

# **WORKING PAPER**

## **Methodological Approach of Proyek Pesisir in North Sulawesi**

**Prepared for the Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island,  
Proyek Pesisir, Jl. Madiun No. 3, Menteng, Jakarta, Indonesia 10320**

**By**  
**Brian R. Crawford**  
**Associate Coastal Resources Manager**  
**Coastal Resources Center**  
**University of Rhode Island**  
**and**  
**Johnnes Tulungen**  
**Field Program Manager**  
**North Sulawesi**  
**Proyek Pesisir**

**PROYEK PESISIR**  
**(Coastal Resources Management Project)**  
**USAID/BAPPENAS NRM II PROGRAM**

**November, 1998**

**PROYEK PESISIR**  
(Coastal Resources Management Project)

**WORKING PAPER**

**Methodological Approach of Proyek Pesisir in North  
Sulawesi**

**Prepared for the Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island,  
Proyek Pesisir, Jl. Madiun No. 3, Menteng, Jakarta, Indonesia 10320**

By  
Brian R. Crawford  
Associate Coastal Resources Manager  
Coastal Resources Center  
University of Rhode Island  
and  
Johnnes Tulungen  
Field Program Manager  
North Sulawesi  
Proyek Pesisir

Citation : Methodological Approach of Proyek Pesisir in North Sulawesi  
Author : Brian R. Crawford and Johnnes Tulungen  
Year : Novemebr, 1998  
Title :  
Place of  
Publication : Jakarta, Indonesia  
No of Pages : 7

Funding for the preparation and printing of this document was provided by the Coastal Resources Management Project of the USAID-BAPENAS Natural Resources Management Project

# **METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH OF PROYEK PESISIR IN NORTH SULAWESI**

## **Development of Models of Best Practice in Coastal Management**

At the provincial field site level, the goal of Proyek Pesisir is to establish models of best practices in coastal resources management - through the development and application of methods, strategies, actions, local ordinances and plans - which can lead to improved or stable quality of life for the coastal communities, and stable or improved conditions of the coastal resources from which much of their livelihood depends.

A key project assumption is that in a country as large and diverse as Indonesia, no one planning model will be appropriate to all regions, provinces or for the thousands of coastal communities within the country. Any one province may also need to apply more than one approach to coastal planning and management. Therefore, it is likely that a range of models will be needed and the approach selected will depend on a variety of factors. Within the three project provinces in Indonesia, different planning approaches will be developed and tested. The primary planning approaches being tested in North Sulawesi are community-based village-level models of coastal resources management. Based on initial experience and lessons learned in the first year of the project, we are now focusing on three specific community-based models as follows:

- Community-based village-level marine sanctuaries
- Community-based village-level integrated coastal management plans
- Community based village-level ordinances and policies

The goal in the three North Sulawesi field sites is to develop and implement village-level integrated coastal management plans and/or local ordinances which can guide development and management efforts in order to achieve the broad outcomes of improved quality of life of the coastal people and stable or improved conditions of the coastal resources. Rather than starting initially with integrated plan development, the project has emphasized identifying issues, establishing baselines, and selecting a few simple management measures (referred to as “early actions”) for implementation initially, so that project staff, communities, and local government can gain experience and confidence, before taking on a more comprehensive planning process. This decision was in part, due to the acknowledgment of the lack of experience and low capacity of staff, communities, and local institutions to initiate and follow through on a highly participatory and comprehensive ICM planning program. In the case of the Blongko field site, the project started by promoting the establishment a community-based marine sanctuary, and addressing water and sanitation issues identified by the community as a key concern. The initial strategy for Blongko proposes only to establish a marine sanctuary and it’s associated management plan, as well as address a few other select issues such as water and sanitation, hillside farming and sedimentation. In the other field sites, full scale village-based ICM plans will be developed. This is explicitly being done in the acknowledgment that not all programs can necessarily afford to develop integrated management plans, and therefore, some simpler and more easily attainable model options should be available.

