

JICA's Cooperation with Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC)



Project Sites Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore

1. Background and Objectives of Evaluation

Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) is an international organization that was established in 1967. Since its establishment, Japan has contributed to establish and strengthen the system and functions of SEAFDEC through continuous support in terms of both financial contribution and technical cooperation (experts dispatch, acceptance of trainees, and provision of equipment).

However, in recent years there has been a growing demand in Japan for more efficient and effective ODA project execution. With respect to more than thirty years of continuous cooperation from JICA to SEAFDEC, it is time to re-examine effects to date and plans for the future.

For this evaluation, in order to gain a third party perspective, Professor Tsuneo Sugishita of Ibaraki University was asked to lead the evaluation team¹⁾. Professor Sugishita has a rich knowledge of Japan's ODA projects, and also serves as a Board Member of the Japan Evaluation Society. Professor Kohei Kihara of Tokyo University of Fisheries was asked to evaluate from the technical standpoint of the fisheries field. Professor Kihara has a great deal of experience as a JICA expert, and also serves as a technical advisor for the Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV).

2. Evaluated Projects

- (1) Long-term experts dispatch (139 experts) and short-term experts dispatch (96 experts) through JICA from FY1968 to FY2000. (Data for short-term experts only available after FY1978.)
- (2) Acceptance of SEAFDEC staff members (234 members) dispatched to Japan as trainees from FY1976 to FY2000.

- (3) Provision of equipment.

3. Members of Evaluation Team

Team Leader:

Tsuneo SUGISHITA, Professor, College of Humanities, Ibaraki University

Marine Techniques:

Kohei KIHARA, Professor, Dept. of Ocean Studies, Tokyo University of Fisheries

Evaluation Planning:

Yoshitaka SUMI, Deputy Director, Office of Evaluation and Post-Project Monitoring, Planning and Evaluation Department, JICA

Evaluation Planning:

Takuo KARASAWA, Office of Evaluation and Post-Project Monitoring, Planning and Evaluation Department, JICA

Impact Analysis:

Shigeru KOBAYASHI, System Science Consultants Ltd.

4. Period of Evaluation

20 March 2001 – 7 April 2001

5. Framework of Evaluation

<Evaluation Method>

Before field study was conducted, references were made through questionnaires with concerned departments of the SEAFDEC secretariat. During the field study, inter-

¹⁾ The full report consists of the report of the evaluation team, comments from SEAFDEC, and comments from JICA experts who were dispatched to SEAFDEC at the time of evaluation. Therefore, opinions in this report are a summary of each opinion.

views were carried out with the people concerned.

<Viewpoint of technical evaluation and criteria>

When technical cooperation projects are carried out, it is important that techniques introduced to solve problems or meet social demand, not only conform with existing techniques, but, more importantly, employ methods so that the recipient organizations can apply and generate new techniques by themselves through application. Therefore, in this evaluation, the following points were noted:

- 1) issues in Southeast Asia at the time of SEAFDEC establishment and social needs toward SEAFDEC activities;
- 2) basic principles of SEAFDEC for resolving issues and its precondition and level of problem solution;
- 3) types of techniques necessary for input for the purpose of realization and goal achievement and related qualities and quantity;
- 4) necessary techniques to input, the input range, methods of input and extension to achieve the goal;
- 5) planning, management system and method of implementation in SEAFDEC;
- 6) degree of extension of the input techniques, entrenching, fusion with existing techniques, and congeniality with various conditions;
- 7) effectiveness and relevance;
- 8) self-inspection and method for review; and
- 9) sustainability of SEAFDEC as an international organization.

6. Evaluation Results

(1) History of JICA's Cooperation with SEAFDEC

SEAFDEC was established in 1967 to promote fisheries activities in Southeast Asia by training piscatorial technicians and conducting research on fishery techniques and fishery resources. In the latter half of the 1960s, it was necessary in the Southeast Asian countries for an increase in food supply, improvement in the level of nutrition, and especially an increase in the supply of animal protein. Therefore, promotion of fisheries development was an

extremely important issue. At the time of establishment, there were only three member countries. Currently, the following ten countries are members: Japan, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, Vietnam, Myanmar, Indonesia, and Cambodia. The techniques developed or accumulated at SEAFDEC are extended to the member countries mainly through training of government officers dispatched from those countries. The trainees are expected to become mainstay technicians or members of training institutions in their respective countries after completing the training in SEAFDEC.

