

Assessment sheet for the evaluation of the design and performance of the fisheries co-management system

Name of fisheries co-management system: _____

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.1	ENABLING ENVIRONMENT – EXTERNAL FACTORS							
I.1.1	GOOD PRACTICE: Enabling policies and legislation for fisheries co-management: supportive legislation, policies, rights and authority structures are in place							
I.1.1.1	INDICATOR: The legal framework gives the resource users, and their representatives, an equitable and clear role in developing and implementing a fisheries co-management plan	Review of legislation; questionnaire survey (perception); Interviews and consultations with local institutions						
I.1.1.2	INDICATOR: Number of co-management agreements that have been signed and approved between government and resource users/community	Review of co-management agreement or arrangements agreed by involved parties to constitute co-management						
I.1.2	GOOD PRACTICE: Tenure rights of the co-managed fishery resources: formal and recognized rights to the fishery resources are granted to the co-management unit and defined mechanisms (economic, administrative and collective) and other structures required for allocating use rights among co-management participants are in place							
I.1.2.1	INDICATOR: Tenure and access rights are fairly and equitably allocated in a transparent and accountable manner	Review of government agreement and tenure arrangements; Questionnaire survey (perception) among different resource users along the value chain; Focus group discussion among resource user groups; Consultations with organizations/associations of resource users						
I.1.2.2	INDICATOR: Tenure and access rights have been adequately integrated/reflected in the fisheries co-management agreement	Review of government agreement and tenure arrangements; Questionnaire survey (perception) among different resource users along the value chain; Focus group discussion among resource user groups; Consultations with organizations/associations of resource users						

Annex 1. Assessment sheet for the evaluation of the design and performance of the fisheries co-management system

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.1.2.3	INDICATOR: All stakeholders have access to information on the tenure rights and resource allocation criteria and processes	Review of existing (legal) documentation and how it can be accessed; Stakeholder consultations; Standardized semi-structured questionnaire as part of key informant survey, supported through focus group discussions						
I.1.3	GOOD PRACTICE: Authority of government on the right to organize and make management rules: resource users have legal right to organize and make rules							
I.1.3.1	INDICATOR: There are legal provisions for resource users to organize and register formal organizations	Review of legislation and procedures for registering an organization						
I.1.3.2	INDICATOR: Co-management responsibilities have been formally delegated to the co-management committee	Review of co-management agreement; Review of the charters of professional fishers' organizations; Review of terms of reference of co-management committee partners, co-management bodies, professional organizations, and executive boards						
I.1.4	GOOD PRACTICE: Support of government and political/economic elites: active cooperation and power sharing with resource users							
I.1.4.1	INDICATOR: The government supports and participates in co-management according to agreement with resource users on cooperation	Review of co-management agreement; Discussions with key informants; Interviews with local authorities (district, communal) delegated to implement co-management; Focus group discussion with co-management partners; Interviews with key informants and stakeholders						
I.1.4.2	INDICATOR: Decision-making is shared across scales and between diverse stakeholders with an interest in the resource being co-managed	Review of co-management membership and protocols for member participation and representation on the co-management committee; Interviews with key informants and stakeholders						

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2	CO-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM – INTERNAL FACTORS							
I.2.A	ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY							
I.2.A.1	GOOD PRACTICE: Membership and rights clearly defined: individual fishers, households or companies with rights to fish in a bounded fishing area, to participate in management and to be an organization member are clearly defined							
I.2.A.1.1.	INDICATOR: Right to fish, to participate in management and to be a member of related organizations are agreed and clearly stated in co-management documentation	Review of co-management documentation; Interviews with key informants; Consultations with representatives of the professional fisher's organizations on compliance with the rules and regulations by all co-management parties						
I.2.A.2	GOOD PRACTICE: Conflict management mechanisms: existence of a mechanism to address conflict							
I.2.A.2.1	INDICATOR: Conflict management mechanism is in place, functional and documented	Review of co-management documentation; Interviews with key informants; Consultations with representatives of the professional fishers' organizations.						
I.2.A.2.2	INDICATOR: Conflicts between different resource user groups/ stakeholders are resolved in a sustainable manner	Review of incident reports and complaints to police, community leaders or other instances addressing conflicts; Interviews with conflicting parties (if any)						
I.2.A.3	GOOD PRACTICE: Accountability: co-management conducted in an equitable, open and transparent manner							
I.2.A.3.1	INDICATOR: Decision-making by and leadership of the co-management system is transparent and documented in committee meeting minutes available to all co-management participants	Review of co-management committee meeting minutes; Questionnaire survey (perception)						
I.2.A.3.2	INDICATOR: There is a democratically elected management committee representing resource users/user groups	Review of protocols of the election of co-management committee members						

