

CHAPTER 2

COASTAL GOVERNANCE IN DONOR-ASSISTED COUNTRIES

Lynne Zeitlin Hale and Stephen Bloye Olsen

BACKGROUND

The Coastal Resources Management Program (CRMP) has pioneered an approach to assisting developing countries progress towards better governance and use of their coastal resources. Through this 18-year initiative, the Coastal Resources Center (CRC) at the University of Rhode Island has had the privilege to assist a wide array of countries to make progress in coastal management. CRMP has worked with a range of nations to do a better job of allocating, using, developing and conserving coastal resources for the purpose of improving the well-being of the people of the place, the development of the nation, and the health and quality of the environment. The countries in which CRMP has worked are diverse. They range from small, very poor but relatively peaceful and stable nations like Tanzania, to middle-income countries like Mexico and Thailand, to nations experiencing political transformations and social turmoil like Indonesia and Ecuador, and to nations in a longstanding civil war like Sri Lanka. In each place,

CRMP has worked with a wide range of partners to make substantial forward progress. The program has also tried to take what has been learned—place by place, year by year—and have an impact on how coastal issues are defined and addressed at larger regional and global scales. These lessons are also used to shape how the profession of coastal management evolves by integrating what is learned into training materials and publications that document and analyze that experience. This chapter is a reflection on some of what was learned through the experience of leading this major coastal management program. (See Box 1.)

As pointed out by Lowry (2002), learning from experience can occur through a wide range of activities, and the practice-relevant conclusions may be expressed along a scale that ranges from anecdote to statistically significant conclusions. What follows are lessons drawn from insights from project implementation, from discussions with colleagues, and from CRC's participation in the evolving field of coastal management. They are offered to complement the more analytical pieces on aspects of the practice that CRC and CRMP have produced over the last decade. This repertoire can be accessed through the papers in this volume and CRMP's *World of Learning in Coastal Management: A Portfolio of Coastal Resources Management Program Experience and Products* report with an accompanying compact disc, which contains over 100 CRMP-generated documents (CRC, 2002).

CRMP'S FOUNDATION OF BELIEFS, VALUES AND CONCEPTS

When CRMP began, CRC had developed through its work in New England a number of principles as to how to successfully launch and sustain coastal programs. (See Box 2.) The Center believed that for such programs to succeed they must be supported by the people of the place—that a program constituency is essential (Olsen, 1993). CRC believed that an unwavering focus on participation, relevance and results is critical to building such support. The process through which a program is developed is as important as the reliable knowledge or technical information on which it is based. Successful programs need to enjoy strong national support but must produce tangible results in specific places. CRC knew that local leadership was essential, and that government, universities, non-governmental

**BOX 1: THE COASTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
(CRMP)
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

CRMP I (1985 TO 1995)

Goal: Demonstrate that the principles and practice of integrated coastal management (ICM) can be usefully applied to critical coastal issues and geographic areas in developing countries.

Objectives

1. **Pilot ICM programs.** Assist three pilot nations—Ecuador, Sri Lanka and Thailand—establish ICM programs (1985-95)
2. **Capacity building and outreach.** Widely disseminate approaches, techniques and learning from the pilots (1991-95)
3. **Leadership.** Contribute to U.S. leadership in advancing a global ICM agenda (1993-95)
4. **Institutional Capacity.** Build sustained capacity at the University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center in international coastal management (1985-95)

CRMP II (1995-2003)

Goal: Increased conservation and sustainable use of coastal resources.

Objectives

1. **Improved management of coastal resources in key USAID countries.**
 - ❖ Provide field support to ICM programs in participating countries—Indonesia, Mexico, Tanzania, Kenya
 - ❖ Catalyze increased USAID mission interest in ICM
 - ❖ Promote interaction and learning among USAID-supported ICM programs
2. **Global technical leadership in ICM.**
 - ❖ Participate in global initiatives and build strategic partnerships
 - ❖ Develop and disseminate ICM tools
 - ❖ Build global capacity for ICM, especially among practitioners

organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and resource users must all be active participants in coastal planning and implementation.

Over the 18-year period of CRMP, these beliefs have been tested, not only by CRC but by many others as the number of ICM projects and programs around the world have proliferated (Sorensen, 2000). During this period, the basic values and beliefs that underlie CRMP's work have remained unchanged. However, CRMP's approach to coastal management has been adapted and modified over the years to reflect lessons learned through experience—both its own and others. CRMP staff have generalized from their experience to develop a number of basic concepts and tools to guide programs in their design, implementation and assessment. These concepts and tools are set forth in some detail both in CRC's *Manual for Assessing Progress in Coastal Management* (Lowry, Olsen and Tobey, 1999) as well as in a number of papers (Olsen, 2002; Olsen 2003; Olsen and Christie, 2000; Olsen et al., 1998; Hale et al., 1998).

The essential aspects of the approach are:

- ❖ Recognition that the scope of ICM must include a *definition of ICM* that includes both conservation and development. CRMP embraces the definition of ICM as used by the United Nations Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) (1996): “(A) continuous and dynamic process that unites government and the community, science and management, sectoral and public interests in preparing and implementing an integrated plan for the protection and development of coastal ecosystems and resources.”
- ❖ Recognition that while ICM's fundamental purpose is to move towards more sustainable forms of development, progress is made through a *linked sequence of outcomes*. (See Chapter 1.)

❖ Recognition that *ICM is a governance process* that goes through a policy or project development cycle with each cycle representing a “generation.” (See Chapter 1.) It is through completion of successive generations, with each generation building on the accomplishments and lessons of the previous one but expanding in scope and scale, that ICM programs will begin to achieve Second and Third Order outcomes at significant scales. The policy cycle and the essential actions that need to occur at each step of the process provide a road map for sustained progress.