Departments of SEAFDEC are spread throughout different countries. The SEAFDEC Secretariat and the Training Department (TD) are located in Thailand, the Marine Fisheries Research Department (MFRD) in Singapore, the Aquaculture Department (AQD) in the Philippines, and the Marine Fishery Resource Development and Management Division (MFRDMD) in Malaysia. The board consists of members selected one each from each member country.

JICA's assistance with SEAFDEC involved expert dispatch and acceptance of trainees. There have been 235 experts dispatched since 1968, and the fields of training have changed in line with Southeast Asian fisheries trends and the fishery policy of each government. The evaluations of JICA experts dispatched to SEAFDEC have always been high, since the technical level and results of the projects have been satisfactory. The areas of expertise of long-term and short-term JICA experts vary, and include many areas in marine science and techniques. This means that through SEAFDEC, most areas of marine-related techniques have been introduced to the Southeast Asia region.

Among the long-term experts, there is an expert in each department who serve as a Deputy Chief. SEAFDEC regards the Deputy Chief's role as largely administrative, while it also requires them to have expertise in their respective departments.

The number of trainees dispatched to Japan from 1976 to 2000 totals 234. The majority was dispatched up to 1985, and the number has been declining rapidly since then. One

Actual numbers of JICA Experts Dispatch (FY1968 – FY2000)

| Department | Experts dispatched | | | Expert-monthes (man - month) | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|-------|------------------------------|------------|-------|
| | long-term | short-term | Total | long-term | short-term | Total |
| Training Department (TD) | 64 | 35 | 99 | 2,660 | 102 | 2,762 |
| Marine Fisheries Research Department (MFRD) | 38 | 15 | 53 | 1,481 | 40 | 1,521 |
| Aquaculture Department (AQD) | 30 | 16 | 46 | 1,194 | 32 | 1,226 |
| Marine Fishery Resource Development and Management Department (MFRDMD) | 7 | 30 | 37 | 288 | 46 | 334 |
| Total | 139 | 96 | 235 | 5,623 | 220 | 5,843 |

of the reasons for this decline is the selection system. The trainees are usually selected within a pre-set number of trainees of the country where each department is located. Therefore, there were many cases where, even when SEAFDEC requested training in Japan, other training programs were given a higher priority in the selection process by the government of the country where the SEAFDEC departments were located, and the application was declined within the country. In recent years, due to a reduction in JICA's budget, the number of trainees from the international organizations has also been decreasing. This could be another reason for the decline of the number of trainees from SEAFDEC. Despite this situation, many departments and trainees evaluated the results of the training in Japan highly since they were able to learn the latest techniques. Some trainees even pointed out that the training in Japan had not only improved their technical ability, but had also established a human network with Japanese experts and engineers.

(2) Actual Activities and Issues of SEAFDEC

1) Establishment purpose and basic ideology

SEAFDEC was established with the objective of promoting fisheries as a food source to help Southeast Asian development. It aims to research fishery for the rational development of fishery resources and their effective use. This can be achieved through provision of training in the areas of fish catch, fishing boat organization, marine product processing, aquaculture techniques, and extension. It also functions as an institution to investigate and study the areas of fishing equipment, fishing methods, fishing resources, resource evaluation, fishing preservation and aquaculture technique development. However, there was no clear explanation during the investigation about indispensable items such as the

motive, external conditions, preconditions, or methods for problem extraction when the purpose and targets were set ²⁾. A basic principle is necessary to carry out the projects to realize the purposes and achieve the targets. However, for these items, neither was clear from the provided materials.

2) Management System

When different departments are dispersed to different countries such as in SEAFDEC, a management system exerts a large influence on the activities of the organization. Therefore, this evaluation focused on the committee in order to evaluate SEAFDEC activities and the management system. Generally, a committee is an indispensable means for an organization to adjust opinions, solve issues, and make decisions to support the achievement of targets set by the whole organization, each department and each departmental office for management. Therefore, it is one of the important elements for assessing the activity of an organization. The committee activities in SEAFDEC varies by the department. On one hand, with the AQD, for example, there are department offices that eagerly establish many committees—from ones that focuses on specific fields to those related to research seminars. On the other hand, there are department offices that are less active in committee activities.

