY There is a risk that: FOA will not be able to spend all the funds and will have underspend leftover at the end of the FY Which will result in: a negative impact on Defra's spending and budget | Strategic / Business | Medium | Low | **6** | We are investigating whether FOA can accrue activities before the first payment in August. | Closed | 26/02/2021 | No |

Table 3. GOAP risk register

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description** | **Risk Category** | **Impact** | **Likelihood** | **RAG Status** | **Mitigating action(s), action completion dates and action owner(s)** | **Status** | **Date Last Reviewed** | **Need to be escalated?** |
| Due to COVID-19 there is a risk that delays will be caused to the project as activities cannot go ahead as planned due to lockdowns and travel disruptions. This will result in the project missing log frame targets, underspending, and being unable to deliver expected results over the lifetime of the project. | External | Medium | Medium | **9** | The activities for 2021/22 have been put together specifically with COVID-19 in mind. Limited, travel will be required as many of the activities can be delivered virtually or locally. The creation of national pilot ocean accounts and development roadmaps will be sub-contracted out to delivery partners in the five countries selected to limit the need for international travel as far as possible. The remaining COVID-19 risk is lockdowns in pilot countries. This would impede delivery, but some work would still be able to proceed virtually. Defra BPF team will work with GOAP to monitor spend and continually review progress against log frame milestones to ensure that impacts are achieved. | Closed | 07/04/2021 | No |
| Due to the possibility of political instability, there is a risk that the delivery of one or more of the ocean account pilots may be disrupted. This will result in the inability to deliver all five pilots, or cause delays to the pilots and create inefficiencies. | External | Low | Medium | **6** | Two of the three intended outcomes are to be delivered virtually and political instability is unlikely to impact them. Whilst the creation of five national pilot ocean accounts and development roadmaps would be impacted, it is unlikely that there would be political instability in all five. Furthermore, when selecting those countries to deliver in, political stability will be considered. We will be taking an agile approach to delivery and will be able to shift countries if absolutely necessary. We will work closely with GOAP and with HMG ambassadors to monitor any associated risks. | Closed | 07/04/2021 | No |
| Due to a lack of capacity, there is a risk that GOAP does not adhere to agreed reporting requirements set out in the grant agreement. This will result in Defra not being able to assess performance against the deliverables. | People | Medium | Low | **6** | GOAP has provided a log frame, concept note, and has fed into Defra’s Theory of Change. The disbursement schedule, set out in the grant agreement, will ensure that payments are given subject to satisfactory progress. Furthermore, GOAP receiving funding for years 2-5 are dependent on its performance in year 1. This decision was made specifically to mitigate against the risk of funding a relatively new partnership. GOAP have recruited an additional resource to work at the Secretariat in August 2021. | Closed | 19/08/2021 | No |
| Due to corruption either by GOAP, or third parties contracted by GOAP, there is a risk that funds will be misused. This will result in damage to Defra's, and HMG's, reputation and mean that the project is unable to deliver. | Financial | High | Very Low | **4** | Two of the three intended outcomes are to be delivered virtually by GOAP and corruption is highly unlikely. The creation of national pilot ocean accounts and development roadmaps will be sub-contracted out to trusted delivery partners in five selected ODA eligible countries. The countries’ ranking in Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index will be considered during selection, and Defra BPF team will work with GOAP to monitor spend to ensure financial propriety. | Closed | 07/04/2021 | No |
| Due to low resources and capacity in Defra's BPF team, there is a risk that Governance delays hinders ability of GOAP to deliver which will result in delays to project delivery. | People | Medium | Low | **6** | Once FLD resources for 2021/22 are finalised the likelihood an impact of this risk will be clearer. Currently we are not able to recruit for an economist or M&E specialist. As of August 2021 there are no resource issues affecting the project so the likelihood of this has been downgraded to low. | Closed | 19/08/2021 | No |
| Due to several outcomes relying on the capabilities and efficiencies of deliver partners such as UN-ESCAP, UNSEEA, and UNSC to hit deadlines, there is a risk that low capacity, bureaucracy and other delays could result in an inability for GOAP to deliver on some outcomes. | Operational | Medium | Medium | **9** | We have deliberately selected a delivery partner that is well-integrated into UN systems. These existing professional relationships will save time and ensure these UN bodies are accountable to GOAP. | Closed | 07/04/2021 | No |
| Due to: GOAP being a relatively new initiative founded in 2019, there is a risk that it will be unable to meet KPIs due to relative inexperience or lack of capacity and coordination. This will result in a failure of GOAP to deliver the project. | Operational | Low | Medium | **6** | Defra recognises this risk. As mitigation, investment into GOAP is one year initially. To test the success of delivery, the project will deliver pilots in year one. Any further investments over subsequent years of the BPF are not confirmed and are dependent on performance in year one. | Closed | 19/08/2021 | No |
| Due to: The unexpected death of the co-Chair of GOAP Michael Bordt in August 2021. There is a risk that: the output he was leading on - the global expert panel might not be delivered to milestones Which will result in: GOAP missing some milestones delaying payment. | Operational | Medium | Medium | **9** | Defra will ask for an update on Michael's replacement at the monthly check-in meeting scheduled for the 31 August. Defra will re-evaluate the risk based on discussions at the meeting. | Closed | 19/08/2021 | No |