TRANSLATING CRMP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES INTO SUSTAINED PROGRESS

While CRMP goals and objectives have evolved over the course of the last two decades, in each nation where program staff works their primary objective is to advance the ICM governance process towards more sustainable forms of development. How this broad objective gets translated into an effective program in a specific place is at the core of designing and implementing donor-assisted projects. For CRMP, that translation is guided by values which explicitly recognize the country and its people as its primary “client,” the program’s underlying concept of how ICM programs progress, and a pragmatic integration of the preceding with the objectives of the USAID mission sponsoring the work.

At a practical level, CRC analyzes the complex development, environmental and governance situations. The Center also pays careful attention to assessing the demand and capacity for ICM, as well as reviewing a place’s previous experience with ICM. These two factors are of particular interest and concern. Since progress is most important, CRMP wants to capitalize on potential building blocks (e.g. existing and completed projects). At the same time, work is done to develop an appreciation for how the current coastal management issues have evolved. Lastly, a realistic assessment of capacity for undertaking an ICM governance initiative is essential. It has been CRMP’s practice to balance the complexity of a program’s design and aspirations with local capacity. Absent this balance, local ownership and sustained progress are unlikely. In this way, program staff try to shape a

BOX 2: GOOD PRACTICES FOR INITIATING AND SUSTAINING EFFECTIVE COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The Coastal Resources Management Program has identified good ICM practices that can be adapted to the unique contexts of different nations and sites:

- ❖ Recognize that coastal management is essentially an effort in governance. Coastal programs follow a policy process where the challenge lies in developing, implementing and adopting sustainable solutions to resource use problems and conflicts
- ❖ Work at both the national and local levels, with strong linkages between levels
- ❖ Build programs around issues that have been identified through a participatory process
- ❖ Develop an open, participatory and democratic process, involving all stakeholders in planning and implementation
- ❖ Build constituencies that support effective coastal management through public information/awareness programs
- ❖ Utilize the best available information for planning and decisionmaking. Good ICM programs understand and address the management implications of scientific knowledge
- ❖ Commit to building national capacity through short- and long-term training, learning by doing, and forming long-term partnerships with host country colleagues and institutions based on shared values
- ❖ Complete the loop between planning and implementation as quickly and frequently as possible, using small projects that test and demonstrate the effectiveness of innovative policies. Recognize that programs undergo cycles of formulation, implementation and refinement, with each cycle building on prior experience, and program cycles expanding in scope and detail to address new or more complex issues
- ❖ Set explicit goals and targets, monitor and self-evaluate performance

From: Olsen, et al., 1998

course of action that navigates among competing interests, and sets realistic intermediate project objectives to assist a nation in advancing a governance process that can lead to more equitable, and environmentally and socially sustainable patterns of coastal resource use.

CONTEXT AND CAPACITY MATTER

In considering how the principles and practice of coastal management can help address coastal problems and opportunities in any country, it is necessary to look at its unique context for management. The aspects of country context that matter are many—from size, to governmental system, to relative significance of the coast to the country, to the degree, amount and distribution of wealth, to literacy, to scientific expertise, to traditions of democracy, to religion. As mentioned above, a nation’s previous experience with ICM is crucial.

Governance context

Since ICM is a governance process, and one that was initially developed in the U.S., differences in governance context and capacity are important to understand. The U.S. is a wealthy nation, with a relatively high degree of social stability with multiple institutionalized mechanisms to balance individual and societal rights. The U.S. has multiple levels of government, and while they often have different objectives and different capabilities, they provide a relatively stable structure for coastal management. There are also well-developed organizations within civil society that can represent stakeholder interests, from environmental advocacy groups, to business associations, to fishermen’s associations, to labor unions. There are democratic traditions, checks and balances among the branches of government, and a free press. A “social contract” exists between people and their government. In many donor-assisted nations, these structures and traditions are lacking. The impact is that programs attempting to advance ICM in such nations must devote considerable time and attention to creating the context, or enabling conditions, that allow an ICM governance initiative to succeed. This means it is likely to take longer to reach sustainable outcomes—even First Order outcomes—in USAID-assisted countries than it did in the U.S.

Why is creation of enabling conditions both so important and so challenging for ICM initiatives? ICM is about promoting social equity as interests are balanced and resource allocation decisions are made. Balancing the many interests that need to be considered when making significant coastal management decisions—decisions that are often about common property resources—requires inclusive, transparent processes, facilitated by effective institutions. Such processes are difficult to carry out even in places with democratic traditions. In countries where poor people and other major segments of society, such as women and youth, are too often “voiceless” and powerless, initiating such processes is challenging, time consuming and not without risk. The disparity in power—and therefore influence—over decisionmaking among interest groups in CRMP countries is great. Prior to CRMP, there were often no mechanisms for bringing groups and their concerns regarding coastal resources to the table. The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) mandated substantial public and inter-governmental participation in coastal program formulation and implementation. This mandate was initially resisted by some government agencies, particularly those with a “command and control” tradition of management. Such participation is now the norm in America’s environmental management. It is useful to remember that coastal management programs were at the forefront of this transformation in the U.S..

Overcoming the implementation gap is the greatest challenge

There is always a gap between what laws and plans say and what happens in the real world. The magnitude of that gap, however, is almost always orders of magnitude greater in the countries where CRMP works than in the U.S. In America, one has a full suite of management tools to apply—laws, regulations, voluntary actions, financial incentives, education, and public works projects, as well as access to financial resources and well-trained personnel. In CRMP countries, many of these tools are ineffective (as in the equitable application of regulatory processes) and/or too expensive. Meaningful implementation is difficult to achieve without a full set of tools, without sustained commitment and without sustained funding. This has led not only to greater challenges, but frequently to great innovation in developing new approaches to implementation.

