



Office of Inspector General

July 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia's Mission Director, Michael Yates

FROM: Regional Inspector General/Manila, William S. Murphy /s/

SUBJECT: Review of USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia's Coral Triangle Support Partnership (Report No. 5-493-12-001-S)

This memorandum transmits our final report on the subject review. In finalizing the report, we considered your comments on the draft version and have included them in their entirety in Appendix II of this report.

This report contains 14 recommendations to assist the mission in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of its program. On the basis of information provided by the mission in its response to the draft report, we determined that final action has been taken on 10 recommendations—1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13—while management decisions have been reached on the remaining four—3, 6, 8, and 14. Please provide the Audit Performance and Compliance Division of USAID's Office of the Chief Financial Officer with evidence of final action to close the open recommendations.

I want to thank you and your staff for the cooperation and courtesies extended to us during this review.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Considered by some scientists the global epicenter of marine biodiversity, the Coral Triangle region spans six countries between the Western Pacific and Indian Oceans. These countries include Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste. In December 2007, these six countries formed the Coral Triangle Initiative for Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF, or CTI for short).

In response to the CTI, the U.S. Government initiated the CTI Support Program (USCTI),¹ which consists of three agreements:

1. The Coral Triangle Support Partnership, a cooperative agreement between USAID and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Conservation International, and the Nature Conservancy.
2. A Program Integrator contract awarded by USAID to Tetra Tech ARD Inc. to coordinate technical assistance from various U.S. Government agencies and partners.
3. An agreement through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide information and technical assistance.

This performance review focused on the Coral Triangle Support Partnership. USAID's Regional Development Mission for Asia (RDMA) awarded the partnership, a 5-year, \$32 million leader with associates cooperative agreement, on September 30, 2008. WWF is the prime implementer, and it provided subawards to Conservation International and the Nature Conservancy, forming a regional consortium. As of December 2011, cumulative obligations and disbursements under the program totaled \$23.5 million and \$15.8 million, respectively.

The partnership's goal is to improve the management of biologically and economically important coastal and marine resources and associated ecosystems that support the livelihoods of people and economies in the Coral Triangle. To achieve this goal, the partnership has four major objectives:

1. Strengthen regional and national platforms to catalyze and sustain integrated marine and coastal management.
2. Improve the approach to fisheries management throughout the region.
3. Improve the management of marine protected areas in Coral Triangle countries.
4. Improve Coral Triangle countries' ability to adapt to climate change.

The objective of this performance review was to determine whether the Coral Triangle Support Partnership was achieving its main goal. The review team determined that while the partnership has had some successes, it has made limited progress in improving the management of biologically and economically important coastal and marine resources. This is largely because the performance management plan was inadequate as was the quality of the data on the partnership's accomplishments.

¹ The U.S. Department of State also provided an initial grant.

The USCTI (and the partnership by extension) has made significant headway in developing the national and regional platforms meant to catalyze and sustain integrated marine and coastal management among the six governments in the Coral Triangle. The Interim Regional Secretariat—a coordinating body for CTI efforts—was formed and is awaiting final ratification from the six governments. CTI national coordinating committees have also been established in each of the governments, along with national and regional technical working groups addressing priorities including fisheries, marine protected areas, and adapting to climate change.



This map of the Coral Triangle shows the partnership's activity sites. (<http://www.usctsp.org>)

Despite these achievements, the review team found several problems that the mission needs to address:

- The partnership did not tailor indicators to its activities. Instead it used standard indicators that did not measure progress toward the four main objectives (page 4).
- Reported results were not reliable. Some achievements were misleading, and there were deficiencies in collecting, maintaining, and storing data (page 5).
- Partners did not integrate the development of alternative livelihoods or public-private partnerships into activities (page 9).
- Beneficiaries were unaware of USAID's contributions (page 11).

The report recommends that USAID/RDMA:

1. Develop performance indicators that measure activity-based outputs and related results for each of the partnership's four objectives (page 5).
2. Assess the tangible achievements in each of the partnership's four objectives (page 5).
3. Share the results assessment with key stakeholders in the six governments to help gain their support (page 5).
4. Establish improved policies and procedures to verify that reported accomplishments are adequately supported (page 7).
5. Clarify indicator measurements and definitions (page 7).
6. Establish procedures so that data quality assessments evaluate an implementing partner's data collection, maintenance, and processing procedures and test the accuracy and consistency of the data (page 8).
7. Work with the partnership's prime implementer to expand the data collected for reported accomplishments. This could be done through a standard template that tracks the specific location of activities, the number of participants by type, the results each event contributes to, etc. This information should be stored in a way to allow adequate analysis of cumulative results (page 8).
8. Work with the partnership's prime implementer to implement procedures to include only intended beneficiaries in formal reporting to USAID. Other training participants, such as consortium members and students, should be tracked separately (page 8).
9. Issue guidelines on how to integrate alternative livelihood development into activities that involve managing marine protected areas, fisheries, and adaptation to climate change. These guidelines would be available as a part of the Coral Triangle Initiative tool kit for future efforts in the region (page 10).
10. Incorporate the discussion of developing alternative livelihoods into future workshops hosted by the partnership (page 10).
11. Clarify in writing the roles and responsibilities of who is in charge of developing the partnership's public-private partnerships (page 10).
12. Issue written guidance to the partnership's prime implementer on informing beneficiaries of USAID's sponsorship of the partnership (page 11).
13. Implement a plan for monitoring the implementation of the prime implementer's branding strategy and marking plan (page 11).
14. Use local languages for branding in activity sites to ensure greater recognition from community members (page 11).

Detailed findings follow. The review scope and methodology are described in Appendix I. Our evaluation of management comments will be included on page 12, and the full text of management comments will appear in Appendix II.

REVIEW FINDINGS

Partnership Did Not Tailor Indicators to Its Activities

A performance indicator forms the basis for observing progress and measuring actual results compared with expected results. The performance management plan must include performance indicators for all development objectives.²

The entities that contribute to the USCTI developed six performance indicators to measure their combined efforts in the initiative's consolidated results framework. Because each of the entities has different programmatic objectives, the indicators were very generic and not meant to measure the specific accomplishments of any program's objectives in particular.

During our review, we found that the Coral Triangle Support Partnership did not establish performance indicators to measure progress relating to the accomplishment of its four objectives. Instead, it tracked progress using the USCTI's six indicators, which do not correlate directly to the partnership's objectives.