Annex 1. Assessment sheet for the evaluation of the design and performance of the fisheries co-management system

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.A.4	GOOD PRACTICE: Leadership: existence of a singular individual with entrepreneurial skills, highly motivated, legitimate and respected as a local leader							
I.2.A.4.1	INDICATOR: A qualified local leader with entrepreneurial skills elected by local people to lead overall co-management activities	Review of protocols of the elections of co-management committee members						
I.2.A.4.2	INDICATOR: A qualified local leader is properly working with resource users/user groups for sustainable fisheries and community livelihoods	Questionnaire survey (perception); Focus group discussions; Observation						
I.2.B	FEASIBILITY AND PERFORMANCE							
I.2.B.1	GOOD PRACTICE: Appropriate scale: scale may vary but should be appropriate to the area's ecology, people and level of management							
I.2.B.1.1	INDICATOR: The scale and the area of the co-managed fishery have been agreed through a participatory process with concerned stakeholders	Review of co-management documentation; Questionnaire survey (perception)						
I.2.B.2	GOOD PRACTICE: Clearly defined boundaries of the co-management system: the boundaries of the area to be co-managed are distinct so that the fishers have accurate knowledge of them							
I.2.B.2.1	INDICATOR: Boundaries of the fishery to be co-managed have been demarcated, if a spatially defined area; or otherwise clearly described in co-management agreement	Review of co-management documentation; Observation or photos of markers; Review of documentation relating to demarcation procedure; Existence of (GIS-based) maps officially endorsed by the co-management body and incorporated in the co-management agreement; Consistency of the demarcated co-managed areas for fishing with the zones of exclusion, such as conservation areas, navigation routes, nursery ground, etc.						
I.2.B.3	GOOD PRACTICE: Regular interaction: regular, active and participatory meetings of co-management partners to serve as a forum for discussion, power-sharing and trust building							

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.B.3.1	INDICATOR: Regular, active and participatory meetings of co-management participants are held	Review of co-management meeting minutes; Questionnaire survey (perception); Observation of meetings						
I.2.B.3.2	INDICATOR: There is representation of men and women at meetings and active participation by both men and women	Review of co-management meeting minutes; Questionnaire survey (perception); Observation of meetings						
I.2.B.4	GOOD PRACTICE: Adequate financial resources/budget: existence of a financial sustainability mechanism							
I.2.B.4.1	INDICATOR: Funding is secured for at least one year	Review of accounts and agreements with funder						
I.2.B.4.2	INDICATOR: There is a budget and identified sources of funding	Review of financial records and reports						
I.2.B.5	GOOD PRACTICE: Co-management plan: existence of a co-management plan developed and agreed by resource users/co-management participants through a participatory mechanism							
I.2.B.5.1	INDICATOR: There is a co-management plan and it contains key provisions and clear goals and objectives	Review of co-management plan						
I.2.B.5.2	INDICATOR: The co-management plan has been developed with the adequate participation of different stakeholders	Documentation of co-management plan development process; Perception survey; Interviews with key informants; Stakeholders' focus group discussion						
I.2.B.5.3	INDICATOR: The co-management plan has been translated into the stakeholders' native languages	Review of co-management plan						
I.2.B.5.4	INDICATOR: The co-management plan adequately addresses gender equity needs and reflects diversity of perspectives in community/ society	Review of co-management plan; Interviews with key informants						

Annex 1. Assessment sheet for the evaluation of the design and performance of the fisheries co-management system

