Chapter 9

Re-Focusing With A Gender Lens:

A History of CRC's Efforts to Mainstream Gender Issues into Integrated Coastal Management Programs

Nancy K. Diamond

Introduction

How "integrated" is the practice of integrated coastal management (ICM)? Is coastal management decisionmaking inclusive and are diverse stakeholders represented? What type of information and processes are used for making decisions? What type of program partners are selected and tapped for expertise? Who receives benefits from coastal management programs and who bears the costs? How are coastal management programs affecting both men and women and how are they making a positive contribution to gender equity (i.e., gender mainstreaming). (See Box 1.) Over the last nine years, the University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center (CRC) has taken a number of institutional and operational steps to mainstream gender issues into its international programs.

Drawing from staff interviews and the author's experiences as CRC's primary gender advisor, this chapter summarizes these valuable lessons learned about more inclusive forms of coastal management.

BOX 1. DEFINITIONS: GENDER AND GENDER MAINSTREAMING

The term "gender" refers to the socially constructed roles, rights and responsibilities of women and men, the relationships between them and changes over time.

"Gender mainstreaming" efforts aim to transform the mainstream to achieve greater gender equity within programs and policies by promoting more equitable benefit distribution and/or reducing existing gender inequalities. As part of gender mainstreaming, coastal managers assess the implications and impacts of any planned action for both women and men. Gender-related information is collected, analyzed and applied to coastal management strategies so that both women's and men's concerns and experiences are integrated during program design, implementation and evaluation phases.

METHODS

Several sources provided data for this report. This included 12 key informants with extensive knowledge of gender-related activities under the second phase of the Coastal Resources Management Program (CRMP), which was funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Both current and former CRC project staff were part of this informant group. To reduce bias, multiple informants were interviewed for each country program and interviews were conducted individually and in pairs. As well, a review was made of relevant reports and project

documents. Because the author served on the 1994 evaluation team for the first phase of CRMP and has intermittently served as CRC's gender advisor since 1995, the author's observations (and biases) are also reflected in this report.

Findings

Gender-Blind (1994)

The CRC gender mainstreaming story begins in 1994. As part of a renewed effort by USAID's Office of Women in Development (G/WID) to provide technical assistance to sectoral projects, the new gender and environment advisor (the author) met with the USAID project manager for CRMP to discuss opportunities for collaboration. The CRMP project manager invited the G/WID advisor to join the external evaluation team that would examine the first 10 years of CRC's work and provide recommendations for CRMP's second phase. As a result of this collaboration, the 1994 evaluation included the first comprehensive look at how gender, participation and social science issues were being addressed in CRC's international ICM work. The findings from this evaluation (Towle et al., 1994) indicate that in the first 10 years of the CRMP Cooperative Agreement, CRC had undertaken few steps to address gender issues. Key deficiencies included:

- Little involvement of social scientists, gender specialists and related institutions, as well as weak in-house capacity in these areas

- Very limited collection and use of primary and secondary data related to gender and social science topics for site profiling, project monitoring and evaluation

- An absence of social and gender-related information and methods in CRC-sponsored courses for international coastal professionals (e.g., the bi-annual Summer Institute in Coastal Management and regional courses)

- Limited attention to gender and social science topics in CRC publications

- Lack of explicit and gender-sensitive criteria related to the selection of country project stakeholders, participants and activities at the community level

- Significantly lower levels of participation by female URI faculty, consultants, trainers, trainees and graduate fellowship participants

Box 2: Gender Mainstreaming Signals and Support from USAID

The focus and beneficiaries of CRMP had shifted during its first decade. The original design of CRMP in the mid-1980s focused on policy and planning activities and the direct beneficiaries were seen as coastal management professionals and policy-makers. Gender and participation issues were not addressed by the original project performance criteria. Although all USAID projects were supposed to include and benefit women under the 1973 Percy Amendment to the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act, agency support was weak.

By the early 1990s, the CRMP focus shifted to participatory coastal management under a project amendment. The direct beneficiaries of CRMP now included everyone who lived in, worked in, and visited the coastal zone. In addition, gender mainstreaming in sectoral projects was given an additional boost of agency resources after a highly critical 1993 U.S. General Accounting Office evaluation of USAID's progress—or lack thereof—with gender mainstreaming.