Generally, as an internal committee for an organization that performs education, training, and development of techniques such as SEAFDEC, it is presumed necessary to have committees in charge of planning, training courses (curriculum), budgeting, personnel, future policy, maintenance of facilities and equipment, self-inspection and evaluation, staff training, and publishing and public relations. Among these, committees related to project planning, formulation of training programs, management and maintenance of facilities are considered to be essential. However, in most of the departments, only committees related to personnel and facility management were established (except for MFRD in which those committees were established in February 2001 but have never actually been assembled). Meetings for these committees seem to be held once a month in each department. However, regarding the facility management committee, it is not clear whether



The evaluation team taking the explanation of the activities of AQD using panels

²⁾ Comment from SEAFDEC Secretariat: The activities of SEAFDEC are analyzed, prioritized, and decided through a needs assessment process with the participation of experts from the member countries. Through this process, SEAFDEC aims at reflecting member countries' interest and social needs on principle and objectives of the organization.

maintenance of existing facilities, which is the most important topic, is included, or if it is merely focused on setting up new facilities. Committees related to technical training issues were not established, such as for training courses (programs and curriculum), training contents (syllabus), training for creating teaching materials, and examination on contents of training, despite the fact that training is considered one of the SEAFDEC's major mandates. Furthermore, there is a necessity to carry out projects that meet SEAFDEC's purpose. This can be achieved by listening to social requests and opinions in order to increase the contribution to society and further promote project cooperation with the organization concerned. In order to do so, it is important to exchange and collect external opinions through committees with fishery-relevant expertise. However, such committee has not been established.

Moreover, it has become clear through this evaluation that the sense of technical independence by SEAFDEC's staff members seemed to be low. In order to create the necessary techniques to independently solve fishery-related issues in the area, it is essential not only that each staff in SEAFDEC possesses awareness of the issues, but that a forum be created to exchange expertise among the relevant staff members. The fact that committees have not been established for these purposes could be a reason for the delay in developing self-reliance.

Therefore, it can be said that, under the conditions for establishing committees, there is room for improvement in the decision-making process and the management system required for SEAFDEC's undertakings as an international organization ³⁾.

3) Development and extension of necessary techniques

The publication of SEAFDEC's research activities in many technical journals should be highly esteemed, as it is means for accomplishments to be introduced worldwide. However, research should not be confined to mere research, but should lead to achieve effective use of fishery resources and to improve the food situation by fishery development, which SEAFDEC states as its targets. Although it must be one of SEAFDEC's duties to make the results of the research available to the many people concerned in fishery activities for further application, it was not possible to obtain enough information on the types of activities SEAFDEC has been carrying out ⁴⁾.

At SEAFDEC, various extension activities are carried out, such as group training, workshops, seminars, and announcements of research results via academic societies,



The introduction of the chemical analysis carried out at AQD

various reports, newsletters, and public information journals. As for techniques introduced by SEAFDEC, they were extended through different channels and many steps, depending on the country. Thus, the question is how many necessary techniques actually reached the areas facing various issues in fishery. Unfortunately, however, through the studies, information was not available on, for example, what kinds of techniques were introduced, what methods were used in which area, and how useful the techniques were in solving the problem. These are, in other words, fundamental items concerning the geographical range of extension, extension scale, and the target group (class).

Information on not only activities, but also on their effects are expected to be demanded in the future. It is also necessary to build a system to constantly measure and evaluate the effects of SEAFDEC's various activities in order to clarify the significance and contributions of SEAFDEC.

4) Relevance of techniques input

When a technical project is evaluated, it is necessary to examine the type and level of techniques used and its components, whether the target group (class) of input technology was appropriate, and whether the implemented techniques unite with existing techniques and take root. To implement evaluation on these points, it is necessary to understand the basic principles of SEAFDEC and, at the same time, to find out what issues

³⁾ Comment from SEAFDEC Secretariat and dispatched experts: In SEAFDEC, there are internal and external committees necessary for administration, and originally, the organization itself incorporates administrative mechanism through a hierarchy.