Continuity of effort is essential for program learning, evolution and growth

Coastal management issues are never “solved” once and for all, nor is an effective coastal management program a static one. Successful coastal programs are developed incrementally, they learn from their own and others’ experience, and they develop institutional mechanisms that allow them to identify and address new issues, to innovate, to sustain and re-invent themselves (Olsen, 2003). Achieving program continuity is often challenging in donor-assisted countries. ICM efforts are too often a disconnected group of donor-funded projects rather than contributions to a coherent, country-driven program, in which different donors fund different elements of a national program. In the 1980s and 1990s donors favored working with NGOs, often excluding governments completely from their environmental and biodiversity conservation programs. Very rarely are promising beginnings passed on for continued support from another donor. Too frequently, the assumption is that once a program has been designed, implementation is the responsibility of the national government or that individual initiatives must become financially self-supporting. In other words, that it is time for “graduation.” Yet we have learned in all programs—whether in the U.S. or in a donor-assisted nation—that continuing financial support is essential to the implementation and sustained success of a program.

The issues that ICM programs address

There is a great commonality in coastal issues around the world. With few exceptions, most coastal nations are experiencing the environmental problems of habitat loss, pollution, and declining resources, as well as the social problems that accompany such issues, including resource use conflicts and the governance issues raised by poor planning and decisionmaking on major development actions. (See Box 3.) But this apparent similarity masks important differences among countries. Because poor nations and poor people are heavily dependent on the natural resources around them and have few-to-no options when local natural resources decline or vanish, ineffective management produces dire consequences. A decline in fisheries means that people go hungry, a loss of mangroves means no shellfish to eat and no fuel wood for cooking, water quality deterioration means that

BOX 3: ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CRMP COUNTRIES							
COASTAL ISSUES	U. S.	ECUADOR	SRI LANKA	INDONESIA	KENYA	TANZANIA	MEXICO
MARICULTURE	●	●	●	●		●	●
THREATS TO CRITICAL AREAS AND HABITAT	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
DECLINE IN COASTAL FISHERIES	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
TOURISM	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
URBAN DEVELOPMENT	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
LAND-BASED SOURCES OF POLLUTION	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
EROSION/ACCRETION/HAZARDS	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
SHOREFRONT DEVELOPMENT	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
LOSSES IN HISTORIC, SCENIC AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
PUBLIC ACCESS	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

● CRMP priority ● Issue present, but not a CRMP priority to date

people get sick and, too often, die. A second difference is in the rate of transformation of the landscape and the changes in resource condition. When development happens—whether explosive shrimp mariculture growth in Ecuador, Indonesia or Mexico, or tourism development in Mexico, Thailand or Zanzibar—its pace usually far exceeds the capacity of society to steer the process of change to desirable ends.

Finding the conservation/development balance

While in the U.S. ICM is not a “green program,” internationally it is often viewed as such. In all USAID-assisted countries, conservation and biodiversity protection are rarely high on the political agenda. Instead, the priority is on economic growth and livelihood development. Yet a healthy ecosystem is crucial to such development. ICM programs are most successful when they are seen as encouraging appropriate, sustainable development and not as a tool for promoting a one-sided conservation agenda. For example, in both Tanzania and Mexico, the ICM programs

feature strategies and activities that encourage sustainable resource-dependent economic development that benefits local communities. At the same time, ICM and biodiversity conservation programs are already complementary and would benefit by being even more closely linked. (See Chapter 10.)

CRMP OUTCOMES

Over the five- to eight-year life of CRMP II programs (1995-2003), substantial and important First Order outcomes (adopted policies, strategies, order and laws) and Second Order outcomes (changed institutional and individual behaviors) have been achieved at multiple scales. These provide the foundation for larger-scale Second and ultimately Third Order outcomes. In addition, CRMP II has documented Third Order outcomes—i.e. changes in environmental and or socioeconomic conditions at a number of demonstration sites—but at a relatively small scale. These outcomes are discussed in the case studies in Part 2 of this volume.

This progress is substantial and is consistent with the rate of progress made by start-up ICM programs in the U.S. after passage of the CZMA. In the CZMA, coastal states are eligible for three years of federal planning funds to develop a plan for approval to the national government (First Order outcome). In reality, the state program development process has ranged from four years to more than a decade. Once programs are approved and begin implementation, achieving significant Third Order outcomes has required many years of sustained effort.

KEY CRMP STRATEGIES IN THE FOCUS COUNTRIES

Tailoring the principles of ICM practice to local circumstances is central to CRMP. Through the stories presented in each country case study in Part 2, the art and science of “tailoring” projects is demonstrated. In this section, the focus is on five key strategies that have been central across the portfolio of CRMP programs, and how the application of each strategy has been different in each country.

Catalyzing and sustaining the coastal management process—the critical partners

Moving away from “business as usual,” and advancing towards more sustainable forms of coastal governance requires both a catalytic spark and a sustained effort. The individuals and organizations that begin programs and sustain their progress vary widely across CRMP countries. In Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Tanzania, CRMP had a single, strong government agency as the primary partner from the beginning. In Ecuador and Indonesia, there were multiple, designated government partners, and it took time to develop their central role in project planning and implementation. In Mexico, CRMP worked primarily through NGOs and universities, and relationships with government have been less direct. Regardless of which institution plays the initial catalytic role, in all CRMP projects government, universities, NGOs, the private sector and resource users must all play strong roles. Below, selected examples of approaches that proved particularly successful are highlighted; additional examples are found in the country case studies.

Government

Government is, of course, crucial. Government sets policy, has legal authority over common property resources, regulatory control over private property and development, maintains a civil service system, and has recurrent budgetary funds (however limited). Government is the entry point for many (but certainly not all) donors. It has been CRMP’s approach to work closely, but not exclusively, with governmental agencies. In working directly with government, the program has also experienced the normal challenges and frustrations. Corruption is a reality in many CRMP countries; civil servants are often so underpaid that they must work multiple jobs to survive, and the lack of operating funds often results in capable people sitting in non-functioning offices doing routine paperwork rather than carrying out activities that would lead towards meaningful results.

For CRMP, as for other projects, there is not a single strategy for overcoming these problems. Rather, a number of strategies have proven effective in harnessing the capability of government for real progress. For example, in

Tanzania, inter-departmental working groups were the primary means for getting work done. These groups provided a positive venue for government employees to contribute. Individuals were formally “seconded,” or loaned, to the working group for a percentage of their time. Working groups had budgets that allowed individuals the opportunity to work on well-supported activities, and CRMP’s well-equipped office (computers with Internet access, etc.) provided secretariat support and a welcoming atmosphere that substantially increased professional commitment and motivation.

