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I. Introduction and Purpose

This document is an overall assessment of the third phase of the Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership. It places the current two year effort in the context of earlier phases, the USAID Tanzania strategic objectives and results, as well as the rapidly evolving context of Tanzania's environmental management and economic agenda, which have been in turn influenced by the Millennium Development Goals and the World Summit on Sustainable Development as well as regional initiatives in East Africa. Also part of the context is the continuity of effort afforded by USAID/Washington's SUCCESS project, which supplements the TCMP and links it to work in Central and South America, Thailand and possibly other areas. In addition, the PEACE (Population, gender Equity, and AIDS in Coastal Environments) project integrates the crosscutting themes of HIV/AIDS, population, and gender into the coastal districts of Pangani and Bagamoyo. USAID Tanzania has funded a fourth phase of the TCMP, under a significantly different results framework, but one that is in line with SUCCESS and emerging policy of the Government of Tanzania itself.

This assessment is not a detailed performance review of the many individual activities, rather it attempts to confirm in a more general way what work was done, how it contributed to achieving Life of Project Objectives, and what recommendations can be made for the next phase of the TCMP and integrated coastal management in Tanzania. A summary of performance can be found in Appendix 1.

II. Methodology and Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The assessment and report has been prepared principally by Don Robadue, a senior staff member of the Coastal Resources Center with a long career and experience spanning 30 years in coastal management in the United States as well as similar international ICM programs in Ecuador, Mexico, Fiji, Sri Lanka and Thailand as well as Central America. He was generally familiar with the Tanzania program and core staff but had not previously visited the country or carried out any of the tasks.

The methodology for preparing the assessment is relatively simple, first involving review of some core documents and interviews with project managers and advisors at the Coastal Resources Center. This was followed by a field trip to Tanzania to conduct a number of in depth interviews with program leaders, advisors and partners, reviewing additional documents, and brief field visits to Bagamoyo and Mkuranga Districts. A debriefing took place with both USAID Tanzania and the Director of the National Environment Management Council, NEMC. A draft of the assessment was circulated to program staff in Tanzania, and CRC, as well as selected project associates, and then revised.
Regional administration map of Tanzania showing coastal districts
Summary Findings

The key headline for Phase III has been mainstreaming ICM ideas into a variety of programs, policies and projects at the national level, and this is a significant and highly desirable outcome. The influence of the Tanzania ICM Strategy prepared in earlier phases has spread much wider, encompassing major new initiatives.

One of the key expectations in Phase III was that the NEMC would have absorbed the secretariat-type functions that only a partner government unit can provide, but this has not occurred.

The most important change in TCMP during Phase III was a major adaptation in program staffing and the work program, leading to a substantial improvement in clarity and focus on supporting District level work in project Year 7.

In addition the TCMP shifted from a passive stance of providing “limited technical assistance to locally based field programs as requested”, to a concerted effort to meet the expectations of villagers and district officials to support policy and planning actions as well as livelihood actions in a serious and effective way.

Even so these measures to help empower districts and villages to manage their local coastal resources is not being accompanied by a proper share of implementation resources. A major improvement in performance in Year 7 was attained by redirecting financial resources and refocusing team and technical support to alternate income generation activities that had been identified in the district action plans. The addition of resources from the SUCCESS project has been important in this regard.

Many of the livelihood activities are being treated as 'pilot' or 'experimental' in nature. This means that a variety of technical, business and market uncertainties have to be addressed that are beyond the ability of a village or even district to handle on their own.

The collegiality and esprit de corps that quite evidently characterized earlier phases of TCMP when the working groups were at their peak and when the National ICM Strategy was the focus also needs to be replicated for the TCMP and district level practitioners as Phase IV gets underway. Local technical advisors are scarce in Tanzania, vary in quality and skill level, and not all are interested in or able to sustain the follow-up required to foster success.

It is urgent that NEMC, through the Integrated Coastal Management Unit, ICMU, when established, play a key role in convening meetings to bring the new set actors together on an annual basis in the tradition of Phases I and II.

A performance-based approach is needed with respect to the professionals involved in the program in order to insure that scarce funding in Phase IV is used as effectively as possible. Limited technical resources need to be directed to help current activities succeed and to 'finish the jobs already started' rather than become diluted by pursuing too many different, unrelated tasks.
The TCMP needs to fully engage itself in the mission to bring ICM to the districts, by working to showcase the three districts it is directly engaged with, but also to track and foster progress in all of the others. The TCMP and NEMC need to articulate and advocate for the districts.

The TCMP should consider a special effort to review and discuss existing livelihood projects within the context of economic development in the districts.

The PEACE, SUCCESS and TCMP projects are not effectively communicated as a unified effort to carry out facets of the National Coastal Management Strategy by the Coastal Resources Center and USAID. It is up to CRC and core leadership to create a sense of team effort, purpose and identity within the TCMP team, and to foster the connections and sense of well-being and commitment that flows from inclusion in the broader CRC global enterprise.

Recommendations

1. Engage District Level partners and staff into the Methodology for preparing the Phase IV Year One Work Plan.
2. Take a broader approach to enterprise development than just pilot projects or experiments. Focus on creating real businesses.
3. Strengthen the work in landscape and seascape planning in the districts toward a stronger coastal management emphasis in support of the National ICM Strategy.
4. Join together the TCMP and Tanga Program legacy documentation and prepare new District Action guidelines based on this experience.
5. Strengthen the project monitoring plan including greater in-country staff involvement.
6. Utilize the cross-portfolio framework offered by the USAID Tanzania’s Linkage/Theme/Tool.
7. Link to USAID Tanzania Democracy and Governance Programs.
8. Recognize and communicate that all the ICM projects are working in service of the National ICM Strategy.
9. Set the program management bar high in terms of transparency, equity, efficiency and commitment to the most vulnerable groups living in coastal regions.
10. Foster a true sense of participation by field staff and in-country project leaders in Tanzania-level as well as Global-level partnership and network.
III. Background and Evolving Context of Coastal Management in Tanzania

This two year project represents Phase III of the Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership, which was formed in 1997 to “establish the foundation for effective coastal governance in Tanzania.” Phase III began just after the National Integrated Coastal Management Strategy was adopted by the Government of Tanzania in December 2002. Phase III can be rightfully regarded as the first stage of implementation of the National ICM Strategy. USAID Tanzania funded it at the level of $1,800,000. Additional funding was obtained by the University of Rhode Island to supplement as well as carry out other aspects of the strategy, most notably the USAID Washington funded SUCCESS project, and the USAID PEACE project, addressing HIV-AIDS and environment linkages. The Coastal Environmental Awards Scheme, for example, generated a variety of local contributions.

Table 1  Funding of the TCMP

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCMP Phase I &amp; II - June, 1997 to April, 2003:</td>
<td>$4,523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCMP Phase III - May, 2003 to September, 2005:</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Phases I, II, and III</td>
<td>$6,323,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCMP-SUCCESS, October, 2005 -September, 2010</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost share</td>
<td>$                157,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL 1997 to 2010</td>
<td>$8,055,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations at the end of TCMP Phase II

The assessment carried out at the close of Phase II (Delaney, 2002) made several suggestions for what TCMP should pay special attention to during Phase III. For example, it was expected that the TCMP would try to offer feedback to the six local projects that it originally drew inspiration from in preparing the National Strategy (for example, the Tanga ICM program funded by Irish Aid). It anticipated that the TCMP might become involved in approving the coastal projects included in local development plans. A proposed Environmental Management Law was seen as an opportunity to consolidate and harmonize existing coastal laws. It was thought that the TCMP could point out gaps and weaknesses, as well as emit additional guidelines for managing the coastal zone. The Phase II assessment recommended that the TCMP get involved in preparing oil and gas development guidelines.

In addition to these policy-oriented ideas, the Phase II assessment also directed TCMP’s attention to the need for market feasibility studies of major coastal business opportunities such as mariculture. Assuring sustainable livelihoods should be the focus in coastal communities, and TCMP should “strive to involve the private sector in its work”.