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.B.6	GOOD PRACTICE: Clear goals and objectives from a well-defined set of issues: clarity and simplicity of goals and objectives to steer the direction of co-management							
I.2.B.6.1	INDICATOR: Clear and simple goals/objectives and indicators are defined in the co-management plan	Review of co-management plan; Analysis of the extent to which objectives are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely)						
I.2.B.7	GOOD PRACTICE: Knowledge of resource: resource is one of which stakeholders have a good knowledge and there is recognition of traditional knowledge							
I.2.B.7.1	INDICATOR: Stakeholders have a good knowledge of resources	Questionnaire survey; Focus group discussions						
I.2.B.7.2	INDICATOR: Traditional knowledge is explicitly taken into account in management decision-making	Review of discussion making documentation; Focus group discussions						
I.2.B.7.3	INDICATOR: Participatory research under development/developed	Review of research to determine if it was done in a participatory manner with stakeholders						
I.2.B.8	GOOD PRACTICE: Monitoring and evaluation: participatory, indicators, targets and baselines							
I.2.B.8.1	INDICATOR: Continuity of monitoring and evaluation are conducted in a participatory way	Questionnaire survey (perception); Reviews of monitoring and evaluation reports and minutes; Interviews with key informants						
I.2.B.8.2	INDICATOR: Indicators, targets and baselines are defined in a monitoring and evaluation plan in the co-management plan	Review of co-management plan						
I.2.B.8.3	INDICATOR: Number of changes/adaptations made by co-management committee based on analysis and decision-making of available monitoring and evaluation results	Review of minutes of co-management committee						
I.2.B.9	GOOD PRACTICE: Adaptive management: a focus on systematic learning-by-doing							
I.2.B.9.1	INDICATOR: Adjustments to the co-management have taken place based on monitoring and evaluation results	Review of co-management plan and committee meeting minutes; Review of the monitoring and evaluation reports						

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.B.10	GOOD PRACTICE: Mutually beneficial alliances and networks: communication and connectedness among various resource user groups and stakeholders							
I.2.B.10.1	INDICATOR: Networks and alliances among various user groups/ stakeholders are in place and functional	Review of registered organizations and their memberships; Questionnaire survey among stakeholders on their organizational memberships; Focus group discussions among co-management parties/user groups and stakeholders						
I.2.B.10.2	INDICATOR: Experiences and lessons learned are shared among various stakeholder groups	Focus group discussions, questionnaire survey (perception)						
I.2.C	PARTICIPATION AND EQUITY							
I.2.C.1	GOOD PRACTICE: Participation by those affected: most individuals affected by co-management arrangements are included in the group that makes decisions about and can change the arrangements							
I.2.C.1.1	INDICATOR: Stakeholders affected by co-management arrangements and decisions are included in the co-management committee	Review of co-management committee membership in comparison with stakeholder analysis (carried out under Step 1); Focus group discussion with outsiders/excluded stakeholder groups; Review of mechanisms envisioned to broaden the membership into co-management organization						
I.2.C.1.2	INDICATOR: Co-management participants and committee members receive advance information before decision-making	Focus group discussions; Review of communication mechanisms and meeting minutes						
I.2.C.2	GOOD PRACTICE: Group/social cohesion: similar characteristics in terms of kinship, norms, trust, fishing gear type, etc. among the resource users							
I.2.C.2.1	INDICATOR: Co-management participants trust each other	Questionnaire survey (perception); Interviews with key informants						
I.2.C.2.2	INDICATOR: The co-management committee members are representative of the ethnicity, religion, etc. of the resource users/ co-management participants	Review of co-management committee members Review of the election/selection mechanisms; Review of the co-management agreement concerning social inclusion and equitable share of representation						

Annex 1. Assessment sheet for the evaluation of the design and performance of the fisheries co-management system