Non-governmental organizations

NGOs have been key partners for CRMP in Mexico and Ecuador. In both these Latin American countries, strong NGOs existed, and USAID encouraged NGO partnerships. In both countries substantial investment was made in strengthening the capacities of existing NGOs to provide ICM services. In other CRMP countries, NGO involvement at the beginning of the programs was relatively small. This was a result of multiple factors—primarily the relatively underdeveloped ICM-relevant NGO community, and government counterpart suspicion of NGOs. In both Indonesia and Tanzania, CRMP has worked to strengthen selected NGO capacity for engagement, and provide venues where NGO involvement would be positively viewed by governmental counterparts.

Universities

CRMP has consistently sought out university partners in focus countries as it recognizes these partners can and often do play a crucial role in both catalyzing and supporting ICM (both technically and from a process perspective). For example, in Indonesia, CRMP contributed to the establishment and growth of a Center for Coastal and Marine Resources Studies (CCMRS) at the nation’s leading fisheries and agricultural university. CCMRS now serves as a national repository for learning on the many ICM projects ongoing in the nation, helps build capacity of ICM practitioners, and provides research results and technical advice to CRMP programs. CCMRS has also helped establish a national network of coastal universities that could ultimately provide similar services across the vast expanse of Indonesia.

A central issue surrounding university involvement in ICM programs has been the tension between academic and practical approaches to engagement in what is—at its core—a political process. In Indonesia, Mexico, Thailand and Ecuador, CRMP has worked with centers within universities that have a “service” and/or “extension” mission. Such centers have full-time professional staff (not tied to the academic calendar/teaching schedule) and can offer sustained services to governmental and community groups working to advance ICM. In addition, such centers can be brokers in identifying, managing and incorporating university-based research and knowledge into the ICM process. However, there are many challenges to the sustained viability of such centers within universities. Among the greatest obstacles is the reward system for faculty members, which typically values research and publication over extension and service.

Despite the reality of the challenges of sustained practical engagement of universities in the ICM process, CRMP remains a strong advocate for their continued involvement. Their ability to act as “neutral ground” and

BOX 4: THE ROLE OF CRC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

CRC is not a primary actor for ICM in the various nations where it operates. Rather, CRC is a secondary actor working to strengthen and influence the people of the place to better manage their coastal resources. CRC believes that its role is largely to motivate, verify and coach in-country professionals. It brings expertise and experience from elsewhere about how the coastal governance process can progress, as well as options for how to address the typical coastal development and conservation issues.

Providing this knowledge can stimulate local creativity and adaptation, thereby accelerating progress. It is CRC’s strong conviction—a belief reinforced by its CRMP experience—that the verification, motivation and coaching roles, built on trust and mutual respect that develops over the course of a five- to seven-year project, have played a critical role in helping in-country coastal managers achieve success.

provide respected advice on contentious issues in many but not all countries—in many Latin American countries universities are highly politicized—their relative stability as institutions, and their recognized and accepted role in education, training, research and extension make them essential partners for progress.

A capacity-building approach to ICM

Inadequate capacity to practice ICM, and to design and implement strategies that lead to more sustainable forms of coastal development are well-recognized problems. Building the capacity of individuals and institutions to successfully lead, catalyze and support coastal management efforts is, therefore, central to the work of CRMP.

CRMP's primary approach to building human capacity is through "learning by doing." In-country work is largely implemented by host country nationals through in-country staff, consultants, working groups and other partners who undertake project activities and develop products that advance the country's ICM initiatives. Local practitioners are frequently "accompanied" by advisers from CRC.

Capacity is also strengthened by building national, regional and international networks of ICM practitioners that actively share experience and develop the professionalism of participants. These vehicles range from participation in professional conferences to preparation of journal and newsletter articles.

CRMP also builds individual capacity through education and training. In 1995, CRMP convened a conference in Rhode Island entitled "Educating Coastal Managers" (Crawford et al., 1995). This conference identified and described approaches to building human capacity and defined the knowledge, skills and attitudes most critical for ICM. CRMP conducts several types of training—international short courses, regional courses and in-country courses—for coastal management practitioners, government officials and decisionmakers, universities, local communities and other

stakeholders. Over the course of the last 18 years, CRMP, just through its international training courses, has helped raise the skills of nearly 400 men and women from 69 countries worldwide. Many of these individuals now play an important role in national and local ICM programs around the globe.

While much emphasis has been placed by both CRMP and others on building individual capacity, it is now widely recognized that such effort is necessary, but is certainly not sufficient. Overall capacity development requires that individuals operate within an enabled environment—within institutions that function well and support values and goals conducive to sustainable coastal development. CRMP’s explicit institutional capacity-development activities, have, however, been relatively modest and limited to targeted NGO and university partners.

Linking projects to advance programs

When CRMP began in 1985, the countries where CRC worked were just beginning in coastal management and there were at most one or two donor-assisted ICM projects in each. At that time the distinction between an ICM project and a nation’s ICM program was small. Now, in every CRMP country, there are multiple ICM and ICM-related projects, but too frequently there is little connection among them and they seldom add up to a national program. Both Sri Lanka and Tanzania are notable exceptions to this pattern.

Creating and sustaining nested systems of governance to advance ICM

The need to link and promote synergy between national and local coastal management initiatives is well recognized in many of the coastal management guidance and lessons-learned documents which have emerged over the last five years (e.g. Cicin-Sain and Knecht, 1998; World Bank, 1998). All essentially recognize the need for a “two-track” approach to coastal management (Olsen, 1993; Olsen et al., 1998; Hale et al., 1998) that links “top-down” with “bottom-up” planning and management. A top-down approach focuses upon central government, its policies, procedures and

structures. A bottom-up approach works to enable change at the site, community, and local government level, with the hope that success can solve urgent problems, encourage resource users to become resource managers, and produce good practice models that can be transferred and replicated across a nation.