While applauding the efforts of the Scientific and Technical Working Group, especially in publishing the State of the Coast series, the need was seen for ecosystem-specific assessments as
well as setting out the causal structure that generates pressures leading to coastal change. The working group approach was noted to have achieved significant results in Phases I and II, but there remained “the need to re-organize, make more efficient and reorder priorities”, while retaining interest of group members. Collegiality was also important, but the quality and productivity of program retreats needed to be improved as well. Finally, communication and outreach needed to become more strategic and a more active exchange of information from experience was desired as well.

In 2004 a retrospective and update of the TCMP was prepared by Torell et. al. as a chapter in the book Crafting Coastal Governance in a Changing World. Torell anticipated that Phase III would lead to the formation of a national ICM steering committee and a new unit within NEMC to carry out the strategy. Torell also anticipated that the TCMP would draw continued strength from the “culture of collaboration and common purpose” among the existing field level ICM initiatives.

Phase III embraced a number of these suggestions, however neither of the reports fully anticipated the changes in the policy environment that were already unfolding by 2003 and which led the TCMP to make major mid-course corrections in 2004. USAID Tanzania’s environment portfolio budget dropped considerably and this in turn impacted TCMP Phase III. In addition some tasks were cut in Year 8 due to a reduction in the anticipated award and internal budget allocation adjustments.

Policy change in Tanzania: environmental management and poverty alleviation

One of the challenges in assessing Phase III is that many changes in environmental policy and funding for conservation and development in coastal areas were set into motion in the early 2000s and the TCMP needed to act quickly to adjust to these shifts. The National Environmental Management Act of 2004 integrates many of the key ideas of integrated coastal management into the country’s broader approach to environmental problems and resource management. The Government of Tanzania’s new poverty alleviation strategy, guided by the Millennium development goals, emphasizes the need to concentrate attention on making progress at the local level. Other core pieces of legislation adopted in Tanzania address parks, protected areas and land management. The national tourism law and policy is being revised as Phase III draws to a close, and it too emphasizes a focus on tourism that alleviates poverty rather than mega-resort development that characterizes other countries.

Many of these provided opportunities to incorporate aspects of the National Integrated Coastal Management Strategy, for example coastal resources are now subject to the same environmental management policies and procedures as inland resources in the new Act. However, TCMP project leaders remain disappointed at the slow pace of incorporating key aspects of institutionalizing the National ICM Strategy into the National Environment Management Council.
Table 2: The Seven Elements of the National Integrated Coastal Management Strategy and TCMP Phase III contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NICMS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TCMP III contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>Support environmental planning and integrated management of coastal resources and activities at the local level and provide mechanisms to harmonize national interests with local needs</td>
<td>Focus on disseminating guidelines and carrying out elements of the District Action Plans in Pangani, Bagamoyo, Mkuranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Promote integrated, sustainable and environmentally friendly approaches to the development of major economic uses of the coastal resources to optimize benefits</td>
<td>Guidelines for tourism development, seaweed farming, oil and gas field/spill contingency planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>Conserve and restore critical habitats and areas of high biodiversity while ensuring that coastal people continue to benefit from the sustainable use of the resources</td>
<td>Seaweed projects, bee-keeping in mangroves, community based fisheries management, Dar Es Salaam Marine Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 4</td>
<td>Establish an integrated planning and management mechanism for coastal areas of high economic interest and/or with substantial environmental vulnerability to natural hazards</td>
<td>Early work in Kilwa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 5</td>
<td>Develop and use an effective coastal ecosystem research, monitoring and assessment system that will allow available scientific and technical information to inform ICM decisions</td>
<td>State of the Coast 2003, guidelines for ecosystem monitoring, research and extension working group; monitoring at local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 6</td>
<td>Provide meaningful opportunities for stakeholder involvement in the coastal development process and the implementation of coastal management policies</td>
<td>District action plan implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 7</td>
<td>Build both human and institutional capacity for interdisciplinary and intersectoral management of coastal environment</td>
<td>Awareness raising; training of district level officials and groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in the USAID Tanzania results framework for natural resources

USAID Tanzania developed its new results framework for natural resources management during Phase III. This will not take effect until FY 2006, and does provide the framework for TCMP Phase IV. This new framework shifts the emphasis of the environment strategic objective from “Improved conservation of coastal resources and wildlife in targeted areas” to a focus on “biodiversity conserved in targeted landscapes through a livelihood driven approach”, which is in alignment with current Government of Tanzania priorities. The University of Rhode Island entered into a new cooperative agreement with USAID called SUCCESS that also has a different results framework than the recently completed CRM II program and is in fact more in line with the USAID Tanzania approach.

A new focus on marine parks and protected areas at the regional and national levels

The World Conference on Sustainable Development in held in Johannesburg in 2002, and the Millennium Development Goals set out at the Millennium Summit in 2000 call for a substantial
increase in the percentage of land and coastal resources under improved management in the next twenty years. Tanzania has taken this responsibility seriously and entered into an agreement with the World Bank to improve management of its Exclusive Economic Zone, establish a system of marine parks and protected areas and improve coastal management in the districts.

**TCMP decides to shift its focus to the districts**

Phase III of the TCMP was designed to shift the attention of the program from national strategy development to implementation. At the local level this means working in the districts, in order “to improve the well-being of coastal residents and their environment through the implementation and strengthening of the Tanzania Coastal Strategy”. At the national level it means institutionalizing coastal management, building national constituency and meeting the needs of districts.

This shift was slow in coming, so between Year 6 and Year 7, the TCMP made adjustments to its activities and staff in order to reduce costs and improve its implementation performance. It also began to adjust to the new priorities and focus of the Government of Tanzania and USAID. As a result, work at the district and village level took on much greater urgency during Year 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX 1: TCMP Phase III Life of Project Results (LOPR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOPR 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOPR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOPR 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOPR 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOPR 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3  Alignment of SUCCESS project and USAID Tanzania’s new results framework for the environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESS project/ Tanzania-East Africa activities</th>
<th>USAID Tanzania Environment Intermediate Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achieving Tangible On-the-Ground Results by</td>
<td>IR 3 Conservation enterprises generate increased and equitable benefits from sustainable use of natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementing sustainable coastal fisheries</td>
<td>1. Promote emerging conservation enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoting ecosystem-based, low-impact aquaculture</td>
<td>2. Increase effectiveness of benefit sharing mechanisms between, within NRM actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania TASK A1. Equitable livelihood development through mariculture. Milkfish, seaweed, bivalves, integrated fish (tilapia)</td>
<td>3. Train communities to take advantage of new NRM framework (e.g., entrepreneurial skills, financial management, governance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increasing Capacity through training by</td>
<td>IR 2 Participatory landscape scale conservation practiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing active mentoring systems among peers within and across target regions</td>
<td>1. Promote broad participation in NRM planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing locally-tailored ICM curricula in targeted countries</td>
<td>2. Strengthen skills in planning, inventory, legal framework and by-law formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task B.1 East Africa: Regional training courses</td>
<td>3. Promote mechanisms for improving and utilizing knowledge base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establishing Regional Learning Networks by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing information, technical expertise, experience and ideas on priority topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging field practitioners and applied researchers to better integrate their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task C2 Preparation for development of a web-based knowledge management system for East Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Merging Science, Management and Governance by</td>
<td>IR 1 Policies and laws that integrate conservation and development applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing understanding of the relationships between human activities and the condition of coastal environments and resources</td>
<td>1. “Mainstream” ENR concerns into key GOT development policies and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Applying methods for monitoring societal and ecosystem change at a range of spatial scales</td>
<td>2. Strengthen civil society organizations for ENR advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Revise legislation to increase transparency and reduce legal conflicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Overview of Accomplishments and Adaptations during TCMP Phase III

A. Mainstreaming ICM ideas and approaches at the national level

Accomplishments

If the headline result from Phase II was adoption of the National ICM Strategy, the headline for Phase III has been mainstreaming ICM ideas into a variety of programs, policies and projects at the national level. In the new, wide ranging National Environmental Management Act, coastal resources are included among all of Tanzania’s resource patrimony, so coastal management will draw upon this overarching law rather than separate legislation. The influence of the ICM Strategy has spread much wider, encompassing major new initiatives such as the Marine and Coastal Environmental Management Program of the World Bank, the East Africa Marine Eco-region initiative, and a number of Tanzania programs and policies including tourism, fisheries and maritime commerce.

