

Performance audit evaluation of the implementation of the sectoral support provided under the 2014-2020 protocol of the EU/Seychelles Fisheries Partnership Agreement



FINAL

December 2020



Valsen Consulting

Address: Suite C, Second Floor, Orion Office Complex, Palm Street, Victoria

Mailing address: PO Box 136, Victoria, Mahe, Seychelles

Email: djas@seychelles.net; -+ or daniella@valsen-corporate.com

Tel: 00 248 4321018; **Mobile:** 00 248 2619960

Date: 24th December 2020

Mr Nichol Elizabeth
Chief Executive Officer
Seychelles Fishing Authority

Dear Mr Elizabeth

Valsen Consulting has performed a performance audit evaluation of the implementation of the sectoral support provided under the 2014-2020 Protocol of the EU/Seychelles Fisheries Partnership Agreement. The purpose of this report is to communicate the results of the audit observations and applicable recommendations.

In accordance with the terms of reference, we reviewed available documentation on the Protocol in order to gain an understanding of the activities that were implemented between 2015 and 2020; we then developed a plan of action which was communicated to the SFA. The audit was implemented according to this plan of action.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the SFA and its board and the EU/Seychelles Joint oversight bodies, and is not intended to be used, and should not be used, by any other parties.

We appreciate the cooperation received from the management and staff of the SFA during the conduct of this performance audit.

Sincerely

Daniella Larue, Mrs
Managing Director

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CAS	Catch Assessment Survey
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FADs	Fishing Aggregated Devices
FBOA	Fishing Boat Owners Association
FDF	Fisheries Development Revolving Fund
FMC	Fisheries Monitoring Centre
FPA	Fisheries Partnership Agreement
IDC	Island Development Company
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
IRD	Institut de Recherche et de Développement
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance section
MSP	Marine Spatial Plan
MTC	Maritime Training Centre
NPOA	National Plan of Action
NTB	National Tender Board
PFA	Praslin Fishers Association
PFCCC	Praslin Fisheries Co-management Coordination Committee
SBS	Seychelles Bureau of Standards
SEYPEC	Seychelles Petroleum
SFA	Seychelles Fishing Authority
SIH	Systeme Informatique Haleutique
SNPA	Seychelles National Parks Authority
SPDF	Seychelles Peoples Defence Forces
UNISEY	University of Seychelles
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System

Table of contents

1	Introduction and background	6
2	Scope and methodology	7
2.1	Scope.....	7
2.2	Methodology.....	7
2.3	Criteria.....	8
2.4	Limitations.....	8
3	Findings and Analysis	10
3.1	Budget Execution	10
3.1.1	REVIEW OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEM	11
4	Achievements under each of the 3 major objectives	13
4.1	Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans.....	13
4.1.1	Monitoring of the tuna fishing activities in the Seychelles EEZ.....	13
4.1.2	Development and implementation of national fisheries management plans.....	14
4.1.3	Monitoring of the Fisheries Development Fund (FDF) under DBS	17
4.1.4	Development and implementation of the aquaculture management plan	24
4.1.5	Monitoring, Control, surveillance and enforcement	25
4.2	Fisheries infrastructure development for artisanal and industrial sectors	30
4.2.1	Project level findings.....	31
4.2.2	Projects implemented or being implemented.....	32
4.2.3	Discussion and recommendations	41
4.3	Capacity building.....	43
5	Strategic management issues	47
5.1	Corporate governance and reporting	47
5.1.1	Board of directors	47
5.1.2	Leadership.....	47
5.1.3	Planning.....	48
5.1.4	Reporting.....	49
5.2	Capacity building.....	49
5.3	Networking and Partnerships	49
5.4	Policy Implementation	50
6	Conclusions and recommendations.....	51
6.1	Conclusions	51
6.2	Recommendations	52

List of tables

Table 1: Agreed multi-year programme and budget for the 2014-2020 Protocol	6
Table 2: Cash flow over the period 2014 - 2020	10
Table 3: Budget execution by priority area, 2014-2020	11
Table 4: Percentage trips covered as part of scientific observer programme 2015-2029	16
Table 5: Milestones in management of FDF – 2014-2020	18
Table 6: Borrowers under the Relief Scheme, 2020	18
Table 7: FDF – Loans active and in arrears as of 31 st July 2020	19
Table 8: Catch & Effort for vessels purchased with outstanding FDF loans	23
Table 9: Air and sea patrols 2014 - 2019	25
Table 10: Vessels inspected and tracked, 2014-2019	26
Table 11: Infrastructure projects expenses, 2014 - 2020	28
Table 12: Infrastructure projects planned between 2014-2020 by status	30

1 Introduction and background

This report presents the findings following an independent performance audit to evaluate the implementation of the sectoral support provided under the 2014-2020 protocol of the EU/Seychelles Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA). The agreement covered the period of 2nd November 2013 to 1st November 2019 and its Protocol ran over a period of six years, which started on 18th January 2014 and ended on 17th January 2020.

The total financial contribution was for EUR 30.7 million comprising of 2 components:

- I. EUR 2.75 million annually for the first and second years and EUR 2.5 for the remaining years for access to Seychelles' EEZ equivalent to a reference tonnage of 50,000 tonnes per year, and
- II. A yearly component of EUR 2.6 million for the first and second years and EUR 2.5 million for the remaining years for the support and implementation of Seychelles' sectoral fisheries and marine policy.

In relation to component (2) above, the EU-Seychelles Joint Committee as established under Article 8 of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement, adopted annual work programmes for the sectoral support equivalent to the yearly amount provided for under the Protocol. The priority areas agreed for financing were:

- I. Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans;
- II. Fisheries infrastructure development for artisanal and industrial sectors; and
- III. Capacity building.

The agreed multi-year programme and budget for the period features in table 1.

Table 1: Agreed multi-year programme and budget for the 2014-2020 Protocol

Priorities		Budget (€'000)					
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
1	Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans	1,215	925	1,224	1,000	750	750
2	Fisheries infrastructure development for artisanal and industrial sectors	3,225	1,116	782	750	1,000	1,000
3	Capacity building	496	369	365	625	625	625
	Contingencies	84	190	128	125	125	125
	Total	5,020	2,600	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500

Source: Joint Committee Meeting, March 2014

The report is structured as follows:

- Part 2: presents the Scope and Methodology of the audit, including the audit objectives, criteria and the limitations;
- Part 3: presents the findings and analysis and

- Part 4: the conclusions and recommendations.

2 Scope and methodology

2.1 Scope

The assignment required the consultant to provide recommendations on whether significant improvements in implementation of the sectoral fisheries and marine policy has been made, and that funds have been utilized promptly, economically, efficiently and effectively. The detailed terms of reference for this performance audit features in appendix 1.

2.2 Methodology

In undertaking this audit, the consultants used the following methods and techniques:

We reviewed the following:

1. Documents relating to the Protocol setting out the financial contribution provided for by the 2014-2020 Protocol of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the EU and the Republic of Seychelles, the agreed records of the Joint Committee Meetings over the period, project related documents and SFA annual reports in order to understand the activities planned and the funds available;
2. *“Guidelines for the implementation of EU Sectorial Support for fisheries policy in the Seychelles”* and the terms of reference for the TA in order to understand the framework for the management of the funds including programming and the reporting requirements;
3. Annual activity reports prepared by the TA and the SFA annual reports to identify the activities and projects that had been implemented; we requested completed project files for the infrastructure projects to take stock of the costs and the duration of implementation of these projects. We also reviewed previous performance audit reports to understand the issues identified previously and in order to gauge the stage of implementation of the various recommendations.
4. Available financial information including audited and unaudited financial reports, budget execution records maintained by the TA and records kept at the Accounts Section.
5. Board minutes over this period to understand what information in regards to the implementation of the sectoral programme was submitted to the board and what decisions if any did the board make in relation to the implementation of activities and projects.
6. Policy documents that were current over this period, including the new Fisheries Policy and Strategy and the Fisheries Comprehensive Plan 2019, in order to identify the indicators to be used to assess impact of the various activities implemented.

2.2.1.1 Interviews and consultation

7. Our team met with a range of stakeholders with whom we conducted semi-structured interviews. The list of persons consulted appears in the appendix.

8. We met with the board chairman, the Chief Executive Officer, who had been recently appointed, the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, who coordinates the project, and the Technical Assistant person, who has also been managing the project funds. We also met with all SFA staff implementing a project funded by the EU funds, the Financial Controller and Management Accountant and the Senior Procurement Officer. The meetings were aimed at understanding the history of the project, the strengths, weaknesses and threats to project implementation, lessons learnt and their views on the intended and non-intended impact.
9. We surveyed fishermen and boat owners through one-to-one structured interviews as the ultimate beneficiaries of all infrastructure projects implemented over the period.

2.2.1.2 Site Visits

10. Given the short time available for the audit and the absence of impact indicators, we focused on assessing the impact of the fisheries infrastructure constructed over this period. We conducted site visits to all projects implemented over the protocol period with the aim of establishing that infrastructure construction had been completed, their current condition and utilisation. In addition, beneficiaries of these infrastructures were consulted on-site using a structured interview guideline.

2.3 Criteria

11. The assessment criteria used, which are the standards against which the performance audit is measured is as follows:
 - **Governance** –the implementation of activities funded under the EU agreement was characterized as a project and all the activities were seen as sub-projects. We therefore applied a project management approach to the management and implementation of the activities;
 - **Laws governing the operations of the SFA**– the SFA Establishment Act 1984, the Procurement Act 2008 and the Policy on Classification of Public Bodies 2010 were used;
 - **Planning documents, contracts and budgets** as agreed at the Joint Committee Meetings and evidenced in the Agreed Records;
 - SFA Policies and Procedures
 - Expectations and experiences of beneficiaries.

2.4 Limitations

12. There is no monitoring and evaluation framework for the fisheries policy or any of the planning instruments in the fisheries sector with pre-determined impact indicators. Therefore, impact assessment is subject to the Consultants' understanding of the possible impact of the various activities and projects.
13. Records remain a problem: comprehensive records relating to infrastructure projects, indicating start and completion dates and a schedule of expenses capitalized are not available and consequently it has not been possible to assess financial efficiency of infrastructure projects.
14. The indicators for some projects tend to change throughout the protocol and in some instances, it is not possible to see clear trends or progress.
15. The time available to conduct the audit, 3 months was too short and there was very little time to validate data collected or views expressed and consequently, the consultants focused on 2 areas:

the Fisheries Development Fund and the infrastructure projects because the latter tend to impact the ultimate beneficiaries directly.

16. Difficulty to obtain information quickly especially from SFA's partners either because there are no reporting requirements for activities funded with sectoral funds or the bureaucratic practices of some of the institutions making access to information lengthy.

3 Findings and Analysis

3.1 Budget Execution

Table 2: Cash flow over the period 2014 - 2020

CASH FLOW						
Receipt Inflows	2014 €	2015 €	2016 €	2017 €	2018 €	2019 €
Balance brought down	2,420,342	2,636,155	2,686,664	726,738	681,418	745,527
Instalment	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Total inflows	5,020,342	5,236,155	5,186,664	3,226,738	3,181,418	3,245,527
Expenditures	2,384,187	2,549,491	2,767,711	2,516,526	2,435,891	2,225,985
Adjustment to the expenditure			1,692,215	28794		
Balance carried forward	2,636,155	2,686,664	726,738	681,418	745,527	1,019,542

Source: Various SFA reports

1. Over the protocol period, €17,640,342 was available for spending representing €15,200,000 from the 2014-2020 protocol and €2,420,342 carried over from the previous protocol. Overall, €16,600,800 had been spent by July 2020, 6 months following the end of the protocol period and €1,019,542 was carried over to the next protocol representing 5.8% of the total amount available to spent during that period.
2. In the absence of audited financial statements, we reviewed the detailed budget execution reports for 2017 to 2020 protocol years. However, we could not compare with the years 2015 and 2016 as the records available for these years were not as detailed as the ones for subsequent years.
3. The total expenditure for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 does not correspond with the given figure in the revised work programme for the 2019 installment due to a technical accounting error of omission. There are several discrepancies in the figures provided, which a full-fledged financial audit should address:
 - I. For the year 2017, there is a difference of €1,692,215 in the expenditure provided in the budget execution report.
 - II. Whereas the €28,794 was added and corrected in 2018 Joint committee meeting and
 - III. correction of omission of €54,604 was added to the 2019 expenditure.
4. The Treasury Data received contained a comprehensive list of all approved budget disbursements throughout the protocol period. The closing bank balance of €1,019,542 corresponds with the Treasury disbursement statement from the Central bank of Seychelles.
5. We reviewed the SFA financial reports and noted that that the sectoral funds were included in the financial audits for 2015 and 2016 and in the unaudited reports for the years 2019 and 2020. The information for the years 2017 and 2018 were not available due to loss of data as a result of a computer crash. From the audited financial reports, it is noted that in 2015 the EU funds represented around 20% of the total income of SFA whereas it was 16% in the year 2019.

Table 3: Budget execution by priority area, 2014-2020

	PRIORITY 1: Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans € ,000			Priority -2 (FISHERIES INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT FOR ARTISANAL AND INDUSTRIAL SECTORS) € ,000			Priority -3 (CAPACITY BUILDING) € ,000			PRIORITY 4 (COVID 19 RESPONSE PROGRAMME) € ,000		
	Budget	Budget Execution	Variance	Budget	Budget Execution	Variance	Budget	Budget Execution	Variance	Budget	Budget Execution	Variance
2014	1,215	1,016 84%	199 16%	3,225	854 26%	2,372 74%	559 11%	515 92%	44 8%	-	-	-
2015	1,357	1,127 83%	230 17%	2,974	955 32%	2,019 68%	777 15%	467 60%	310 40%	-	-	-
2016	1,141	1,140 100%	1 0%	1,226	1,226 100%	- 0%	588 20%	402 68%	186 32%	-	-	-
2017	1,161	973 84%	187 16%	1,772	1,240 70%	532 30%	294 9%	303 103%	- 9 -3%	-	-	-
2018	1,642	1,192 73%	450 27%	971	728 75%	243 25%	569 18%	516 91%	53 9%	-	-	-
2019	1,108	975 88%	133 12%	1,037	885 85%	151 15%	219 7%	205 94%	14 6%	919 28%	161 18%	758 82%

Source: Agreed records of Joint Committee Meetings.

6. Table 3 indicates that the overall budget utilization, calculated as budget outflows divided by budget inflows, works out at 94% over the protocol period. The benchmark budget utilization was 75% annually, which means that in terms of budget utilization SFA has performed above benchmark.

7. Overall, funds utilized represents:

- **Priority 1:** Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture Management plans: Actual spend was €6.423M or 84% of its allocated budget of €7.623M.
- **Priority 2:** Fisheries infrastructure development for artisanal and industrial sector only utilized €5.888M or 53 % of its overall funds available of €11,205.
- **Priority 3:** capacity building has utilized €2.408M or 80% of its € 3.0M available and
- **Priority 4** utilized €161k or 18% of the funds allocated to it at the end of the protocol period in July 31st.
- €1.721M remains unallocated for the year 2016 (€1,692,215) and 2017(€28,794),as shown table 1.1

3.1.1 Review of accounting system

1. The SFA became financially autonomous as of 1st January 2019, which is towards the end of the protocol period. Prior to this, SFA was a government budget dependent organization. Due to the arrangement above,

- There was limited control by SFA authorities over the debtors and creditors management and other operating activities.
- There were limited number of accounting staff.
- There was no accounting platform and software to capture accounting transactions made it difficult to monitor and maintain report friendly accounting.
- The financial statements for 2014 to 2016 were audited but qualified. No financial statements and subsequent audits have been performed for 2017 and 2018. However, there was budget records, reconciled by the Technical Assistant but no proof that a senior accounting officer verified the reconciliations.

- Budget, receipts and payments were being prepared and executed on a cash basis.
2. **Reporting:** Prior to 2019, accounts staff reported to the Ministry of Finance whereas now they report to the accounting officer, the CEO, which puts the responsibility to ensure controls and monitoring expenses on the SFA.
 3. A new accounting software, QuickBooks, was purchased and is now in use and all accounting transactions have been automated so that presently all accounting documents and financial reports can be quickly generated. A payroll system was also purchased and installed.
 4. The Finance and Accounts function has been beefed up with additional senior accounting staff in the first quarter of 2019, which has allowed segregation of duty to avoid conflict of interest e.g. accounts are reconciled by the accounts technician for reconciliation and not by other technicians who are directly involved in banking and payments.
 5. The new financial controlling system, added value to the accounts. They brought immediate and strong internal management control measures.
 6. All accounting is now done on accrual basis, invoices (including those from suppliers) are recorded and accounted for as per invoice date. Debtors and creditors are recognized. Prepayments and arrears are accounted for and reconciled.
 7. During 2020, further improvements were made to reorganize and modernize the Finance & Accounts department to reflect SFA's strategy and business activities. Specialization of duties was introduced which allow staff to focus on certain duties and cover more areas that needed more controls.
 8. Project management is the fundamental part of reporting to EU, to monitor fund allocation and its effective usage. We noticed that there are unclear project reports; we were unable to obtain project related documents. Even for the 2019-2020 period, where accounting and reconciliation systems are in place, the EU secretariat report was not easily traceable. There are no end of project reports done and project files maintained.
 9. There is duplication of work done for the purpose of preparing the EU report. In the current accounting system, improvements are required to record sectoral support related, activity-based transactions.