The conceptual framework for the community-based planning and implementation process in North Sulawesi is to carry out the following steps:

1. Communities Identified
2. Communities Oriented and Prepared for the Planning Process
3. Baselines Conducted
4. Issues Identified
5. Issues Validated and Prioritized
6. Management Options Developed
7. Management Options Selected and Adopted
8. Implementation Initiated
9. Review, Evaluation, Reflection and Adaptation Carried Out

For each step, assumptions of best practice which are to be tested and validated have been made. These assumptions are in essence, a series of hypotheses based on previous worldwide experience, on how the planning and implementation process should be carried out to achieve final outcomes of stable or improved quality of life of coastal peoples, and stable or improved condition of coastal resources. The project has not completed all of these steps yet, and will require at least another year before management plans are adopted and plan implementation begins. However, through an approach referred to as “early actions,” (designed to build support for the larger planning effort and test implementation procedures), some implementation activities which can be completed quickly and at low cost to address simple issues identified, are conducted while the longer term planning process progresses. While many donor funded and foreign assisted projects have stopped at the plan development and approval stage, Proyek Pesisir intends to continue in the field sites until implementation has been initiated through normal Government of Indonesia budgeting and implementation channels. The assumptions of best practice made for each step in the process - which are provided below - represent the guiding philosophy behind the project.

Communities Identified: A set of criteria are used that may predict rapid and easier attainment of sustainable use practices as well as building of the capacity of the community to assume responsibility for management (a priori factors which may enhance project and planning success). These criteria include:

- Degree of resource pressures or the vulnerability of the resources from unsustainable use practices (several CRM issues present at the site, resource degradation not too severe, issues not too numerous, over-exploitation not too severe)
- Social and political cohesion of the community (high)
- Community dependence on coastal resources for livelihoods (high)
- Community predisposition to resource conservation (high)
- Community interest in project goals and activities (high)

Communities Oriented and Prepared for the Planning Process: Initial efforts need to be made to describe and clarify project goals, process to be followed, and potential benefits to the community. Prolonged engagement in the community is necessary and fulfilled by placing a full time extension officer (outsider) at the site, and engaging a part time assistant/motivator

from the community. These field staff must be supported by a technical assistance team which can provide specialized technical services as needed.

Baselines Conducted: Baselines of socio-economic and environmental conditions are necessary to determine ultimate outcomes of project interventions. Model and best practice testing and validation at pilot sites requires detailed surveys and analysis combining empirical and systematic techniques with participatory techniques, as well as use of control sites. Once a model or best practice is validated, replication to other areas will require a smaller set of indicators to be collected and monitored, with more emphasis placed on participatory and rapid assessment techniques, and less emphasis on systematic techniques.

Issues Identified: Issue identification is based on expert technical assessment through environmental and socio-economic surveys, as well as by the community through formal meetings, discussions with key informants, informal meetings and discussions with a wide range of community members and stakeholder groups, and direct observation carried out by the extension officer and community assistant.

#### Issues Validated and Prioritized

Empirical estimates of severity are made by technical teams. Perceptions of severity of issues and priorities for action are provided by the community through formal and informal meetings, discussions and workshops. Specific participatory monitoring is initiated with the community where appropriate and depending on the issues (e.g. participatory coral reef mapping and monitoring using Manta Tow, beach profiling of erosion prone areas). Technical studies pertaining to specific issues can be carried out by outside researchers or experts when additional information is considered necessary for management planning and decision making. However, results of the studies and management recommendations must be shared with the community.

Management Options Developed: Options developed are a combination of technical suggestions and inputs from the technical team along with community generated ideas and recommendations. There must be widespread community commitment and approval before any action is implemented. Early actions to test implementation arrangements and procedures, and build support for the longer-term and more comprehensive planning are initiated by the community with or without project support (e.g. mangrove planting, well and latrine building/construction), or, are suggested by the project team and carried out after community approval (e.g. Crown-of-Thorns clean-ups, marine sanctuary establishment).

Management Options Selected and Adopted: The community decides the priorities among the issues, objectives for management, actions selected to achieve objectives, management structure and implementation arrangements. Extension officers and technical teams can add ideas and recommendations, but final decisions are the community's responsibility and prerogative. The process should strive for consensus and majority support, but if a minority is not supportive, this is all right as long as the minority will not try to actively sabotage the decision and actions to be carried out. The decision making process must be transparent and fair so while some individuals or groups may not fully agree or be fully satisfied, they at least understand how decisions were reached and can live with the majority viewpoint. Final

ordinances or plans must be formally approved by the village government and the village head.