TCMP’s counterpart, the National Environmental Management Council, NEMC, is assigned a number of functions that, if and when exercised in the coastal zone, would represent a number of elements of a coastal management program:

- surveys,
- research,
- environmental impact statements,
- monitoring,
- compliance with standards,
- prevention of accidents,
- education and awareness,
- manuals and guidelines, and
- technical support.

A great deal of responsibility is placed at the district and even village level for planning and implementation. NEMC, which adopted the ICM Strategy, in conjunction with local government authorities “shall issue guidelines and prescribe measures for the protection of riverbanks, rivers, lakes or lakeshores, and shorelines.” (Section 55) The law prohibits permanent structures within a 60 meter no-build buffer along the coast. Section 59 states that “the Minister (of Environment) shall, after consultation with the Minister responsible for local government authorities and any other relevant institutions make regulations for the promotion of integrated coastal management.”

The work of carrying out the many provisions the Act will take many years and financial resources that may be hard to come by, however some important projects are already underway in Tanzania.

Following on the publication of Blueprint 2050, a document that draws on TCMP concepts and experience, the World Bank announced its approval of the Marine and Coastal Environmental Management Project (MACEMP) in 2005. This will provide $50 million in funding to create, among other things, a system of marine parks and protected areas along the coast in conjunction
with village and district level livelihood and coastal management activities, in addition to initiating policy making for the Exclusive Economic Zone. The influence of the National ICM Strategy in MACEMP is unmistakable.

The World Wide Fund for Nature, WWF, published the details of its East Africa Marine Ecoregion initiative in 2005, and this also clearly draws upon the National ICM Strategy and supporting work of the TCMP. Many, including the Director of National Environmental Management Council and USAID Tanzania now believe that the strategy has made it much easier for a host of different government agencies, projects and initiatives to incorporate one or more of the seven core ICM strategy elements into the design of their projects.

Adaptations

The system of frequent working group meetings and annual retreats was substantially reduced during Phase III due to budget considerations and the strong desire to attain on-the-ground results. However, members of the TCMP project team, including staff of NEMC and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, have interacted with a number of line agencies to incorporate coastal management ideas from the Strategy, ICM guidelines series and experience in the districts. For example support has been provided to the Parks and Protected Areas Program, the Fisheries Unit in terms of mariculture development, community based fisheries, gear and trawling issues. The Tourism Department is revamping its own national strategy and for the first time is recognizing the unique opportunities of coastal tourism, especially that which helps villages and locally trained guides offer cultural and environmental experiences to visitors. The Shipping Department was assisted in preparing contingency plans for the coast.

Concerns

Getting operational seems to be needlessly difficult for a program that is relatively well funded, enjoyed such a strong national reputation and influence and supported by the URI Coastal Resources Center which has helped several other developing countries do just this. For its part NEMC has simply not absorbed the secretariat-type functions that only a partner government unit can provide.

To be sure, the good will and capacity built during the earlier phases has meant that a number of working group and project participants are continuing to disseminate ideas and draw upon TCMP materials, guidelines and approaches. The risk and concern with this approach is the loss of identity of the National ICM Strategy with its source, NEMC, as well as dissipation of the momentum generated for ICM compared to other, narrower approaches such as marine protected areas or community based fisheries management. The new project teams that are forming to carry out major environmental programs such as MACEMP are likely to begin afresh and view themselves as stand-alone efforts unrelated to the Tanzania coastal governance story when in fact they owe a considerable debt to it. No major NGO has taken up the banner as leading advocate for ICM in Tanzania.

The network of emerging ICM professionals—government officials, organizations and others interested in coastal management—is extensive and has grown over the life of the TCMP. It
needs to be cultivated and brought together periodically to celebrate as well as assess technical, policy and implementation achievements, to maintain collegial relationships and common purpose as well as debate the future, and this is a key role for NEMC.

To put a finer point on this, we can re-analyze one of the indicators in the progress monitoring plan, PMP. It set a goal for the number of new practitioners to be involved each year. That target number, oddly, declines each year, from 105 in 1998 to 0 in 2003, the outset of Phase III.

Table 4: Project monitoring indicator for “number of people gaining experience in ICM”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people gaining experience in ICM</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Target</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Actual</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Target</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Actual</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking this data at face value, it would appear that expectations reached close to their peak by 2001 (1 in Figure 1) with essentially no further expectations in Phases II and III. Not surprisingly, the program always bested this annual target by a considerable amount (Point 2), while exhibiting a slowing reported actual performance after 2001.

Figure 1: Declining expectations and slowing performance in the number of people gaining experience in ICM through the TCMP?
In fact, as work shifted its focus to the three districts we would expect that many more people new to ICM are becoming aware, trained and engaged, so the graphic on actual performance is probably conservative. Raising the target to create a stretch objective for the program might be a better approach and offer a point of comparison with the Tanga ICM Program, which also worked in three districts.

**B. Emergence of Tanzania-style District ICM**

**Accomplishments**

The TCMP has provided substantial, recognized support to three districts: Pangani, Bagamoyo and Mkuranga. Bagamoyo is the centerpiece and most advanced of the three in terms of progress in carrying out actions set out in the locally approved action plans. This means that several staff in this district office and selected villages are aware, committed and motivated to carry out resource management activities as well as support livelihood activities in the villages. In fact, the district group believes it is developing a TCMP version of district ICM that draws upon prior examples such as the Tanga ICM program, but includes original features, and is ready to be shared with others. District level officials cite the field visit to Tanga as a highly motivating experience, and were especially impressed with the innovative Community Based Fisheries Management program. Bagamoyo has made significant progress in developing its own version of the program. Key differences with the Tanga approach include identifying and defining issues clearly, incorporating context information about the setting within which the action plans are to occur, as well as vision and mission statements to set out the purpose for specific projects and actions.

The Community Based Fisheries Management Plan prepared as part of implementing the Bagamoyo District Action Plan has many features that greatly improve upon how the district action plan itself was written and produced. For example it includes a clear issue analysis written in narrative form, reports on monitoring data, demonstrates a thorough community participation process, includes a brief but clear governance assessment, and contains a specific action plan that appears easy to translate into project tasks and also has an evaluation scheme.

Mkuranga District is not only the newest district in the coast, it is the most recent addition to the District level effort, and the most isolated and undeveloped of the three. The ICM facilitator does not yet enjoy the same level of team work as in Bagamoyo, however villages have succeeded in developing and adopting fisheries management bylaws, and two of the four have been ratified by the district council. Livelihood activities, especially adapting salt ponds to fish ponds, has been well received and producing test results, and the technical assistance is also well received.

Pangani is seen by TCMP as the least developed of the District initiatives, which is significant in light of the fact that the district also hosted the Tanga ICM project. This district was not visited nor interviews conducted with district officials during the assessment trip. TCMP leaders indicate that in Pangani the TCMP and Tanga projects co-existed rather than collaborated and built upon each other, in fact the district leader sought to maintain separate tasks to avoid redundancy. Torell and Nzali reported in 2004 that “the existence of the Tanga program also hampered the creativity
of the action planning process because participants skipped some steps...this made the Pangani district action strategy quite narrow....”