For example, Indicator 4 tracks the number of people who received training in natural resources management or biodiversity conservation. This indicator does nothing to identify to what extent these "trained people" contribute to the objectives of (1) strengthened national or regional platforms, (2) an improved fisheries approach, (3) improved management of protected marine areas, or (4) improved adaptation to climate change. None of the other indicators demonstrates how the training affected the behaviors or beliefs of participants.

Similarly, the number of laws, policies, agreements, or regulations proposed, adopted, or implemented that address climate change (Indicator 5) do not indicate whether there has been any progress on improving the region's capacity to adapt to climate change. There is also no recognition of how the partnership has strengthened institutional capacity and collaboration under results for strengthening regional and national platforms.

The consortium's regional program office, which coordinated the efforts and reporting of the members, did not have a monitoring and evaluation officer for the first 2.5 years of the partnership's existence because WWF determined that each consortium member would be responsible for its own monitoring and reporting while the regional program office consolidated the results before reporting to USAID. This "regional" monitoring and evaluation officer could have brought the consortium together to work out a series of performance indicators specific to the partnership's objectives.

USAID did not follow up to confirm that the partnership developed program-specific indicators; instead the Agency ratified the partnership's usage of the six generic indicators by acknowledging and approving them in the mission's data quality assessment—an assessment that was lacking, as noted in the next finding.

² Automated Directives System (ADS) 203.3.4, "Performance Indicators for Performance Management Plans and Projects."

While appropriate as part of a consolidated framework for USCTI efforts, these six indicators were not sufficient for measuring the partnership's accomplishments. Consequently, the data collected did not provide the information needed to determine the partnership's progress or to assess the effectiveness of activities.

Not being able to communicate any progress can impair the partnership's ability to generate consistent support and interest from local and national governments in the Coral Triangle. In fact, some national representatives have expressed frustration at the lack of tangible results. We therefore make the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to implement performance indicators that measure results of activities related to each of the partnership's four objectives.

Recommendation 2. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to assess the tangible achievements toward each of the partnership's four objectives and document the results.

Recommendation 3. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia share the documented results of this assessment with key government stakeholders in the six governments in the Coral Triangle to help gain their support.

Reported Results Were Not Reliable

To be useful for performance management and credible for reporting, the data in the partnership's performance management plan should be valid, trustworthy, and timely. Data should also be sufficiently precise, with a suitable level of detail, to present a fair picture of performance and help managers make decisions.³

During our review, however, we found that the performance indicators in the partnership's performance management plan and the data on them were not precise enough to present a reasonable picture of what had been accomplished to date. Available data on the indicators did not clearly represent the intended result, raising questions about the integrity of the data. We also found that the partnership's database was inadequate for tracking and reporting activities. These problems are discussed in detail below.

Reported Achievements Were Misleading and Unreliable. Throughout our substantive testing, we noted concerns with the reliability, precision, and integrity of the partnership's data. Evidence to support the reported results was unavailable, rendering them unreliable or misleading.

The review team performed substantive tests on four of the six performance indicators. We tested the reported results for Indicators 3, 5, and 6 in their entirety because they were not too numerous. We selected a sample of 3,927 people who participated in 32 reported training events for Indicator 4, which made up 64 percent of the total number of people trained and 39 percent of the 82 total training events.

³ ADS 203.3.5.1, "Data Quality Standards."

Reported Versus Actual Results

	Indicator	Reported Results	Substantiated Results*
1	Number of hectares of biological significance under improved management	9,579,177 [†]	Not tested
2	Number of hectares of natural resources under improved management	5,892,522	Not tested
3	Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented	46	25
4	Number of people receiving training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation	6,129	Reported result is unreliable ^{††}
5	Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations addressing climate change proposed, adopted, or implemented	3	2
6	Number of public-private partnerships formed	9	2

* Data substantiated during performance review.

[†] Although we did not test this indicator substantively, analytical procedures showed that roughly 1 million hectares of this amount were part of the proposed Tun Mustapha Park in Malaysia. Government authorities have intended to establish the park since 2003, but still have not drafted an integrated management plan. The review team determined that only a few thousand hectares of the 1 million were linked to specific demonstration sites supported by the partnership and “under improved management.” Therefore, the total is closer to 8.5 million hectares.

^{††} We validated training records for 1,357 out of 3,927 people included in our sample. We did not test the other 2,202.

As shown in the table above, some of the supporting documentation was insufficient. For example, only 54 percent of Indicator 3’s reported number of agreements were documented. Of the rest, 22 percent were only draft versions of agreements that have not yet been adopted, let alone implemented; another 15 percent had no supporting documentation; and 9 percent were not laws, policies, agreements, or regulations at all. The number of reported public-private partnerships under Indicator 6 also lacked adequate supporting evidence.

For Indicator 4, the partnership had no support whatsoever to prove it had trained 1,023 people (26 percent). In fact, the partnership had adequate proof that it had trained only 1,357 people, or 35 percent of the 3,927 reported number trained, rendering the reported figure for Indicator 4 unreliable.

The general understanding among the partnership’s consortium and USAID representatives was that each implementing partner would be responsible for collecting, tracking, and reporting data for their own activities. Moreover, the primary role for the partnership’s chief of party—as determined by the partnership’s prime awardee—originally was meant to assist with political mobilization and facilitate technical discussion, and did not include the authority to provide programmatic direction to the consortium for the first year. Instead, WWF formed a consortium strategy committee to provide oversight and management responsibility—duties normally allotted to the chief of party; this committee was composed of two members from each of the three implementers. Additionally, because the regional office in Jakarta was not able to hire a monitoring and evaluation officer until 2.5 years after the program began (because of limitations set by WWF), nobody was in charge of setting reporting standards or following up with implementers to be sure they documented their work adequately.

Consequently, each implementer decided how and when to report results. Discrepancies in various consortium members' understanding of when and how to report accomplishments limited the comparability of reported results, which meant that management could not rely on the results to make decisions. Therefore, we make the following recommendations.

Recommendation 4. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to implement improved policies and procedures to validate reported accomplishments.*

Recommendation 5. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to clarify in writing indicator measurements and definitions.*

Data Quality Assessment Did Not Disclose Deficiencies in Collecting, Maintaining, and Processing Data. USAID conducts data quality assessments to provide reasonable assurance that reported data meet five data quality standards: validity, precision, integrity, reliability, and timeliness. When data quality assessments include data from secondary sources, like the partnership's implementing partners, USAID should test the data for accuracy and consistency to ascertain its reliability.⁴

The data quality assessment that USAID/RDMA conducted, however, only superficially reviewed the performance indicators reported on by the partnership's consortium. According to the mission's assessment, all five data quality standards were reportedly met and no data limitations were noted, though we found that the indicators did not clearly and directly measure progress toward meeting the partnership's four objectives.

