*Table 9: Summary of review recommendations for the period November 2018 to March 2024*

|  | **Recommendation** | **Section** | **Rating** | **FRDC Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | FRDC should consider and clarify the interface between its Strategy & Innovation and Research & Development Investment divisions and communicate their respective roles internally and externally. | 4.6 | Important | **Supported**   * As part of the new R&D Plan, FRDC is refining investment processes to identify leads and support roles for investment * FRDC are also increasing the communications on the role of Strategy and Innovation |
| 2 | The next version of the R&D plan should include some organisational key performance indicators and these should cascade through the annual operational plans and annual reports. | 5.3 | Important | **Supported**   * The new R&D Plan will include key performance indicators * FRDC will be developing a new Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for 2025-2030 to complement the revised R&D Plan |
| 3 | FRDC should clearly define and communicate, internally and externally, the scope of Extension Officer Network activities to ensure extension officers focus on agreed FRDC transformation areas. | 6.6 | Important | **Supported.**   * The design of the Extension Officer Network included a role to work with large scale or transformation challenges (involving behaviour change) as well as tactical or smaller scale challenges. Each Extension Officer has a role to support one or two of the 10 FRDC strategic focus areas plus other strategic issues as they arise e.g. Gillnets, Futures of Seafood. * The FRDC is consideration the future of the EON which highlights the increasing need and opportunity for the EON to facilitate transformational change given their trusted stakeholders networks and the importance of bringing people together to ensure research for impact. * Content will be developed for the FRDC website about their transformational roles. The Extension Officers and communications team will communicate this content to stakeholders. |
| 4 | Progress against the Barnett review of the Indigenous Reference Group needs to be articulated and, where appropriate, any recommendations implemented by FRDC. | 7.2.4 | Better practice | **Supported**   * All recommendations from the Barnett review were considered and most were implemented into the next iteration of the IRG (as presented to the Board in April 2023). When the new IRG project is activated, there will be communications around this. The exception to this is two recommendations; that there is Indigenous representation on the Board and establishment of a peak body/representative organisation. While the FRDC is supportive of both of these it is not within the remit of the organisation to enact either of these. |
| 5 | FRDC should consider the development of a segmentation strategy (particularly within aquaculture) that allows more customisation of delivery of information and R&D outcomes depending on the aspirations, capacity, and capability of individual companies or organisations. | 7.7 | Important | **Supported**   * This will be continually developed through the FRDC structures, particularly the Industry Partnership Agreements, to meet the needs of specific FRDC stakeholders |
| 6 | FRDC should consider using *ex-ante* benefit-cost evaluations for some components to optimise allocation of investments across the RD&E portfolio. | 8.2 | Better practice | **Partial Support**   * FRDC will consider this evaluation format and look to apply for programmatic investment rather than at a project level |
| 7 | FRDC should encourage Industry Partnership Agreements to invest in impact assessment on a regular basis to inform their future investments. | 8.3 | Better practice | **Supported**   * FRDC will revise the Industry Partnership Agreement and process to include the ability to review the IPA and its investments. |
| 8 | FRDC could consider changing to conducting impact assessments of projects using a cluster approach where projects from one of the five R&D strategic outcomes (or other clusters as appropriate) are randomly selected for assessment each year and on a rolling basis. | 8.4 | Better practice | **Supported**   * As part of the review of the new impact assessment provider, FRDC will scope options for evaluation using clusters as recommended. |
| 9 | FRDC should ask its impact assessment providers to provide more detailed commentary on the likely distribution of benefits from projects between sectors and supply chain stages, notably aquaculture, wild-catch, recreational fishing, Indigenous, wholesale, processing, export, and retail. | 8.4 | Better practice | **Supported**   * FRDC has engaged a new provider (GHD) with a review point after the first year to confirm success * FRDC will ensure that part of the scope includes implementing this recommendation |
| 10 | FRDC should report the aggregate results from its impact assessments to stakeholders using clear, simple language in its annual report (notably the benefit-cost ratio result in the key performance indicator table), in presentations to stakeholders, in communications to stakeholders and in a single, easy to find tab on the FRDC website. This should include case studies where appropriate. | 8.6 | Better practice | **Supported**   * FRDC has approved this project, with the condition that an aggregate report of multi-year results be provided |