Irish Aid, through close-out of the Tanga project has in effect “transferred” it to the Districts, but with misgivings. The Tanga project’s own Phase III evaluation conducted in 2003 expressed deep concern about the lack of an ‘exit strategy’ and the sustainability of the successful village participation process:

...it is debatable whether this benefit from the [Tanga] Programme will be sustained for long. For example, the [fisheries] bylaws need to be standardized across management areas to strengthen collaboration and there needs to be improved data collection and processing and general document referencing and filing....There is no institutional home for the Programme to take the place of the Tanga Coastal Consultative Forum and Support Unit and it is debatable whether the stakeholders will continue to collaborate without such a home. [p. 49]

The Tanga program was designed to “safeguard the resources of the Tanga Region coastal environment” by working with regional resource managers and through community participation. The focus shifted to districts during decentralization. It did not set out to influence national policy or serve as a pilot or model for other districts. Tanga program evaluators note that information from the initiative has been provided to the national Mangrove Management program as well as the National ICM Strategy. However, “the large number of documents produced by the Programme are not readily available and archived and this valuable material could easily be lost.” [p 37]

Adaptations

The most important and substantial change in TCMP in Phase III has been the substantial improvement in clarity and focus on supporting District level work in project Year 7. As the discussion of LOPR 4 below demonstrates, the TCMP shifted from a passive stance of providing “limited technical assistance to locally based field programs as requested”, to a concerted effort to meet the expectations of villagers and district officials to support policy and planning actions as well as livelihood actions in a serious and effective way. This shift has contributed positively to resolving the identity crisis of the TCMP alluded to in earlier assessments. There is now a more broadly held understanding among the coordinators and technical experts assigned and hired by the TCMP and NEMC that success at the district level, including livelihood development and community level empowerment for management, remains the partnership’s overarching purpose. This new stance is well aligned with the newly emerging national and donor priorities.

Concerns

The TCMP has not organized itself to achieve the kind of sustained and complete support to districts that characterizes other USAID coastal management programs operated by CRC, for example Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Ecuador or Mexico. Torell, Tobey and Van Ingen drew the following conclusions about the Tanga project in 2000:
A challenge of the [Tanga] programme, particularly in stages two and three, has been developing an effective dialogue and feedback loops between government offices and the villages. Tanzania has a hierarchical decision making structure, and it is still difficult to find mechanisms and space for all stakeholders to be genuine partners in the action planning process. For example, during the process of plan adoption feedback and dialogue has been less than adequate between District and national government offices on the one hand, and Environmental Committees and the Central Co-ordinating Committee on the other hand. In another example of the tendency to hierarchy, some programme participants have indicated that the monthly visits to villages by the District Technical Team were little more than a government check-up on progress and were not real dialogues among partners about successes, failures, and needs for support. The monthly meetings were eventually cancelled and replaced with visits upon request.

Much the same could be said about TCMP in 2005. National awareness, validation and problem solving are essential elements of the needed feedback loops in trials of district and village planning. In Ecuador, the national coastal management commission periodically met in the special area management zones both to conduct their own business and hold the equivalent of a town meeting where villagers could and did complain to the admiral of the Navy on enforcement problems and difficulties with a local port captain, for example. Blongko, a small village that created a tiny marine protected area in North Sulawesi, Indonesia, became a must-visit site for

### Box 2: The Tanga Project as Model for TCMP District Action Planning and Implementation
(Source: Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation Programme End of Phase III Evaluation.)

The goal of the Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme funded by Irish Aid and others is “integrity of the Tanga coastal zone ecosystem improved, and its resources supporting sustainable development.” Its underlying purpose focused on attaining “improved collaborative coastal and marine management by District administration, resource users and other stakeholders”. The accompanying results framework emphasizes local action rather than influencing national policy or sharing results in other districts.

- **Result 1:** Improved capability of key stakeholders and local institutions for collaborative coastal and marine resources management, conservation and monitoring.
- **Result 2:** Collaborative coastal and marine resources management plans developed, implemented and monitored.
- **Result 3:** Key stakeholders aware of coastal zone management issues and values and using information to improve management.
- **Result 4:** Programme effectively managed, monitored and evaluated.

The following activities characterized Phase III of the Tanga program.

- An institutional capacity assessment, creating a regional resource center, monitoring system and revenue collection pilots.
- Village action plans, mangrove management, supplementary income generation, fisheries management plans, sea weed farming.
- Youth awareness and education, policy maker awareness and monitoring.
- Effective program management
national and international officials and donors. In Sinaloa, Mexico, the State Director of Environment and Urban Planning personally intervened in negotiations between two municipalities attempting to form a joint commission to manage an estuary. Sri Lanka’s special area management plans, developed within districts, were identified and officially recognized by the national Coast Conservation Department as well as given direct support and attention. In Quintana Roo, Mexico, the Secretary of the Environment became directly involved in negotiations to create a marine park proposed by local fishers, and the President of Mexico attended its inauguration.

It will be important to revisit the initial premise of the TCMP that examples such as Tanga ICM could adequately serve as appropriate models for work in other districts, as well as some of the assumptions and recommendations in the original District Action Plan guidance. Phase IV of TCMP needs to be sure that revised guidance fully understands these adaptations. The MACEMP project is going to establish community funds and focus on district level ICM as well, offering a further justification for a careful review, assessment and revision to the guidelines.

The new Environmental Management Act and other changes in national policy, in addition to accumulating experience in the districts, creates the new platform for district level environmental management over the longer term. This will be some years in arriving, and TCMP can clearly have an influence on how this is carried out.

In the meantime it is essential to understand that the empowerment of districts and villages to manage their local coastal resources is not being accompanied by a proper share of implementation resources. The Tanga program evaluation noted that neither the fisheries management or mangrove management plans had been approved by national authorities. The central government needs to do more. Since much of what coastal management does is to protect common property resources and generate public goods, it is not reasonable to believe that all conservation and management can be funded through enterprise oriented incentives. The districts certainly understand this, but the national program, through NEMC itself, needs to show that district level ICM is supported within the National Environmental Management Act, that there is plenty of early implementation experience to draw lessons from, and that much good would follow from a national stance that continuously inquires of the districts “What do you need, how can we help?” and then follows through on those requests.

There is early evidence that TCMP supported districts are funding some action plan items, for example patrols, and CEAS awards, but this is not the same as having an adequate budget and line items for these new functions. To succeed, specific commitments from the districts are needed.
C. TCMP team capability and commitment to District and Village Level ICM for poverty alleviation

Accomplishments

The adjustments made to refocus work plan activities at the beginning of Year 7 came none too soon. The result was a solid year of experience by a number of core team, international advisor, NGO partner and district level leaders in working on implementing the ideas and selected tasks set out in the district action plan. The TCMP team drew upon Working Group members from NEMC and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, but also included selected international experts and local NGOs with specific experience in small business and livelihood development, and drew as well from the district level staff with backgrounds in extension and natural resources management.

Three words stand out from the interviews with TCMP, NGO and District participants: champion, initiative and feedback. Project participants are acutely aware of the deeper changes taking place in Tanzania as its government tries to decentralize, as its economy becomes more market based and efficient and as both the nation and the international community direct their resources to the challenge of poverty alleviation.

In operational terms, government cannot be satisfied with an inefficient, top-down approach that builds expectations, consumes a lot of “fuel” but results in only a few benefits trickling down to districts and villages. For their part, villagers and district officials cannot expect that presenting long wish lists and waiting for the resulting trickle of response is the solution to their needs. At its best, district action planning and village based management and livelihood development are breaking this cycle.

The most effective TCMP work couples awareness raising and participation with strategic planning, professional project design and assembling of capable and experienced advisors who find work at the district level personally rewarding and act as champions for this facet of ICM. The Bagamoyo district is receiving the most help from the TCMP. District officials specifically stated that they viewed their district as the showcase and training ground for the overall district action effort in Tanzania. TCMP staff and advisors appear to have more frequent contact and are carrying out a wider variety of activities than in Mkuranga and Pangani.