Furthermore, the mission concluded that mechanisms were in place to reduce the possibility that data were manipulated, though we found that 10 of the 46 reported "number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations . . . that are implemented" (Indicator 3) were still in the draft phase. When asked why they are already being counted as being adopted and implemented, a consortium official told us that if they had to wait for everything to be formally adopted, they wouldn't be able to report anything.

In the assessment, USAID/RDMA also concluded that the consortium planned to collect data as soon as they were available, but would only be reporting to the mission on a semiannual basis. We learned, however, that the consortium's regional program office sent out semiannual requests for data instead of expecting it as soon as the data were available. The partnership's former deputy chief of party acknowledged that he was not aware that anyone in the consortium ever tried to analyze the collective data gathered from the implementing partners.

The data quality assessment did not evaluate the partnership's data collection, maintenance, and processing procedures. We did not find any evidence that anyone checked to see if the data were accurate and consistent. Had someone done this, he or she could have found the deficiencies we found in the consortium's database, which are discussed below.

- Reported training events were not tracked individually. Instead, multiple unrelated training events were grouped together in a single category in the database, thus preventing anyone from tracking the results of individual training activities.

⁴ ADS 203.3.5.3, "Conducting Data Quality Assessments."

- Reported data were not tracked by (or clearly attributed to) specific results as required in the approved performance management plan. This made it difficult to determine how much progress was made toward achieving the four objectives. It was also unclear how some training events, like a volleyball tournament, were related to any of the objectives.
- Because training activities could be tracked based only by the country where they occurred, we could not determine how much progress was made in any of the 17 geographic priority areas in the six countries—let alone the sites in each of these areas.
- In addition to recording multiple trainings as a single event, the reported number of people trained during these events and the events' descriptions were included in the same cell of the Excel spreadsheet rather than recorded separately. As a result, we could not run a query to determine how many people were trained in a particular country or perform other queries through Excel. The combined figures were added manually and reported elsewhere in the spreadsheet, often without annotation as to how these figures were calculated. We noted several errors in these calculations.
- Participant type was not recorded. Thus, we could not determine from the database who actually participated in—and benefitted from—partnership activities. While testing the reported number of people trained, we found that 12 of the 32 tested training events (38 percent) included consortium members as trainees—averaging 22 percent of the training participants who attended these events. We could not make this determination for 14 (or 44 percent) of the events because of insufficient documentation, while no concerns were noted for the 6 remaining training events.

Consolidating training accomplishments in the database inhibits management's ability to analyze aggregate data and determine the partnership's progress toward achieving its intended results. Additionally, consortium members reporting their own employees as beneficiaries under training activities inflates results and masks how effective the partnership is in reaching its intended audience: local community members and government officials. We therefore make the following recommendations.

Recommendation 6. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia implement procedures to require data quality assessments to (1) evaluate an implementing partner's data collection, maintenance, and processing procedures and (2) determine the accuracy and consistency of the data through substantive testing.

Recommendation 7. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to expand the data collected for reported accomplishments. This could be done through a standard template with fields for the specific location of activities, the number of participants by type, and what objective could be achieved through each event. This information should be used to modify the database so the implementer can keep better track of progress for future work.

Recommendation 8. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to include only intended beneficiaries in formal reporting to USAID. Other training participants, such as consortium members and students, should be tracked separately.

Some Partnership Priorities Were Not Addressed

Alternative Livelihoods Were Not Sufficiently Developed. The partnership's cooperative agreement notes the importance of addressing human needs in addition to those of the ecosystem to have a sustainable impact on conservation:

Success will require attention to both human and ecosystem needs, including those of segments of society often overlooked. . . . During the early design phase, a specific strategy on gender will be elaborated and lessons learned from past experiences with alternative livelihood approaches will be incorporated into activity design to maximize the human benefits. Specific local activities with the potential for being replicated elsewhere or scaled up to the national or regional level will be given priority.

The Consortium will also address the demand side industries that affect the marine environment of the Coral Triangle. Additional examples of activities . . . include diversification of livelihoods sufficient to encourage fishers to not only supplement their fishing, but to actually leave it. All activities to diversify livelihoods or create alternative livelihoods will be directly linked and contingent upon actions to decrease the number of fishers and licenses in the fishery, thus reducing fishing pressure and threats.

Each workplan should elaborate, in a clearly understandable and concise manner . . . a logical framework that shows the direct links between biodiversity threats and any proposed alternative livelihoods that may reduce those threats.

Through our interviews with consortium staff members, we noted that developing alternative livelihoods was not being seriously considered as part of an integrated approach to manage fisheries and marine protected areas sustainably, as prioritized in the cooperative agreement. The partnership's annual work plans make only generic references to developing alternative livelihood programs. Partnership officials were unable to explain why this was the case.

While reviewing the consortium's database, we found that only 3 of the 82 reported training events included anything that could be related to developing alternative livelihoods. One was a mat-weaving course taught in Malaysia, which we verified during a site visit. The other two were ecotourism courses both occurring in Wakatobi, Indonesia; we were unable to determine the content of these courses.

Several local community members we interviewed over the course of fieldwork expressed a need for alternative livelihoods to counter the effect of decreased fishing. As the representative of one local association said, "It is fine to come and explain a reason for not fish-bombing. But without providing an alternative option for earning income? Don't talk to me."

By not integrating alternative livelihoods into its activities, the partnership loses a valuable tool for improving the sustainability of fisheries and the effectiveness of those who manage them. We therefore make the following recommendations.

Recommendation 9. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia to require the Coral Triangle Support Partnership to issue written guidelines on how to integrate alternative livelihoods into activities involving marine protected areas, fisheries, and climate change adaptation. These guidelines would be available as a part of the Coral Triangle Initiative tool kit for related efforts in the future.*

Recommendation 10. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia formally require that the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer incorporate and document the discussion of developing alternative livelihoods into future workshops hosted by the partnership.*

Public-Private Partnerships Were Not Formed to the Extent Envisioned. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) have been identified as strategically important in developing sustainable fisheries management, as shown from the cooperative agreement references:

Public-private partnerships are a centerpiece of the . . . proposal. For a region with one of the fastest growing rates of economic activity and influence in the world, the combining of public and private interests in the future of the Coral Triangle and its resources is critical.