4 Achievements under each of the 3 major objectives

In this chapter, we detail the major achievements over the protocol period 2014 to 2020 under each of the 3 main objectives focusing on the impact both intended and unintended and any recommendations for improvement during the new protocol.

4.1 Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans

4.1.1 Monitoring of the tuna fishing activities in the Seychelles EEZ

4.1.1.1 Data collection, processing and dissemination

Although statistics and the Fisheries Information Management System is not an objective of the SFA strategic plan, statistics is vital and an enabler and required for all monitoring and compliance requirements of SFA as a regulator, for research, fish stock management and monitoring vessel compliance.

Achievements
<p>During the period 2014 to 2020, EU funds were used to modernize the fisheries information management system (FIMS) which consisted of harmonization of data capture software into two systems: a system to capture industrial and one to capture coastal fisheries data. For example, sea cucumber and lobster fishery research falls under the research section, both the Statistics Unit and the Research Section will be using one system.</p> <p>Three new software were introduced over the protocol period to assist with data collection and processing. The plan is to converge all industrial fisheries data into one database to cut down on maintenance time and improve cross-validation of data.</p> <p>Preparation of fisheries statistics reports</p> <p>This activity was plagued with delays over the protocol period resulting in backlog in data capture especially for industrial and artisanal fisheries, stemming from lack of human resources and technical issues associated with introduction of new software. By July 2020, the team was finalizing data capture for 2018 and are catching up on the data for the first semester of 2019 and plans to publish a report covering 10 years from 2010 to 2019.</p> <p>To note that delays in producing the fisheries statistical reports does not mean that SFA does not have the data; it only means that it has not compiled it into a report. Indeed, SFA shares fisheries data with Government and with IOTC for example, but the data is not available in the agreed format or there is missing data for one or two fisheries, in which case the whole report cannot be published.</p>
Impact
<p>Relevance: Seychelles has to publish fisheries information as part of its obligations to comply with different organisations such as IOTC, FITI, World Bank, etc. Without good quality data, government cannot make informed decisions. When a boat goes fishing, it is now possible to know where fishing happens, how much is caught and what species are caught. Data is also made available for research in fish stock management.</p>
<p>Implementation of the modernization projects has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• streamlined the number of platforms• Introduced a paperless system which now eliminates the possibility of fungus infestation of paper records and enables the use of electronic logbooks.• Improved timeliness, reliability and accessibility of fisheries information and• Allows Government to publish fisheries information as part of its obligation to comply with different organisations' requirements such as FITI, IOTC, World Bank, etc.

The modernized FMIS is able to:

- Provide more reliable fisheries information in a timelier manner.
- A larger range of data can be captured for example, the previous system could provide artisanal fisheries catch data only by group species level and now the data is available at disaggregated species level.
- For industrial fisheries, every year at the IOTC meeting, there are new resolutions, which means additional data to collect. The new system can be easily expanded to include additional data capture for new resolutions.
- There is increased productivity because of faster data processing and eventually, fewer people are required for data capture, which will allow staff to start new projects, such as data capture for sports fishery, which can be done on the same platform.
- There is now more efficient monitoring of the catch inside the Seychelles EEZ which means that the SFA will be able to better assess the catch within Seychelles EEZ and ensure that Seychelles maximises revenue in this area.

Improved fisheries management: The data collected has been used to establish management measures for different fisheries, e.g. IOTC quota system for yellow fin tuna, DMP for artisanal fisheries on the Mahe Plateau. Without the data for the artisanal fisheries, SFA would not be able to justify the measures it is introducing.

Unforeseen negative or positive impacts: The quota system on yellow fin was unforeseen because for many years SFA submitted data to IOTC. Now that the system is in place, it has increased the Unit's workload as SFA has to conduct weekly monitoring of fishing vessels to ensure timely dissemination of the data.

Capacity building: There was a large component of capacity building in the implementation of the project and staff can now validate and process the data which means the staff can now spend more time doing data analysis.

Going forward

Industrial fisheries is dynamic and there are constant changes in data collection and processing and new modules have to be added and processing has to be revised and reporting changed. Therefore, the Statistics Section has to maintain modern systems, keep abreast with technology to ensure efficiency and avoid technical issues as had happened in the past.

4.1.2 Development and implementation of national fisheries management plans

4.1.2.1 Implementation and adjustment of the management plans in collaboration with stakeholders and experts

The sectoral funds have been used to develop management plans in the following areas:

- I. Demersal fisheries Management Plan for the Mahe Plateau:
- II. The Shark National Plan of Action
- III. Scientific research for the management of the lobster and sea cucumber fishery.

The Demersal Fisheries Management Plan (DMP) which addresses sustainability of fish stocks on the Mahe Plateau, has now been turned into regulations and managers remark that it is now urgent that they are enacted. The process to convert the plan into a regulation was long and the authority is now still unable to implement some measures such as minimum size and bag limits and therefore cannot address sustainability issues. Open access management is still practiced, so undersized fish is still being caught and recreational fishing remains unregulated.

Managers point out that whilst the implementation of the DMP will not address all challenges associated with open access management, it will be a first step before the authority introduces more stringent measures. Managers report that there is localized fish stock depletion and there is now clear evidence of over-fishing on the Mahe Plateau, in terms of size and diversity. The issue of over-capacity on the Plateau is partly being addressed through licensing. The authority now needs to move and develop plans for other areas identified under the Marine Spatial Plan for other sustainable use areas.

Shark National Plan of action: An obligation under IOTC is to have a plan to mitigate over exploitation of sharks. Despite developing the Shark NPOA, the demersal fishery took priority. It was also decided that instead of a separate committee to oversee the implementation of the shark NPOA, a sub-committee of the demersal fisheries Committee will be set up to oversee its implementation which will promote an integrated view of the issues related to fish stock management.

Impact

The process for the development of the DMP was participatory where stakeholders were not only consulted but they also participated in the research for developing stock management measures. The consultation process and collaboration with stakeholders has increased education and awareness of stakeholders on fisheries sustainability issues and the staff reports that they are becoming more aware and less resistant to new measures being introduced.

The management indicates that the sectoral funds remain critical in furthering the objectives of fisheries stock management, especially now that stakeholders are becoming more receptive to management measures being introduced.

4.1.2.2 Scientific Surveys, applied research and programme

During the protocol period, the SFA relied heavily on sectoral funds to support its research activities and it is estimated that presently the funds supports 80% of research related operational expenses. The Chief Fisheries Scientist indicated that going forward, sectoral funds will be requested to support capital costs, whilst funds for operational expenses will be sourced elsewhere.

Funds from sectoral support have allowed refurbishment of the R/V L'Amitie with a new engine in 2015 and now it is the platform for all SFA's research activities such as lobster surveys, sea cucumber research and research on coastal species and even for trips to the outer islands.

Impact

The research conducted has provided crucial information on fish stocks for decision makers especially on sea cucumber and lobster fishery. It is the first time ever that the SFA has been able to implement a quota system for sea cucumber fishery, which started to be implemented 2 seasons ago in 2018 although the impact will be seen within the next 5 years.

Constraints

The staff reports that political over-reach undermines efforts to work with stakeholders. In some instances, politicians may wish to see quick results and fail to appreciate that the process is just as important as the eventual measures. The example of the ban on "bourgeois export" which was announced without consulting the SFA, was given as an example. The stakeholders felt betrayed given

that they had been part of the process and this had not been discussed and agreed. This led to loss of trust of the stakeholders.

In other instances, politicians fear making decisions that are perceived to be unpopular among some stakeholders and the example given is the closing of the lobster fishing season in 2017, where there was political pressure to reopen the season despite fisheries scientists advising against it.

4.1.2.3 Scientific observer programme

To comply with the IOTC Binding Resolution 11/04, contracting parties covenant to implement a regional observer scheme covering 5% of the activities of their fishing fleet. This relates to Seychelles flagged vessels consisting of 13 purse seiners and 4 supply ships. Seychelles started implementation of the scientific observer programme in July 2013 and SFA targets to have observers on 50% trips on the national and purse seine fleets. The table below details achievement from 2014 to 2019.

Table 4: Percentage trips covered as part of scientific observer programme 2015-2029

PERCENTAGE TRIPS COVERED (%)		
YEAR	NATIONAL FLEET	PURSE SEINE FLEET
2015	65%	37%
2016	61%	32%
2017	69%	25%
2018	81%	22%
2019	49%	*

**The figures for the foreign purse seiners and few figures for the national flagged vessels have not been uploaded in the database due to technical server issues.*

Prior to 2014, SFA did not have a scientific observer programme and the sectoral funds have allowed the SFA to build its capacity to implement this, which was done in different phases. The funds were critical because the SFA needed to train its staff which also necessitated a lot of collaboration with institutions such as the IRD, programme OCUP and use of consultants to train its observers. By 2015, the authority was able to produce its own data, start basic analyses and compile reports to send to IOTC. In 2019, it started implementation of the third phase, which is undertaking comprehensive data analysis and dissemination of same. The programme also covers the European purse seine fleet as part of the FPA.

Despite the 5% IOTC target, SFA tries to target 30-40% coverage to develop the capacity of its observers. The coverage trend from 65% to 49% in 2019, is not a reflection of diminished coverage but rather because increasingly fishing vessels use electronic surveillance methods (e.g. CCTV), although it is yet to be recognized as an acceptable method of compliance to the observer programme.

Impact

The implementation of the observer program is deemed to have had a massive impact in terms of compliance, capacity building and job creation.

Reputation as a leader in tuna fisheries in the Indian Ocean: The staff believes that as a key player in the fisheries sector in the Indian Ocean, Seychelles needs to ensure that it is able to comply with its obligations as a member of the IOTC despite there being no punitive consequences for non-

compliance to the regulations. Seychelles as a coastal state, flag state and licensed state has to comply with many obligations which consists mostly of data submission, reporting on mitigation measures and coverage. Seychelles aimed to be 80% compliant with all regulations which it failed to achieve in 2019, when compliance went down from 78% in 2017 to 70% in 2019. This was because SFA was modernizing its FMIS and was unable to submit certain data, which caused its level of compliance to drop.

Employment opportunities: The observer programme has created employment opportunities in the fisheries industry. At one point, there were 50 observers and now there are about 30 as the main constraints are retaining well-trained observers in the job, monitoring their work, which is felt to be a high-pressure job. In addition, there is a need to continuously train and upgrade the observers' skills – an example is presently, new observers have to be computer literate to undertake data entry.

4.1.2.4 Discontinued activities

Two activities that started during the protocol period and were halted include:

Development of anchored FADs

In March 2015, 4 FADs were deployed around the inner islands with the aim of supplementing artisanal catch with pelagic species. The activity was halted because all the FADs were washed away during bad weather and in addition, consultations with fishers showed that they were not popular among them. Only the La Digue fishers and the sports fishermen found the FADs useful. Although this activity had to be discontinued, it has provided the SFA with the knowledge that this particular method is not adapted to the Seychelles climatic conditions.

Semi-industrial longline fishery by-catch mitigation research programme

This activity was to explore ways to diversify semi-industrial fishery at the time when swordfish could not be exported to Europe because of the high cadmium content. However, the vessels returned to fishing tuna and tuna-like species under the influence of Sri Lankan fishermen, so the problem no longer existed.

4.1.3 Monitoring of the Fisheries Development Fund (FDF) under DBS

The scheme was established in 2009 and a sum of €2.7M was allocated for the FDF initially. From available records, an additional amount of €1,119,750 was injected into the fund over the protocol period. Management of the fund is subject to an agreement between the SFA and DBS.

The purpose of the fund was 3-fold:

- I. Develop semi-industrial fishing through purchasing of fishing vessels
- II. Value addition and
- III. Training of skippers for semi-industrial fishers although no loan has been issued for that purpose.

The table 5 details the milestones for management of the fund over the protocol period.

Table 5: Milestones in management of FDF – 2014-2020

Year	Milestones
2015	Loans for the purchase of long line fishing vessels were suspended following a decision of the EU-Seychelles Joint Committee
2016	84% of the funds had been allocated as loans and the recovery was 1%
2017	Loan recovery low due to inability to export swordfish to the European market because of high mercury content. At JCM, it was agreed that priority will be given to processing and value addition but no loans were allocated to processors because the fish processing facilities at Bel Ombre and Providence were not operational.
2018	Value-addition: SFA recommended 3 loans: 2 for processing and one for value addition but no loans were disbursed. By Dec 2018, SCR46,598,781 worth of loans had been disbursed and repayment was SCR6,498,156.
2019	By Dec 2019, there were 13 active loans amounting to SCR47,5M
2020	By July 2020, there were 13 active loans, 11 were in arrears representing SCR50,822,430 including interest.

1. The Chief Economist indicates that initially, most of the loans went towards the development of semi-industrial fishery by providing funding to purchase fishing vessels. Out of the 13 loans disbursed for this purpose, only two have been repaid. Table 8 details the status of the 13 active loans as of 31st July 2020 and it indicates that 77% of the loans are non-performing representing an amount of SCR50.8M.
2. Eight (8) out of the 11 non-performing loans have been used to purchase 12 fishing vessels out of which 4 were second hand ones and one of these, despite the money being transferred to the promoter, never arrived in Seychelles. From statistics available from the SFA (see table 7), only 8 vessels out of the 11 that were received were fishing at some point between 2012 and 2019: one has reportedly never been active and based on SFA records, only 3 were active in 2018 and the first semester of 2019. The Chief Economist indicates that some of the vessels purchased were not fit for purpose and after a couple of fishing trips had to be berthed. Promoter F was given the largest loan in 2014 to set up a fish processing plant at Providence and it is reportedly the largest exporter of fresh seafood.
3. In 2017, it was agreed to give priority to value addition projects following the inability to export swordfish to the European market. Although SFA has evaluated and recommended 3 loans, only one has been disbursed.
4. In 2019, in response to the COVID-19 situation, Government introduced a relief scheme to support operators with working capital and SFA approved three loans, totaling SCR2.8M for working capital as presented in table 6.

Table 6: Borrowers under the Relief Scheme, 2020

Borrower Name	Approval date	Purpose	Loan Amount (SCR)
LESPERANCE James Harry	22.04.20	Working Capital for use in existing fish processing	1000000
BENOITON Alderic	01.06.20	Working Capital for food processing	800000
BENTLEY Reginald David	05.06.20	Working Capital fish processing	1000000
Total loaned			2800000

Source: SFA

Table 7: FDF – Loans active and in arrears as of 31st July 2020

Borrower	Loan Amount	Approval Date	Install Due	Rpmt Schedule	Arrears	Capital Outstand	Addi Interest	Total Outstand	Months Arrears	Status	
A	4,223,000	3/9/2014	43	x	43,052	1,097,865	-4,167,506	26,446	-4,167,506	26	Construction of vessel, purchase of engines/navigation equipment Active 2018 & 2019 1 st Reminder letter issued in June.
B	4,836,000	27/09/2012	45	x	50,202	2,158,686	-5,756,715	80,034	-5,756,715	43	Purchas & refurbishment of 3 units, 2nd hand vessels Active 2017 only A Brief report dated 08.07.2020 sent to SFA for views and recommendation regarding additional grace being requested by the clients. 1st Reminder letter issued in June.
C	3,900,000	18/12/2012	33	x	42,562	1,404,546	-4,811,135	42,819	-4,811,135	33	Purchase of a brand-new vessel & engine; Vessel never been active; 2nd reminder letter issued in June.
D	3,537,000	15/12/2011	45	x	35,057	1,506,756	-3,960,673	63,432	-3,960,673	43	Purchased brand new vessel, engine & equipment Active 2017, 2018 & 2019 Claimed that he is still waiting for a feedback from the last meeting conducted with SFA. 2 nd reminder letter issued in June.
E	2,604,000	3/11/2011	37	x	33,166	1,193,976	-3,790,257	45,172	-3,790,257	36	Purchase of a 2nd hand vessel and a brand-new engine; Vessel never arrived in Seychelles. In legal proceeding
F (1)	6,000,000	17/12/2014	39	x	61,065	366,390	-4,886,351	26,470	-4,886,351	6	Setting up of a fish processing plant at Providence Fishing Port Monitoring repayment.