The most effective local groups and villages are those that see how to combine the opportunities set out through the TCMP with their own aspirations, ideas, good judgment and hard work. Those that are the most ready, in a sense “sitting in the front row” are selected at first, allowing the time for others to observe and build up their skills to follow later on. This summarizes in part the approach used by partners in the enterprise activities of TAWLAE, FINCA and ACDI in selecting participants in livelihood and action projects.

Gluing all of this together needs to be continuous feedback, which means evaluating, assessing and then applying insights and observations to improve the work. Participants in the tour guide group in Bagamoyo received this feed back from advisors and leaders, but also provide it to the advisors...
so that advising as well as activity implementation can be improved. District leaders help plan and carry out actions in Bagamoyo, but are at their best when they also listen to how the groups and villages are doing so they can make sure the technical and material assistance is available when and where it is needed. They also speak back to the TCMP to make sure that the village and district level work is understood, appreciated and properly supported, and they look ahead at the next groups and opportunities that could become engaged.

Adaptations

Realigning the work plan at the outset of Year 7 also meant deemphasizing national level tasks and activities and creating a supporting capability for the districts. Not everyone involved in environmental management is or needs to be comfortable with this shift, however only those who want to “sit in the front row” are going to be effective in the day to day listening, advising and following-up that is necessary to work well in the field. In fact, there is a general concern over the shortage of field-oriented professionals and extension agents. Several of the TCMP team members have made this shift, and the involvement of new NGOs and district level staff are creating opportunities for others to move into this work.

Concerns

The collegiality and esprit de corps that quite evidently characterized earlier phases of TCMP when the working groups were at their peak and the National ICM Strategy was the focus also needs to be replicated for the TCMP and district level practitioners as Phase IV gets underway. The CEAS program gives national recognition to villages; likewise district level work needs to be both recognized and listened to. This is important not only to encourage more experts and extension professionals to engage in ICM in the districts, but to be sure that the problems and adaptations occurring through experience, and the unmet needs for national intervention and follow up are also heard. For example, a district can conduct patrols to enforce fisheries and mangrove laws, but help is needed in addressing the trawling industry which become involved in conflicts with artisanal fishers.

Peer to peer contacts are also valued at the district level. Study tours have been effective---rotating meetings of district and village leaders involved in ICM among the three programs and engaging them in overall work planning can also offer both validation and insight.

D. Combining conservation, enterprises and the coastal poor

Accomplishments

The National ICM Strategy sets the stage for the emerging emphasis on local conservation results and incorporated the notion that livelihoods development would have to be a necessary ingredient. This was reinforced by the preparation of the District Action Plans and selection of initial projects. As a result, several different livelihood projects were selected and tested by villages. New technical advisors and support groups were brought in to provide expertise, training, and guidance. Two operating assumptions are in force here: (1) villages will only engage in ICM if some of their pressing needs are being addressed in some way, and (2) villages will be motivated to
undertake conservation measures when some economic benefit can be obtained. At the individual level, the assumptions is that success flows through increasing entrepreneurship and management skill and that some individuals are more ready and motivated early on, while others benefit from additional training and observing the early actions.

Villagers and local small business owners have a great many ideas for generating cash as well as obtain the food and goods they need. Any business owner needs training, financing, material inputs, good technology and production methods, marketing and distribution. Legal rights and tenure of some kind over the natural resource or land being utilized is also essential. The actions selected for TCMP support in Year 7 draw from national guidelines, for example seaweed farming, mariculture and tourism, the experience of more established field projects in the case of community based fisheries management and bee-keeping (Tanga ICM Project, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism's Bee-keeping Department and Pangani experience.) Some other projects focused on community sanitation and generating other public goods.

Adaptations

The major improvement in performance in Year 7 was attained by redirecting financial resources and refocusing team and technical support to alternate income generation activities that had been identified in the district action plans. In addition, skilled NGOs were recruited to aid in project implementation. TAWLAE provided business training and assistance to bee-keeping. FINCA experimented with micro-credit to seaweed farmers and tourism guides. Finally, additional resources were brought to bear during Year 7, most notably funding for mariculture (fish farming) through the USAID - URI SUCCESS project, involving expertise from the Institute of Marine Sciences in Zanzibar.
Table 5 Summary of several alternative income generation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Conservation connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bee-keeping (Mkuranga)</td>
<td>Locally adapted hives; a few liters of honey so far; mangroves remain intact</td>
<td>Training on business, honey production, adapted hive design for local construction</td>
<td>Adapting apiculture to coastal environments: humidity, bee behavior and other technical problems; slow results</td>
<td>Maintaining mangrove forest in pristine condition, prevent cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tourism guides, (Bagamoyo)</td>
<td>Trained and organized guides, inventory of local cultural resources,</td>
<td>Motivation to work together, business and guide skills, relationships with hotel and tour companies.</td>
<td>Expanding the offerings and providing high quality interpretive materials of both culture and natural environment. Stronger connections to market and tourism supply chain. Design, marketing and care of tours and routes. Interpretive signs. Engaging villages to offer food, crafts, home stays</td>
<td>Understanding of cultural and natural resources leads to their conservation. Improve practices in hotels, prompt local pride and clean up of villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based fisheries, (Bagamoyo)</td>
<td>Plan adopted, enforcement of rules (reduced destructive practices, overharvest) through patrols, identification of issues such as gear substitution. Bylaws adopted at village and district levels</td>
<td>Preparation of plan including surveys, negotiation and implementing agreements, monitoring resource stocks</td>
<td>Cost of boat patrols versus other means of enforcement, cost of introducing and adopting alternate gear, conflicts with trawlers</td>
<td>No take areas, gear and catch rules reduce pressure on stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaweed Production Bagamoyo, Pangani sites</td>
<td>Production and sales in several locations including experiments with group ownership of gear rather than acquisition through buyers</td>
<td>Production techniques, harvest and processing, business skills, agreements with buyers</td>
<td>Appropriate sites, depths, locations, avoiding use conflicts, tenure for sites, working with intermediaries, enforcing contracts, obtaining higher prices, shifting species to higher value cottonii</td>
<td>low- impact economic use of near shore water areas, option for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Capabilities</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Conservation connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkfish production (Bagamoyo, Mkuranga)</td>
<td>Test harvests and sales to markets, modification of salt ponds to meet technical requirements, selection of innovators and training of adopters, value added business activities</td>
<td>Techniques and scientific evaluation of pond construction and operations, business skills and entrepreneurial outlook</td>
<td>Theft, proper pond construction, transport to market, continuous technical assistance and extension</td>
<td>New use for abandoned salt ponds, protein and local cash source, option for declining artisanal and near shore fisheries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns**

Even the smallest, seemingly no-fail project can run into trouble for a variety of reasons. The right people might not yet be involved. For example, the first to show interest may not be the one to follow-through. It could prove difficult to identify those with an entrepreneurial outlook. An idea, for example bee-keeping, that works well in Tanzania, and even in the coastal mangroves, might prove to have hidden difficulties that take time to sort out. Technical questions might not be asked in a timely way to allow for solutions and work-arounds. Technical advisors are scarce, vary in quality and skill level, and not all are interested in or able to sustain the follow-up required to foster success. Ultimately, both donors and villagers themselves need to understand the relationship of the community to the global market place as well as their limited ability to take financial risks.

Building up trust and confidence among community members involved in projects, donors and government is a high priority. Completing and providing follow-through on activities is an essential ingredient and when combined with skillful assistance and implementation, a recipe for success. Starting and stopping an activity half-way is a drain on trust. The TCMP also needs to anticipate technical and policy pitfalls ahead of the work in the field. It also has to find, cultivate and support extension agents and experts who truly relish working at the district and local levels.

**E. Performance based technical assistance**

**Accomplishments**

The TCMP is contributing to a gradual increase in the availability of skilled and experienced technical advisors both in integrated coastal management and livelihoods development at the district level. During phases I and II, the TCMP was very successful in created inter-sectoral working groups by drawing upon and nurturing relationships among the growing number of professionals working in a wide range of government agencies and organizations. Torell (2004) reports that these groups served as "sounding boards in which agencies could contribute their ideas and assist in achieving its goals" to minimize the perception of threat that individual agencies
might feel. The National ICM Strategy was followed up by guidelines for a number of coastal development issues.