# ANNEX C

Table of assumptions used in modelling – *Taken from Business Case*

This table has a list of assumptions made for the illustrative BCR analysis across the different strands.  For the appraisal of the option an appraisal of 30 years and the recommended 10% discount rate for ODA were used.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assumptions** | **Details** | **Confidence**  **(low, medium, high)** | **Influence of assumption on BCR** | **How incorporated in analysis** |
| Marine litter – for marine pollution | | | | |
| Mismanaged waste reduced due to marine litter programme | Over 10 years:  1% waste reduced for a national programme  0.1% waste reduced for a region in country programme  Projected mismanaged waste based on Jambeck et al 6 | Medium – high dependency on country commitment and action.  However, figures used are likely to be conservative given previous evaluations of CLiP: an optimism bias has been applied compared to previous evaluations. | **Medium** impact - a change in % reduced for national, little change on BCR but if a change is % for regional programmes assumed for large countries, larger impact on BCR as larger change in mismanaged waste reduced. | optimism bias incorporated across both ranges (conservative estimate used) |
| Ecosystems benefits of reducing marine plastic ($) | Use a third of the lower and upper bound global estimate from the Beaumont et al7 study. | Medium – will value from country to country. By using a range, it should mitigate some uncertainty. | **High** influence on BCR, hence a range used to cover the different values of ecosystems for, different degrees of marine dependencies and community value in countries the OCPP may work in. | This provides the range of low to high estimates |
| When benefits start to occur after programme implementation | Benefits occur 5 years after first year of programming. There are a range of benefits, from economic to nutritional, when these materialise are unknown and depend on host country commitment. | Medium – due to lack of evidence. | **Low** influence on BCR if the benefits start accruing a few years earlier or later. We believe the benefits of reducing plastic on ecosystems will be lower than the time it takes to fully restore habitat benefits which evidence suggest is 5-8 years. |  |
| Cost per country | Split the budget for the strand equally per country per year. As this is unknown and depends on country need. | Low- may be higher or lower given activity needed. | Low influence on the BCR- Whilst what is spent in each country and year on year my vary it is unlikely based previous spending on CLiP that costs may be higher or significantly lower. | Potentially overestimated at country level, which would *under*estimate the BCR |
| Countries used | Existing countries are based on commitment to continue in year one. New country example and how long they are in the OCPP is an assumption. | Medium – most countries used will continue receiving support. Less confidence of new country partners. | **Medium** impact- There will be an impact on the BCR if the new country has comparatively high volumes of mismanaged waste, impacting potential costs and benefits. The country used determines whether a national or regional programme is likely and the % of mismanaged waste reduced. | Range of countries have been chosen |
| One Health Aquaculture | | | | |
| Countries used in example | New programme, only Bangladesh guaranteed, depends on interest from countries. | Low- of the three countries we are only sure of continuing work in Bangladesh.  However, countries have been chosen to be representative of those we are likely to be working in. | For the options that include new countries there is a high impact on the BCR, if there a smaller nation the OCPP might have a larger impact and vice versa, impacting potential costs and benefits. | Range of countries have been chosen |
| Price of aquaculture production | Used retail price of fish in Bangladesh, assumed the same for Indonesia and India as domestic data was unavailable. | Medium- Price is sensible for only one country, as there is a difference in fish produced per country therefore price could not be evidenced. | This has a proportionate impact on the BCR. Prices do always fluctuate; however we have taken the average data for the key country we will be working in in year 1: Bangladesh. |  |
| % that can be improved due to One Health initiative | A range is considered for each Option in the appraisal case.  This is a new programme therefore assumption is based on no evidence.  Option A: 1%-2%  Option B: 0.4%-0.8%  Option C: 0.2%-0.3% | Low- New programme, no evidence of success therefore using conservative scenarios. | Because of its **high** influence on the BCR, it is used to present a low and high scenario as part of the appraisal. This assumption determines the range of the BCR as is. | Range  and conservative scenarios applied |
| MPAs | | | | |
| Countries used in example | Illustrative, based on likely priority (scale of challenge, FCDO Strategic Framework for ODA, existing interest) | Medium. Countries may not be the exact countries, but they have been chosen to be representative of different sizes and regions. | Large differences in BCRs for different countries: which is the rationale for using a range of different country sizes and regions | Incorporated in figures |
| Values of ecosystem services provided by habitats | Used Ecosystem Services Valuation Database (2020), for specific country where available and using averages were not available. | Medium. ESVD is the best available evidence and where possible, is country-specific | **Low-medium.** Influencing factor, but figures are country specific and changes in one country has small impact on overall BCR. |  |
| Rate of loss of habitats in absence of intervention | Mangroves: country specific data, based on average of past 20-year data from Global Mangrove watch  Seagrass: worldwide average, based on loss over past three decades (IPCC): 1%. Low scenario: 0.25%  Reefs: lack of data and based on assumption of 0.25%. Low scenario: 0.1% | Medium (for mangroves)  Low (for seagrass and corals) | **Low** impact on BCR. In high scenario, BCR increases 1% when assumed rate of loss of seagrass doubles, 0.2% when rate of loss of coral reefs quadruples. | Incorporated in range |
| Avoided reduction through MPAs | Assumed 40% of habitat loss is reduced when MPAs are in place. MPAs will focus where there are greatest potential gains (and where reduction is highest), but 100% is not applied since optimism bias has been applied: programmes may not be as effective as assessed. Plus, some pressures causing decline include the impacts of climate change, which will not be directly reduced through the establishment of MPAs | Medium. Optimism bias has been applied. | Influences BCR, but considered to be incorporated within the attribution of avoided reduction below | Incorporated in range (as part of below) |
| Attribution of MPA technical assistance programme to effectively implemented and managed MPAs | Assumed 5-10% attribution | Medium. New programme, with no existing evaluations. However, given that a lack of expertise / technical capabilities has been identified as a key barrier, the programme could be assessed to be an enabling factor and 5-10% attribution could be assessed to be reasonable | **High** importance for BCR | Key assumption influencing range |