⁴⁾ Comment from SEAFDEC Secretariat: There can be an example such as MFRDMD (Malaysia), where there is only limited direct extension of techniques to the people in fishery, since the activities mainly involve research and development. However, each department publishes many extension materials, pamphlets, and videos every year using the results presented in research papers after verification processes.

the community requires of SEAFDEC. On inquiry regarding these issues to SEAFDEC, no clear explanations was given. It can be assumed that this is because SEAFDEC was carrying out activities without always clarifying the target group (class, range), type and the level of the techniques necessary to input, as related to the achievement of its purpose ⁵⁾.

The abovementioned issues were also indicated in the results that the techniques introduced by SEAFDEC were diverse and all-inclusive. In Southeast Asia, very small fisheries using non-powered boats and fishing equipment make up the majority. Owing to this background, evaluating from the target group (class, range), type, level and social needs of the input techniques, the relevance is low regarding the following cases: establishment of expensive experimental and training devices for offshore fishing such as radar simulators, training sessions on trawling with large training ships for pelagic fishing and on tuna long-line fishing (which is also for large-scale fishing), fishing product processing necessary for large-scale fishing, and technical training on, for example, large fishing boat engines. Under the present condition of the member countries, where fishermen largely engage in coastal fishing in small fishing boats, there seemed to be problems such as in the present objectives for training, the type of training techniques, and the training course (curriculum). In the same way, the relevance of introduced techniques remained unclear in the areas of aquaculture and fishery processing.

As mentioned above, due to the lack of analysis regarding the target group (class, range), type and level of input techniques and social needs, it can be said the project objectives were not properly set in line with the principles of SEAFDEC, as normally done by other

international organizations. Through this evaluation study, necessary materials for the evaluation were not obtained - issues such as the adaptation, the extent to which the techniques transferred unites with the existing techniques, and the extent to which those techniques conformed to the various socio-economic conditions.

As for technical cooperation in the field of fisheries, it is necessary to develop techniques that have high conformity with existing techniques and applicability for various conditions, and to develop a methodology for cooperation that allows sustainability in the target area. At SEAFDEC, it is important that JICA experts, who provide techniques, and SEAFDEC, which receives the techniques, make joint efforts to research and develop unified techniques and, at the same time, strive to see the techniques take root.

5) Technical Independence

In the evaluation, interviews were conducted with the staff members in each department who received technical training in Japan. They were asked what they expect technically from Japan, and how much they relied on Japan. It was found that even after more than thirty years from the establishment, their sense of dependence on Japanese fishery techniques and Japanese experts was high. There was no clear explanation on how they would develop necessary techniques as an independent international organization, or any policy or plans for future technical self-sustenance ⁶⁾. SEAFDEC needs to develop its own original techniques to adapt to the marine conditions in South East Asia, so that it may contribute to fishery promotion in each member country. However, the willingness towards technical independence for meeting social needs and expectations did not seem high. Furthermore, each department does not seem conscious of its position as part of an international organization. Therefore, although benefits on fishery promotion should be commonly shared among the member countries, the concern remained that the undertakings reflected more of an interest of the country in which the department is located, rather than that of all member countries.

From these findings, it is clear that a system for technical independence must be prepared immediately. Even



Watching hatched hata larval fish, one of the important fish for development

⁵⁾ As seen in 2)

⁶⁾ Comment from SEAFDEC Secretariat: SEAFDEC is making efforts to enhance our technical ability ourselves and by cooperation with other agencies. However, since techniques advance day by day, it is natural, in a sense, that we request necessary techniques from Japan, which is one of the most developed countries in the fishery field.

in cases in which necessary techniques are introduced from external expertise, it is necessary to foster technical self-sustenance. In so doing, it is important not to rely too heavily on a specific country, ensure diversification of the type and source of the techniques, and make use of the existing techniques of Southeast Asia. By doing so, the degree of conformity with existing techniques and the stability of the techniques would increase.