In Phase III, many of the district level actions refer back to these guidelines, and in turn, some of the agency staff and contributors are now providing technical assistance and oversight to the actions. For example, staff from NEMC oversees district action implementation, staff from the Divisions of Fisheries and Tourism contribute to tourism, seaweed and aquaculture projects. Sanitation projects were also undertaken.

*Adaptations*

The TCMP (and the related SUCCESS project) brought in several new sources of technical support, providing both scientific and business management training and expertise. For example, TAWLAE provides business training and technical advice in bee-keeping, FINCA offers rigorous training and small loans to several groups, the Institute of Marine Science is working on fish farming in two districts, and ACDI is providing business training and advice on seaweed farming projects. Dr. Michael Rice, Dr. Maria Haws, Dr. Jim Tobey and Brian Crawford are among the international experts that have contributed to livelihood analysis, training and field work. Several of the district level staff also have professional backgrounds in natural resources management, extension and fisheries.

It should be noted that much of the technical assistance as well as production inputs currently provided to some livelihoods, such as seaweed farming, comes from middleman buyers. What works best so far is a team approach that combines domain knowledge with specialized scientific and technical guidance, business skills development and continuous follow-up.

*Concerns*

Advisors in the NGOs indicate that much more than technical information is needed to help people develop successful small enterprises at the village level. Indeed a culture change toward individual initiative, group organization and skill building is required, and is equal in importance. Many of the livelihood activities are being treated as 'pilot' or 'experimental' in nature. This means that a variety of technical, business and market uncertainties have to be addressed that are beyond the ability of a village or even district to handle on their own. These add to the risks faced by local participants...that need quicker cash results for at least some of their livelihood efforts. Risks are also increased to those offering micro-credit, who need to be sure the business is feasible and profitable.

The idea of performance - based technical assistance refers to the need to shift the culture of extension and advisory services of TCMP away from conducting pilot tests that may or may not be successful and illuminate some facet of the national guidelines, toward supporting local projects with a high degree of accountability to the villages and districts and generates new businesses. The Director of NEMC proposes that each project that includes technical assistance involve an agreement among the participating village group, the district and the TCMP provided advisors. The arrangement with the Institute of Marine Sciences, with seaweed farming in Bagamoyo for example might serve as a model of success as it specifies what all the parties are to provide in
carrying out the project. The Financial Officer of TCMP recommends that advisor contracts be performance based rather than FTE based. The related concern is frequency of contact. Bagamoyo indicated they have only one knowledgeable [bee-keeping] extension agent...no where near enough to cover the different projects underway and make interventions in a timely way.

The performance based approach needs to apply to all professionals involved in the program to insure that scarce funding in Phase IV is used as effectively as possible and limited technical resources are directed to help current activities succeed, to 'finish the jobs already started' rather than become diluted by pursuing too many different, unrelated tasks.

Technical advisors express or reveal concern about the selection and design of projects, again reinforcing the distinction between interesting experiments and actual micro-enterprise creation. For example, Tanzania has experience in bee-keeping through a government department and TAWLAE’s volunteers have considerable success inland. Supplies are scarce and the market price is high. However, coastal bee-keeping proved to be more difficult, with some lessons available from Pangani that were detected only late into the project, as well as a misperception that a local bee-keeper in Mkuranga was having success and had already solved the problems.

The broader question is whether the national government is prepared to offer continuing technical assistance on the range of technical topics raised through an integrated coastal management perspective as part of its routine work, not for supplementary pay as the current project provides. Even bee-keeping expertise is scarce in the districts and there at least is a Department of Bee-Keeping.

Village councils, the districts, TCMP and the national agencies have a responsibility to look ahead and address issues of tenure, space allocation and use conflicts as the pilots and experiments become viable businesses that begin to grow. These conflicts are handled informally without the full set of tools that are available under Tanzanian law, such as land or marine area zoning, reliable maps, unambiguous use rights or concessions, ready access to national land allocation decisions and national awareness of village plans and decisions. The Districts and TCMP can do more to insure that the way is paved for expansion of the livelihood efforts once they are demonstrated and adopted.

F. Program Management

A detailed assessment of administration and management was not carried out. In terms of overall performance, most tasks were accomplished at least nominally and in consideration of the various adaptations and adjustments which project team leaders carried out at the end of Year 6 and beginning of Year 7 (see Appendix 1). Some observations are offered here as staff and leaders raised a variety of concerns during the interviews as well as the author’s own impressions based on 18 years of international experience in similar projects in developing countries.

The TCMP needs to make every dollar count and deliver the highest level of service to its beneficiaries, especially the people living in the coast. According to several interviews, the impression given by the history of the program until perhaps Year 7 has been one of high costs and deluxe treatment for core members, NEMC and CRC staff and consultants. At the same time there
has been a great difficulty in initiating and following through on the delivery of projects and services that benefit the field level. This runs counter to CRC’s own tradition of international field program work dating back to 1985, and to the client-centric, passionate commitment to Rhode Island coastal management dating to our origins in 1971 and which continues today.

The TCMP, like any CRC program, needs to set the bar high in terms of transparency, equity, efficiency and commitment to the most vulnerable groups living in coastal regions. Insuring that this occurs is the primary responsibility of CRC program management at URI.

It is urgent to address the problem of tracking the TCMP’s cash flow so that program leaders and task managers in the field know how much they have to spend, and not be blindsided by substantial errors in cash flow estimates that force curtailment of core field activities as occurred in Year 7. In Tanzania, monthly or more frequent meetings are needed that include a fiscal review made transparent to project leaders and partners. CRC must commit itself to providing a reasonably accurate real-time balanced checkbook service to the TCMP, regardless of the limitations of PeopleSoft, the complex software system that the University of Rhode Island utilizes to manage project funds.

The TCMP must adopt a transparent, robust work planning process that fosters active decision-making, peer review throughout the project year, and continuous feedback and adjustment. Partners and beneficiaries need to know how much money is available, how it is going to be spent, when they will have use of it, and they need to have a say in how technical services and management support are provided to them. These technical services must be provided on a performance basis not as a retainer paid regardless of how much support is offered or its quality.

V. Implications of Results from Phase III and Recommendations for TCMP Phase IV

A. Implications of Phase III Results

Maintaining a spotlight on the National ICM Strategy

The period 2005 - 2010 will see the unfolding of implementation of the National Environmental Management Act and the updating of strategies in a range of programs that involve marine and coastal areas, most notably the World Bank’s MACEMP project. The National ICM Strategy and many of its supporting elements will be advanced by these efforts, indeed they helped lay the foundation for them.

However it is likely that the flurry of new activity will mean that these links and the much needed sense of continuity of ideas and effort will be lost and the tendency to have each new project live in its own world will predominate. It is urgent that NEMC, through the ICMU when established, play a key role in convening meetings to bring the new set actors together on an annual basis in the tradition of Phases I and II. This is in doubt, since the National Environmental Management Law does not indicate the need to create such a unit, and it remains unclear whether NEMC will move ahead with it.
Within the next five years work at the district level will mature and the original District Action Planning guidelines will need to be revised, and many line agencies will have tested, incorporated and moved beyond the sector specific guidelines also prepared through the TCMP. By 2010, the life of project for Phase IV, it will also be time to revisit and revamp an ICM strategy within the context of the Environmental Management Act and the major coastal, marine and watershed projects that are about to take place.

A full court press on ICM in the Districts

The TCMP needs to fully engage itself in the mission to bring ICM to the districts, by working to showcase the three districts it is directly engaged with, but also to track and foster progress in all of the others. It would be great to see a banner reading "TCMP --- the District ICM People" to crystallize and validate this identity, and to build collegial relationships among the variety of groups contributing in one way or another to livelihoods, conservation and district/village capacity. National Steering Committee recognition of this would be essential, however even the USAID National Committee, which contains many of the same members, could reinforce this identity through both recognition and holding one of its sessions in Bagamoyo, for example, where district action could be showcased.