Implementation Initiated: To the greatest extent possible, implementation actions are carried out by the community acting as the primary resource managers. Funding and technical support are provided by the project and or local/provincial government where considered necessary. Where certain actions cannot be carried out by the community alone (improvements in road infrastructure, drinking water supply development) they are forwarded to the appropriate level of government and to the agency concerned through an annual work planning process. Annual action plans are developed by the community and submitted to the village and higher levels of government through the normal bottom-up top-down development planning and budgeting procedures and meetings (“*Musbang*”, “*Rakorbang*”, etc).

Review, Evaluation, Reflection and Adaptation Carried Out: Annual reviews are conducted by the community with or without local government assistance and support. Reviews are conducted before the Government of Indonesia (GoI) budget planning cycle begins and are used as input for annual action planning.

### **The Long-Term and Scaling-up Strategy**

While the short-term goal is to develop community-based models and document how they can be implemented effectively, the long-term goal is to promote such models as part of a provincial and/or national coastal management extension program where they can be replicated and adopted throughout the province and nation. Our vision of the future, perhaps 20 years from now, is one where every coastal village has a marine sanctuary, every coastal village has an integrated coastal management plan, and every coastal village can and is developing ordinances to deal with specific issues such as coastal tourism, erosion control and protection, etc.

The concept currently being discussed to achieve this vision is some form of a decentralized coastal management extension program. It is being proposed that such a program be voluntary similar to coastal management programs in the United States and similar to how the Philippine Local Government Code also provides for local authority over marine resources management. In such a program, coastal communities can choose to participate or not. While planning and decision making is done at the village level, technical support, training and facilitation of the planning process is provided by a lead government agency. The major responsibility for decision making and determining how the resources are to be managed would be delegated to local communities. However, communities would need to follow a set of broad guidelines and policies established by the program. For instance, in the development of a marine sanctuary, the area selected must be permanently closed to fishing and other extractive uses; the area selected must have a high level of live coral cover; and, a high level of community participation involving all key stakeholders must be ensured for developing the village ordinance to establish the sanctuary. The location of the sanctuary, size, allowable uses (e.g. diving, passage of boats on the surface, etc.), management committee structure, and penalties for violations, are decided by the community. The lead

agency is responsible for ensuring plans and ordinances are developed and implemented within these parameters, but allowing a broad level of discretion by the community of how they are actually implemented. As an incentive to establishing marine sanctuaries, villages following these guidelines would then be eligible for implementation block grants.

### **The Role of the Extension Officer**

We believe that one of the most important factors to ensure a successful outcome is a high level of participation in the planning and implementation process. The extension officer in each of the field sites is critical to facilitating this process. The extension officer acts as the principal catalyst and coordinator of community-based activities by the project with technical support provided by the CRMP Manado Office, local consultants and local government agencies. The extension officer must live in and work full time in the communities, and must also be well trained in a range of knowledge and skills including marine ecology, and community development. Significant investments are required to build the capacity of these officers. Field extension officers come into the Manado office on a monthly basis for work reporting and planning. In meeting with other field extension officers, peer problem solving and feed backing of work activities and plans occurs. In addition, senior extension staff mentor the field staff and provide periodic, incremental training activities to constantly build the capacity of the field extension team.

The field extension officers will not remain assigned in the communities forever. Hence over the long term, they will need to ensure that local institutions within the communities have the capacity to be the principle stewards and managers of local resources. Once plans and/or ordinances are developed, approved and implementation initiated, and the community has developed sufficient capacity, the extension officer will be withdrawn from full time assignment in the community. They will then start outreach and planning activities in neighboring coastal villages as well as documentation of lessons and approaches based on the results at the initial field sites. The full time assignment of the field extension officer will be for an estimated period of from one to three years, followed by part time visits for at least one year after their full time withdrawal.

Another important factor to consider is the length of time spent within the community. It is important that an exit strategy be developed so that communities do not become dependent on the extension officer. The communities must be empowered to manage on their own, and their capacity developed to sustain management independently or with minimum outside assistance beyond the initial planning intervention. Each community is different, and the pace of development of community capacity and completion of the planning process cannot be specifically determined in advance. Rather than placing time limits on when the planning process should be completed or extension officer withdrawn, a better approach is to look at what milestones and outcomes need to be reached before the intervention is considered completed and sustainable.