The two-track strategy combines both approaches by simultaneously and incrementally building capacity both within central government (national and provincial) and at selected geographic sites. National and local governments, in partnership with communities and resource users, are involved in the analysis of development issues and in taking responsible action. The power of the two-track approach lies in creating linkages between the tracks and promoting a sense of shared purpose at all levels. The challenge lies in the fact that different levels of government typically do not work easily together. When national government is the program initiator, it is not uncommon for local government to be resistant and even hostile to the program. This is especially true if local government perceives that they will lose power or authority, that their discretion will be constrained, and/or that they will be required to do more work or incur costs without commensurate benefits. Similarly, when local levels of government initiate coastal programs, resistance sometimes occurs if central government believes locals are becoming too powerful or independent, or that national interests are being compromised. Similar tensions and pitfalls have occurred when trying to launch co-management regimes at the local level, with similar strategies being used to overcome resistance.

As elaborated in Chapter 1, CRMP country programs have typically (but not always) followed the same sequence—the establishment of tangible ICM demonstrations at the local level which are recognized and supported by national government, then the creation of enabling frameworks at the national level that support and sustain local initiatives, as well as address coastal issues of larger-than-local concern. In Sri Lanka, initial work concentrated on the development of a national ICM program, one with substantial regulatory authority. A second, local track of special area management (SAM) plans was added in a second generation to make the coastal

BOX 5: DEMONSTRATION SITES: BUILDING BLOCKS OR DEAD ENDS?

The proliferation of “demonstration” projects as an effective strategy for launching larger-scale ICM programs and ultimately achieving larger-scale impacts is being questioned. Among the legitimate questions are just what is being demonstrated and at what cost? Once external investment at a site has ended, what impacts are sustained? Does the work continue to develop and grow? Do pilot sites get replicated or have an impact on how similar situations are addressed in other locations within the country or elsewhere. Do demonstration projects actually inform national policy, making it more effective? Both CRMP and experience reviewed at the Xiamen Conference in China (Olsen et al., 1997) strongly suggest that site examples of successful ICM are crucial. (See Chapter 8) However, as illustrated in the country case studies in Part 2, how site work is designed, how it explicitly connects to national initiatives, and how program implementers work with other projects and players determines both site sustainability as well as the potential for replication.

program a more proactive and positive force for improving the environment and lives of coastal people. In Ecuador, after an extensive, coast-wide consultation process, a national program was created that focused implementation in five local-level SAM sites. In Thailand, Kenya, Indonesia and Mexico, CRMP focused on establishing demonstration sites that then inspired and informed policy formulation at higher levels of government. In Tanzania, CRMP was able to build directly on the existing, ongoing local-level ICM projects, especially the Tanga Project, an initiative supported by Irish Aid and implemented by the World Conservation Union-IUCN (Torell et al., 2000). This enabled CRMP to focus its resources on the creation of the country’s National Integrated Coastal Environment Management Strategy.

Promoting rapid and effective program implementation

For ICM programs to achieve their goals, they must be implemented. In the policy cycle, the time to choose implementation strategies is after

issues have been selected and agreement on management objectives reached. While there are a vast number of management tools, they can be broadly categorized as regulatory and non-regulatory. In CRMP country programs, with the exception of Sri Lanka, the emphasis has been on instituting primarily non-regulatory interventions to address the selected issues.

While non-regulatory initiatives have proven extremely effective for building a foundation and constituencies for management, it is clear that to achieve Third Order outcomes, such measures must be complemented by codification and enforcement of guidelines of existing policies, or promulgation and enforcement of new regulations. The dilemma is that while the need for regulation is recognized, getting effective enforcement of regulations in most developing countries is difficult, and the consequence of ineffective regulations can be especially damaging to an emerging coastal program. Regulatory tools that are not enforced create only cynicism and frustration that together lead to a loss of credibility for a young ICM program. Such a loss will then undermine a program's constituency. Lastly, the cross-sectoral and cross-institutional nature of ICM programs seldom yield a new institution with direct regulatory power. More typically, ICM programs are "networked," meaning they rely on existing sectoral agencies to apply and enforce their regulations in a manner that is supportive of coastal management strategies.

Staying on the political agenda

CRMP programs take an issue-based approach. The majority of coastal management projects have been initiated as a response to the deterioration of coastal resources. These typically are expressed as losses in such important habitats as coral reefs and mangroves, and threats to public health and livelihoods brought about by such factors as declining water quality, the inappropriate siting of infrastructure, or losses in biodiversity. ICM programs are recognizing, especially since the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, that they must also address basic development issues such as poverty alleviation and equity if they are to be salient to the societies they serve and remain on the political agenda. At the same time, donors and ICM professionals recognize that to address

many issues in coastal regions (e.g., land-based sources of marine pollution, water scarcity) requires moving farther up the watershed and linking upstream and downstream management initiatives.

Coupled with the recognition that ICM program scope must be broadened, CRMP also recognizes that given the limited capacity of most coastal programs, success is most often found by focusing planning and implementation efforts on a relatively narrow set of issues. This presents an operational dilemma.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Over the last 15 years, there has been a convergence and an emerging consensus as to the basic concepts and principles that underlie ICM, and what it will take to advance towards more sustainable forms of coastal development. At the same time, CRMP experience and that of others reinforces that despite such consensus, there is no formula or recipe for ICM. The art, and the crucial determinant of success or failure, is in how these broad principles are tailored to the particular social, cultural, political and environmental conditions of a place. Given this convergence, CRMP's practitioners have refrained from making new lists of success factors or "lessons learned." Such lists already exist—both from CRMP and from others. Instead, the program can share a number of key messages that have emerged from its collective experience. Given that the approach or philosophy of ICM—that of integration, participation and transparency—is increasingly recognized as the approach to many of the complex problems in our society¹, it is hoped that these messages are heard both within and outside the ICM community.

There is an urgent need to define, support and sustain the ICM agendas of coastal nations and to escape the tyranny of short-term projects.