There are related opportunities and needs to offer training and peer to peer interchanges to participants in the MACEMP funded projects for example, since that project chose sites where TCMP was NOT working. Also, a deeper examination of the different "models" that have been tried would be worthwhile. While the Tanga ICM project does not seem to have recognized its value and influence outside the Tanga region and Pangani, TCMP districts have been adapting at least some of the activities, in particular community based fisheries. Closing the feedback loops back up to district, regional and national levels is also important. Conflicts between trawlers and artisanal fisheries affect most of the districts. A program to help finance more selective nets would benefit all fishers. Much better links between village coastal resource use allocation decisions, and national level regulatory and land concessions are needed.

While there is sophisticated GIS and mapping available at the national level, the picture at the district and local level in terms of basic planning and regulatory tools seems grim. District/village level technical information and tools could easily be developed, and capability could be created in District offices to assemble information layers that would support decision making and project tracking as well as securing tenure and access for conservation oriented resource users.

Livelihoods projects, entrepreneurship and related extension support to villages and local resource users

The TCMP should consider a special effort to review and discuss existing livelihood projects within the context of economic development in the districts and achieving high quality training and support in the field, and to foster candid interchange among project partners within the overall context of the poverty alleviation challenge and objectives in Tanzania.
B. Recommendations for TCMP Phase IV

Phase IV of the TCMP is designed to achieve three main results over its five year life of project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1</th>
<th>The Tanzania Integrated Coastal Environment Management Strategy is mainstreamed into NEMC and related sectoral policies, laws, strategies and decentralized governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICMU to deliver services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of 'model' by other donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy discussions in Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2</td>
<td>Seascape - landscape scale conservation is practiced in the targeted areas through local level governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants to districts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wami River Basin: Bagamoyo - Pangani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mkuranga District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replicate Tanga fisheries co-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3</td>
<td>Increased and equitable benefits from expanded opportunities for sustainable, natural resource-based micro-enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate - integrate marine initiatives, learning network (Result 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following recommendations draw upon the Phase 3 assessment in light of the Phase IV initial design.

**Recommendation 1  Engage District Level partners and staff into the Methodology for preparing the Phase IV Year One Work Plan**

Broader project team participation is needed during the transition to Phase IV. Hold project wide meeting to design and launch the work plan that emphasizes the role of TCMP in anchoring CRC and other partner coastal management activities in support of the Tanzania ICM Strategy.

Suggested methodology
- Invite district team members, key partners and selected village representatives.
- Determine leadership style and structure to use during the meeting
- Exercise(s) to establish sense of common purpose, collegiality, commitment
- Time for reflections on Phase III successes, challenges, opportunities
- Phase IV within the context of USAID’s new strategic objectives and results framework. Other relevant donor and client perspectives on the work to be done.
- Consensus on identity of TCMP in district action and livelihoods
- Understanding context of NEMC and other ongoing ICM type projects.
- Select project year one priorities,
Exercises to design some of the main activities, or at least Terms of Reference
Reviewing and creating internal work processes project management style to support work plan, norms and best practices for technical support.
Activity implementation team, partners, responsibilities.
Jointly develop overall schedule.

Recommendation 2  Take a broader approach to enterprise development

Set out and clarify expectations for economic development during the first year of Phase IV. Focus on business development, not on a continuing string of high risk 'pilots'. Recognize that coastal villagers rely upon multiple sources of income and may value TCMP support for meeting their needs even if the specific idea does not involve the use of a coastal resource.

Recommendation 3  Strengthen the work in landscape and seascape planning in the districts toward a stronger coastal management emphasis in support of the National ICM Strategy

Improve the quality of the district action plans. Address the problems and limitations of the administrative and decision making process at national versus district and local levels. Make useful, sufficiently detailed maps and data available at district level. Approach and involve the Lands Ministry on town-country planning matters, as this is more relevant than the Natural Resources agency.

Recommendation 4  Join together the TCMP and Tanga Program legacy documentation and prepare new District Action guidelines based on this experience

The Tanga Program was carried out in three districts of the province. It carried out many activities similar to the TCMP. There is the real threat that Tanzania will lose the bulk of the repertoire and knowledge of the Tanga project experience. TCMP should collect, organize and widely distribute the Tanga results and recognize its contribution to implementing the National ICM Strategy. Further, analysis and discussion in Tanzania is needed to make pertinent comparisons of TCMP and Tanga project contexts, approaches and results. This will demonstrate that TCMP is a strong advocate for district level coastal management throughout Tanzania. All of these materials and insights need to be incorporated into a knowledge management system.

Recommendation 5  Strengthen the project monitoring plan

Develop indicators that project team members will actually use in judging own progress, if necessary in addition to those needed by higher levels for administrative or research purposes.
Recommendation 6  Utilize the cross-portfolio framework offered by the USAID Tanzania’s Linkage/ Theme/ Tool

Phase IV of the TCMP should recognize and work to make additional contributions to the innovative program support objective emphasizing synergy among projects:

L: Linkage: a shared result (as defined by a common indicator/s) between two or more SOs. The result appears in two or more results frameworks.

T: Cross-Cutting Theme: a development problem that the Mission has determined requires integration into and across all SOs. The Mission’s themes are gender, HIV/AIDS, and governance.

T: Tool: an implementation approach (or a way of doing business) adopted by the Mission as an effective means to deepen development results. The Mission’s tools are information and communications technology (ICT), capacity building, and public-private alliance building.

USAID Tanzania recognized the case of ACDI/VOCA (an EG SO grantee) and University of Rhode Island (an ENR SO grantee) Seaweed Development Alliance with three private seaweed investors.

Recommendation 7  Link to USAID Tanzania Democracy and Governance Programs

One of the specific areas where the TCMP could achieve synergy is through the Democracy and Governance Program. The TCMP needs to determine how to take advantage of cross-portfolio opportunities and demonstrate how linkages are being made in the TCMP.

Recommendation 8  Recognize and communicate that all the ICM projects are working in service of the National ICM Strategy.

During the next five years a number of marine and coastal management projects will be carried out using funds from a variety of donors. TCMP needs to work with NEMC to insure that these projects recognize their contribution to the National ICM Strategy, their affinity to each other, and to both continuously assess as well as freely and widely distribute news, knowledge and intermediate results of each others work.

Recommendation 9  Set the program management bar high in terms of transparency, equity, efficiency and commitment to the most vulnerable groups living in coastal regions.

It is urgent to address the problem of tracking the TCMP’s cash flow so that program leaders and task managers in the field know how much they have to spend. The TCMP must adopt a transparent, robust work planning process that fosters active decision-making, peer review throughout the project year, and continuous feedback and adjustment. Partners and beneficiaries need to know how much money is available, how it is going to be spent,
when they will have use of it, and they need to have a say in how technical services and management support are provided to them.

**Recommendation 10  Foster a true sense of participation by field staff and in-country project leaders in Tanzania-level as well as Global-level partnership and network**

It is up to CRC and core leadership to create a sense of team effort, purpose and identity within the TCMP team, and to foster the connections and sense of well being and commitment that flows from inclusion in the broader CRC – led global coastal management initiative including SUCCESS and PEACE programs. This in turn has to be replicated within TCMP so that the leadership team is drawing people in Tanzania together, explaining how the parts fit together, and acting as an entity in its own right that has a continuing commitment to coastal management and poverty alleviation in the country. A brochure and other communications are also needed that demonstrates this congruence of effort.
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Masakesa, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
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Rebecca Savoie, Chief of Party, ACDI/VOCA, Smallholder Empowerment and Economic Growth through Agribusiness & Association Development, SEEGAD project
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Appendix 1: Annotated Checklist Review of Activities Carried out to Achieve Phase III Life of Project Results

Summary of Activities Planned and Completed, by Life of Project Objective.