The Consortium will work to bring together alliances of national and local governments, NGOs and fishing industry players around specific objectives and activities related to specific issues such as . . . sustainable live reef fish trade, sustainable coastal fisheries management and maximizing the potential of the tourism industry. . . . All three [Consortium members] give significant attention to public-private partnerships to galvanize sustainable business practices and new revenue streams.

Despite this declaration, consortium staff members interviewed in country offices and at demonstration sites generally were not aware of any strategy for encouraging PPPs or of a particular target to work toward. Partnership officials were unable to explain why this was the case.

In addition, a number of the PPPs the partnership claimed to have forged (for which supporting documentation was not provided) appear to be arrangements between private organizations. They would fit more accurately in Indicator 3, which measured the number of implemented agreements that promoted sustainable natural resources management. This discrepancy indicates that the consortium's staff members did not know what a PPP was, thus affecting their ability to facilitate these important relationships.

As a result, the partnership might have missed an opportunity to encourage sustainable business practices through combining public and private interests. We therefore make the following recommendation.

Recommendation 11. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to clarify and document the partnership's public-private partnership objective and the roles and responsibilities of partners in achieving it.*

Beneficiaries Were Unaware of USAID's Contributions

The partnership's branding strategy and marking plan stipulates that the consortium will work closely with USAID country missions to find opportunities to publicize the American people's support for the Coral Triangle Initiative. According to the plan, the consortium will take advantage of all situations—including formal and informal meetings—to identify USAID and the American people as the partnership's supporters. Additionally, ADS 320.3.1 states that USAID employees involved in program implementation must confirm that implementing partners communicate that USAID-funded foreign assistance is from the American people.

However, there was very little awareness, particularly at the community level, of the U.S. Government's role in funding and supporting the initiative. In fact, 27 of 34 community members we interviewed during site visits in three countries were either unaware of USAID entirely or unaware of what it was and its connection with the partnership; four people had the impression that USAID was another nongovernmental organization. Two employees of one of the consortium's partners were unaware that USAID was funding activities.

USAID personnel involved in implementation did not monitor the consortium's application of the branding strategy and marking plan to be sure it consistently and properly identified USAID and the American people as the partnership's supporters. The partnership's midterm evaluation, completed in October 2010, expressed concern about the generally limited awareness of USAID-funded support for activities and included recommendations to address this problem. Nonetheless, the same concern exists 1.5 years later because the consortium's implementing partners have not made much effort to communicate the information. Partnership officials were unable to explain why this problem was recurring.

Furthermore, we found during our site visits that USAID branding in the field was always in English, which was not commonly used. For example, signs in a community in Nusa Penida, Indonesia, included the USAID logo and the phrase "From the American People" in English—a language that local participants do not speak. We were unable to determine why they produced the signs in English instead of the local languages.

Because of limited, poorly designed publicity about USAID's involvement, the American people are not being recognized for their considerable investment in the Coral Triangle. We therefore make the following recommendations.

Recommendation 12. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia issue written guidance to the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer on how to inform beneficiaries of USAID's sponsorship of the partnership.

Recommendation 13. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia implement a plan for monitoring—and documenting the monitoring—the execution of the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's branding strategy and marking plan by the partnership's prime implementer.

Recommendation 14. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to use local languages for branding in activity sites to increase recognition within communities.

EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

The Office of Inspector General has reviewed the mission's response to the draft report and determined that final action has been taken on 10 of the 14 recommendations—1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13—while management decisions have been reached on the remaining 4—3, 6, 8, and 14. Our evaluation of comments on the recommendations is below.

In response to Recommendation 1, the mission had the implementer revise the performance management plan to include new, custom sub-indicators for each of the existing standard ones. These sub-indicators provide greater detail on outputs and achievements of the Coral Triangle Support Partnership. Because the partnership is well into its fourth year of implementation and detailed data from the past are not likely to be available, we are not asking the mission to retroactively populate the results of these new sub-indicators. Instead, the partnership can use the new indicators in the future and also as a model for other programs. This revised performance management plan was submitted to the mission on June 29, 2012, and was approved by the mission on July 8, 2012. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 2, the mission conducted an in-depth assessment of the partnership's tangible, outcome-related achievements within each of the four major objectives. This assessment determined the partnership's overall progress relating to its four major objectives and documented this progress in a draft results achievement brief. A list of 31 USAID-supported tools and other guidelines was also developed for distribution. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 3, the mission plans to communicate the partnership's progress with the six governments in the Coral Triangle using the drafted results achievement brief. This will be done during the presentation of the partnership's Year 5 work plans to the CTI National Coordination Committees. We conclude that a management decision has been reached. Final action will be taken when the official communication takes place, which is expected to take place by September 30, 2012.

In response to Recommendation 4, the partnership's regional and country team members participated in a source document simulation using a revised template. Feedback from this simulation resulted in updated data management policies and procedures as formalized in the partnership's revised performance management plan. The mission approved these on July 8, 2012. The implementer also hired a new monitoring and evaluation officer on July 1, 2012. This officer plans to visit field teams to monitor and conduct onsite training on source documentation and reporting. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 5, the mission and the implementer conducted a review of the partnership's current performance management plan and indicator definitions. This review led to the development of custom sub-indicators as well as revised definitions of the already existing standard indicators. The mission approved them on July 8, 2012.

Furthermore, the mission has proactively announced that all environmental programs under USAID/RDMA's purview will be undergoing a data quality assessment to clarify understandings of indicator results measurement and definitions. This process will culminate in a 2-day workshop with all implementing partners to (1) present preliminary findings of the data quality assessment, (2) address common issues, and (3) clarify partners' understanding of indicator reference sheets and definitions. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 6, the mission's monitoring and evaluation working group has a missionwide plan to (1) conduct formal training on performance management plans, data quality assessments, and quarterly monitoring for agreement officer/contract officer representatives, (2) establish a process to conduct regular data quality assessments, and (3) institute a process for formal quarterly reporting by technical offices. The mission is drafting an order that outlines specific requirements for monitoring. This will be finalized once the Policy, Planning and Learning Bureau issues monitoring guidelines, which are due out shortly. The mission is also hiring a monitoring and evaluation specialist to provide increased guidance and support for activity monitoring for all the mission's programs, including planning for and advising on data quality assessments. We conclude that a management decision has been reached. Final action will be taken when the order is formally issued, which is expected by December 31, 2012. This order should include the requirement for a data quality assessment to include testing of data when received from secondary sources, like program implementers.