Nations need well-articulated, results-oriented, integrated programs to

¹ For example, ICM is the approach called for by a wide range of international declarations and treaties on topics relevant to coastal areas—from wetlands, coral reef and biodiversity conservation, to adaptation to global climate change and sea level rise, to controlling land-based sources of marine pollution.

which individual projects contribute if meaningful progress towards more sustainable forms of coastal development is to be made. There is a need to build on each other's work. Those involved in coastal management need to thread together the many individual projects that now exist in almost every location, to make the whole equal more than the sum of its parts. All partners—donors, secondary organizations and the many primary actors within each country—need a greater willingness to learn from each other and work together, share credit, and to vest program ownership where it belongs: in the hands of coastal people and nations.

Longer-term commitments to places and programs must be made to achieve implementation on a meaningful scale.

A second message is that past investments in creating the enabling conditions for ICM have been essential. It does take years, not months, to develop trust among key players, envision a positive coastal future that is different from today's conditions, and then build the capacity, commitment, constituencies and programs for carrying that vision forward. In many countries these conditions are now in place. This is not the time to "graduate" such programs. Rather, this is the time to harvest the investment—to move to meaningful implementation at scale with a full array of management tools. This means that more mature programs need to be willing to go beyond approaches that rely exclusively on voluntary compliance. While attaining high levels of societal support for and compliance with ICM programs is crucial, this approach must be increasingly supplemented by strengthened legal frameworks and enforcement measures.

While ICM must remain a locally centered endeavor, a major effort is needed to create enabling and supportive frameworks at larger scales to sustain and support these local initiatives and address the root causes of coastal degradation at larger scales.

This third message is directed to those engaged in the debate as to which level or what scale should be the primary target for investments in ICM. CRMP's collective experience reinforces the notion that ICM must be rooted at the local level. However, it also stresses that unless positively reinforcing governance systems are created at larger scales—at regional,

provincial, national and even international levels—those local efforts cannot and will not be sustained over the long term. CRMP has also concluded that the strategy of investing in demonstration projects remains an important and powerful strategy for launching ICM programs. They can and do inspire and inform action at other locations and at larger scales. Explicit attention and strategies are needed to ensure they do not become expensive dead ends.

Capacity development remains central to ICM, but one must tackle the full set of capacity-development challenges, and not focus exclusively on individual training and education.

Since coastal systems are among the most dynamic on earth, coastal programs must be able to adapt to both predictable changes as well as inevitable surprises. To do so requires a full suite of capable players—individuals who are willing and able to work together to solve problems. All of the central players (at both the individual and institutional level)—from government to universities to NGOs to the private sector to resource users and communities—must embrace their role and have the capacity to fulfill it.

If ICM is to achieve its long-term goal, it must form multiple new partnerships and address human development needs head-on.

The last and perhaps strongest message is that as ICM practitioners, it is necessary to get out of the coastal management box. One can no longer separate fisheries management or biodiversity conservation or integrated water resources management from ICM. Nor, if one truly believes that ICM must address issues that are most salient to coastal societies, can poverty alleviation or the basic governance issues of equity and transparency be ignored. While recognizing this need for a much expanded scope for ICM programs, initiatives must remain focused if they are to be successful and achieve results. This calls for an unprecedented expansion of the number and type of partnerships that coastal programs seek.

REFERENCES

- Cicin-Sain, B. and R. Knecht. 1998. *Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management Concepts and Practices*. Island Press. Washington, D.C.
- Coastal Resources Center. 2002. *A World of Learning in Coastal Management: A Portfolio of Coastal Resources Management Program Experience and Products* (CD-ROM included). Coastal Management Report #2235. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.
- Crawford, B., J.S. Cobb and C.L. Ming (eds.). 1995. *Educating Coastal Managers: Proceedings of the Rhode Island Workshop*. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.
- Joint Group of Experts on the Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP). 1996. *The Contributions of Science to Integrated Coastal Management*. GESAMP Reports and Studies No. 61. Rome, Italy.
- Hale, L., M. Amaral, A. Issa and B. Mwandotto. 2000. *Catalyzing Coastal Management in Kenya and Zanzibar: Building Capacity and Commitment*. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 28. New York, NY.
- IWICM (International Workshop on Integrated Coastal Management in Tropical Developing Countries: Lessons Learned from Successes and Failures). 1996. *Enhancing the success of integrated coastal management: Good practices in the formulation, design and implementation of integrated coastal management initiatives*. MPP-EAS Technical Report No. 2. GEF/UNDP/IMO Regional Programme for the Prevention and Management of Marine Pollution in the East Asia Seas and the Coastal Management Center, Quezon City, Philippines.
- Lowry, K. 2002. The Landscape of ICM Learning Activities. *Coastal Management*, #30, 4:285-298. New York, NY.
- Lowry, K., S.B. Olsen and J. Tobey. 1999. Donor evaluations of ICM initiatives: What can be learned from them? *Ocean and Coastal Management*, #42, 9:767-789. New York, NY.

- Olsen, S.B. 1993. Will Integrated Coastal Management Programs Be Sustainable: The Constituency Problem. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, #21:201-225. New York, NY.
- Olsen, S.B., J. Tobey and L. Hale. 1998. A Learning-Based Approach to Coastal Management. *Ambio*, #27 (8):611-619. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Olsen, S., K. Lowry, and J. Tobey. 1999. *A Manual for Assessing Progress in Coastal Management*. Coastal Management Report #2211. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.
- Olsen, S. and P. Christie. 2000. What Are We Learning from Coastal Management Experience? *Coastal Management* #28: 5-18. New York, NY.
- Olsen, S.B. 2002. Assessing Progress Towards the Goals of Coastal Management. *Journal of Coastal Management* #30 (4): 325-345. New York, NY.
- Olsen, S.B. 2003. Frameworks and indicators for assessing progress in integrated coastal management initiatives. *Ocean and Coastal Management* #46, (3-4): 347-361. New York, NY.
- Olsen, S.B. and D. Nickerson (in prep, 2003). *The Governance of Coastal Ecosystems at the Regional Scale: An Analysis of the Strategies and Outcomes of Long-Term Programs*. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.
- Sorenson, J. 2000. *Baseline 2000*. background paper for Coastal Zone Canada 2000: Coastal Stewardship - Lessons Learned and the Paths Ahead, September 17-22, New Brunswick, Canada, <http://www.sybertooth.ca/czczcc2000/>.
- Stiglitz, J. 1998. *Towards a New Paradigm for Development: Strategies, Policies and Processes*. Prebisch Lecture to UNCTAD given by the Senior Vice President and Chief Economist to The World Bank. October 19, 1998.
- Torell, E., J. Tobey and T. Van Ingen. 2000. *Integrated Coastal Management Action Planning: Lessons Learned from the Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Program*. Tanga, Tanzania.
- Torell, E. 2000. Adaptation and Learning in Coastal Management: The Experience of Five East African Initiatives. *Coastal Management* #28: 353-363. New York, NY.