(3) Future method of cooperation with JICA

1) Degree of technological transfer

It is found through the evaluation that each department has high esteem for the achievements of technical transfers carried out by JICA experts. For example, when the Training Department (TD) was established in Thailand on the operation of research and training vessels, captains and all other higher officers concerned with navigation, communication, fishing works etc., were all JICA experts. Currently, all staff members except the chief of fishing works are from the TD. As for instructors on the ground, such as on navigation, communication, meteorology, and basic sciences, TD has tried to shift toward Thai instructors by establishing an appointing system for instructors from the related institutions and universities in Thailand. Furthermore, in the Aquaculture Department (AQD) in the Philippines, experts for shrimp and fish culturing techniques were dispatched from the time of establishment to the mid 1990s, but now staff members of AQD have taken over the seed production of various fish and shellfish.

2) Quality and quantity of input techniques

Regarding the quality and quantity, target groups, ranges and methods of input techniques, results of trainee acceptance and experts dispatched by JICA all implied that a wide range of continuous input had been carried out. Consequently, a wide range of marine techniques was transferred from Japan to SEAFDEC, and on through to member countries. In recent years, with Third Country Training, techniques were introduced outside member countries, to Africa and around the Pacific. Regarding projects involving JICA expert dispatch and acceptance of trainees, it is worth noting SEAFDEC's unprecedented contribution that introduced a variety of marine technologies in South East Asia as the only regional international organizations in fishery.

3) Coherence with other Japanese cooperation

JICA has dispatched a substantial number of experts to promote fishery in Southeast Asia. Other than to SEAFDEC, individual experts were dispatched to other



The evaluation team hearing the activities of SEAFDEC in Thai FMO, which sends a staff member for the training of SEAFDEC training

fishery organizations, and lecturers to Third Country Training held in related countries. JICA had also been dispatching Senior Overseas Volunteers (SV) and Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV), cooperating in various ways to fisheries in Southeast Asia. It can be said that multi-layered cooperation was carried out for the field of fishery in Southeast Asia, including both multilateral cooperation through SEAFDEC and bilateral cooperation. There still is room for JICA to improve since cooperation has been biased toward specific areas and countries.

Furthermore, the Japanese government has disbursed of more than 200 million yen as contribution to multilateral organization each year for the administration and operation of SEAFDEC. At the same time JICA has spent around 200 million yen (as bi-lateral cooperation) to cover the cost of expert dispatch and equipment every year. As it can be viewed as a duplicated cooperation, it would be desirable for the situation to be rectified.

4) Relevance to continue cooperation

A review of the following two points is necessary to examine the relevance of JICA continuing cooperation with SEAFDEC. One is that, whether JICA should continue cooperation with an international organization such as SEAFDEC, since JICA is a technical cooperation organization in the field of bi-lateral cooperation. The other is whether, it is appropriate to continue providing technical cooperation to the same organization for more than thirty years.

Regarding the cooperation of JICA to an international organization, one of the positive opinions is, "dispatching experts for technical cooperation by JICA to SEAFDEC, which is an international organization engaged in technical cooperation execution, does not conflict with JICA's mandate." However, the circum-

stances at the time SEAFDEC was established should be considered. From the viewpoint of the evaluation team, it is assumed that at that time, considering that it was during the Cold-War, Japan had to cooperate with SEAFDEC to contribute to stability in Southeast Asia. Therefore, the cooperation may have been politically motivated ⁷⁾. Since international circumstances have dramatically changed, there seems to be no reason why JICA should continue cooperation with SEAFDEC. In light of the severe financial conditions facing the Japanese government, it is time to reexamine budget cutback on Japan's ODA. Thus it is not appropriate to maintain support for SEAFDEC in the conventional scale, also from the aspect of ODA efficiency.

Regarding the future cooperation to SEAFDEC being an execution organization of technical cooperation, even though JICA had been cooperating for more than thirty years and many expert dispatches have been completed, SEAFDEC has not yet developed proper independency. Future technical cooperation from JICA to SEAFDEC must have a pre-assumption of promoting self-sustenance. However, in obvious areas in which SEAFDEC has difficulty such as development of fisheries resources, protection of resources, preservation of the environment, and development and maintenance of distribution channels, continuous dispatch of experts by JICA is considered necessary. Due to the budget cutback on ODA, there has been a large reduction in the number of new dispatches of long-term experts. Thus, it is necessary to promote early independence of SEAFDEC, with long-term experts dispatched only for truly necessary posts for the minimum period. Future cooperation between JICA and SEAFDEC should be focused on dispatch of short-term experts. Appropriate human resources should be widely recruited for transferring

new knowledge and skills under the request from SEAFDEC.