In response to Recommendation 7, the implementer established templates for reporting and capturing detailed information about the location of activities, participant types, and coverage in terms of the partnership's four major objectives. The mission approved these templates on July 8, 2012. The implementer has also hired a monitoring and evaluation officer to conduct onsite training on the proper application of the templates. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 8, the mission and the implementer updated the performance management plan to include specific guidance for proper reporting and standard templates to accurately record intended beneficiaries. This updated plan was approved on July 8, 2012. The partnership's new monitoring and evaluation officer will conduct onsite training on the revised performance management plan to help employees comply with its policies and procedures. We conclude that a management decision has been reached. Final action will be taken when the implementer issues its formal report to USAID demonstrating only intended beneficiaries are included. This report is expected by October 31, 2012.

In response to Recommendation 9, the mission formally asked the implementer to create guidelines for alternative livelihood development to be incorporated into an integrated approach with marine protected areas, fisheries management, and climate change adaptation. Further, an ecosystem-based management guidebook, developed on June 5, 2012, incorporates strategic steps and associated activities to diversify livelihoods of coastal communities. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 10, the mission formally asked the implementer to incorporate the discussion of alternative livelihood development into future regional exchanges. During the regional exchange on fisheries management in Putrajaya, Malaysia, between May 22 and 25, 2012, the development of alternative livelihoods was integrated into the presentation. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 11, the mission asked the implementer to review the current public-private partnership objective, identify any partnerships not accounted for, and identify specific partnership implementers responsible for developing sustainable public-private partnerships. In response to this request, the implementer identified key staff responsible for managing, reporting, and documenting public-private partnership activities. The implementer also defined public-private partnerships more clearly and provided examples to show how they could support the partnership's objectives. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 12, the mission sent a memorandum to the implementer emphasizing the need to inform beneficiaries of USAID's sponsorship of the partnership. In response, the implementer redesigned the partnership's Web site to feature USAID branding and program successes. Updated brochures and other print materials were also released recently for distribution. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 13, the mission issued a written notice to the implementer requiring it to provide the mission with periodic updates on program materials that demonstrate compliance with branding and marking regulations. The agreement officer's representative will also conduct site visits to verify reported branding materials. We conclude that final action has been taken on this recommendation.

In response to Recommendation 14, the mission provided implementer staff members with the Web link so they could get access to the translated USAID logo for Malaysia, the Philippines, Timor Leste, and Papua New Guinea. The USAID Web site link, however, does not include local language translation for the Solomon Islands. USAID's Regional Development Mission for Asia and the USAID/Pacific Office, in collaboration with the partnership, will develop and translate the USAID logo into this local language. The English version will be used until the translation is done. The mission will monitor usage of the translated USAID logo in future partnership communication materials. We conclude that a management decision has been reached. Final action will be taken when the USAID logo is adopted in the local languages for the Solomon Islands. This is expected to be completed by September 30, 2012.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope

We conducted this performance review in accordance with the evidence and documentation standards in *Government Auditing Standards*, Paragraphs 7.55 and 7.77 through 7.84. Those standards require that we obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions in accordance with our review objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides that reasonable basis.

The purpose of this performance review was to determine whether the USAID/RDMA's Coral Triangle Support Partnership was achieving its main goal of improving the management of biologically and economically important coastal and marine resources in the region. To implement the program, USAID awarded a \$32 million leader with associates cooperative agreement to WWF as leader (prime awardee) with Conservation International and the Nature Conservancy as subawardees. The agreement lasts from September 30, 2008, until September 30, 2013. As of December 2011, cumulative obligations and disbursements under the program totaled \$23.5 million and \$15.8 million, respectively.

The performance review covered the partnership's activities from September 30, 2008, through April 20, 2012. The most recent formally reported data covered the 3-year period that ended on September 30, 2011. We conducted visits to selected areas to interview training participants and recipients of technical assistance. We also observed activity sites.

In planning and performing this performance review, we assessed management controls related to management review and performance targets and indicators:

- Program work plans for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012
- Certification required under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982⁵
- Portfolio review sheets
- Data quality assessment
- Cooperative agreement and modifications
- Reported results
- Financial reports

Because the Coral Triangle Support Partnership is a regional effort, we performed our fieldwork in Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines from March 12 to April 20, 2012. We observed activities and interviewed participants as well as members of the consortium's staff. During these site visits, we spoke with 30 government officials, 34 community members, and 45 consortium staff members.

Methodology

To determine whether the program was achieving its main goals, we initially interviewed key staff at Tetra Tech ARD's office in Bangkok to gain an understanding of their role in coordinating with the partnership as the Program Integrator. We also met with the main officials at

⁵ Public Law 97-255, as codified in 31 U.S.C. 3512.

USAID/RDMA to discuss their roles and responsibilities and the reporting procedures and controls for monitoring the partnership. In addition, we interviewed key staff at the consortium's regional program office in Jakarta, Indonesia. We also interviewed consortium employees in Jakarta and Bali, Indonesia; Kota Kinabalu and Kudat, Malaysia; and Puerto Princessa, Philippines. Additional work to answer the review objective entailed conducting site visits to selected countries in the Coral Triangle to interview participants and observe activities. We also reviewed and analyzed documents to validate data reported under selected performance indicators.

The performance review included interviews with training recipients as well as with other stakeholders engaged with the partnership on some level, like government officials who received technical assistance. We also made an effort to validate reported results for selected performance indicators through testing and analytical procedures.

To determine the reliability of computer-processed data related to the partnership's activities contained in the consortium's information management system, we selected 100 percent of the reported results relating to Indicators 3, 5, and 6. For Indicator 4, 32 of 82 reported training events were tested. Indicators 1 and 2 were not tested because they were measurements theoretically supported by the other four indicators. The partnership's reported results proved unreliable because of insufficient documentation and misleading data.

We established a materiality threshold of 85 percent to assess the test results. For example, if at least 85 percent of tested results data reported under a specific performance indicator were adequately supported, we concluded that the reported results were reasonably accurate.

On **April 30, 2012**, RDMA communicated with CTSP staff, via email, regarding the RIG Performance Review. Along with an email cover letter, a copy of the RIG Draft Discussion Document and the RDMA Management Action document were also conveyed. The RDMA Management Action memo establishes and documents all corrective actions, including that CTSP develop custom performance indicators in response to RIG findings.