Introduction
The Year 6 Work Plan was organized according to five Life of Project Objectives which meshed with and supported USAID/Tanzania's Strategic Results Framework. These were mapped to the specific intermediate results for USAID/Tanzania's Strategic Objective #2. Work in the coastal districts and the national level was scattered across several of these IRs. The Year 7 work plan attempted to pull together and coordinate a reduced set of the 31 different activities from Year 6, grouping them under three overarching "goals". This scheme also was mapped to SO 2.

The following table tries to summarize the body of work carried out in Years 6 and 7. It retains the original five life of project objectives but regroups the activities from Years 6 and 7 slightly differently to emphasize the adjustments in emphasis made between the two years. Year 6 contained 31 activities, while Year 7 had a much reduced set of 17. Ten were added and many others discontinued, in most cases by completion without further follow-up.

Key: Y6 L1_1, means Year 6, Life of Project Result 1, Activity 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life of Project Objective 1: National Coastal Strategy Implemented through interventions at the national and local levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ICM technical team was kept together and functioning through Phase III. The National ICM Strategy was presented to a number of stakeholder groups after its adoption. As noted above, the subsequent adoption of the National Environmental Management Act in 2004, as well as several important new projects that will fund coastal and marine conservation and management. Finally some short term tasks were included. The link to marine protected areas seems more appropriate in another category, see the work in the Dar Es Salaam Marine Park (Y6 L2-12 for example.) The new MACEMP project funded through the World Bank, will make a major investment in a system of Marine Parks. Work in Zanzibar is featured in the MACEMP as well, and even a small activity on pearl culture is occurring there through the SUCCESS project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Started?</th>
<th>Completed?</th>
<th>Notes on implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y6L1_1</td>
<td>Maintain ICM technical group See Year 6 Work Plan, 3.3.1</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L1_2</td>
<td>Present adopted strategy to stakeholders</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L1_3</td>
<td>Initiate preliminary assessment of coastal management in Zanzibar</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L1_6</td>
<td>Develop a guide for SAMP development process</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L1_7</td>
<td>Links with Marine Protected Areas</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life of Project Objective 2: integrated, sustainable approaches promoted for the development of major economic uses

This project result could be characterized as "response to requests for support from the National Environmental Management Council". For example, activities Y6 L2_15 and Y7 L5_6 were carried out to help the Shipping Department address oil spill contingency planning. This result area also encompasses the formation or continuation of an interagency working group to draft policy papers and guidelines, for example the Coastal Tourism Development Guidelines. This was accompanied by the compilation of a "tool kit" of related materials, and then followed up with response to a specific request in Kilwa (Y6 L2_14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Started?</th>
<th>Completed?</th>
<th>Notes on implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_12 Dar es Salaam Marine Reserve Management Plan</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_8 Support the mariculture focus group See 3.3.2 in Year 6 work plan</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_9 Extension activities targeting private sector</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>How to prepare seaweed strategy, coastal guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_10 Support coastal tourism group. See Year 6 3.3.2</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Main focus on coordination through Masakesa, who has been involved in a variety of policy and district field activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_11 Guidelines for Coastal Tourism Development</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Not translated to Kiswahili yet, a chance to revise the pub when translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_13 Tool kit for Local Tourism Planners</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_14 Technical input to coastal tourism Kilwa</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Management plan produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L2_15 Oil and gas field development</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>At request of NEMC to address pending issue, links made to WWF, Shipping Dept., represents support to sectoral agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L5_6 Oil spill contingency plan</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Same as Y6 L2_15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life of Project Objective 3: Effective coastal ecosystem monitoring and assessment system, ICM decisions informed

The Scientific and Technical Working Group was reorganized as the Research and Extension Group to emphasize the need to link science more closely with management needs. The second State of the Coast Report was published and NEMC is pursuing funding for a third edition, which is in line with their requirement to issue such documents under the new Environmental Management Act. In addition, the new World Bank MACEMP project is expected to finance a considerable amount of new work as part of the creation of the system of marine protected areas for Tanzania. TCMP also prepared and released the Ecosystem Monitoring publication in Kiswahili. Field work was conducted in support of coral reef, mangrove management and fisheries management during Years 6 and 7, with a focus on the Bagamoyo district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Started?</th>
<th>Completed?</th>
<th>Notes on implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L3_16</td>
<td>Support research and extension group</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L3_17</td>
<td>Produce State of the Coast 2003</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L3_18</td>
<td>Produce Guide to Ecosystem monitoring</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Life of Project Objective 4: Enhanced general awareness on, and constituencies for, ICM

A number of activities related to district actions plans were originally included here. In Year 6, activity #22 seemed to be the overarching approach to district level work...that is, responsive not proactive. Year 7 saw the most significant change in how this LOPR was pursued. The proportion of overall funding assigned to the activities listed below increased substantially, in part due to the contribution of complementary work by the SUCCESS effort, for example Y7 L4_7 to 12.

Most of the communication and broader constituency generating tasks were in fact carried out. The future of the popular Coastal Environmental Awards Scheme remains unclear as of the close of Year 7. There remained overlap with activities included to respond to LOPR 3. [NOTE: MACEMP communication program is slated to pick this up.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Started?</th>
<th>Completed?</th>
<th>Notes on implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L4_20</td>
<td>Support information and communication systems...network of practitioners...newsletter and email</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_15</td>
<td>Public awareness of ICM issues</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L4_21</td>
<td>Raise awareness and build support for ICM media, CEAS, magistrates, selected studies</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Started?</td>
<td>Completed?</td>
<td>Notes on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_14</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Yes, however there is no funding for the follow up and handing off CEAS, nor was an NGO found to take it on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L4_22</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>This was consolidated and greatly expanded in Year 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L1_4</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Limited to the three TCMP districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L1_8</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Checked off if any ICM related issues show up in district budget, for example fisheries patrols Gender book used in Mkuranga: funding at district level is in-kind only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L1_5</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Coordination element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_9d</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_9e</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Completed but districts want to modify approach so it included much more than patrol boats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_9</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Grants issued, implemented...complementary funds from SUCCESS, FINCA, TAWLAE and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_10</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_11</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_12</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_13</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Successful, elections coming up in October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_9a</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L3_19</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Yes, with focus on coral reefs, mangroves, however much of the work was disconnected from local issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life of Project Objective 5: Increased institutional effectiveness of coastal management at the national and district levels. This LOPR, like most of the others, incorporates national and local level activities. The TCMP has provided some support to students, staff and practitioners and maintains an archive of project and grey literature documents. Many of these are also available on its web pages. However, the ICMU called for in the National ICM Strategy has not yet been formed. As of this writing, its function is seen more as the host of a revived annual ICM meeting featuring scientific and policy papers and discussions. The TCMP itself will continue to focus on carrying out projects at the district level while NEMC, presumably through ICMU, would focus on supervision and oversight of work carried out through other agencies and entities. The ICMU has not been set up, so the approach at the national level remains ad hoc. MACEMP will be implemented by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism in cooperation with NEMC, and will have its own independent project management unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Started?</th>
<th>Completed?</th>
<th>Notes on implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L5_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cancelled due to budget limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L5_4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Applied in project sites where seaweed trials are taking place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L5_6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>See National Environmental Management Act and various other laws such as new tourism policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L5_7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Completed, need the specific details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L5_27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Nomination of members by steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L5_28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>For ICM facilitators, team leaders, law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L5_29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Student interns, individuals associated with the technical groups, some district people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L5_30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>The project coordinator, J. Daffa and others participated in many workshops and events at the regional level. These were funded primarily by non-project sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L5_16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>See oil spill plan, review of policies in different agencies. See Y6 L2_15 Office space for GIS until May 2005, computer systems support, vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y6 L5_31</td>
<td>Y6</td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y7 L4_17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>Yes, see WILD, PEACE project Tanzania ICM Story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership
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