Borrower	Loan Amount	Approval Date	Install Due	Rpmt Schedule	Arrears	Capital Outstand	Addi Interest	Total Outstand	Months Arrears	Status	
F (2)	934,000	5/4/2012	45	x	8,895	311,325	-826,946	12,502	-826,946	35	Purchase of equipment/accessories Letter of Demand issued in June.
F (3)	5,313,000	3/9/2010	45	x	50,845	1,985,025	-5,098,795	84,163	-5,098,795	39	Purchased of 2 vessels for long-line fishing; 2012 Last time vessel recorded activity Letter of demand issued in June.
G	3,000,000	14/04/2020	0	x	29,403	0	-2,976,369	0	-2,976,369	0	Purchase of equipment & fitting for completion of fish processing Disbursement/Grace.
H	4,168,000	29/11/2012	45	x	42,512	1,913,040	-4,971,038	74,584	-4,971,038	45	Purchase of boat, engine, equipment and accessories Active 2018 & 2019 Letter of Demand issued in June.
I	8,060,000	27/09/2012	7	x	95,832	95,832	-6,724,067	61,945	-6,724,067	1	Purchase brand new vessels (3), engine & fishing equipment 2016 Last time recorded activity Monitoring repayment.
J	1,502,000	17/04/2019	0	x	14,612	0	-1,173,210	0	-1,173,210	0	Replacement of equipment & upgrading ex-fishing vessel Disbursement/Grace.
K	156,692	20/12/2013	36	x	13,754	398,866	-1,679,368	12,242	-1,679,368	29	Taking over liabilities of Garry Gerry & payments of insurance premium & other fees Final Reminder issued in July.
Total Files in Arrears	48,233,692					12,432,307					
					520,957	-50,822,430	529,809	-50,822,430			

Source: Development Bank of Seychelles, Seychelles Fishing Authority

Non-performing loans

The non-performing loans have been an issue of concern and has been discussed at the JCMs since 2015. In the time available for this audit, it was not possible to delve in depth into all the issues but discussions with the FBOA executive members, SFA staff and DBS staff, flagged the following issues.

5. Long serving DBS staff confirms that this was a performing scheme until the promoters were unable to export swordfish. It is claimed that at the time, a Ministry official instructed promoters not to pay until new terms could be worked out such as capital for new equipment, loan rescheduling, more working capital, etc., which did not materialize. We could not verify this.
6. **Loan approval:** DBS clarified that loan approval consists of 2 stages: a technical evaluation undertaken by SFA who confirms that the business activity is in line with government policy and approves for the loan to be considered and a financial evaluation made by DBS, after which the approved loans can be disbursed. DBS staff stressed that projects approved by SFA are not automatically approved for loan disbursement; they have to fulfil the bank's criteria in terms of due diligence such as feasibility, collateral, creditworthiness of the promoter, etc. They explained that this includes full security to cover the loans and collateral is based on loan size and is set at a ratio of 1:1. Promoters were allowed to use the boats as collateral except where the boats were being imported.
7. They explained that in the case of Promoter E in the table, the security was to be the purchased boat and whilst the vessel was being imported there was no security. This practice dates to 2011 when they first started managing the fund and it has since stopped. Another practice that was stopped is that of disbursing loans directly to promoters, which was also practiced with Promoter E. They explained that at the beginning, applicants purchased their own foreign currency so funds were transferred to their accounts to allow them to shop for competitive rates.
8. **The promoters:** We have been informed that there is a perception among some promoters that the fund is a gift to Government and therefore it is a grant to them and not a loan. Some borrowers run viable businesses for example Promoters A, D and H whose vessels are actively fishing and Promoter F, who is involved in fish export whose business is deemed to be doing very well and it is postulated that they can repay but are choosing not to, because of this perception of having received a gift.
9. **Political interference:** It was also pointed out that despite the presence of an agreement, SFA would intervene at different points during the lifetime of the loan on behalf of the promoters. Promoter E was used as an example where DBS had reservations about continuously disbursing funds into the promoter's account but SFA intervened.
10. There was a level of laxity where SFA would instruct DBS to provide lenders with extended grace periods. Initially, the grace period was extended to one year from 6 months and then further instructions from the SFA would request further extensions over and above the usual grace periods. This increased the difficulty with repayment because of the capitalized interest.
11. DBS staff indicates that the FDF is managed according to the agreement with SFA and not like its own products. Whilst the agreement lays out the role of each party, it is felt that some terms are ambiguous. DBS receives instructions from the SFA related to policies such as grace periods, loan scheduling and recovery, but they feel that the criteria are sometimes being changed without justification. In addition, the bank's compliance rules require it to apply the agreement to the letter and some terms of the present agreement lacks clarity. In addition, the 2009 agreement now has many addendums and they feel a complete review is warranted.

12. The provision of working capital to cover operations under the relief Scheme is given as an example by DBS staff where it does not appear to be a justification for the policy. Under the scheme, up to SCR1M is being provided as working capital to operators without a business plan and no financial analysis. DBS staff pointed out that this approach is not based on market principles and is not in line with their lending procedures as it removes the need for DBS to conduct a financial analysis.
13. SFA staff contacted also indicates that the directives issued to DBS was at the behest of the Department of Fisheries at the time. We did not find evidence that these emanated from the SFA board. Some FBOA members also claim that there has been political interference in who were considered to receive the loans and in its management.
14. **Loan recovery:** The agreement gives DBS the responsibility for loan recovery but the staff indicates that they continue to face difficulties to recover the loans. Its parent ministry, the Ministry of Finance, advised that DBS institutes its own loan recovery procedures. However, SFA keeps intervening on behalf of the lenders for extended grace periods, loan rescheduling, etc and this is preventing it from doing so. The staff related that DBS wanted to move to seize 3 boats when it was instructed in a letter on 24 September 2020, to negotiate with the promoters and if they agree to pay back the principal and interest for one year, then DBS should consider writing off the outstanding loan amounts, which DBS staff remarked is not in line with DBS' procedures and banking best practice. They also report receiving a directive not to institute any actions against one specific promoter.
15. Meanwhile, interest is being accrued and the securities are deteriorating and the SFA Chief Economist claims that most of the boats are not sea-worthy and the bank will be repossessing an almost worthless asset and would still be unable to recover the loaned funds. Another potential issue for DBS is they would need space to berth the repossessed vessels and in the present economic climate, there may not be appetite for these vessels. Therefore, there is skepticism as to whether it will recover the loan amounts.

Impact

16. The facility has increased the fleet capacity in the semi-industrial fishery sector but this has not translated into higher catch because only 3 vessels are contributing to the total catch (see table 7), which is not significant (Can Michel confirm?). It is facilitating businesses to venture into value addition activities in line with Government policy. One of the promoters is presently the biggest exporter of fresh seafood, especially tuna.
17. However, although the funds were meant to support fisheries development, it narrowly focused on the 3 purposes above at the exclusion of other activities in the fisheries value chain. Presently, it is felt that the funds are not being utilized fully, and the funding agency might question whether the funds are really needed.
18. **Relevance:** Private sector stakeholders opined that a fund to provide funding at low interest to support the development of the fisheries industry is very much needed but its scope needs to be enlarged to provide loans for all fisheries business activities and ensure all projects are properly assessed for viability and not for political favors. They also felt that the loans should create employment for Seychellois and pointed out that of the vessels that are now active, most or the entire crew is Sri Lankan and some exclude Seychellois fishers. They feel that it is now even more highly relevant given that with COVID-19 situation, fisheries is the only viable economic activity for the country but banks are not keen to lend money. In addition, the government policy of focusing on value-addition, is attracting young talents who would need this type of funding to implement their projects. However, they stakeholders feel that for this to be sustainable, borrowers must

honor their obligations or the funds will dry up. They feel, that it is also an issue of equity and fairness because some promoters do repay their loans.

Going forward

19. The issues with the non-performing loans stress the need to have a clear framework to manager facilities and funds transferred for the management of third parties to ensure that it meets its intended objectives. In the FCP 2019, government proposed a moratorium on the importation of second-hand fishing vessels and indicated that capacity assessment will be conducted on both fishing vessels and processing facilities before approving new loans. In addition, Government wants to create a fund under FDF to assist boat owners involved in small-scale pelagic fishery with small gears, engine maintenance and a one-off working capital of SCR 150,000 for vessels and a scheme to finance semi-industrial boat owners who opt to install autonomous ice machines on their boat and prohibit the importation of new semi-industrial fishing vessels not equipped with autonomous ice machine on-board. In this context, it is important that the criteria to access the funds are clear and its management must not be subject to political interference.
20. We reiterate that it has not been possible in the time allocated for this performance audit to explore all the issues associated with this programme and we would recommend a special audit in 2021 in order to provide specific recommendations for a review of the present agreement for fund management, clarifying roles of all parties, providing a clear process to review policies and ensuring that it works along market principles.

Table 8: Catch & Effort for vessels purchased with outstanding FDF loans

VESSEL		2012	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019 (1 ST SEM)
Ave Maria	Hooks				47,500	7,000	24,884
	CPUE				0.6	1.0	1.94
	Catch (MT)				28.5	7.0	48.3
Nanu	Hooks					10,800	21,777
	CPUE					0.9	1.15
	Catch (MT)					9.8	36.5
Soleil2	Hooks					6293	24,813
	CPUE					0.3	0.71
	Catch (MT)					1.9	17.71
Lion	Hooks				9,700		
	CPUE				3.06		
	Catch (MT)				29.7		
Blue Ocean 1	Hooks		3,034	18,240			
	CPUE		0	0			
	Catch (MT)		0	0			
Blue Ocean 2	Hooks		9,529	24,628			
	CPUE		0	0			
	Catch (MT)		0	0			
Blue Ocean 3	Hooks			790			
	CPUE			0			
	Catch (MT)			0			
Haifa 001	Hooks	3,200					
	CPUE	0					
	Catch (MT)	0					

Source: Seychelles Fishing Authority

4.1.3.1 Fishermen's insurance scheme

1. The fishermen's insurance scheme was launched in 2013 as part of the Agricultural Disaster and Fisheries Insurance Scheme (ADFIS) with the aim of covering all losses due to all types of natural perils, operate the scheme along market principles and have a cost effective and voluntary scheme for all registered fishers which is easy to handle.
2. Presently, the policy applies to full time boat owners registered with the SFA for up to an individual vessel value of SCR2M. Fisheries insurance have 3 different sections: Marine hull, Third Party Liability and Personal Accident (which covers the crew). The premium is calculated at 4% of the value of the boat and for the scheme, government pays 2% and the owner pays 2% and the agreement is that the crew is covered.
3. This scheme has proven not to be popular among fishermen. At the beginning of the programme, 50 boat owners availed of the scheme and now there are only 25 whilst there are over 500 registered fishing vessels. Therefore, utilization of the funds for the insurance scheme has been very low. Boat owners perceive that there is no difference whether they obtain a policy under the scheme or a normal policy because their pay out is roughly the same and the premium under the scheme is therefore seen to be too expensive. The difference is that under the scheme, their 2% contribution also provides cover for the crew.
4. There is also no real promotion of the scheme by either the SFA or the insurance companies and it appears that the advantages of availing of the scheme are not well known. The Chief Economist reckons that this may change in 2021 when the new SMSA regulations comes into force requiring all fishing vessels to be registered and licensed and a condition of the license is to be insured.

4.1.4 Development and implementation of the aquaculture management plan

Achievements
<p>Over this period, sectoral funds were used to fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Surveys in 2014 and 2015 leading to the Small-Scale Aquaculture Report and Guidelines for Licensing which led to the development of the Aquaculture Regulations, approved by Cabinet in October 2020 and now awaiting a commencement date.• Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the inner islands in 2016. <p>Implementation of Phase 1 of the Brood stock Acclimation and Quarantine Facility (BAQF), comprising of a multi-species quarantine and acclimation facility that provides quarantine treatments for wild-caught brood stock and prepares these animals for life and reproduction in captivity. It was commissioned in August 2019 and officially launched in October 2019. The Manager informs that funding for the brood stock facility was difficult from usual donors as they did not find it lucrative and the sectoral funds was the only source of funds for this project.</p>
Impact
<p>Although the aquaculture industry is still to be formally launched, having the brood stock facility is felt to have contributed to changing the perception of stakeholders on aquaculture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outreach sessions especially in schools and post-secondary institutions, have created increased awareness and interest in aquaculture;• Local investors, from both within the fisheries sector and without, can now visit a facility and find out for themselves what this industry is about; and it is attracting investors with non-fisheries backgrounds;• The facility has seen visits from bilateral partners and the EU has expressed interest to co-fund phase 2 of the project, a hub for aquaculture offices consisting of a hatchery, nursery and laboratory as well as offices;• Local funding agencies such as banks and SeyCCAT now have a point of reference to evaluate investors seeking funding for aquaculture projects.• There is scientific collaboration with SMA and UNISEY for students coming on work attachment and to conduct research for their dissertation.• Job creation – the facility now employs 6 staff and a majority are SMA graduates.

- The project contributes to government's policy on diversification as part of the blue economy and is seen as the most significant industry with the most potential, as fisheries is felt to have matured and now needs more controls.
- Other innovations: the facility can also support research for exploitation of other marine resources such as seaweed as both feed for fish as well as human consumption.

In summary, sectoral funds have assisted the SFA to move closer to launching the aquaculture industry in Seychelles. There is increased acceptance of aquaculture as a viable alternative in the fisheries sector: before, stakeholders used to see only the negative impact of aquaculture but now it is being seen as an alternative investment opportunity and a viable source of livelihood for fishers and non-fishers.

Some negative impacts include:

- Unintended wastage of funding because the SFA was instructed to install sea cages despite not having a hatchery and therefore there are no juveniles to populate the cages. Now it has to undertake maintenance of these cages and it does not have a boat to be able to do so.
- Social impact: the land on which the brood stock facility is situated is seen as taking away land destined for fishers and therefore SFA is seen to be in competition for industrial land for fisheries processing, which could lead to possible conflicts with other fishermen.

4.1.5 Monitoring, Control, surveillance and enforcement

Table 9: Air and sea patrols 2014 - 2019

Year	Air patrols	Sea Patrols		Detection	Comments
	(Hours)	Coastal (No.)	Long range (Days)	No. of cases	
2014	18 (target 50hr)	6	13	2 cases	Long range patrols paid out of credit fund from 2013.
2015	18 (target 50hr)	6 (target36)	0	6	No long-range patrols took place because the board cancelled the budget for national sea patrols
2016	19 (target 50hr)	4 (36)	0	0	Aircraft charter costs increased gradually over the years and it was impossible to reach the target of 50 hours of air patrol
2017	20 (target 20hr)	12	0	2	Insufficient funds to conduct long range sea patrols
2018	15 (target 20hr)	12	23 (15)	3	
2019	34 (target 20hr)	19.5	10 (15)	7	Patrols conducted in conjunction with the Seychelles Cost Guard and the Seychelles Air Force

Source: SFA

Seychelles responsibility as a coastal state is to ensure that resources are well managed and therefore monitoring and detection of illegal activities is part of this obligation for UNCLOS 3. Patrols are critical as they enable SFA to detect illegal activities and also deter potential offenders.

The Fisheries Monitoring Centre (FMC) depended entirely on the sectoral funds to conduct air and sea patrols over the protocol period and at the time of this audit, no patrols were taking place because FMC had run out of funds. Table 9 shows that there were no long-range patrols in 2015, 2016 and 2017 following a board decision not to allocate funds for this activity. Management also reports that the costs of doing air and sea patrols have increased considerably over the protocol period and the

Government has explored other means of conducting surveillance of fisheries activities. Increasingly, surveillance is by electronic means and there is increased regional collaboration with IOC and ???.

The missions are not all planned missions because the Coast Guard and Air Force respond when they are notified and then the SFA refunds them. We were informed that since 2017, FMC prioritized coastal missions and there has been an increase in detection rate of illegal activities since and we were informed that out of 20 cases detected, 4 are now being prosecuted.

4.1.5.1 VMS Monitoring and compliance

Table 10: Vessels inspected and tracked, 2014-2019

Activity	Vessels inspected at port	Vessels tracked	EU, IUU catch certificates issued	Communications systems – Safety at sea
2014	15 (10)	355	1984 / (1000)	34 VMS installed
2015	21	411	2,514 / (1000)	30VMS purchased & installed 20 SVTU purchased & installed
2016	20	425?	2,917 / (1000)	300/355 small vessels equipped with VMS
2017	? (90)	460	2,578 / (1000)	20 VMS procured
2018	223 (90)	493 (350)	1223 (1000)	20 VMS installed No small vessel tracking units (SVTU) installed
2019	177	508 (350)	2401 (1000)	20 VMS installed
Comments	This is in compliance to FAO/IOTC requirements Inspections extended to include purse seiners and long liners		Target is issuing 1000 certificates per year	SVTU bought in 2020 with 2019 budget. In 2020, 24 SVTU were installed in the 3 months preceding this report; 3 of these have been installed on sports fishing vessels

Source: SFA

VMS monitoring and compliance is part of obligations under FAO and IOTC. The target for vessel inspection has increased over the protocol period and reflects the need to increase inspections under new port state measures following IOTC resolution passed in 2016 which came into effect in 2017.