As for long-term expert dispatch, it is necessary to examine the posts of Deputy Chiefs in each department of SEAFDEC. The Japanese government has been sending JICA experts as Deputy Chiefs to each department based on the agreement with SEAFDEC. The Deputy Chief of the Secretariat and Training Department (TD) in Thailand is served concurrently by the same person; so there are four Deputy Chiefs. These posts have been mainly filled by the staff of the Fisheries Agency at the Ministry of Forestry, Agriculture, and Fisheries of Japan (present and retired employees). The previous position of these officers before their dispatch can be categorized in two: specialists in administration and technical specialists in the field of fishery. Deputy Chiefs who have experience in the administrative side are capable of contributing to the administration of the organization. However, their work naturally becomes "rendering services" rather than "achieving technical purposes." ⁸⁾ As the requirement of work for Deputy Chiefs is often related to technical aspects, it would be more effective for technical specialists to take these positions.

On the other hand, the aim of reflecting Japan's opinions on policy development or decisions to ASEAN countries related to fishery, which was considered to be the reason why Japan should dispatch Deputy Chiefs, has not been well achieved ⁹⁾. Japan's influence on fishery policies in this area has been displayed at ASEAN Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Ministers' Meetings and SEAFDEC board meetings, not through the influence of the Deputy Chiefs. For these posts, there is also a problem that staff from the Fisheries Agency of Japan has been almost automatically dispatched. If the major part of the work of the Deputy Chiefs of each department continues to be "rendering services," the Japanese gov-



Evaluation team that takes the explanation on learning about FMRD activities with a panel from the managing director of FMRD

⁷⁾ Comment from SEAFDEC Secretariat: SEAFDEC understands that the cooperation between Japan and other SEAFDEC member countries is established based on common interests in the fields of fishery, and do not agree with the reasons mentioned at all.

⁸⁾ Comment from an expert dispatched to SEAFDEC: Regarding the expert dispatch to an international organization such as SEAFDEC, whose original mandate is technical cooperation, "rendering services to those organizations" itself can be understood as technical cooperation in fishery. These dispatched experts should be treated like "policy advisors" in the context of bi-lateral cooperation.

⁹⁾ Comment from experts dispatched to SEAFDEC: Before 1998, SEAFDEC had been limiting its activities to technical cooperation, thus it is natural that it does not relate with the fishery policy of ASEAN.

ernment should recommend that qualified proper staff be selected as Deputy Chiefs, and that Japanese expatriates be withdrawn from Deputy Director posts. This process might not require any amendment to the agreement. The continued dispatch of experts "rendering services," which differs from JICA's original mandate as technical cooperation, will negatively affect the quota of experts dispatched in other areas to places where they are really needed. Due to these reasons, the dispatch of long-term experts as Deputy Chiefs should be re-examined in the future.

(4) Japan's future cooperation

In terms of cooperation of Japan to SEAFDEC, there are circumstances that can not be controlled by technical cooperation alone. Most significant is that, Japan intends to maintain its influence in South East Asia through ASEAN, and obtain support in times of resolution of international disputes such as over marine resources and environmental preservation issues. Currently, through examining the point of whether Japan has had influence in Southeast Asia or in the international society through SEAFDEC, not all member countries were Japan's absolute advocates, but it did appear to maintain a certain level of influence through SEAFDEC. Thus, it is extremely important for Japan to maintain influence on SEAFDEC, which Japan has largely supported for thirty years, for the national interest. There are conditions that "If Japan withdraws, countries where each department is located will not be able to secure enough funding, and there will be difficulties in some parts for administration (MFRMDM)". It is necessary to prevent such a situation from occurring in order not to waste the past cooperation by Japan.

If SEAFDEC expands its function as a full-fledged international organization in the future, cooperation for all ASEAN countries except Laos will be possible. Therefore, to efficiently utilize ODA, the cooperation to SEAFDEC must be continued.