CRAFTING COASTAL GOVERNANCE IN A CHANGING WORLD

STEPHEN BLOYE OLSEN, EDITOR

DECEMBER 2003

COASTAL MANAGEMENT REPORT #2241
ISBN #1-885454-50-3

The Coastal Resources Management Program is a partnership between
the U.S. Agency for International Development
and the University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center

This publication was made possible through support provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Environment and Natural Resources Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade under the terms of Cooperative Agreement No. PCE-A-00-95-0030-05.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
PREFACE	vii
PART 1: FROM PRINCIPLES TO PRACTICE	
INTRODUCTION	i
Chapter 1: Welcome to the Anthropocene	5
CHAPTER 2: Coastal Governance in Donor-Assisted Countries	37
PART 2: CASE STUDIES FROM THE CRMP	
INTRODUCTION TO CRMP I COUNTRY CASE STUDIES	61
CHAPTER 3: Ecuador	75
CHAPTER 4: Sri Lanka	117
INTRODUCTION TO CRMP II COUNTRY CASE STUDIES	149
CHAPTER 5: Tanzania	167
CHAPTER 6: Indonesia	205
CHAPTER 7: Mexico	243
PART 3: PRIORITY THEMES FOR THE NEXT GENERATION OF COASTAL GOVERNANCE	
INTRODUCTION TO THEMES	273
CHAPTER 8: Nested Systems of Governance	277
CHAPTER 9: Refocusing with a Gender Lens	305
CHAPTER 10: Conservation and Integrated Coastal Management	325
CHAPTER 11: Integrated Coastal Management and Poverty Alleviation	343
CHAPTER 12: Freshwater Management in Coastal Regions	359
Chapter 13: A Critical Path to Desirable Coastal Futures	367

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The relationship between the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Coastal Resources Center (CRC) at the University of Rhode Island has been a true partnership. Together we have faced the difficulties, surprises and successes that mark any attempt to apply new ideas to old problems. The knowledge that we are a single team working for the same goals, and defining together the changes in strategy required by our own learning and the changing circumstances in each country and the world at large, has been central to success of the Coastal Resources Management Program.

A great many people in USAID, in CRC and in the countries where we have worked have contributed to what has been achieved and learned. The authors of this volume thank everyone involved for their creativity, their energy and their leadership in addressing the complex issues in coastal regions. Most especially we thank our in-country teams and our partner institutions who taught us how what was being learned elsewhere could be appropriately applied to their own cultures and the needs of their countries. We have not attempted to list all those that have contributed to the ideas and the experience presented in this volume. To do so would require several long paragraphs.

While so many contributors to the program, one name stands out: Lynne Hale, former associate director of CRC. Lynne left CRC in the last year of the program—but only after setting in motion the drafting and redrafting that has resulted in this volume of reflections, experience and future directions. Lynne was CRC's point person with USAID. She led the design of the CRMP II field programs and made sure that they capitalized on what had been learned from the first set of field programs. Throughout the 18 years of the program Lynne's passion, perseverance and perception made it the success it became. All who have contributed to this volume thank her and wish her well in the next stage of her career.

PREFACE

OCEANS, COASTS, WATER, AND THE EVOLVING USAID AGENDA

By Bill Sugrue

Director

Office of Environment and Natural Resources

Bureau for Economic Growth, Agricultural and Trade

U.S. Agency for International Development

Since 1985, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has partnered with the University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center (CRC) in carrying out the Coastal Resources Management Program (CRMP). CRMP is a pioneering initiative working with developing countries around the world to advance the principles and practices of integrated coastal management (ICM). During this 18-year partnership, USAID and CRC, together with partners in the field, have learned a great deal about the complexities and challenges of better managing our coasts. This has included learning how to balance the need for ecologically healthy coasts with the need to promote a better quality of life for those who live and work there. Throughout this process, CRC has been an instrumental force in promoting a “learning agenda” for (ICM). In the selected CRMP stories included in this book, you will share in some of that learning. Let me summarize here some of the key principles that underlie the ICM learning agenda.

ADVANCE INTEGRATED WATER AND COASTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR IMPROVED ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

It is essential that ICM and integrated water resources management (IWRM) be mainstreamed into sustainable development efforts. ICM and IWRM are essential foundations for improvements in health, food security, economic development, democracy and governance, and biodiversity conservation. We must recognize the interdependence of these development goals. The interdependence of human health, food security, governance and the other human activities is obvious. How development objectives are pursued in these sectors can have dramatic impacts on biodiversity, and on the biosphere. The biosphere is currently in free-fall, so the significance of these impacts is not trivial. Conversely, biodiversity conservation programs, properly conceived, can significantly support CRMP objectives in economic development, food security, governance and other areas. The challenge to development assistance organizations is to ensure that they move beyond single sector responses to more integrated, cross-sectoral approaches that do justice to the exceedingly complex and interrelated factors that shape our world. Principles of integration as practiced in ICM and IWRM must be given the commitment of time and resources that they deserve.