Tracking small vessels without power source was given priority at the end of the period as there was pressure following the development of the FCP 2019 to ensure that all fishing boats have VMS installed. This is being regulated through licensing and it is now illegal for licensed fishing boats not to have a VMS installed. During this period, the SFA also developed capacity to install and maintain the SVTUs, although the new SVTUs are very autonomous and require minimum maintenance. SVTUs have also been installed on 3 sports fishing vessels as a pilot in preparation for the implementation of the DMP on the Mahe Plateau.

Impact

Over the reporting period, MCS was entirely dependent on sectoral funds to upgrade, maintain and purchase new equipment and build capacity of its staff. Without the sectoral funds, no patrols could be conducted to detect illegal activities and no new equipment or software procured.

Monitoring and compliance activities have wide implications and impacts the work of SFA immensely tying in with law enforcement and fisheries management. Installation of SVTUs supports efforts to monitor the fuel concession programme, and presently all processing of subsidies requires MCS to confirm that there has been a fishing trip.

The impact has been mostly to act as a deterrent. By tracking Seychelles flagged vessels, FMC ensures that Seychelles flagged vessels do not fish illegally in other EEZs or fish in the high seas without authorization. If Seychelles is unable to monitor this and ensure compliance by its flagged vessels, the implications are huge and can include trade sanctions.

Recommendations

Given the move away from long range sea and air patrols for surveillance, a focus on building the capacity of the staff to increase the efficiency in detecting illegal fishing activities and operational procedures on how to inspect vessels and detect under-reporting is called for.

Table 11: Infrastructure projects expenses, 2014 - 2020

	2015 EUR	2016 EUR	2017 EUR	2018 EUR	2019 EUR	2020 EUR	TOTAL EUR
2.1 Fish Processing and increased value addition of fish products landed in Seychelles							
2.1.1 Artisanal Infrastructure Projects / Bel Ombre		171,205	134,804	81,007	57,020	170,269	614,305
2.1.1.1 Construction of Fish Processing Facilities			9,643	50,230	11,461	109,401	180,736
2.1.1.2 Construction of Sewage Treatment Plant (STP)			125,161	30,777	45,559		201,497
2.1.1.3 Construction Gear Store			-	-	-		-
2.1.1.4 Construction of Fuel Substation			-	-	-		-
2.1.1.5 Construction of loading Bay			-	-	-	15,586	15,586
2.1.1.6 Civil Work: Internal Road, Utilities and Security Fencing			-	-	-	45,282	45,282
2.1.1.7 Utilities Up-grade and Connection			-	-			-
2.1.2 Artisanal Infrastructure Projects / Providence Zone 6	657,791	234,415	462,519	773,260	427,640	16,007	2,571,631
2.1.2.1 Aquaculture hatchery construction contract signature			362,502	159,039	196,873	16,007	734,421
2.1.2.2 Civil Work: Internal Road, Utilities			-	614,221	230,767		844,988
2.1.2.3 Construction and Installation of Sewage Pump (STP)			-	-			-
2.1.2.4 Utilities Up-grade and Connection			100,017	-			100,017
2.1.2.5 Cold Water Storage Facilities			-	-			-
2.1.2.6 Completion of Fish Center (FBOA)			-	-			-
2.1.3 Support Fishing Communities in Districts	67,584	193,880	465,343	324,320	143,992	599,069	1,794,189
2.1.3.1 Anse Aux Pin: Reclamation, Construction of fish market, Gear store			194,891	-	447	33,017	228,356
2.1.3.2 Praslin: Construction Quay facilities and Loading Shed			-	7,034	1,045	7,043	15,122
2.1.3.3 Anse Boileau: Construction of fish market			-	-	-		-
2.1.3.4 Cascade: Construction of fish market, Gear store and Slip way			-	192,746	-	145,910	338,655
2.1.3.5 La Retraite: Reclamation/Provision for power supply and additional civil works			95,664	-	9,181	218,171	323,016
2.1.3.6 Perseverance: Fish Market			-	-	-		-
2.1.3.7 Victoria: Installation of Navigational Aid			25,232	7,019	27,620	7,177	67,047

	2015 EUR	2016 EUR	2017 EUR	2018 EUR	2019 EUR	2020 EUR	TOTAL EUR
2.1.3.8 Victoria: Artisanal Fishing Port Upgrade and Utilities			-	4,545	7,781	10,196	22,522
2.1.3.9 English River: Fishing Facilities			-	-	-	16,504	16,504
2.1.3.10 Beau-Vallon: Slip-Way			-	-	-		-
2.1.3.11 La Digue market and Gear Store			91,191	73,874	27,143		192,209
2.1.3.12 Glacis			51,468	1,614	7,245	9,525	69,851
2.1.3.13 La Digue- Dredging of lagoons			6,897	-	20,129	5,186	32,213
2.1.3.14 Consultancy Fees			-	37,490	36,700	(268)	73,922
2.1.3.15 · Victoria: Fuel Station and Offices			-	-	-	29,113	29,113
2.1.3.16 · La Digue: Ice Plant Civil work			-	-	6,700	39,225	45,926
2.1.3.17 · Providence fishing port upgrade			-	-	-	19,246	19,246
2.1.3.18 · Anse Royale			-	-	-	35,731	35,731
2.1.3.19 · Anse a La Mouche			-	-	-	16,892	16,892
2.1.3.20 · Victoria Market			-	-		6,399	6,399
2.1.4 Ice plants construction/maintenance	5,853	172,524	64,398	43,575	99,003	99,984	485,337
2.1.4.1 Ice plants operational			64,398	30,101	85,112	72,478	252,088
2.1.4.2 Conversion of 3 Ice Plants from R22-R 404 A			-	-			-
2.1.4.3 Maintenance and repair work on main structure of 5 ice plants			-	13,474	13,892	27,506	54,872
			-	-			-
2.2 Maintain Port Victoria as the Major Tuna landing / transshipment port in the Western Indian Ocean-							
2.2.1 Tuna Purse seine infrastructure	122,320	183,464	99,257	17,827			422,868
2.2.1.1 Contract for Ile du Port	122,320	183,464	99,257	17,287			422,328
quey							-
Total spending	853,548	955,488	1,226,321	1,239,988	727,655	885,330	5,888,330
Budgeted cost	3,225,257	2,974,191	1,226,321	1,771,743	970,548	1,036,605	11,204,665

Source: SFA

4.2 Fisheries infrastructure development for artisanal and industrial sectors

Over the protocol period, €5.9M (as detailed in table 11) of sectoral funds was spent on infrastructure projects and it mostly targeted improving the facilities being used by the small-scale, artisanal fisheries sector. This included the construction of loading sheds, fishermen’s gear stores, installation and maintenance of navigation aids, construction of slipways to facilitate the retrieval and launching of boats, construction of fish processing units and provision of necessary utilities (e.g. electricity sub-station, sewage treatment plant, water connections) for their effective functioning, among others. There were also infrastructure projects supporting the industrial fisheries as well as the development of the aquaculture sector. The list of projects that were planned is listed in table 12.

Table 12: Infrastructure projects planned between 2014-2020 by status

	STATUS
2.1.1 Artisanal Infrastructure Projects/ Bel Ombre	
2.1.1.1 Construction of Fish Processing Facilities	Completed
2.1.1.2 Construction of Sewage Treatment Plant (STP)	Completed
2.1.1.3 Construction Gear Store	Not started
2.1.1.4 Construction of Fuel Sub-Station	On-going
2.1.1.5 Construction of loading Bay	Completed
2.1.1.6 Civil Work: Internal Road, Utilities and Security Fencing	On-going
2.1.1.7 Utilities Up-grade and Connection	Completed
2.1.2 Artisanal Infrastructure Projects / Providence Zone 6	
2.1.2.1 Aquaculture hatchery construction contract signature	Completed
2.1.2.2 Civil Work: Internal Road, Utilities	On-going
2.1.2.3 Construction and Installation of Sewage Pump (STP)	Not started
2.1.2.4 Utilities Up-grade and Connection	Completed
2.1.2.5 Cold Water Storage Facilities	Not doing
2.1.2.6 Completion of Fish Centre (FBOA)	Not doing
2.1.3 Support Fishing Communities in Districts	
2.1.3.1 Anse Aux Pin: Reclamation, Construction of fish market, Gear store	On-going
2.1.3.2 Praslin: Construction Quay facilities and Loading Shed	On-going
2.1.3.3 Anse Boileau: Construction of fish market	Not started
2.1.3.4 Cascade: Construction of fish market, Gear store and Slip way	On-going
2.1.3.5 La Retraite: Reclamation/Provision for power supply and additional civil works	On-going
2.1.3.6 Perseverance: Fish Market	Not started
2.1.3.7 Victoria: Installation of Navigational Aid	On-going
2.1.3.8 Victoria: Artisanal Fishing Port Upgrade and Utilities	Not started
2.1.3.9 English River: Fishing Facilities	Not started
2.1.3.10 Beau-Vallon: Slip-Way	Not started
2.1.3.11 La Digue market and Gear Store	Completed
2.1.3.12 Glacis	Not started
2.1.3.13 La Digue- Dredging of lagoons	Completed
2.1.3.14 Consultancy Fees (For Bel Ombre facilities)	On-going
2.1.3.15 Victoria: Fuel Station and Offices	On-going
2.1.3.16 La Digue: Ice Plant Civil work	Completed

Source: SFA

We used a mixture of methods to assess the impact of infrastructure projects. A list of fisheries-related infrastructure projects to be funded under the Protocol was provided by SFA with the current status of each project and issues that were affecting the implementation of individual projects. Projects that had not started were not assessed as their expected impacts were yet to be realised. Some projects from

the list were also removed as decisions had been taken not to implement them, either because they were no longer considered as relevant or there were complications that had reduced the feasibility of the projects.

A structured questionnaire (see appendix D) was then prepared and was used to obtain feedback from project beneficiaries on the relevance and their perceived impact of the projects implemented. Project beneficiaries consulted were asked to provide a score of Low, Medium or High to rank the relevance and impact of the project and they were also encouraged to provide their proposals on what SFA could have done better to improve the relevance and impact of the projects implemented. The information gathered was then collated and used to provide an informed relevance and impact score for each project. Arguments are provided in support of the final relevance and impact scores allocated.

4.2.1 Project level findings

4.2.1.1 Projects not started

Twelve (12) projects that appeared on the list of infrastructure projects obtained from SFA were not assessed either because construction activities had not started by the end of November 2020 or they had been cancelled. They include:

- I. **Construction of fishermen gear stores at Bel Ombre.** Construction had not started as the site identified was not ready; it was found to be occupied by a number of containers belonging to an entrepreneur in the fishing industry residing at Bel Ombre. It is unclear why the clearing of the site to start construction was taking long. The SFA should work with the current user of the site to find alternative locations for the storage of his containers.
- II. **Construction and installation of Sewage Treatment Pump (STP) at Providence Zone 20:** This has not yet started and some of the entrepreneurs that were provided with a letter of offer for the fish processing units have still not been able to provide the expected volume of waste water that they are projected to produce to be integrated in the design. This project will be funded under the next Protocol.
- III. **Construction of Anse Boileau Fish Market:** SFA has not been able to secure the land to build this facility. The market and gear store for the Anse Boileau district is thus still at concept stage.
- IV. **Construction of fish market at Perseverance:** A site for the construction of the Perseverance fish market is yet to be identified. A concept has still not been prepared for this market by SFA.
- V. **Construction of fishermen facilities at English River:** A concept is available and it is anticipated that part of the area behind the current English River District Administrator's Office will be reclaimed for the construction of a quay. Floating pontoons will be installed around the quay to provide berthing space. SFA needs to discuss the concept with stakeholders in the area before finalizing and it is working with the Public Utilities Corporation (PUC) to re-route an electricity cable that traverses part of the area that is to be reclaimed.
- VI. **Construction of fishermen facilities at Glacis:** Construction of the proposed slipway, gear store and ice plant at Glacis is yet to start. The site identified for the project is considered as not ideal in its current state. SFA is discussing with the family of the late President Mancham to buy part of their property in the area so that the road can be diverted to create space for the construction of the required infrastructure close to the sea front.
- VII. **Construction of fuel station at Victoria:** Construction has not started although the site has been identified and the plan prepared and approved.
- VIII. **Construction of Aquaculture hatchery:** The aquaculture hatchery will be funded under the next Protocol. One of the four fish processing units at Bel Ombre will be used for the setting up of

this facility. A hatchery for sea urchins has been set up on the premises of the Seychelles Maritime Academy (SMA) until the facility is completed at Bel Ombre.

- IX. **Victoria artisanal fishing port upgrade and utilities.** Most of the work with regards to small utilities upgrade for the Victoria artisanal fishing port is yet to be implemented.

A number of projects have also been cancelled. These include:

- I. **Construction of slip-way at Beau Vallon:** The project will not go ahead as the site which was identified at the Northern end of the Beau Vallon beach is considered not ideal. It is anticipated that the construction of a slipway at the identified location will create environmental issues related to beach erosion. Cleaning of boats on the slipway may also result in pollution of the sea in the area and the loss of the tourism appeal of this part of Beau Vallon beach.
- II. **Cold water storage facilities at Providence.** The construction of this infrastructure was not funded under the current Protocol though it appears on the list of projects. SFA does not have a concept for this facility.
- III. **Construction of the fish centre for the Fishermen and Fishing Boat Owners Association at Providence.** The concept for this facility was never finalized. It is claimed that the FBOA was not able to provide SFA with the required documentation and details to design this facility. This is further discussed in section 4.3.1.5.

4.2.2 Projects implemented or being implemented

The impact of the infrastructure projects that were fully implemented or that were under implementation as of the end of November 2020 are assessed individually. For each project a ranking (Low, Medium or High) is provided for the observed impacts as well as for the relevance of the project for the area.

4.2.2.1 Construction of Fish Processing Facilities Bel Ombre

Construction of fish processing facilities at Bel Ombre is not yet having its anticipated impact. As a result, a **medium impact** score was allocated to this project. On the positive side, the project was seen to be in line with the government's policy to increase revenue from the fisheries resources through value addition. On the negative side, these units have been completed and have been allocated for some time now but none are being used or have been equipped with the required machinery for fish processing. While it was generally agreed that fish processing units were needed for the Bel Ombre area, stakeholders express doubts as to whether three units were necessary. Fishers question whether the owners of these processing units will support them and whether there will be enough raw materials for them to work with. Perception was that these units will be relying mainly on by-catch from the industrial purse seine fishery and will not greatly support artisanal fisheries. Fishers are of the opinion that it would have been better to make use of part of the facilities for cold storage.

The project was assessed to be of **medium relevance** for the Bel Ombre area. Three fish processing units at Bel Ombre maybe too much for the amount of fish that is landed at this port. When all of the processing units start production, it is believed that there will be too much processing capacity. Consultation with members of the Bel Ombre Fishers Association suggest that they are not aware where the idea originated to build the fish processing units and claimed that it did not come from them. Government's policy is to build the processing plants and allow the entrepreneurs to equip them based on the types of fish processing that they will undertake. This strategy appears not to be working even though there are schemes that have been put in place such as Blue Investment Fund of the

Development Bank of Seychelles, to support the financing of such types of businesses. The issue might be linked to the present low demand for value-added products and a lack of supply of raw materials. These two factors appear to be causing doubts regarding the financial viability of such ventures.

Fishermen from the area have suggested having a fish processing facility that would process fish for individual fishermen or boat owners for a fee instead of having to sell their raw products to the fish processors. It is argued that this would promote individual fishers and boat owners to look for markets. No such models have been previously tested in the Seychelles but the idea might be workable if such services are able to be provided at affordable rates.

4.2.2.2 Construction of Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) Bel Ombre

The completion of construction of the sewage treatment plant (STP) at Bel Ombre has had **no positive impact** to date. As a result, a low impact score was assigned to this project. The low impact score is directly linked to the lack of use of this facility due to the fish processing units not being operational and not making any positive contribution to the fisheries sector. Under usage of the STP could lead to deterioration of the equipment and if this situation persists, the equipment could be non-functional when the time comes for them to be used.

The project was however assessed to be of **high relevance** since the construction of the fish processing units, which have previously been described could not go ahead without a functional STP to treat the effluent which would be generated by these facilities. Connection to an STP is actually a prerequisite for the construction of fish processing units. Otherwise, the large volume of waste water generated by fish processing activities would create problems of nutrient enrichment of coastal waters, resulting in rapid deterioration of the water quality and marine habitats in the area which would have serious repercussions for the quality of life of the inhabitants and negatively impact coastal tourism.

Delays in operationalizing the processing units and the use of the STP puts serious doubts on whether such facilities are truly necessary, especially at the regional level. There are already fish processing units which have been constructed at Providence which are not being fully used. The SFA should aim to maximise the use of the existing facilities at Providence before investing in other similar facilities in other parts of the country. Despite the fact that Bel Ombre has a relatively large fishing community, they do not necessarily need to do the value addition on-site and the construction of such costly facilities should be looked at from the angle of maximising use and net productivity of the sector. The construction of fish processing units should also be aligned with projected level of catch, as having excess processing capacity will tend to exert pressure on the stock as fishers try to meet demand of such facilities for raw materials.