## **Interagency Coordination**

At the village level, the project extension officers work closely with local village government, particularly the village head (“*Kepala Desa*”) and the village development council (“*LKMD*”), and are responsible for primary coordination with the District (“*Kecamatan*”) Government. The Manado office maintains linkages with Provincial government and at the Regency (“*Kabupaten*”) level by acting as the secretariat of a Provincial Advisory Group and a Regency Task Force. The Provincial Advisory Group - chaired by the Regional Development Planning Board of the Province and under the Governor - played an initial role with site selection and overall project activity coordination. In year two, this role is changing to more emphasis of policy development and overall project guidance. The Regency Task Force on the other hand, which is being formed in the project’s second year, will focus on coordinating implementation actions at the field site level. The Manado Office, and the Jakarta Project Office, also maintain close links with national institutions including BAPPENAS (The National Development Planning Board) and BANGDA (The Directorate General for Regional Development). While these mechanisms provide both horizontal and vertical linkages throughout the government system, it is with the communities themselves where most of the activities and discussions take place. Communities themselves are deciding allowable and prohibited activities within marine sanctuaries, site location, sanctions, management structure, and authority of the management committees. At the village sites, primary responsibility for enforcement, management and compliance lies with the community. The project will assist with dissemination of information to other communities to reduce the threat of illegal fishing in sanctuaries by outsiders. The project is building to address integrated management issues in a comprehensive manner, but it is still too early in the process to draw any conclusions from our project experience.

**Proyek Pesisir Implementation Framework at North Sulawesi Village-Level Field Sites:  
Planning Steps and Associated Assumptions of Best Practice**

<b>Planning and Management Steps</b>	<b>Assumptions of Best Practice Being Tested and Validated</b>
1. Communities Identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A set of criteria are used that may predict rapid attainment of sustainable use practices as well as ease of building the capacity of the community to assume responsibility for management (a priori factors which may enhance project and planning success).</li> </ul>
2. Communities Oriented and Prepared for the Planning Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial efforts describe &amp; clarify project goals, and community benefits.</li> <li>• Prolonged engagement in the community is necessary.</li> <li>• A technical assistance team support on-site staff.</li> </ul>
3. Baselines for Models and Replication Sites Conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socio-economic and environmental baselines necessary to determine project outcomes.</li> <li>• A combination of empirical/systematic techniques and participatory techniques are used.</li> <li>• Control sites are necessary for model/best practice testing and validation.</li> <li>• A subset of indicators with more emphasis placed on participatory and rapid assessment techniques used for best practice replication.</li> </ul>
4. Issues Identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue identification based on expert technical assessment and by inputs from the community through key informants, meetings, informal discussions.</li> </ul>
5. Issues Validated and Prioritized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empirical estimates of severity of issues are made by technical teams.</li> <li>• Perceptions of severity of issues and priorities are provided by the community.</li> <li>• Participatory monitoring initiated where appropriate.</li> <li>• Technical studies, when needed, are carried out by outside experts, but results shared with the community.</li> </ul>
6. Management Options Developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options developed are a combination of inputs from the technical team and from the community.</li> <li>• Widespread community commitment and approval necessary before any actions initiated.</li> <li>• Early actions are initiated by the community or suggested by the project team and carried out after community approval.</li> </ul>
7. Management Options Selected and Adopted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community makes final decisions on priority of issues, objectives for management and actions selected, management structure and implementation arrangements.</li> <li>• Technical teams provide guidelines, inputs and recommendations only.</li> <li>• Consensus or majority support required.</li> <li>• The decision making process must be transparent and fair.</li> <li>• Formal approval of plan by village head and district government.</li> </ul>
8. Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation actions carried out by the community as the primary resource managers, and where needed, by higher level GOI agencies.</li> <li>• Funding and technical support is provided by local/provincial government where needed.</li> <li>• Annual actions plans are developed by the community.</li> <li>• Action plans approved through GOI regular budgeting process.</li> </ul>
9. Review, Evaluation, Reflection & Adaptation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual reviews conducted by the community with or without GOI.</li> <li>• Reviews are used as basis of annual action planning .</li> </ul>