CTSP reported on May 18th regarding the status of the ongoing review of their current Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) led by an independent monitoring and evaluation (M&E) consultant, contracted by WWF, who started work on **May 21, 2012**. The draft "Report on the Review and Customization of the PMP Indicators" as of **June 10, 2012** has identified and proposed custom indicators that measure CTSP's activity-based outputs for Indicators 3, 4, 5, and 6. The review results are further embodied in the CTSP Revised PMP and M&E Manual submitted to RDMA on **June 29, 2012**, which will be included in the upcoming Regional Environment Office (REO) Data Quality Assessment (DQA) process. The DQA will culminate with a two-day workshop with REO implementing partners to present preliminary findings of the DQA, address common issues, and provide clarification on interpretation of indicator reference sheets and definitions. A CTSP M&E Specialist started work on **July 1, 2012** to focus on mentoring/training at CTSP field sites to improve source documentation and data quality.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 2. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to assess the tangible, outcome-related achievements within each the Partnership's four result areas (page 6).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

On **June 7, 2012**, CTSP completed Country and Regional Brochures that introduce CTSP's program priorities and success stories under each of four result areas. The same sets of materials are available in print and electronically in the newly revised CTSP website (<http://www.usctsp.org/demo/>). A more in-depth assessment on CTSP's "tangible, outcome-related achievements within each of the four result areas" took place on Day 1 of the CTSP Year 5 Work Planning Meeting on **June 13, 2012**. On Day 1, CTSP's country field team and regional thematic team leads for Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM), and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) reported on progress against the four result areas of the USCTI Endgame Strategy. Cumulative program progress has been further consolidated into a USCTI Results Achievement Brief, which is discussed in the next recommendation. A USCTI Tools/Products Inventory datasheet was rolled out on **June 21, 2012** and now includes a total of 31 USAID supported "tangible" tools/products developed with CTSP, NOAA, and the Program Integrator (PI) technical assistance. The datasheet also lays out a plan for a systematic and collaborative "roll out, distribution and handover" process with appropriate CTI-CFF partners and stakeholders. This action is incorporated in the Year 5 Work Plan priorities.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 3. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia share the results of this assessment with key government stakeholders within the six governments in the Coral Triangle region to help develop political buy-in (page 6).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

The USCTI Results Achievements Brief summarizes the results achieved by the CTSP, NOAA and the Program Integrator (PI) and is presented in a format easily comprehensible to CTI government stakeholders from site, national and regional levels. The Achievements Brief, submitted to RDMA on **June 29, 2012**, is a 2-page document (i.e. regional and by country) detailing USCTI progress against the four results areas and will be officially communicated by RDMA to the CTI-CFF government partners, in particular, the CTI National Coordinating Committees (NCCs), CTI-CFF Secretariat, and Local Government officials. The Results Achievements Brief will also be published and posted in the USCTI, CTSP, and CTI-CFF websites. Over the next year we expect at least 12 NCC meetings to take place, and RDMA staff will attend at least one in each country in order to present the Achievements Brief in person. RDMA staff will also personally convey the Achievements Brief to key government stakeholders at Senior Officials Meetings and CTI Ministerial Meetings. As has been the practice since 2009, CTSP country teams have already started a series of consultations with their government counterparts to “socialize” CTSP’s Year 5 Work Plan priorities and to define respective roles and responsibilities of government partners in program implementation. These regular meetings provide a good opportunity to take specific action on communicating program achievements to help garner and sustain country level buy-in. CTSP also issued a memo on **June 28, 2012** to its field staff on guidance to share CTSP results in-country with each NCC as a first step in the consultation process of the Year 5 Work Plan.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 4. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership’s prime implementer to establish improved policies and procedures to ensure reported accomplishments are adequately supported (page 8).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

On **May 18, 2012**, WWF submitted to RDMA a memorandum that outlines the CTSP process for data gathering and management and also provides guidance on proposed modifications and improvements to its data gathering and management procedures. On **June 14, 2012**, at Day 2 of the CTSP Year 5 Work Planning Meeting, the CTSP regional and country team members participated in a Source Documentation simulated exercise where they were asked to fill out source documentation forms and attendance data sheets. Comments and feedback from CTSP teams were gathered to further refine the templates for source documentation and data reporting. CTSP’s PMP Data Management Policies and Procedures are described in more detail in the CTSP Revised PMP and M&E Manual submitted on **June 29, 2012**. The new CTSP M&E Specialist, who started work on **July 1, 2012**, will visit CTSP field teams to monitor and conduct on-site mentoring/training on source documentation and reporting on the revised PMP.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 5. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership’s prime implementer to clarify understandings of indicator result measurements and definitions (page 8).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

To arrive at a common understanding of indicator results measurements and definitions, RDMA/REO announced on **May 11, 2012** at the REO Partners Meeting its plan to conduct an REO-wide Data Quality Assessment (DQA) involving all REO programs with the goal of clarifying understandings of REO indicator results measurements and definitions. Copies of the REO Performance Management System plans were distributed to implementing partners at the meeting. A DQA process led by an external consultant will assess REO’s data management and reporting systems and verify reported data for key indicators at selected sites in order to determine whether indicator data meets the following data quality standards set forth in USAID’s Automated Directive Systems Chapter 203 on “Assessing and Learning.” The process will culminate with a two-day workshop with REO implementing partners to present preliminary findings of the DQA, address common issues, and provide clarification on implementing partners’ understanding of indicator reference sheets and definitions.

CTSP has taken parallel action steps at the project level to clarify CTSP indicator definitions and measurements. CSTP conducted a review of the current Performance Management Plan (PMP) and indicator definitions led by an independent M&E consultant who started work on **May 21, 2012**. The review resulted in the development of custom indicators, the first draft of which was vetted and validated with the CTSP regional and country teams on Day 2, **June 14, 2012** at the CTSP Year 5 Work Planning Meeting where comments were discussed and consensus reached on the indicators presented at the meeting. The CTSP Revised PMP and M&E Manual submitted on **June 29, 2012** incorporates comments and suggestions received from RDMA and the CTSP regional and country teams at the CTSP Work Planning Meeting. CTSP’s revised PMP will then be subjected to a further DQA review by RDMA under REO’s Performance Management System’s development process.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 6. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia establish procedures to ensure that data quality assessments (1) evaluate an implementing partner’s data collection, maintenance, and processing procedures and (2) determine the accuracy and consistency of the data through substantive testing (page 10).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

RDMA’s Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG) has a Mission-wide plan that includes a) conducting formal training on PMPs, DQAs, and Quarterly Monitoring for AOR/CORs; b) establishing a process to conduct regular DQAs more frequently than every three years; and c) instituting a process for formal quarterly reporting by technical offices. RDMA is drafting a Monitoring Mission Order (MO) that outlines specific Mission requirements for monitoring, in addition to RDMA’s currently implemented Evaluation Mission Order. The Monitoring MO will be finalized once the Policy, Planning and Learning Bureau issues Agency monitoring guidelines, due out shortly. RDMA is also hiring an M&E Specialist, to be on board

in 2012, who will provide increased guidance and support for activity monitoring for all RDMA programs, including planning for, and advising on, high quality DQAs.