4.2.2.3 Construction of Fuel Sub-Station Bel Ombre

The construction of the fuel sub-station at Bel Ombre is underway and near completion. As the facility is not yet operational it is having no positive impact and a **low impact** score was assigned. It is however expected that the level of impact will greatly increase when the station starts to operate. It will facilitate access to fuel for fishermen and fishing boat owners and should cut down on the amount of time required for sourcing and loading of fuel before departing on fish trips.

The project was assessed to be of **medium relevance** for Bel Ombre. It is true that Bel Ombre has a relatively large fishing community and the fishing port is used by lots of boats. It is also true that the

construction of a fuel station on the fishing port will greatly improve access and speed of fueling and will help fishermen to become more efficient during their preparation for going fishing. However, boat owners in the area claimed that at its present location, larger boats making use of the Bel Ombre jetty will not have sufficient draught to fuel at low tide. Another argument is that Bel Ombre is less than a five minutes' drive from the Beau Vallon fuel station, which has traditionally been used by fishermen for sourcing fuel, and that the construction of a fuel station at this fishing port may not be necessary. But overall, the project has its merits since Bel Ombre is the third largest artisanal fishing port on Mahé and it should have facilities for fueling which are at par with what is available at the Victoria and Providence artisanal fishing ports. Some fishermen had concerns regarding the close proximity of the fuel station to the PUC electricity sub-station. It is expected that such an issue would have been discussed between engineers from PUC and SEYPEC and that the decision to proceed with the construction would have been objectively considered.

4.2.2.4 Construction of loading Bay Bel Ombre

The construction of the loading bay at the Bel Ombre fishing port was assessed to be having **medium impact** on beneficiaries. The loading shed is structurally complete and is being used extensively for what it was designed for. It provides adequate space for use during the unloading of fish after fishing trips and the loading of provisions before trips; it protects fish being landed from direct exposure to sunlight and is playing an important role in helping fishermen to improve the quality of fish reaching the market. In addition, the loading shed is being used as a site for gear (nets, lines) repair by Bel Ombre fishermen. There is however a small problem with the design of the quay. The side of the quay along the foot of the loading shed is not straight. This makes it a bit complicated when berthing large fishing boats. However, this quayside was built a long time ago and its design should not affect the evaluation of the impact that the construction of the loading shed is having. Hygiene wise, the landing shed was found to be clean and it did not have any problems of foul smell. Stainless steel benches that were supposed to be installed for the handling and cleaning of fish are not in place. Project beneficiaries are questioning the cause of the delay. Once these benches are provided it is expected that the impact of this project will be further increased.

The volume of fishing related-activity taking place at the Bel Ombre jetty makes the construction of the loading shed **highly relevant**. Fishermen are of the opinion that the project could have been made more relevant if it had included a small facility for toilet and recreational facility for fishermen and office space for the fishers' association.

4.2.2.5 Internal Road and Security Fencing Bel Ombre

Medium levels of **impact** are being observed from the implementation of infrastructure project to construct internal roads and install security fence at the Bel Ombre fishing port. The security fencing is providing extra security to the newly constructed facilities at Bel Ombre and for fishermen's possessions and equipment while they are working. The fencing facing the main road at the loading shed has large gates which can be opened to provide vehicular access to the loading area. The parking area in front of the loading shed has also been recently re-tarmacked. However, no barriers have been set up to control access to the parking and the parking is used mostly by people going to the shop or living close by, which on occasions have been known to leave their vehicle in the parking for extended periods. This has restricted access to vehicles involved in the unloading of fish and loading of materials on fishing boats.

The road on the reclaimed area where the fish processing units and ice machines are located remains unpaved.

Overall, the increase in security and better control of access at this fishing port was required to bring it at par with similar types of fishing ports at Victoria and Providence. The increased security of the facility is having the desired impact in keeping unwanted activities out of these areas where food is being handled. Resolving issues related to blocking of access to the loading shed would facilitate work for fishermen and boat owners in gaining access to the loading shed and for doing their activities. Paving of the road on the reclaimed area would improve the ease and speed of access to the site and would also reduce possible damage to vehicles.

The project was assessed to be of **high relevance** since security and good road access is necessary for the development of the small-scale fisheries sector. Fencing at the loading shed has allowed fishermen to physically separate their work activities from the many other things that take place on the Bel Ombre jetty and has provided greater safety for their gears and other materials that they use in their trade while loading, unloading or preparing their gears. Having a proper road to the reclaimed area is also necessary to facilitate access to the site, especially to the fish processing units, once these become operational.

4.2.2.6 Utilities Up-grade and Connection Bel Ombre

The utilities upgrade and connection at the Bel Ombre fishing port is having **low** levels of **impact** on the intended beneficiaries. Construction of the electricity sub-station is complete and connections are available for use by the fish processing units. Water pipes have also been laid and are supplying water. There is also installed capacity to handle waste water from the fish processing units. However, despite the investments made, these facilities are presently not being used as none of the fish processing units are operational. Water and electricity are being used mostly by the people involved in boat repairs (fishing and recreational) operating nearby. The project was ranked as being of **high relevance** given that the availability of water, electricity and sewage infrastructure are prerequisites for the operation of the fish processing units which have been built at Bel Ombre. When fully operational such fish processing units have high demand for electricity for freezing and water for cleaning and generate large volumes of effluent which need to be treated before being discharged.

4.2.2.7 Aquaculture brood stock facilities

The construction of the brood stock facilities at Providence is generating **medium level of impacts**. The facility was completed and has been operational for over one year and has been stocked with many of the target aquaculture species such as Red snapper (*Lutjanus sebae*), Mangrove snapper (*L. argentimaculatus*), Green job fish (*Aprion virescens*), Camouflage grouper (*Epinephelus polyphekadion*) and Brown-marbled grouper (*E. fuscoguttatus*). The Camouflage grouper have started to spawn and new larvae were collected and are being reared. Spawning activity is yet to be observed in other species. The rearing of larvae is still at an experimental stage and SFA is trialling different methods and techniques, especially with respect to the feeds which are being used. It has been just over one year since the first fish arrived in the brood stock facility from the wild. Hence, one of the reasons why no spawning is being observed in other species might be due to long acclimatisation period. It is also possible that for certain species, the specimens have not yet reached sexual maturity as many were captured at relatively small sizes. It is expected that the impact of the brood stock facility will greatly

increase once other species in the brood stock start to reproduce and the larvae can be reared to fingerling size. The greatest impact will however be achieved once the facility is able to start supplying fingerlings to commercial fish farms. No commercial fish farms are operational thus far as investors have not yet been officially invited to set up and operate.

The implementation of this project is of **high relevance** for the Seychelles, since the country is working towards launching its aquaculture sector. Having a functional brood stock facility is of primordial importance before the sector is officially launched to ensure that producers are able to get fingerlings of the targeted species for rearing and for commercial farms to start production at a relatively fast speed. It is anticipated that the aquaculture sector would greatly increase the amount of high value demersal fishes that is available for export and will greatly contribute to the economy of the country. Aquaculture production is expected to also make important contributions to strengthening national food and nutritional security. The start of aquaculture production should also play an important role in reducing pressure on the wild stock.

4.2.2.8 Internal Road, Utilities Providence Zone 20

Only the road is considered here as there is another infrastructure project for Providence which deals with the provision of utilities. **Low** level of **impact** is observed with respect to the construction of internal roads at Providence Zone 20. This is due to the fact that the work on the road is still incomplete and as a result the project is not achieving its full impact. The road leading to the newest part of the jetty has not been paved and not enough consideration was given in the design of the road in front of the fish processing units and how they were to be used for the delivery of containers to and from the site. The lack of consideration makes it very difficult for these container trucks to deliver containers. Provisions have not been made for these extra-long trucks to turn at the end of the road after they have picked up their load. This has necessitated the trucks to drive over pavements which were not designed to hold their weight. The same is true for the design of the metal grills that have been laid over the drains; they bend when these large trucks roll over them and in some instances have caused serious damage to trucks. There are also incidences of road curbs breaking after having been driven over. Some truck operators have stopped serving clients located in Zone 20 for this reason.

The **high relevance** ranking was assigned to this project. The internal road network at this fishing port has an immense role to play in supporting the fishing related and fish processing activities which are taking place there. The roads provide access to freezer trucks collecting fish from fishermen and to pickups which are bringing materials and transporting ice from the ice plants for loading on the boats. The road also provides access to container trucks bringing empty reefer containers for loading and taking away full containers from fish processing units for delivery at the commercial port for export. Without these internal roads, the efficiency of operations on the port will be greatly reduced.

4.2.2.9 Utilities upgrade and connection Providence Zone 20

Low level of **impact** is observed resulting from the implementation of this project. While upgrade of water connections for the Providence Zone 20 has been completed and water is available at required volume and pressure, upgrade to the electricity network has not been completed. SFA has paid PUC in full for the installation and a transformer has been purchased and is available but not connected. An assessment of projected demands was undertaken with all fish processing unit operators and is known by SFA but present demand is not being met.

It was mentioned that other fish processing unit operators at the zone have not started operation due to the electricity supply issue. The electricity sub-station on the fishing port at Zone 20 was funded by SFA but is apparently being used to provide electricity to other non-fisheries related businesses at Providence. The situation is causing some frustration among current operators in the zone and others who would like to start operation. Some beneficiaries have indicated that there are also issues with the stability of the electricity supply. It is claimed that electricity surge has caused a compressor of one of the fish processors to blow up. Apparently, the issue has not been addressed despite the fact that SFA has been informed.

The construction of the sewage treatment plant to handle waste water from the fish processing units has not started and waste water from the operating fish processing plant is apparently not being fed into the centralised PUC sewage collection network. It is unclear where effluent from operating facilities is being discharged. An operator claimed that due to lack of power, he is being forced to move his full container before-hand to the commercial port to free up reefer connection points. As the cost of access to reefer points on the commercial port is higher than at his premises, he is incurring additional costs by not having more reefer connection points on location.

Despite not having the desired level of impact, the project was found to be of **high relevance**, given that fish processing is highly dependent on the availability of large volumes of water for cleaning and electricity for freezing and for running the machinery used in fish processing. A high electricity load is needed to run the cold stores in the fish processing units and to keep multiple reefer containers plugged in at the site as they are being stuffed and before being taken to port for export. There appears to have been a lack of follow up regarding the completion of this project. SFA needs to work closely with PUC to remedy this situation.

4.2.2.10 Anse Aux Pins: Reclamation, Construction of fish market, Gear store

Since this project is not yet complete, it has not had any observable impact on the beneficiaries. As a result, it was allocated a **low impact** score. The project has started but at the end of November 2020, only the reclamation had been completed. Construction of the gear store and fish markets have not started, apparently due to issues concerning road access. SFA claims that the road issues have now been resolved and the project will start in 2021.

However, there are complaints that are already being made about this project with some fishermen claiming that the market will be too far from the road and that they will not be able to sell their fish. Other complaints come from the fishermen that use another landing site located about 100m south of the project site close to the Anse Aux Pins children's playground. Fishermen using this southern landing site say that they are used to selling their fish by the side of the road and that sale at this location is better than at the market and that they are unlikely to make use of the market when it is constructed. Some of them have asked for the construction of a small shed close to the location where they are presently selling fish but they also acknowledge that the site is privately owned. Some of the fishermen believe that the owner will give permission to construct a structure at this location while others are doubtful. There is also belief that the gear stores will only be allocated to fishermen making use of the landing site behind the existing market and that those using the southern landing site will not benefit from the development.

The project was allocated a **high relevance** score based on the fact that there is a great demand for gear stores from the fishermen of Anse Aux Pins. Gear stores are some of the basic requirements of fishers,

especially those who live inland. As yet, there are no gear stores in this area and fishermen have to transport their equipment back and forth between their homes or other storage locations and the landing sites. The completion of this project will ensure that fishers have adequate space to store their gears and equipment in close proximity to their landing site. This will help to reduce incidences of theft, especially of outboard engines which have been reported from this area from time to time.

In the area where the new market is to be built, there is a history of fishermen making use of the market, so it is highly likely that the market will be used once it is completed, provided that it is not too far from the road. Discussions with fishermen held on-site suggest that it is unlikely that those making use of the southern landing site will start using the new market once it is completed. It is clearly not a cost-effective option to have two markets located 100m apart. A strategy thus needs to be put in place to encourage fishers making use of the southern landing site to use the market. One possible option is to allocate some of the gear stores to be constructed to fishermen currently using the southern landing site. Having their gear store located close to the market will probably encourage these fishermen to make use of the facility once it is constructed.

4.2.2.11 Quay facilities and Loading Shed, Baie Ste Anne Praslin

The implementation of this project has generated **low** levels of **impact**. Construction has not started on the planned quay facilities and only a small loading shed has been constructed to date by members of the Praslin Fishers Association with funding from SFA. The SFA claims that the delayed implementation of the project has been caused by issues concerning the Environmental Impact Assessment and administrative issues which necessitated the Procurement Oversight Unit to delay the procurement process as a result of complications between the identified contractor (Vijay Construction) and their bank.

Even though some positive impacts have been observed from the construction of the loading shed, it is far from what would have been achieved if the quay facilities were completed. The loading shed is now providing fishers with better facilities when unloading their fish and loading ice. Fish for unloading are now placed under the loading shed and are not exposed to direct sunlight. The shed also provides shade to fishermen as they prepare their boats for fishing trips and shelter for people buying fish from fishermen. Negative impacts of the delay of this construction have been in the form of fishermen complaining that the authorities are not doing anything to address their problems and that all efforts are being targeted at fishermen from Mahé.

As with other projects involving the construction of quayside facilities and fish loading shed, this project at Baie Ste Anne was assessed to be of **high relevance** for the development of the fisheries sector on Praslin. The existing small fishing quay at Baie Ste Anne is used by a lot of fishermen and there was a great need for them to have a loading shed especially for use during unloading of fish after fishing trips and during the loading of ice. As the project was taking a bit long to materialise, fishers from the Praslin Fishermen's Association took it upon themselves to have the small loading shed constructed. Overall, the Baie Ste Anne fishing community is in great need of having proper quay facilities so as to facilitate the loading and unloading of fish. There is a need to quickly address the administrative problems encountered so that construction can start.

4.2.2.12 Construction of fish market, Gear store and Slip way Cascade

The implementation of this project has generated **low** levels of **impact**, because the project is not fully completed. Construction at the site started with reclamation of part of the sea to create flat land, followed by the construction of the quay and a small slipway. At the end of November 2020, only the side of the quay had been built and the top of the quay was yet to be paved. Apparently, time is being provided for the dredged carbonate materials, which was used for the reclamation to compact naturally. Compaction of the carbonate materials before the laying of the concrete should contribute to minimising possible cracking of the concrete surface in the future.

The unfinished quay is already being used by some of the larger fishing boats making use of the area for berthing. However, as there is as yet no floating pontoon, the boats are having problems with the changing tides. The slipway has been constructed only as a sloping concrete slab into the sea. No timber skids have been bolted to the surface of the slab to facilitate the retrieval and launching of boats. Short filamentous algae have grown on the bottom part of the slipway which makes it slippery and a danger for fishermen. Construction of the new market and gear store has not started. These will be built on the newly reclaimed area. It is expected that floating pontoons will be installed on the side of the quay along which fishing boats can berth. Planning approval for the floating pontoon is being sought. It is anticipated that the increase in the number of gear stores following the completion of this project will increase security for fishermen as it would help them to better store boat engines, gears, equipment and fuel.

The project was assessed to be of **high relevance** for the fishermen of Cascade. The project location is an important landing site for the small-scale artisanal fisheries and is used by a lot of small boats. At present these boats have to unload their catch by beaching directly on the gravel shore. Fishermen need to climb over the rock riprap to get onto the road where they display their fish for sale. It is claimed that climbing over the riprap have been linked to a number of accidents. The area had a small market but this has now been reduced to a fruit and vegetable stall and as a result, fish are being sold on pallets by the side of the road. A few fishermen's gear stores remain in the same building as the old market. These gear stores are still being used but the number of fishers is now far more numerous than gear stores available and there is a need for new gear stores.

4.2.2.13 Reclamation/Provision for power supply and additional civil works at La Retraite

The project was observed to delivering **low** levels of **impact** to the fishermen of La Retraite since the infrastructure has not been completed and cannot be used. Quite a large area was reclaimed to make space for the construction. The ice plant was installed but it is not yet functional and the gear stores, market and other civil works were all at an advanced stage of construction. This project will be highly beneficial to the fishing community of La Retraite once it is completed. As the site is large enough it has been possible to build the gear store and ice machine a good distance from the market. The length of the seashore along the reclaimed area and the proposed installation of floating pontoons should provide enough berthing space for the small fishing boats that use this landing site. The laybys that have been constructed alongside the road offer enough space for several cars to park at the same time and will help to reduce traffic congestion in the area caused by people parking their vehicles on the side of the road to buy fish. The market that is being built looks very small and it may be problematic if a number of fishermen are trying to use it at the same time.