However, considering the various internal and external situations, a change in Japan's policy is unavoidable. From the viewpoints of maintaining the national interest and ODA reform, two solutions can be considered. First is that if the Japanese government considers that it is having Japanese Deputy Chiefs in the four departments is necessary from the point of view of fisheries policy, the Fisheries Agency should dispatch administrative Deputy Chiefs at their own expenses. This way the quota of JICA experts dispatched will remain unaffected. Second is that, there is a need to reexamine the cooperation with SEAFDEC, including its structural reform. Currently, SEAFDEC has

not fully functioned as an international organization. It is an urgent matter to strengthen the functions of SEAFDEC as an international organization, to cope with the increasing necessity of sharing newly developed techniques, and to understand the needs of new member countries such as Vietnam and Cambodia. As for strengthening its management and function, it is suggested that the Secretariat in Bangkok, Thailand be enhanced first. The Secretariat already carries out the coordination of trainees dispatched to Japan, and it is possible to strengthen the function of the Secretariat as soon as the awareness of the member countries improves. The situation where the administration of each department is managed independently prevents the internationalization of SEAFDEC. Without improvement to this situation, SEAFDEC will not fully function as an international organization.

As for future cooperation, the Secretariat function should be strengthened, and a Deputy Chief whose roles are mainly for management should be dispatched to control the funds and dispatch of experts. The abovementioned Deputy Chief will be responsible for reflecting Japan's policies to those of ASEAN countries. Aside from this Deputy Chief, another Deputy Chief familiar with the latest techniques should be dispatched to the Secretariat. This Deputy Chief will be responsible for managing the technical aspects in SEAFDEC, and should maintain close communications with other Japanese experts or Third Country experts dispatched to various departments.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

(1) Recommendations to SEAFDEC

1) Recommendations

- a) Appropriate functions as an international organization must be consolidated immediately. Various types of internal and external committees must be prepared immediately in each department. These committees must function not only as a means of sharing information, coordinating opinions and making decisions, but also to introduce new techniques by unifying new and existing conventional techniques to solve local issues. It may also provide the opportunity to exchange opinions and increase participation. They are indispensable for strengthening the management system, providing technical sustainability, and strengthening internationalization.
- b) As a plan for strengthening the functions as an international organization, a system has to be established in the Bangkok Secretariat office, so

that the Secretariat office will administer the four departments both from the administrative and technical side. To realize this, the number of staff members must be increased through dispatches from member countries, and closer communications must be carried out between the four departments and fishery-related agencies concerned in the member countries.

- c) With each department maintaining close cooperation with the government of its location, the department should reduce its function as one of a fishery research institution in the country in which it is located. This restructuring should allow each member country of SEAFDEC to participate equally in the policy development of all four departments. In order to reduce disparities in technical benefits between member countries, especially for the newly joined countries, it is necessary to strengthen internationalization by recruiting staff members not only from the country in which it is located, but also from other member countries.
- d) SEAFDEC should try to become technically self-sustaining as soon as possible. SEAFDEC should focus technique-transfer efforts on less developed countries among the members. For this purpose, SEAFDEC must strive to unite and adapt fishery technologies already developed, to match the local needs. It is also important to train local experts.
- e) A SEAFDEC assistance committee could be established consisting of members from fisheries and other areas in the member nations, to make contributions from SEAFDEC member countries more effective. By doing so, a deeper understanding of SEAFDEC activities will be developed in member countries, and functions as an organization are expected to improve.

(2) Recommendations on the future of cooperation from the Japanese government to SEAFDEC

1) Overall Views

- a) Judging from international circumstances, it is considered proper to have provided cooperation to SEAFDEC at the time of its establishment, as an instrument of state policy.
- b) At present, cooperation to SEAFDEC is designed to secure assistance and understanding for Japan's fishery policy in the region and in the international society. Although Japan maintains a certain level of influence on fishery policies in Southeast Asia, not all SEAFDEC member coun-

tries support all of Japan's policies.

- c) For many years, the posts of the Deputy Chiefs have been automatically filled by the staff of the Fisheries Agency of Japan as JICA long-term experts. Their function could be described as "rendering services" regarding management, such as to contact and coordinate with Japan, and control funds. However, they seemed to have no direct influence on making decisions within the department.
- d) In terms of selecting dispatched experts and methods of cooperation, some of them seemed to be perpetuated by inertia. Considering the long history of cooperation, effects are small compared to the cooperation provided.