Additionally, in response to the RIG Performance Review, RDMA/REO announced on **May 11, 2012** at the REO Partners Meeting its plan to establish an improved REO Performance Management System. A presentation was made at that time regarding the issue of data quality and plans for an REO wide DQA. REO has since then instituted several corrective actions to address data quality, not only in CTSP, but for all REO programs:

- 1) On **June 25, 2012**, REO AORs/CORs received copies of the DQA Scope of Work and were requested to submit copies of PMPs and Quarterly/Semiannual Reports for the DQA planning process;
- 2) REO, through USAID/Washington's E3 service provider Development & Training Services Inc. (dTS), will conduct an assessment of REO's data management and reporting systems and verify reported data for key indicators at selected sites in order to determine whether indicator data meet quality standards on validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness as set forth in USAID's Automated Directive Systems Chapter 203 on "Assessing and Learning". The Scope of Work for the REO DQA Process was submitted on **June 25, 2012**. Verification and testing of reported data will be conducted in August 2012 in sample geographic locations that will include CTSP sites. The DQA process will culminate on September 6th & 7th with a two-day workshop to present preliminary findings of the DQA and to clarify and obtain common understanding of all indicator data reference sheets; and
- 3) RDMA advertised, on **June 29, 2012**, the full-time position for a Strategic Information Specialist (SIS) (see Attachment 12 for SIS Position Description) to support REO's improved Performance Management System and represent REO to the RDMA Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group in order to improve overall mission monitoring systems.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 7. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to expand the level of detail collected for reported accomplishments. This could be done through a standard template that tracks the specific location of activities, the number of participants by type, the result area each event contributes to, etc. This information should be stored in a way to allow adequate analysis of cumulative results (page 10).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

CTSP/WWF in their **May 18, 2012** memorandum to RDMA proposed modifications on CTSP's data gathering and management and draft templates (see Annexes A, B and C of the Memo in Attachment 8). The review, which ran parallel to this process, culminated with the development of the CTSP Revised PMP and M&E Manual submitted to RDMA on **June 29, 2012**. The Revised PMP and M&E Manual has a section which includes the standard templates for reporting and capturing detailed information on location, participant types and result areas coverage. The source documentation templates will contain the following data to be collected and reported by CTSP field teams: 1) specific location, 2) type of participants for trainings; 3) coverage in terms of four CTSP results areas; 4) gender disaggregation and others. WWF is looking at the "possibility of creating a web-based data input and verification system". The new CTSP M&E Specialist, who started work on **July 1, 2012**, will visit CTSP field teams to monitor

and conduct on-site mentoring and training on the proper application of the revised PMP standard templates and spreadsheets.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 8. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to implement procedures that ensure only intended beneficiaries are included in formal reporting to USAID. Other training participants, such as Consortium members and students, should be tracked separately (page 10).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

The CTSP/WWF **May 18, 2012** memorandum to RDMA provided draft changes to the CTSP data collection procedures and policies. The revised CTSP PMP and M&E Manual submitted on **June 29, 2012**, provides specific guidance to CTSP teams in proper reporting and use of standard templates and source documentation and specifically deals with this issue of reporting on intended beneficiaries. These revised procedures will ensure only intended beneficiaries are included in formal reporting to USAID. The new CTSP M&E Specialist who started work on **July 1, 2012** will visit CTSP field teams to monitor and conduct on-site mentoring/training on the Revised PMP and compliance with its Policies and Procedures.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 9. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia clarify expectations for the Coral Triangle Support Partnership to create guidelines for alternative livelihood development to be incorporated into an integrated approach for marine protected areas, fisheries, and climate change adaptation management. This guideline would be available as a part of the CTI toolkit for future related Coral Triangle efforts (page 11).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

The **April 30, 2012** RDMA Management Action document includes an RDMA request for CTSP to develop a guideline for alternative livelihoods to be incorporated into an integrated approach with CTSP's MPA, EAFM, and CCA results areas. CTSP, during the May 18th meeting in RDMA (and as shown in May 29th update of the RDMA Management Action), reported on their ongoing process to consolidate and modify guidelines for alternative livelihoods, to be incorporated into the USCTI Integrated Toolkit. This toolkit was presented on Day 2, **June 14, 2012**, of the CTSP Year 5 Work Planning Meeting. CTSP conducted a team review and test-run of the **June 5, 2012** version of the toolkit entitled "Integrating Ecosystem-based Management Approaches in the Coral Triangle: Practical Guidelines for Marine and Coastal Managers and Conservation Practitioners." This Integrated Toolkit or CTI-CFF Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM) guidebook, developed with CTSP technical assistance, seeks to integrate and synergize resource management approaches to multiple threats and issues, traditionally dealt with in isolation of one another that undermine the integrity of coastal-marine resources in the Coral Triangle. The guidebook focuses on mutually supportive objectives on sustainable fisheries, biodiversity conservation (including threatened species) and adaptation to the impacts of climate

change. For CTI-CFF, sustaining fisheries will sustain livelihoods of millions of people in CT region who depend upon seafood for their subsistence.

Table 2 on page 11 of the toolkit, summarizes the coastal-marine resources strategies which cover livelihoods. This table, which the CTSP team tested on June 14, 2012, provides a tool for resource managers to document activities that contribute to multiple objectives. Labeled, “diversify livelihoods of coastal communities,” it includes the following activities: a) vulnerability of current livelihoods to climate change assessed; b) adaptation measures to reduce livelihood vulnerability implemented; and c) environment-friendly alternative income generation opportunities provided to communities. All three activities on livelihoods relate to the three integrated objectives on sustaining fisheries, climate change and biodiversity conservation.