The project was assessed to be of **high relevance** for the fishermen of La Retraite. The area did not previously have any fisheries-related facilities despite the fact that there is a lot of fishermen who operates from this landing site. People stopping their vehicles on the side of the road to buy fish was a source of traffic congestion which had to be tackled. Fishers also had to travel all the way to Victoria to source ice for their fishing trips. The completion of this project will provide the right conditions for the development of small-scale fisheries at this location.

4.2.2.14 Construction of market and gear store La Digue.

This project is having a **medium** level of **impact**. The market is in operation and the gear stores have been allocated and are being used by fishermen operating from the La Passe area. The gear stores are making an important contribution in reducing the hardship of fishermen in transporting their gears and equipment long distances after fishing trips. Project beneficiaries consulted said that they were happy with the stores and that it is of great help to them. The market is used from time to time by fishermen but not on a daily basis. It tends to be used more by farmers selling fruits and vegetables and has turned into a tourism attraction as many tourists holidaying on La Digue use it for their fruits and vegetables shopping.

The project was assessed to be of **medium relevance** for the La Digue fishing sector. Though it was claimed that the fishermen of La Digue needs a market, it is rarely used for selling fish. Fish on La Digue is usually sold by the seashore and rarely find its way onto the market. The market tends to be used for selling fish on days when fish is abundant and when large catch of species such as mackerels and jacks have been made. The construction of gear stores is however more relevant since fishers claimed that they were in great need of storage for their equipment after fishing.

4.2.2.15 Dredging of lagoon La Digue.

This project is deemed to have **medium impact**. The work has been completed and involved the opening up of La Passe Magnan. The newly opened reef channel is said to be used by about 5 to 6 different fishermen. The project is having immediate impact for the fishermen who make use of this reef channel as it provides them a greater degree of freedom in choosing when to depart and return from fishing trips. As yet, it does not appear that the beaches in the vicinity of the pass are suffering from increased sand erosion since the pass was opened. However, the real impact of the reef opening on the dynamics of the sandy beach in the area might take many years before being noticed. The project was assessed to be of **medium relevance** since it is claimed to be benefitting only about 5 to 6 different fishers. Before the reef channel was opened, these fishermen had to plan their fishing trips in relation to the tide as it was not possible for them to move their boats during low tide.

4.2.2.16 Civil works for construction of ice plant on La Digue

The completion of civil works for the construction of the ice plant was observed to be having **high** level of **impact** on the beneficiaries. The completion of the project made it possible for La Digue to have its own ice plant, which has greatly improved access of fishermen to ice and made the sourcing of ice much cheaper than before when the fishermen had to travel to Praslin. It is claimed that improved access to ice is also helping the fishermen to improve preservation of fish while at sea, especially when they go on long fishing trips. There are however complaints that the ice machine is breaking down frequently due to the perceived poor quality of the Chinese-made machines which have been installed. Coastal

erosion is an issue in the area where the ice machines have been installed and granite ripraps had to be installed to halt the erosion. Locating the ice machine close to the edge of the sea was not a good idea as it is expected that the area will continue to suffer from chronic sand erosion. Salt spray could also increase corrosion of the ice machine which could lead to more frequent breakdowns. The project was assessed to be of **high relevance** for the fishermen of La Digue as previously there were no facilities on the island for them to source ice for fishing.

4.2.2.17 Extension to SFA Offices

This project has **medium impact**. The extension of the building has created more office space and helped to reduce the density of workers in some offices. The availability of new office space has been especially beneficial lately when certain offices with fungus infestation had to be vacated while repair work is being undertaken. The Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS) section benefitted the most in terms of the number of new offices and the extra space has allowed for the recruitment of staff and creation of a specific unit to deal with Electronic Monitoring System (EMS). The EMS has helped to improve the maritime domain awareness of SFA and contributed to improved electronic surveillance and implementation of certain port state measures. It has been argued that the office expansion could have had more impact if it was linked to the provision of the technical resources that MCS need for their work.

The SFA building expansion was assessed to be of **high relevance** as it allowed SFA to provide more space and better working conditions to some of its employees. Whenever possible funds under the Fisheries Protocol should be used to improve SFA facilities as opposed to only funding facilities that are used directly by other people in the fisheries value chain.

4.2.3 Discussion and recommendations

1. The impact assessment of infrastructure projects funded under the 2014-2020 protocol indicates that in general these projects are being well targeted and are **highly relevant** for the intended beneficiaries. This is indication that SFA is responding well to the immediate needs of the industry in-terms of project identification and financing. However, many of the infrastructure projects that were planned are yet to be implemented and the reasons for delays are varied. In many instances, delays were caused by factors that were outside the control of SFA such as securing of appropriate site for construction at Glacis, Anse Boileau and Ile Perseverance. There were however some projects, for example, the construction of fishermen's gear stores at Bel Ombre that could have benefitted from better project management.
2. For many projects, the impact will only become apparent many months and sometime years after completion. In our opinion, it is too soon to assess the impact for the majority of projects funded under the 2014 – 2020 protocol, as the majority have just been completed or have not been used for long.
3. Few projects were assessed to be having high levels of impact. Most are infrastructures that were being extensively used and that are directly affecting the lives of fishermen, such the civil works that supported the installation of the ice plant at La Passe on La Digue and the fishermen's gear stores that had been allocated and are being used on a daily basis.
4. Projects with medium impact scores are those that were completed and were being made use of but were however not functioning as per expectation. This includes the construction of the loading

shed at Bel Ombre which still lacks the stainless-steel tables for fish preparation, and the construction of the La Digue fish market which is mostly used by farmers and seldom by fishermen.

5. There were two classes of projects that received low impact scores; incomplete projects and projects where the infrastructure was not being used as they were not functional. These include projects such as the Cascade and La Retraite quay, gear stores and fish markets which were still under construction. The second class consists of projects that were completed but the infrastructure was not being used for their intended purposes. These include projects such as the Bel Ombre fish processing units and electricity sub-station.
6. It is anticipated that the level of impact of the projects funded will become more apparent as more of them are completed and the infrastructure start getting used by fishermen. Some of the most common projects funded were the construction of gear stores for fishermen. These projects are highly personal for fishermen as they impact on them directly and provide security for their gears and equipment. District-based markets were also popular and it is anticipated that the completion of these markets will raise the level of hygiene at the sites where fish is being sold and that it will help in eliminating the selling of fish on pallets by the side of the road.
7. At certain locations it has not been possible to implement any of the projects that were planned at district level and this stresses the issue of district-based infrastructure project planning. Discussions with beneficiaries indicated that they were not always in favour of having district-based facilities. They were of the opinion that having regional facilities were at times better as at those regional sites, available facilities could be grouped (e.g. having three ice machines instead of one) and there were less chances of fishermen not getting the required service at the regional level than at the district level.
8. It was not possible to assess the projects in terms of value for money (financial efficiency) due to weak record keeping at SFA. Proper record keeping is something which should be strengthened so that infrastructure project implementation becomes more transparent, especially now that Seychelles has joined the fisheries transparency initiative.
9. One question that should also be considered at this point is whether the SFA should be managing the implementation of fisheries infrastructure projects. While the SFA is well placed to identify the need and relevance of infrastructure projects in support of the development of the fisheries sector, experience have shown that SFA have not had major successes in infrastructure project implementation if the staff are not technically and externally supported. It is felt that there is not enough capacity within the SFA to manage the number and size of infrastructure projects being implemented. We were informed that a decision has been made to have no more than 5 infrastructure projects being implemented at one time. The issue still remains, should infrastructure development be a function of SFA? Perhaps, the authorities should consider delegating this to the proposed Public Works Department that should be responsible for on the ground implementation and supervision of infrastructure projects in the fisheries sector. There is thus a need to re-evaluate the role of SFA regarding fisheries infrastructure development.
10. Where communication related to the projects is concerned, in most instances, beneficiaries confirmed that meetings were organised by SFA in which they were given information about the projects that were to be implemented. However, many of those consulted said that they could not understand architectural plans and elevations and that SFA should do more to make the projects more visual for the end users. It was recommended that this is done in the form of an artist's impression for each project. The argument was that the artist's impressions would improve the beneficiaries' level of understanding of what is being planned and in this way these beneficiaries

could also keep an eye on the implementation of the project and the promised deliverables. This is something that should be encouraged as it also provides much greater level of visibility at the national level for both the SFA as the project implementer and to the EU as the donor.

4.3 Capacity building

During the protocol period, €2.4M or 14.5% of the total expenditure over that period went towards supporting capacity building activities.

4.3.1.1 Implementation of the SFA training plan

Support for human resource development went almost exclusively towards supporting the implementation of the SFA annual training plan. Over this period, €950,768 or 40% of the funds spent on capacity building went to train SFA staff at tertiary level in various technical areas in fisheries science and for support staff in Engineering, Statistics, ICT and Economics, at BSc right up to PhD level. This has increased the capacity of all its staff especially its technical staff. Staff also benefitted from attending specific technical training through short courses.

Over the protocol period, €783,306 or 32.5% of total funds spent on capacity building activities, went towards supporting participation in international and regional forums and also to support bilateral meetings held abroad and in Seychelles.

However, despite having a strategic plan, SFA does not have a medium to long term training plan and a succession plan and therefore it is unclear how to evaluate the impact of this expenditure over this period. In addition, sectoral funds have been used almost exclusively (73% of funds spent on capacity building) for human resource development of SFA staff. Given that there is now a Ministry dedicated to fisheries, there is a need to have a human resource development function to develop plans and ensure that the entire sector benefits from these funds.

4.3.1.2 BSc in Fisheries, aquaculture and environmental science with University of Seychelles

The programme for the BSc was developed in September 2011 and the course was delivered as a **BSc in Environment Science with specialisation**. Under the sectoral support, the University of Seychelles was assisted with the human resources to deliver the marine and fisheries science specialization by paying for one lecturer from Spain (Alicante University) for Fisheries and one from Portugal (University of Algarve) for aquaculture, recruited in 2014 and 2015. Offering the marine and fisheries science specialization is not cost-effective unless there is a healthy cohort of candidates opting for that specialization. In addition, there are no local lecturers involved in delivering the specialization and hence the need to recruit expatriate lecturers to offer the course each time. In addition, the cohort sizes are too small because many students including graduates of the Seychelles Maritime Academy (SMA) do not meet the requirements to join a degree course. In 2015, two SFA staff enrolled on the BSc Programme: one on a part time basis to complete this year and another on a fulltime basis who completed in 2016.

4.3.1.3 Management of sectoral support programme

Technical assistance to assist with the management of the sectoral support programme started in 2017 and it was addressed in the 2018-2019 performance audit. The end of period report prepared by the

TA for one payment instalment must include additional details such as lessons learnt, strengths and weaknesses, start and end dates and final project costs. For capital projects funded by the EU, the TA must ensure that the Procurement Section maintains complete files with contracts, payment schedules a certificate of completion to signal the end of all payments for a project and a summary of the features, fixtures and fittings, and final costs capitalized for each project completed. This will allow evaluation of financial efficiency of individual projects and provide information to allow value-for-money evaluation.

We note that the end of period reports at the end of one payment instalment, produced by the TA, overlap with the annual performance audits of the sectoral funds. At the same time, performance audits are being done without proper financial audits: for this performance audit, financial audits for 2017, 2018 and 2019 instalments are not available. An independent financial audit of the utilisation of each payment instalment would be useful as the use of the sectoral funds does not fall neatly into the SFA's budget cycle and would complement the TA's narrative report. This can be supported by special audits of programmes that are not meeting the original intended objective e.g. FDF. This can provide the TA and the SFA more useful information to address non-performance issues. A comprehensive performance audit can then be considered at the end of a protocol period because impact for most of the activities are felt in the medium and long term.

In addition, to ensure timeliness of financial and performance audits, the TA should consider scheduling interim audits before the end of a period, which allows auditors time to collect information in order to complete audits within 3 months of the end of the period.

4.3.1.4 Support to small scale fishermen associations

Over the protocol period, funds were provided to the FBOA and the PFA to assist with office rentals and remuneration of a Secretary which has sustained both these associations. It is important to note that membership of these associations is not representative of the fishermen or boat owners', although they continue to advocate on behalf of fishers and boat owners. It is important that SFA establishes the percentage of beneficiaries represented by these two associations and explore ways to support a majority of the fishers to have a voice when addressing the authorities.

4.3.1.5 Operationalisation of the selling platform initiative at Providence

In 2015, €225,000 was transferred to the FBOA account to support feasibility studies on the viability of a fish centre at the Providence Industrial Fisheries Port. The FBOA wanted to focus on processing and value addition as the way forward to address the issue of fishers who find it hard to sell their fish at times when they have had a very substantial catch. The centre was to offer processing as well as storage facilities to fishermen.

Consultations with the executive members of FBOA have established that studies were conducted and one study was conducted by the World Bank. At the time of completing this audit, we have not had sight of a copy of the reports from these studies. It is claimed that both the FBOA and the World Bank studies established that this facility is a good idea and it could be feasible as a Public-Private Partnership venture. Discussions at the time seemed to indicate that Government was willing to pay for the infrastructure and not the running costs. The FBOA did not progress the project because it was not felt that its revenue would cover the operational costs.

We have been given to understand that there are unspent funds in the FBOA account but unfortunately no accounts have been sent to the SFA and none has been requested. In our opinion, this is not very prudent financial management and we recommend a special audit to establish how the funds have been utilized and also make a plan on how to use the remaining funds.

4.3.1.6 Ancillary training support

Achievements

The training vessel, Virgo II, was bought with funds from the previous protocol and delivered to the Seychelles Maritime Academy (SMA) in March 2014. It forms part of the SFA’s research vessel fleet and SFA has an agreement with the SMA on management of the vessel which provides for the SMA to use the boat for training purposes. The management, maintenance and repairs of the boat are undertaken by the SFA. As part of the agreement, SMA has to provide a plan on the use of the vessel, which allows SFA to track the number of trips done by the vessel, but it is reported that this is not always done.

Over the protocol period, €38,195 of sectoral funds went towards undertaking maintenance on the training vessel. The TA reports indicate a 23% budget utilization for this activity in 2017 and only a 2% utilization in 2018, with no explanation, with major repairs undertaken in 2019. Over that period, SFA has had to loan their research vessel to support SMA at various points which means the original objective of providing a training vessel to aid practical training is not being met.

In addition, the monitoring of this programme is inconsistent. The TA reports from 2016 and 2017 report number of students enrolled but in 2018 and 2019, it reports number of trips and number of students trained despite the target being 200 students enrolled. A proper monitoring and evaluation framework will address this.

Impact

The main challenge with effectively implementing this programme over the protocol period is that the training vessel keeps breaking down and therefore it has not been available for training purposes. The Chief Scientist maintains that if the vessel could be well maintained and the equipment secured, the maintenance costs will decrease and it will be available for continuous use by the SMA.

Given that the training vessel was acquired in March 2014, during this short period, the Chief Fisheries Scientist reports that the generator had to be replaced, the wood is rotted in parts and had to be replaced with fibre glass, the hydraulics has also broken down, there has been equipment theft and consequently the boat could not be fully utilized for the purpose of training. It appears that every year, there have been issues where the boat breaks down and SFA had to assist SMA with its own research vessel.

We therefore recommend a special audit of this programme in order to better understand the challenges in managing this vessel and also the development of a plan of action for a way forward.

4.3.1.7 Equipment/training to support the Fish Sanitary Inspection Unit, Seychelles Bureau of Standards

Throughout the protocol period, €56,842 was spent supporting the FIQCU at the Seychelles Bureau of Standards. Presently, there are 7 approved establishments and 16 approved refrigerated vessels (13 purse seiners & 3 long liners) – they are French & Spanish owned but flying Seychelles Flag. The

Competent authority, i.e. SBS, is responsible to ensure compliance to EU sanitary regulations in relation to fish and fishery product processing and export.

The sectoral funds have helped FIQCU to maintain an acceptable level of service and has ensured its continued survival. Its regular government budget does not cover the supplies required to provide all services to the fisheries industry and the funding has ensured that the FIQCU does not run out of supplies such as computer, toner, paper, thermometers, water test kits in order to issue the health certificates.

This activity has a high impact score because no fish exports to Europe can take place without certification from FIQCU. The Manager pointed out that the application of EU standards in approved establishments and in fish handling, has increased fish processing standards generally and is also benefitting the local market. Building the capacity of FIQCU has contributed to the improved quality and standard of products for export and general sanitation of enterprises including fish landing sites, because all segments of the fisheries value-chain has to be at a very good standard in order to assure fish quality.

This programme is highly relevant because without the FIQCU not even one can of tuna can be exported. In addition, FIQCU assures standards across the entire fisheries value chain and for all the different segments from artisanal, semi-industrial to industrial fisheries, and for most of these licenses are renewable annually, and so the volume of work has increased.

The EU funds has assisted the FIQCU to maintain the level of service that it provides the fisheries industry and this creates confidence among importers who are assured that importation of products from Seychelles is generally of a good standard and therefore it has contributed to maintain and sustain the market for Seychelles' fish abroad.