CREATE STRONG GOVERNANCE AT ALL LEVELS

Good governance is more than just good government. It encompasses a range of processes in which public, private and civil societies organize and coordinate with each other to make decisions, and distribute rights, obligations and authorities for the use and management of shared coastal resources. A central operating principle of the CRMP has been that effective governance systems are what create the preconditions for achieving sustainable environmental and social benefits. We have learned that good coastal governance functions best when it exists as part of a nested system—that is, one that operates simultaneously at scales ranging from the local to the global. For example, sub-national and community-based management efforts stand the best chances to be effective and to be sustained

over the long term when they are supported by policies and institutional structures at the national level. Meanwhile, national-level initiatives build capacity for ICM governance across spatial and sectoral scales, providing support to local initiatives while addressing coastal development and conservation of more wide-ranging national interest.

PROMOTE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS

Participatory approaches to conservation are now recognized as one of the few means to ensure sustainable management of ecosystems and natural resources while also meeting local peoples' livelihood needs. This participation is most effective when it includes both the public and private sectors. ICM and IWRM are too complex for one institution or group of constituencies to "go it alone." Forging carefully selected, strategic private-public partnerships can help.

Eco-tourism is just one of the issues around which coastal programs are testing such partnerships. The hope is that by partnering with the private tourism sector, chances improve for achieving environmentally sound, financially sustainable, and culturally appropriate coastal tourism development. When these partnerships succeed, eco-tourism can have significant, positive impacts on local economies and can provide strong incentives for sound environmental protection and management. A caution is that "environmentally sound" and "culturally appropriate" cannot be throwaway lines. They need to be taken seriously. Not all eco-tourism is very "eco," and unless there is true and transparent participation—i.e. the local community is fully engaged, not simply consulted—the impact of tourism on local communities can be destructive economically, socially, and culturally, and the impact on the environment catastrophic and permanent. It is not easy to do this right—but it is essential to do so.

EMPOWER COASTAL COMMUNITIES TO SELF-MANAGE THEIR RESOURCES

This must be done while promoting alternative livelihood and food security objectives. In cases where local social and economic networks are

already well established and thriving, even at relatively low income levels, poorly conceived outside interventions can be extremely and negatively disruptive. Since poverty is not solely a function of income, but also of control of assets, empowerment, and control over one's fate, even the most well-intentioned efforts at poverty reduction or economic growth can have the opposite effect on people if existing arrangements are not taken fully into account. This is especially worthy of consideration in the case of indigenous communities. In such cases, poverty prevention, rather than poverty reduction, may be the appropriate goal. In this way, intact communities with essentially sound traditions of resource management may best be assisted by simply strengthening and supporting their control over local resources. Only modest, incremental initiatives aimed at ensuring continued food security and additional income streams may be called for; but here again, full engagement of the community, not simply consultation, must be the norm.

ADVANCE INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING AND CAPACITY BUILDING AT BOTH THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS

Inadequate capacity to practice ICM and to design and implement strategies that lead to more sustainable forms of coastal development remains a primary factor limiting progress in ICM. Too often, development projects bring in external expertise and funding without a parallel effort to build and strengthen in-country partner organizations—leaving partner organizations and the larger ICM effort vulnerable to failure when outside assistance ends. CRMP has used a different approach. Its preference has been to strengthen institutions over extended periods of time and to transfer the skills and the responsibilities for implementation to CRMP collaborating organizations. This approach is grounded in the belief that long-term collaborative relationships with partners maximizes learning and increases the probability that productive efforts will be sustained over many years.

The CRMP experience has also demonstrated the value to be derived from cross-portfolio learning. For example, we have seen how communities in the Philippines that developed community-based marine sanctuaries were able to provide useful insights to Indonesian practitioners attempting to

establish their own marine reserves. Similarly, experience in Ecuador and Sri Lanka in the development of shoreline management guidelines helped CRMP undertake the process more efficiently in Tanzania.

While USAID, through its overseas missions, presently supports coastal and marine activities in over 40 countries, only a small handful of those USAID missions have been able to invest in a more comprehensive ICM approach, with broad attention to all of the general principles cited above. The challenge remains to enhance the dialogue between development agencies and national governments on the economic, social and environmental values of marine and coastal resources, and the proper level of investment to maintain these resources as national and local assets. These priority challenges, which must be faced, and which will help guide USAID's future directions include the need to:

- ❖ Mainstream applied fisheries research and management into ICM programs, and promote effective governance of commercial, artisanal, and subsistence capture and culture fisheries. Science and technology advances must influence decisions on coastal resource management in a context of good governance. Both are crucial.
- ❖ Establish networks of marine protected areas with substantial ecological reserves in all regions, while ensuring the sustainability of these activities through the development of alliances and partnerships. Conservation groups and their allies in government and the private sector have made good progress over the past 20 years in establishing parks and reserves to preserve terrestrial biodiversity. The scientific basis for defining these reserves, and managing and linking them, has grown more sophisticated. The number and variety of partners supporting these efforts has grown as well. Coastal and marine reserves need to catch up. Strong partnerships among conservation groups, government, the private sector, and local communities will be essential.

- ❖ Enhance coastal and nearshore water quality through partnership programs to control both point and non-point sources of marine pollution, while addressing the impact of the growing number of coastal megacities. There has been little meaningful engagement in a significant way with the challenges of coastal resource management in the context of megacities. This is a huge challenge that needs to be confronted for reasons of human welfare and environmental quality.
- ❖ Reduce the vulnerability of coastal populations and their infrastructure to the growing threat of flooding, storm surge, and coastal erosion due to climate change and rising sea levels. Mitigation efforts are essential. A great deal remains to be done that has not yet been done. But serious—even drastic—efforts in mitigation do not eliminate the need to undertake, simultaneously, ambitious initiatives in adaptation because sea level rise and other effects of global climate change seem inevitable.

What is next? Clearly, coastal and freshwater management challenges and needs will not abate in the foreseeable future. World leaders reaffirmed at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg the central role that these resource issues will continue to play in the sustainable development agenda. USAID is in full agreement with that affirmation and remains committed to full engagement on these issues.