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.C.2.3	INDICATOR: Members of the co-management system work well and make decisions together	Review of co-management meeting minutes						
I.2.C.3	GOOD PRACTICE: Empowerment, capacity building and social preparation: activities for individual and resource user group empowerment and skills development to actively participate in co-management							
I.2.C.3.1	INDICATOR: There are active skill development programmes for enhancing capacity building for fishers to participate in co-management activities at community level	Review of activity programme; Review of training/skills development programmes; Review of training needs assessment (if any)						
I.2.C.3.2	INDICATOR: There is a basic understanding among participants about the purpose and operation of the co-management system	Questionnaire survey						
I.2.C.4	GOOD PRACTICE: Coordination: forum (meeting or assembly) for cooperation between government and resource users							
I.2.C.4.1	INDICATOR: A forum for coordination and cooperation of government and resource users is operational	Review of institutional structures and meeting minutes; Review on the mechanisms of horizontal and vertical coordination in place						
I.2.C.4.2	INDICATOR: There are regular meetings between government and resource users	Review of meeting minutes; Review on the mechanisms of horizontal and vertical coordination in place						
I.2.C.5	GOOD PRACTICE: Community organizations: existence of a legitimate (as recognized by the local people) community or people's organization for representing resource users and other stakeholders in decision-making							
I.2.C.5.1	INDICATOR: A legitimate (as recognized by the local people) organization representing resource users and other stakeholders in decision-making is in place	Review of institutional structures and meeting minutes; Questionnaire survey (perception); Review of formal documents/endorsement papers relating to the establishment of the organization						

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.C.5.2	INDICATOR: A legitimate (as recognized by the government) organization representing resource users and other stakeholders in decision-making is in place	Review of institutional structures and meeting minutes; Questionnaire survey (perception); Review of formal documents/endorsement papers relating to the establishment of the organization						
I.2.C.6	GOOD PRACTICE: Equity: equal opportunity and fair access to the fishery among the various resource users and between different user groups							
I.2.C.6.1	INDICATOR: Different resource user groups have equal opportunities to participate in and benefit from the co-management system	Questionnaire survey; focal group discussions (perceptions); Focal group discussions with excluded/non-participating resource users/groups						
I.2.C.7	GOOD PRACTICE: Inclusiveness: recognition and involvement of different resource users and community members, including youth, women, Indigenous Peoples and others with a stake in the future of the fishery							
I.2.C.7.1	INDICATOR: Different legitimate resource user groups, including youth, women and Indigenous Peoples, are recognized as stakeholders in the co-management and have equal opportunities to participate in the co-management arrangement	Questionnaire survey; Focal group discussions; Questionnaire survey (perception); Focus group discussion with excluded/non-participating resource users/groups)						
I.2.D	RULE OF LAW							
I.2.D.1	GOOD PRACTICE: Congruence: scale and scope of rules are appropriate to local conditions							
I.2.D.1.1	INDICATOR: There are rules and regulations for fisheries management	Review of co-management plan						
I.2.D.1.2	INDICATOR: Scale and scope of rules and regulations fit local conditions and are well defined in a participatory way	Review of co-management plan; Focus group discussions						

Annex 1. Assessment sheet for the evaluation of the design and performance of the fisheries co-management system

Nr.	Good practice & indicator	Examples of approaches for measuring indicators	Scoring (existence of good practice)				Comments/ explanations	Data collection method and source
			Yes	Partly	No	Not applicable		
I.2.D.2	GOOD PRACTICE: Management rules enforced: self-enforcement system of penalties imposed by strong operational rules designed, enforced and controlled by local users							
I.2.D.2.1	INDICATOR: Self-enforcement system of penalties is designed by resource users/co-management participants	Review of documentation on enforcement system; Focal group discussions; Review of the mechanism of sanctioning of violations and active participation of the authorities in the process						
I.2.D.2.2	INDICATOR: There is an active patrolling and enforcement mechanism in place and operational	Review of documentation on enforcement system; Focal group discussions; Review of the effectiveness/regularity of the patrolling routines						
I.2.D.3	GOOD PRACTICE: Graduated sanctions: sanctions increase with the number or the severity of offences							
I.2.D.3.1	INDICATOR: Sanctions are proportional to the number or severity of offences	Review of documentation of sanctions; Questionnaire survey (perception)						
I.3	INDIVIDUAL AND HOUSEHOLD LEVEL							
I.3.1	GOOD PRACTICE: Individual incentive structure: individual incentive structure (economic, social, political) that induces individuals to participate in co-management							
I.3.1.1	INDICATOR: Individuals have incentives (economic, social, political) to participate in co-management and voluntarily comply with co-management rules and decisions	Questionnaire survey (perception); Focal group discussions; Interviews with key informants; Focus group discussion with excluded/non-participating user groups						
I.3.1.2	INDICATOR: Incentives from government are available for individuals and stakeholder groups to positively participate in co-management	Review of government programmes; Questionnaire survey; Interviews with government key informants						