2) Recommendations

- a) If the cooperation to SEAFDEC is considered as a diplomatic tool, it is necessary to review the direction of cooperation not only in areas of fishery, but also in relation to the policy for ASEAN as a whole.
- b) The fishery industry of Southeast Asia has been growing steadily, and in the near future, there will be countries that "graduate" from Japanese ODA. Therefore, the emphasis of future Japanese cooperation should shift from the ordinary technique transfer to those that aim for political impact. Particularly for developed countries in the region cooperation should be focused on transferring high technology or providing grant aid. For relatively less developed countries among the members, cooperation can be in conventional ways such as transferring basic fishery techniques or providing grant aid.
- c) Dispatch of Fisheries Agency staff to the Deputy Chiefs' positions must be reexamined. It is recommended that the four Deputy Chiefs currently on duty dispatched as JICA long-term experts should be withdrawn ¹⁰⁾.
- d) On the other hand, since SEAFDEC involves all ASEAN member nations except Laos, Japan's continuing influence over fisheries policies in

¹⁰⁾ Comment from experts dispatched to SEAFDEC: As is mentioned in the suggestions, as a part of strengthening functions as an international organization, we agree with the necessity to recruit more international staffers. However, in the current situation, if Japanese Deputy Chiefs leave SEAFDEC, there is high possibility that the next person will be from the host country where the department is located. If this to happen, there is a possibility that its undertakings will be more biased towards the interest of the country in which the department is located, thus moving in the wrong direction.

Southeast Asia through cooperation to SEAFDEC cannot be ignored politically. Therefore, it is recommended that after the Secretariat function is further strengthened and thus further enhancing the capacity of SEAFDEC as an international organization, a Japanese Deputy Chief in charge of administration and policy should be appointed.

- e) Since the role of Deputy Chief in charge of administration and policy is to coordinate closely with the Fisheries Agency in Japan, a core member in the Fisheries Agency should be dispatched with their own budget. On the other hand, the Deputy Chief in charge of techniques can be dispatched as a long-term expert from JICA. As it is difficult to solely administer and grasp fishery technologies in all member countries, the Deputy Chief would have to have close connections with long-term experts, short-term experts, or third country experts dispatched from JICA to each department.

(3) Recommendations regarding cooperation from JICA

1) Overall Views

- a) Despite the fact that JICA has been dispatching experts covering most of the fields in fisheries, JICA lacks an active approach to encourage SEAFDEC to attain technical and financial self-sustainability.
- b) Communication between SEAFDEC departments and JICA offices in the respective countries do not result in close liaison.
- c) Technical cooperation has been biased toward training SEAFDEC staff members. Not many effects of extension could be observed in areas where the techniques have been transferred.
- d) It is necessary to reexamine the situation of dispatching experts to an international organization already receiving Japan's contribution as this duplicates aid.
- e) The background in which Japan needs to continue providing cooperation to SEAFDEC is no longer valid. JICA originally is an organization in charge of bilateral technical cooperation.
- f) There might be some duplication with SEAFDEC cooperation and third country training and receiving trainees.

2) Recommendations

- a) Currently, there are calls for drastic ODA reform. Exceptional cases of cooperation to international organizations should be reconsidered. As for long-

term and short-term expert dispatch, allocation should be made to areas with urgent needs.

- b) JICA should not automatically continue its technical cooperation but hand over the undertakings to SEAFDEC in certain fields once the technical transfer is completed. JICA must put its efforts toward cooperation on techniques that SEAFDEC requests.
- c) Future dispatch of experts to SEAFDEC should mainly be short-term experts who give technical training, while limiting long-term experts for only sections where a long commitment is needed, such as human resource development.
- d) It is necessary to carefully examine bilateral cooperation projects, and unite or abolish ones that might be duplicated with SEAFDEC projects.
- e) Cooperation and collaboration between bilateral projects that are carried out in SEAFDEC member countries and projects of SEAFDEC should be promoted to increase the efficiency of activities. The projects should also be utilized as tools for maintaining and strengthening the influence of Japan to SEAFDEC, both from the bi-lateral and multi-lateral perspectives.