This EBM guidebook or Integration Toolkit provides the overarching guidelines for sustainable livelihoods in the CTI. CTSP will roll out and initiate a handover process of the Integrator Toolkit. It will be available electronically to CTI and coastal-marine managers by August 2012.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 10. We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia formally request that the Coral Triangle Support Partnership’s prime implementer incorporate the discussion of socio-economic conditions, such as alternative livelihood development, into future workshops hosted by the Partnership (page 11).

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

During the 2nd Regional Exchange for Ecosystems Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM), held in Malaysia on **May 22-25, 2012**, CTSP incorporated a dedicated session on integrating “Livelihoods and EAFM” in the CTI. Dr. Robert Pomeroy, CTSP EAFM Team Leader, presented four dimensions to consider in coastal livelihoods, namely, diversity, adaptation, incentives and vulnerability. He then stressed that sustainable livelihoods is an important component to EAFM. The guidelines for applying sustainable livelihoods to EAFM are shown on pages *xiii* and 8 of the EAFM Workshop Proceedings and as stated below:

- a) Highlight actual livelihood conditions and needs. Fisheries managers may have preconceptions of what fishers need, and find out that fishers are actually concerned with totally different issues;
- b) Identify factors affecting livelihood and the drivers that make people do what they do;
- c) Identify how to improve and maintain sustainability of resource, income and household needs;
- d) Highlight how livelihoods link to ecosystem health;
- e) Clarify potential impacts of fisheries management changes on livelihoods and social resilience.

The CTI EAFM Technical Working Group represented by Coral Triangle member countries reached a general consensus that livelihood issues should be addressed under the EAFM regional policy and legislative framework. CTSP will follow this approach in incorporating the discussion of socio-economic conditions, such as alternative livelihood development into future CTI-CFF workshops/regional exchanges on Climate Change Adaptation, Marine Protected Areas, and EAFM.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 11. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer to clarify the expectations of working toward the Partnership's Public-Private Partnership objective. The roles and responsibilities of who should be making this effort should also be made clear (page 12).*

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

The **April 30, 2012** RDMA Management Action requested CTSP/WWF to review the current CTSP Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) target, identify any PPPs not accounted for or reported, determine whether the PPP target should be revised, and identify CTSP consortium members responsible for developing PPP targets for Year 5. CTSP's initial action step was to review the current CTSP PMP indicators and PPPs for accuracy. CTSP has submitted a report detailing a review of its indicators including Indicator 6 on PPPs which can be found on page 17 of the report dated **June 10, 2012**. The **June 29, 2012** CTSP Revised PMP and M&E Manual also includes new tentative targets on PPPs to be finalized upon submission of the Year 4 Annual Report and Year 5 Work Plan. The CTSP team also reviewed the PPP indicator at the **June 14, 2012** PMP session during the CTSP Year 5 Work Planning Meeting where general agreement was reached on definitions of PPP and other indicators. The CTSP Chief of Party issued a reminder on **June 26, 2012** to all field teams on PPP definitions and procedures to update Year 5 PPP targets before submission of the Year 5 Work Plan. CTSP/WWF also sent a status update to RDMA on **June 28, 2012** for designating CTSP staff charged with the responsibility of developing and reporting on PPP targets in their respective sites. The CTSP RPO and Chief of Party are the overall coordinators on CTSP PPP initiatives.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 12. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia issue a written guidance to the Coral Triangle Support Partnership's prime implementer of the need to inform beneficiaries of USAID's sponsorship of the Partnership (page 13).*

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

RDMA sent a memo to CTSP/WWF on **June 26, 2012** emphasizing the need to inform beneficiaries of USAID's sponsorship of CTSP. The CTSP Year 5 Work Plan will include a Communications and Branding Section that highlights USAID's sponsorship of the CTSP program that CTSP partners will implement. RDMA also issued the same branding guidelines verbally at the CTSP Year 5 Work Plan Meeting on **June 15, 2012** where the CTSP team discussed key messaging. The CTSP regional and country teams participated in the Key Messaging training exercise facilitated by an independent and professional public relations firm. These key messages will, among other messages, reinforce that USAID is the program sponsor and that USAID funding is from the American people. On **June 28, 2012**, CTSP issued a memorandum to all field teams providing guidance on finalizing the Year 5 Workplan, highlighting CTSP successes and reinforcing USAID's sponsorship of CTSP. CTSP responded to RDMA on **June 27 and 29, 2012** providing copies of the updated CTSP Branding and Marking Plan and the position description of the Communications Specialist.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 13. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia develop and implement a plan for monitoring—and documenting the monitoring—the implementation of the Coral Triangle Support Partnership’s branding strategy and marking plan by the Partnership’s prime implementer (page 13).*

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

In a memo sent by RDMA to CTSP/WWF dated **June 25, 2012**, the CTSP AOR from RDMA issued a Tracking Sheet for CTSP Branding and Marking Plan Implementation. CTSP will update the Tracking Sheet with supporting documents to the AOR on a regular basis. CTSP is adopting a methodology to compile communications materials for USAID’s records. The AOR will conduct site visits to verify reported branding materials. The CTSP Communications Specialist is responsible for ensuring that the branding and marking plan and corresponding guidelines are complied with, implemented/documented properly, and reported on regularly. In addition to the CTSP Communications Specialist based in Jakarta, CTSP is currently in the process of recruiting a consultant to advise on improving on communications, outreach, and branding and marking in Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea (PNG).

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

Recommendation 14. *We recommend that USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia work with the Coral Triangle Support Partnership’s prime implementer to utilize USAID’s local language branding options when identifying specific activity sites to ensure greater recognition from locally involved community members (page 13).*

RDMA Management Action: The RDMA Management **agrees** with this recommendation.

In two related messages, dated **May 9 and June 25, 2012**, RDMA provided CTSP staff with the web link to access the translated USAID Logo for CTI countries namely, Philippines, Malaysia and Timor Leste. The USAID website link, however, does not include Papua New Guinea (PNG) and the Solomon Islands. RDMA and the USAID/Pacific Office, in collaboration with CTSP, will develop and translate the USAID Logo in PNG and the Solomon Islands into Pidgin and in the meantime use the English version until the translated USAID Logo is available. RDMA will monitor usage of the translated USAID Logo in future CTSP communications materials. CTSP is currently recruiting a consultant based either in PNG or the Solomons to advise on improving communications, outreach, and branding and marking in the CTI Pacific countries.

The RDMA Management believes that **final action** has been taken and requests that this recommendation be closed upon issuance of the final report.

U.S. Agency for International Development
Office of Inspector General
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel: 202-712-1150
Fax: 202-216-3047
www.usaid.gov/oig