5 Strategic management issues

5.1 Corporate governance and reporting

Good governance of the sectoral funds would mean that there is a clear process for identifying activities to benefit from this funding which are in line with government policy with clear pre-determined output and impact indicators; there are clear guidelines on how the funds are to be managed; transparent procedures for all processes, accountability obligations are met and the board discharges its oversight functions.

5.1.1 Board of directors

The board was refreshed in 2017 when a new board chairman was appointed and again in February 2020. The implementation of projects using sectoral funds features on the board minutes at different points throughout this period. The board approves the annual sectoral matrices and verbal reports have been presented in the last three years. In addition, a copy of the end of period report prepared by the TA is given to the board. In our view, the board is not being adequately appraised of the progress with implementation of the sectoral plan and budget utilization.

We did not find evidence of board committees that would have ensured processes are in place to address the issues raised in the financial audits of 2015 and 2016 and the performance audit reports over the protocol period. In addition, we did not find evidence that the major procurement decisions relating to implementation of projects worth substantial amounts were being referred to the board. Further, following the change in status to an autonomous entity, we did not find a delegation of authority framework that lays out clearly matters reserved for the board and expenditure thresholds. In our opinion, autonomy gives the board an added responsibility given that other government oversight bodies no longer oversee the management functions of SFA and it is crucial that it structures itself to assume all its fiduciary functions.

5.1.2 Leadership

Over the protocol period, there has been a lot of instability in the leadership of the fisheries sector. The different changes in the leadership and management within the SFA and at the Ministry of Agriculture is detailed at appendix E. Over this period, the sector has seen 5 ministers, 3 chairmen at the helm of the SFA board, 6 Chief executive officers, 5 financial controllers and 4 human resource officers.

To note that changes in leadership in and of itself is not an issue unless there is loss of continuity and momentum in implementation of projects and programmes and if the organization is unable to meet all its obligations. The absence of a financial controller in 2018, has meant that the financial components of the 2017 annual report was not compiled and the financial audits of 2017 and 2018 have been delayed. Despite having had approval to become autonomous in 2018, the autonomy only came into effect in 2019 again because of leadership issues.

Despite the constant leadership changes, there has been an improvement in the management of the sectoral funds and in project implementation, which means that processes within SFA have been strengthened. Following close working with the Ministry in 2019, the change in priorities ensured that community fisheries infrastructure were prioritized under priority 2 in line with government policy.

Dynamism in the careers of senior leaders is acknowledged, however, it is important to ensure that there is a succession plan within the SFA and an emphasis on management and business training for its senior and middle managers enabling them to be able to step in and ensure no disruption in the running of the organization. Robust processes are also required.

5.1.3 Planning

1. Over the protocol period, preparation of the plan of action to use sectoral funds remained ad-hoc, historical (based on activities that had been included in the past) and has not been part of SFA-wide-coordinated, budgeting and finance processes. In addition, despite its objective of supporting the implementation of the national fisheries policy, it was only in 2019 that the Fisheries Department got involved in the identification of priority projects to be funded. In the absence of multi-annual detailed plans for the fisheries sector with clear output and impact indicators, planning is based on wish lists and matrices focus on inputs and output indicators and performance information is limited to budget and project execution.
2. During this period, there does not appear to have been adequate accounting and finance oversight of the sectoral funds. The finance section of the SFA has not been involved in the financial planning for the use of the sectoral funds and there is no evidence that the budget utilization reports issued throughout the period, have been verified by them. This has led to misreporting of budget utilization in a couple of instances and sub-optimal financial planning where the funds remain unspent whilst units have run out of funds to implement their activities which are supported by the sectoral funds. In addition, there is duplication in the maintenance of budget utilization records; since 2017, this is done by the TA and also since 2019, the finance section has been keeping accounting records relating to the use of the sectoral funds. This issue was addressed in the 2018-2019 performance audit which looked at the issue of increasing the value-added of the TA.
3. Another issue that requires accounting and finance oversight is the sectoral funds transferred to third party accounts. During the protocol period, €225,000 and more recently SCR8M were transferred to the accounts of FBOA and SMA respectively. In both instances, there is no agreement or accountability framework in place. In our view, any portion of the sectoral funds have to be afforded the same standard of governance to ensure that the funds are used for the objectives for which they were given and are properly accounted for.
4. An issue for consideration is should SFA, an administratively and financially autonomous entity be the initiator and coordinator of the planning process to identify activities for funding with sectoral funds? There is a risk that the process is less strategic and exclude priority areas in the fisheries value chain e.g. exclusion of FIQCU in 2019 which was reversed by the board or that it focuses on its own priorities such as using the funds to plug its revenue shortfall. There is evidence that in 2019, the involvement of the Fisheries Department in identifying project activities redirected project priorities especially for district infrastructure projects. However, the SFA now has increased capacity to manage the sectoral funds: a TA dedicated to this, a well-structured finance section and competent procurement staff and the Deputy CEO who now has four years' experience in overseeing management of the funds. On the other hand, the new government has set up a Ministry with sole responsibility for fisheries, which provides an opportunity to ensure that its structures itself to assume all policy oversight functions.

5.1.4 Reporting

Over the protocol period, there have been serious delays in production of various reports and a certain laxity in meeting some accountability obligations. The fisheries statistics report is late not because of lack of information but more as a result of implementation of new software where some information is not as up to date, which means reports could not be published with partial information. There are plans to remedy this by the end of 2020. However, there does not seem to be much attention paid to the fact that the SFA is unable to produce biannual economic analyses and none have been produced over the protocol period. The economic situation as a result of the COVID-19, provides an opportunity to highlight the importance of the fisheries sector to the local economy. However, without proper reports, the only information on fisheries is found within the available SFA annual report, which is outdated.

Consideration needs to be given to economic analyses being undertaken in the Ministry of Fisheries, given that there is now a fully-fledged Policy Unit populated with Policy Analysts and since economic analyses forms part of policy analysis. This would also allow taking a holistic view of the fisheries sector. Production of the SFA annual report and the audited financial statements are basic accountability requirements for which SFA management needs to make plans to erase the delays.

5.2 Capacity building

Over the protocol period, the capacity of the SFA to deliver on its mandate and also to manage the sectoral funds have been improved.

1. Its modernised Fisheries Management Information System (FMIS) has streamlined the number of platforms to capture data on the various fishery and has improved timeliness, reliability and accessibility of fisheries information and enabled Seychelles to comply with its present obligations and increased its capacity to comply with additional obligations in future;
2. It has used the data generated to establish management measures for different fisheries e.g. IOTC quota system for Yellow fin tuna, the Demersal Management Plan on the Mahe Plateau, the shark National Plan of Action, and lobster and sea cucumber fishery management plans.
3. It is able to implement the scientific observer programme and is able to monitor activities of fishing vessels within the Seychelles EEZ and ensure that Seychelles flagged vessels do not fish illegally in other EEZs or fish in the high seas without authorization.
4. It has collaborated with local and international partners to better target the sectoral programme, implement activities, increase the reach of programmes and increase its own capacity;
5. It received TA to manage the sectoral funds, it has a fully-fledged finance team, an accounting software to manage the accounts and have better financial reporting and this is all being supervised by the Deputy CEO.

5.3 Networking and Partnerships

1. SFA worked with international and local organisations to implement some of the activities over the protocol period. Of note is the collaboration with the Fisheries Department which became a fully fledged Ministry of Fisheries in November 2020. This has ensured better targeting of sectoral support to address national priorities. A Technical Committee has been set up with representatives of the Ministry and SFA to coordinate activities with policy decisions. The SFA and the Ministry

should work out terms of engagement to minimize political overreach in the regulatory work of the authority whilst still ensuring that the work of the SFA implements government policy.

2. SFA also worked with the following national bodies: fishers NGOs -the Fishermen, Boat Owners' Association, FBOA, Praslin Fishers Association, PFA; government institutions – Seychelles Bureau of Standards, FIQCU, SBS, Seychelles Maritime Academy (SMA), University of Seychelles, Unisey. One of the very notable successes is the work done in collaboration with stakeholders on sea cucumber stock management and development of the fisheries management plans. SFA should ensure that these gains are sustained over the next agreement period.
3. SFA has also signed an MOU with the Seychelles Coast Guard and the Seychelles Air Force in order to conduct joint patrols and also for these two military forces to respond after which SFA reimburses the costs of patrols. MCS has also been conducting joint patrols with NDEA, the Coast Guard and the Marine Police targeting illegal fishing in coastal areas.
4. Collaboration with financial institutions need to be increased over the next agreement period to promote the facilities available to entrepreneurs in the fisheries sector. A review of the agreement with DBS to bring clarity and improve management of the Fisheries Development Fund is warranted. Discussions with insurance companies to explore ways to promote the fisheries insurance scheme and support businesses to lower their operational costs and have increased protection for their business. Collaboration has to extend to all insurance companies rather than be limited to Sacos and H Savy Insurance.
5. EU funding allowed SFA staff to participate in workshops organised by the IOTC, IOC, SWIOFC, etc. As a member of the IOTC, Seychelles has many obligations as a licensed state, coastal state, flag state, and port state, therefore, EU funding has allowed Seychelles to meet its obligations, contributing towards the conservation and management of tuna and tuna-like species.
6. The Indian Ocean Commission, IOC, matches the number of national patrols conducted by the SFA with regional patrols. SFA has to conduct a number of regional patrols as part of its obligations as a member of IOC. EU funding has enabled SFA to conduct national patrols and IOC has matched these and funded regional patrols which have allowed SFA to meet its obligations to the IOC to eradicate illegal fishing.
7. The Institut de Recherche et de Développement, IRD, also collaborated with SFA and provides technical training for SFA fisheries scientists and statisticians. Over the protocol period, the SFA worked with IRD to develop software as part of the modernization of the fisheries Management Information System. SFA collaborated with IRD and OCUP to train its observers as well as other international consultants to train its staff. The SFA will now work with SWIOFISH to develop a module for sports fishery.

5.4 Policy Implementation

Senior managers within the SFA and at the Ministry of Fisheries confirm that implementation of the sectoral support programme over the protocol period has been instrumental in supporting implementation of government policies.

1. Availability of data and statistics have enabled measures to promote conservation and sustainable management of fisheries resources;
2. Implementation of the scientific observer programme and implementation of the aquaculture brood stock facility is creating additional employment opportunities for young people trained at technician level;

3. Use of the sectoral funds has taken Seychelles closer to launching of the aquaculture industry, which meets the objective of diversification away from artisanal and industrial fisheries which are felt to have matured and is now subject to increased controls. It has facilitated further diversification through value-addition by building fish processing facilities at Providence Fishing Port and at Bel Ombre and through developing recipes to promote the use of lower value fish and by training entrepreneurs on the HCCAP method.
4. The funds have contributed to improving existing fisheries by improving artisanal fisheries infrastructure such as district markets, improved the comfort of fishermen by building gear stores and improve access to inputs by installing ice plants and fuel stations in districts.
5. **Promote safety at sea:** Through strengthening of the Monitoring, Control and Surveillance activities, it has increased Seychelles capacity to better regulate IUU activities and also detect illegal fishing around the coast.
6. Stakeholders remark that provision of roads and other utilities on the industrial tuna fishing quay at Isle de Port, is taking Seychelles closer to realizing government's policy to maintain Port Victoria as the number one tuna handling and transshipment port in the Western Indian Ocean.

6 Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

1. Over the protocol period, the SFA spent €16.6M of funds supplied for sectoral support representing 94% of the funds available to spend. There has been increased efficiency in budget utilisation over this period compared to the previous period related to an improvement in its management capacity.
2. Implementation of the activities under sectoral support has built the capacity of the SFA to deliver on its mandate as a regulator of the fisheries sector as well as building the capacity in the rest of the fisheries value-chain. In addition, the issues related to SFA's capacity to manage the sectoral funds have been largely addressed except for accounting and financial oversight of budget utilization and board oversight which warrant some attention.
3. The planning process to identify activities to fund under sectoral support was ad-hoc, historic and SFA-centric and based on what had been done in the past. The participation of the Ministry of Fisheries in planning for the use of the funds, allowed identification of district fisheries infrastructure as a priority which were included on the 2019 sectoral programme. Despite the development of a new fisheries policy and comprehensive plan in 2019, there is no multi-annual implementation plans or resource plans to guide planning at the fisheries sector level. In addition, there is no monitoring and evaluation framework for the fisheries policy which makes performance evaluation challenging.
4. Implementation of activities under the sectoral support has implemented government policies in fisheries by:
 - Modernizing the Fisheries Information System which has enabled the Seychelles to comply with its international obligations as a port state, flag state, license state and coastal state;
 - Developing fisheries management plans and fisheries legislation that contribute to sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources;

- Facilitating diversification of activities through promoting value addition and preparing for the launching of the aquaculture industry, it contributes to maximize employment and revenue from fisheries and fisheries related activities.
 - Improving the capacity of the SFA to regulate the bigger ocean, providing skills for more people to join the fisheries sector and building the capacity of stakeholders to interface with government.
 - Building community fisheries infrastructure to improve fishermen's comfort and make inputs more accessible and facilitated the building of roads to the industrial fisheries port at Isle du Port to operationalize this infrastructure.
5. The planning for the performance audit of the use of the sectoral funds is being done late and the time allocated to have this done is inadequate. In addition, not enough attention is given to investigating problematic programmes such as the implementation of the FDF and making recommendations for resolution. There is also an overlap between the end of period reports produced by the TA and the terms of reference for the annual performance audits of the sectoral funds and the absence of an M&E framework for the fisheries policy makes impact assessment challenging.

6.2 Recommendations

It is acknowledged that many of the issues with the implementation of activities with sectoral support funds have started to be addressed and we recommend the following:

1. Given that a new fisheries policy and comprehensive plan were developed towards the end of the protocol period, there is a need to review the planning process and the planning matrix to ensure that it captures the priorities laid out in the new fisheries policy and comprehensive plan. The participation of the Ministry of Fisheries in the planning and management of the implementation of the sectoral programme is imperative and such engagement should be subject to a clear framework to prevent over-reach and micro-management. The Ministry of Fisheries should develop a monitoring and evaluation framework with predetermined impact indicators to improve performance monitoring and impact assessment. Future sectoral programme matrices should embed impact indicators to guide performance evaluations.
2. Strengthen policy oversight of the planning for the use of the sectoral funds. In addition to M&E, the Ministry should make available detailed multi-annual plans for infrastructure and other resource plans e.g. human resources, to aid planning. The Ministry should consider including production of economic analyses and reports as part of its policy development function and set up a human resource development unit to systematically address capacity building for the fisheries sector.
3. We wish to reiterate a recommendation of the 2018/2019 performance audit to consolidate the management gains made during this protocol period and make better use of the TA. In addition to more detailed and frequent narrative and budget utilisation reports, the TA must ensure that complete records are available for all infrastructure projects in order to establish total project costs and assess financial efficiency and value for money. In addition, the Finance section must become involved at all stages of planning to use the sectoral funds in order to improve accounting and finance oversight of the funds.
4. The EU should consider rationalizing the need for annual performance audits of the sectoral funds given the TA's end of period reports and consider instituting independent financial audits of each year's instalment to complement the TA's narrative reports supported by special audits for specific programmes. A comprehensive performance audit can then be undertaken at the end of a protocol

period because impact for most activities is felt in the medium and long term. To ensure timeliness of financial and performance audits, consider scheduling interim audits before the end of a period to allow auditors adequate time to complete the exercise within 3 months of the end of a period.

5. In line with our recommendation for the conduct of special audits, we also recommend that the Fisheries Development Plan, the Selling platform initiative started by FBOA and the Training Vessel Virgo II are the subject of special audits in 2021. This can provide useful information to better understand the issues surrounding implementation of these projects/programmes and preparation of a plan of action to address them.
6. We strongly recommend stopping the practice of transferring funds to third party accounts without a proper accountability framework and urge the SFA to prepare an agreement for the management of the funds transferred to FBOA and SMA. The agreement should provide for the regular submission of accounts on the funds outstanding and reports on fund utilisation. These funds should be subject to the end of period, independent financial audits and occasional special audits.
7. We would like to reiterate two recommendations from the 2018/2019 performance audits:
 - I. The board should structure itself to ensure it assumes all its fiduciary duties especially given the corporatization of SFA now that is an autonomous entity. The setting up of an Audit and Risk Committee is urgent to ensure that there is a proper process to address risks identified in the various audit reports. We also recommend urgent recruitment of an internal auditor.
 - II. SFA organizes itself to erase the backlog in accountability obligations and set a deadline date by which the backlog in the preparation of annual reports and financial audit reports should be erased and put in place a process to ensure timely preparation and submission of reports in future. The delay also means that the sectoral funds spent in 2017 through to 2019 lay unaudited at this point. SFA should bear in mind, that non-compliance to basic accountability requirements goes to the reputation of the organisation.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERFORMANCE AUDIT EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECTORAL SUPPORT PROVIDED FOR THE EU/SEYCHELLES FISHERIES PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT FOR THE 2018 & 2019 INSTALMENTS AND FOR THE PROTOCOL PERIOD COVERING 2014 - 2020

Objective

The objective of this consultancy is to undertake an independent audit to evaluate the implementation of the Sectoral Support provided under the Protocol and to provide assurance to the parties that the funds are being utilized economically, efficiently and effectively.

The audit is to assess and evaluate the performance of the SFA vis-à-vis the execution of activities approved by the EU and the Seychelles for the calendar years in relation to the allocated budget and the impact of the Sectoral Support within the stipulated Protocol.

The assessment is to provide information to both the Seychelles and the EU to improve accountability and facilitate decision-making by both parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action in relation to the implementation of programmes under the sectoral support fund.

Background and Context

The Seychelles Fishing Authority (SFA) was established under the Seychelles Fishing Authority Act 10 of 1984, with a mission to regulate and promote the conservation and sustainable management of marine resources in order to ensure long term viability of the industry. The vision for the fisheries sector in the Seychelles is “Develop fisheries to its full potential whilst safeguarding the marine environment and resource base for sustainability”.

It is anticipated that this will be achieved via the:

- Good governance and institutional strengthening
- Sustainable management of fisheries and climate resilience
- Infrastructure support and value chain development
- Building efficiency in the industry
- Investment and economic growth
- Seychellois stake-holding in the industrial fisheries sector
- Employment, training, resourcing and human resource development
- Strengthening Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
- Research and innovation in the fisheries sector and aquaculture
- Sustainable development of aquaculture

Fisheries Partnership Agreement between Seychelles and the European Union

The EU/Seychelles Fisheries Partnership Agreement being referred to for the purpose of this performance audit covered the period of 2nd November 2013 to 1st November 2019. Its Protocol ran over a period of six years, which started on 18th January 2014 and ended on 17th January 2020. The Protocol provided for a total amount of EUR 30.7 million. The contribution comprised of:

- An annual amount for access to Seychelles' EEZ of EUR 2.75 million for the first and second years of the application of the Protocol and EUR 2.5 for the remaining years (three to six), equivalent to a reference tonnage of 50,000 tonnes per year, and
- A specific amount of EUR 2.6 million for the first and second years of application of the Protocol, and EUR 2.5 million for the remaining years (three to six) for the support and implementation of Seychelles' sectoral fisheries policy and marine policy.

During the Protocol years, the EU-Seychelles Joint Committee as established under Article 8 of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement adopted annual work programme for the sectoral support equivalent to the yearly amount provided for under the Protocol. The areas of priorities identified were as follows:

- i. Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans;
- ii. Fisheries infrastructure development for artisanal and industrial sectors; and
- iii. Capacity building.

Scope of Work

The Consultant is to provide recommendations on whether significant improvements in implementation of the fisheries and maritime sectoral programme has been made, and that funds have been utilized promptly, economically, efficiently and effectively. In so doing, the Consultant, will assess the operations of SFA, on its:

- Current performance: Determine whether the existing structure, systems and processes (current model) are the most effective way of carrying out the functions of SFA, in the implementation of the fisheries and maritime sector programme.
- Future performance: If the current functions are confirmed as the most appropriate delivery mechanism, then look at how mechanisms and functions, (project initiation, planning, management and procurement procedures) that could improve implementation performance.
- Corporate Governance and reporting: How well are the SFA Management and Board roles and reporting arrangements defined? How could this be improved? Do they provide proper support to operational functions? Establish whether the

current accountability arrangements are appropriate given the role and risks associated with the work of SFA.

- Policy Implementation: To what extent does the implementation of the fisheries and sectoral programme meet the Government's fisheries policy and objectives? How can it be improved to better help in the attainment of the fisheries policy and objectives?
- Networking & Partnerships: What links does, or should, SFA have with other organisations (local or overseas) for faster implantation and greater impact? Where could the SFA develop joint-working arrangements with other bodies to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme execution?
- Stakeholders' views: The assessment is to consider the views of stakeholders, beneficiaries from the support fund, NGOs, civil societies in identifying how to improve the programme implementation, economy, efficiency and transparency in fund utilization. Identify areas of development that could be financed from the fund for the benefit of the sector at large.

Desired Outcome

An Authority through innovative practices which can provide prompt, reliable services whereby the results of its services and programmes contribute towards:

- Stronger service mechanism for the Authority's functions;
- Improved transparency; and
- Improved and strengthened systems attaining the objectives of the fisheries policy.

Resources

The Seychelles Fishing Authority shall provide the Consultant with meeting facilities when it is required to meet with small groups of stakeholders.

Appendix B: List of persons consulted

Table 1: List of persons consulted

Name	Designation
Mr Cyril Bonnelame	Chairman & Chief Executive Officer (up to 30 th September 2020)
Mr Nichol Elizabeth	Chief Executive Officer, SFA (from September 2020)
Mr Calvin Gerry	Deputy Chief Executive Officer, SFA
Mrs Nan Constant	Manager International Corporation, SFA
Mr Roy Clarisse	Special Advisor, Ministry of Fisheries
Mr Vincent Lucas	Chief Fisheries Scientist, Fisheries Management
Ms Sandra Rajoelina	Procurement Manager, SFA
Mr Michel Marguerite	Chief Fisheries Economist, SFA
Mr Aubrey Lesperance	Manager Aquaculture, SFA
Ms Sara Fanchette	Management Accountant, SFA
Mrs Julienne Roseline	Director Human Resources, SFA
Ms Selma Edmond	Senior Human Resources & Budget Management Officer, SFA
Mrs Juliette Lucas	Manager Statistics, SFA
Mr Johnny Louys	Manager Monitoring Control and Surveillance Section, SFA
Mr Ronny Antat	Manager, SFA
Mr Rodney Govinden	Chief Fisheries Scientist, SFA
Mr Andrew Bristol	Project Manager, SFA
Mr Georgie Nicette	Manager Infrastructure Management & Development, SFA
Mrs Denise Mathiot	Information Administrator, SFA
Mr Paul Laurence	Financial Controller
Mr Jude Talma	Principal Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries
Mr Christopher Hoareau	Chief Fish Inspector, Seychelles Bureau of Standards
Mr Jean Claude Hoareau	Investor, Executive Committee Member, FBOA
Mr Beatty Hoareau	Investor, Executive Committee Member, FBOA
Mr William Jacobs	Fisherman and Boat owner
Mr Vivek Vasu	Seychelles Maritime Academy
Christabelle Rose	SFA Officer, La Digue
<i>From Development Bank of Seychelles</i>	
Mr Daniel Gappy	Chief Executive Officer
Ms Rana Fernandez	Head of Credit
Mrs Jennifer Loizeau	Head of Risk, Legal and Compliance
Ms Diana Bonnelame	Credit Manager
Ms Maria Vielle	Recovery Manager
Ms Sharifa Morel	Economist, Ministry of Fisheries
Ms Stephanie Radegonde	Policy Analyst, Ministry of Fisheries

Table 2: List of fishermen interviewed for impact assessment of fisheries infrastructure

Name	Designation	Location
Thomas Adrienne	Fisherman boat owner	La Digue
Andrew Payet	Fisherman boat owner	La Digue
Ernest Constance	Fishing boat skipper	La Digue
Rony Jacques	Fisherman	La Digue
Marcel Figaro	Fisherman boat owner	La Digue
Jeval Radegonde	Fisherman boat owner	La Digue
Donald Gabriel	Fisherman boat owner.	Anse Aux Pins
Sam Esther	Fisherman	Anse Aux Pins
Larry Barbe	Fisherman boat owner	Anse Aux Pins
Andy Didon	Fisherman	Anse Aux Pins
Guy (Tapon) Esparon	Fisherman boat owner	Anse Aux Pins
Carl Bison	Fisherman boat owner	Cascade
Cliva Dine	Fisherman	Cascade
Michel Hoareau	Fisherman	Cascade
Dylan Marie	Fisherman	Cascade
Samuel Asman	Fisherman	Cascade
Michel Savy	Fisherman boat owner	La Retraite
Greg Sinon	Fisherman boat owner	La Retraite
Ryan Banane	Fisherman boat owner	La Retraite
Danny Lalanne	Fisherman boat owner	La Retraite
James Cupidon	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
James Sanders	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
Rodney Niccole	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
Benilda Sanders	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
Christophe Bistoquet	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
Dany Henriette	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
Keith Gabriel	Fisherman boat owner	Bel Ombre
Fred Hoareau	Fish Processor	Bel Ombre
Louis Bossy	Director	Ocean Basket
Darell Green	Praslin Fishers Association	Praslin
Arthur de Bretagne	General Manager	Central Common Cold Store Ltd.

Appendix C: Fund utilisation

Table 3: Funds utilisation by priority area

Project/Programme Area	Activities	2,014 EUR	2,015 EUR	2,016 EUR	2,017 EUR	2,018 EUR	2,019 EUR	TOTAL EUR
1. Development and implementation of fisheries and aquaculture management plans								
1.1. Monitoring of the tuna fishing activities in the EEZ of Seychelles -	Data collection, processing, dissemination, publications and subscriptions to scientific reviews.	178,480	220,476	73,464	52,997	42,072	75,576	643,066
1.2 Monitoring of the Fisheries Development Fund under the Development Bank of Seychelles (DBS)	Loan schemes provided for local fisheries investors involved in semi-industrial fishing, processing & value-addition	210,861	286,973	386,990	175,712	44,902	14,311	1,119,750
1.3 Development and implementation of National Fisheries Management Plans	1.3.1 Implementation and adjustment of the management plans in collaboration with stakeholders and experts	37,173	7,736	818	995	12,888	6,510	66,119
	1.3.2 Scientific surveys, applied research and observer programme			222,183	144,261	246,639	150,630	763,713
1.4 Development and implementation of the Aquaculture Managements Plan	Development and implementation of the aquaculture master plan	7,082	6,028	132,466	53,284	176,871	170,143	545,874
1.5 Post harvest development and value addition	Applied research and advice to support local private sector processing initiatives	205,163	248,790	37,240	71,345	61,471	27,050	651,059

Project/Programme Area	Activities	2,014 EUR	2,015 EUR	2,016 EUR	2,017 EUR	2,018 EUR	2,019 EUR	TOTAL EUR
1.6 Monitoring, Control, Surveillance & enforcement	1.6.1 Air and sea patrols	27,016	51,164	34,341	163,909	215,746	252,652	744,829
	1.6.2 VMS Monitoring and compliance.	139,711	37,755	150,704	96,978	215,056	151,374	791,579
	1.6.3 Safety at sea communication systems			69,698	113,057	-	112,041	294,796
	1.6.4 MCS Office extension	5,487	6,199	31,482	100,730	176,406	14,387	334,692
	1.6.7 VMS data	156,412	185,879					342,291
	1.6.8 safety at sea comm. N systems	28,489	56,748					85,237
	1.6.9 portable VMS	19,984	19,025					39,009
PRIORITY 1: TOTAL		1,015,859	1,126,773	1,139,386	973,270	1,192,051	974,674	6,422,014
PRIORITY 2: FISHERIES INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT for artisanal and industrial sectors								
2.1 Fish processing and increased value addition of fish products landed in Seychelles	2.1.1 Artisanal infrastructure projects/Bel Ombre		171,205	134,804	81,007	57,020	170,269	614,305
	2.1.2 Artisanal infrastructure projects/Providence Zone 6	657,791	234,415	462,519	773,260	427,640	16,007	2,571,631
	2.1.3 Support fishing communities in districts	67,584	193,880	465,343	324,320	143,992	599,069	1,794,188
	2.1.4 Ice plants installation/maintenance	5,853	172,524	64,398	43,575	99,003	99,985	485,337

Project/Programme Area	Activities	2,014 EUR	2,015 EUR	2,016 EUR	2,017 EUR	2,018 EUR	2,019 EUR	TOTAL EUR
2.2 Maintain Port Victoria as the Major tuna landing /transshipment port in the Western Indian Ocean	Tuna purse seine infrastructure	122,320	183,464	99,257	17,827	-	-	422,869
PRIORITY 2: TOTAL		853,548	955,488	1,226,321	1,239,988	727,655	885,330	5,888,331
PRORITY 3: CAPACITY BUILDING								
3.1 Human resources development	Implementation of the SFA training plan	188,765	99,328	203,193	132,571	226,602	100,309	950,768
3.2 Technical Assistance	Management of sectoral support programme	19,480	59,228	27,832	20,435	35,579	33,197	195,752
3.3 Participation in international, regional and bilateral forums	Participation in and hosting international meetings and forums	152,178	101,591	135,436	130,037	211,678	52,386	783,306
3.4 Contribution for improved facilities and functioning to fisheries related bodies and organisations	3.4.1 Equipment/training to support the Fish Sanitary Inspection Unit (Seychelles Bureau of Standards	6,455	15,774	10,556	10,000	6,334	7,723	56,842
	3.4.2 Support to the small-scale fishermen association	58,500	179,209	19,214	9,992	14,783	10,035	291,733
	3.4.3 Ancillary training support		9,771	5,772	233	21,209	1,210	38,195
other		89,343	2,328					91,671
PRIORITY 3: TOTAL		514,721	467,230	402,004	303,268	516,185	204,860	2,408,268
PRIORITY 4: COVID 19 RESPONSE PROGRAMME								
4.1 Ice programme for Artisanal fishers							-	

Project/Programme Area	Activities	2,014 EUR	2,015 EUR	2,016 EUR	2,017 EUR	2,018 EUR	2,019 EUR	TOTAL EUR
4.2 Purchase and sale of artisanal fish							-	
4.3 Monitoring, Control & Surveillance of Artisanal fishers							161,121	161,121
4.4 Food security programme								
PRIORITY 4: TOTAL		-	-	-	-	-	161,121	161,121
Adjustment For omission of expenditure				1,692,215	28,794		54,604	
TOTAL		2,384,128	2,549,491	2,767,712	2,516,526	2,435,891	2,225,985	
Total as per PA REPORT		2,384,187	2,549,491	2,767,711	2,516,526	2,435,891	2,171,381	

Source: Agreed records of Joint Committee Meetings & SFA.

Annex D– Example of a standard interview guide that was used for the recording the response of project beneficiaries

Name of interviewee:		Interviewer:
Position:		Date:
Location	La Retraite	
Activity 2.1.3.5	Reclamation/Provision for power supply and additional civil works	
Deliverable(s)/ Targets	Quay facilities and loading shed	
Verification source:	Site visit	
Activity's relevance		
<i>How would you rate the relevance of this project for the La Retraite fishing community? Use Low, Medium and High.</i>		
<i>What is the reasoning behind your score?</i>		
<i>What could SFA have done to improve the relevance of this activity?</i>		
Activity's impacts		
<i>What has been the impact of the completion of the project?</i>		
<i>Are there any impacts that were not intended at the start of the project?</i>		
<i>What positive impact would you say this activity has had? Use Low, Medium and High.</i>		
<i>For the La Retraite Fishing community would you say that it was the best use of the site?</i>		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>What is the reason for your answer?</i>		
<i>Would you say there was enough communication from SFA about this project and its intended benefits?</i>		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>If No, what would you recommend to SFA?</i>		
<i>What could SFA have done better to improve the impact of this project?</i>		
General comments		
Do you have any other comments on the implementation of this activity?		

Appendix E: Leadership changes at SFA & Ministry of Fisheries 2014 to November 2020

POST	Minister responsible for fisheries	Board chairman	Chief Executive Officer	Financial Controller	Human Resources Manager
2014	May 2011 Peter Sinon	Philippe Michaud	Vincent Lucas	(Sept/Oct 2012) Angele Lebon	Oct 2010 to Sept 2014 Bernadette Julie
2015	Peter Sinon	Philippe Michaud	Roy Clarisse	Angele Lebon	Acting Selma June 2015- Suzanne Dubignon
2016	October -Michael Benstrong	Philippe Michaud	December- Bernard Arnephy	April 2016 Angele Lebon April 2016- Peggy Nassib	Suzanne Dubignon
2017	July 2017 Pamela Charlette	May-Nirmal Jivan Shah	May-Ronny Renaud	Oct 2017 Peggy Nassib left Oct 2017 Pearl Nalletamby	April 2017- Suzanne Dubignon
2018	26 April 2018 Bastienne	Nirmal Jivan Shah	Ronny Renaud	~April : Pearl Nalletamby left Feb-mid Aug: no FC Aug-Dec: Havila Melanie-Acting	Acting Selma Jan-Jun: No HRM July-Gelaze Hoareau
2019	Bastienne	Nirmal Jivan Shah	April R Renaud Left	Jan: Paul Laurence	Dec – Gelaze Hoareau left
2020	Oct: Jean Francois Ferrari	January - Nirmal Jivan Shah left Feb --Cyril Bonnelame	Mar – Sept: Cyril Bonnelame September – present: Nichol Elizabeth	Paul Laurence (Medical Leave) Act: Sara Fanchette	Jessie Roseline