Learn by Seeing: Creating a Gender Lens (1995-2000)

From 1995 - 2000, CRC took several important steps to mainstream gender into the second phase activities of CRMP. Key actions undertaken during this period included:

- Providing financial support for gender-related technical assistance from USAID for the new Ecuador monitoring and evaluation plan (1995)

- Capacity building for home office staff via gender training and individual technical assistance (1996)

- Capacity building for international coastal management professionals via gender sessions at four Summer Institutes in Coastal Management (1994, 1996, 2000, 2002), and a group discussion among CRC female staff and Summer Institute female participants in 2000

- Regional capacity building for coastal management professionals in East Africa via a gender module in the CRC-Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association "Learning & Performing" courses offered in 1999 and 2002

- Publishing the first gender-focused issue of the *InterCoast Network* newsletter (Fall 1996) and increasing the visual representation of community women engaged in coastal management

- Supporting baseline and interim data collection with gender-disaggregated analysis of perceptions and project participation in Indonesia (Pollnac et al., 1997; Crawford et al., 2000)

- Paying the full costs for gender-related field support in Indonesia (1998) and supporting an intern's gender research (Cook, 2000)

- ❖ Leveraging gender-related field support and data from other projects in Tanzania (1998)

- ❖ Promoting and/or hiring three women to become senior staff at CRC and additional female field project managers at CRC

- ❖ Hiring additional female staff (Indonesia and Mexico) and inviting more professional women to join ICM working groups (Indonesia, Tanzania)

While the efforts from 1995 - 2000 indicated increasing commitment to gender issues, some staff remained dissatisfied with CRC's progress in this area. They recognized that CRC lacked a vision for gender-related work; that staff lacked the skills and confidence necessary to accomplish gender mainstreaming; and that there were too few institutional incentives for program managers to incorporate gender concerns into an already busy workplan. While in theory everyone was responsible for mainstreaming gender, in practice it was seldom addressed. Funding for gender-related activities or technical assistance was vulnerable when unanticipated events changed project priorities, such as with Indonesia's political upheaval. (See Box 3). Project publications included few articles on gender, equity or socioeconomic topics. And while project indicators now counted male and female participation at CRC-sponsored field meetings, trainings and events, no targets for improvement in these numbers were set and in most situations—with the exception of Mexico—females generally accounted for one-third of all participants at the local, national or international level. As a result, most staff felt these indicators were inadequate measurements of gender mainstreaming. And while women leaders and managers were well-represented in CRC's home office, little attention was given to women's leadership in CRC's program communities and to the women's leadership in the coastal management profession in host countries. CRC staff summed up their early efforts as little more than "add gender and stir."

BOX 3: THE BEST LAID PLANS: GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN INDONESIA

During the first year of activities in Indonesia by CRMP's Proyek Pesisir, CRC requisitioned a preliminary, short-term gender assessment to identify key gender issues via literature and key informant and group interviews in Jakarta and North Sulawesi (Diamond et al., 1998). This report was intended to lay the groundwork for future gender-related technical assistance that would create and build ownership for a focused and coherent gender action plan for the 1998 - 2003 period. In addition, the assessment would be an opportunity to build CRC's collaboration with local gender experts from academic institutions near Jakarta and in North Sulawesi.

Indonesia's political and economic climate became unstable in the spring of 1998 and project activities operated at a reduced level for a few months when expatriate project staff were evacuated. Unfortunately, CRC redirected funds for gender technical assistance during the life of the project. Most of the recommendations of the preliminary gender assessment, including the gender action plan, were not implemented and opportunities were lost. However, the project managed to hire more female extension staff and community organizers, routinely consult with all-female groups at the community level and increase the number of female professional participants sent for training. Proyek Pesisir continue to track the number of female participants at project-related meetings. A gender component was added to the community-based coastal resource management module and will be used to collected gender-related data in villages where Proyek Pesisir will be scaling-up.

Putting Gender in Focus (2001-2003)

The Women in Leadership and Development (WILD) initiative arose from a CRC strategic planning process in 2001. CRC staff expressed interest in becoming a better "learning organization" and creating dialogue on critical topics that cross-cut their geographic teams. Equity was one of these cross-cutting themes. A small group of University of Rhode Island (URI)-based female staff (including both senior and mid-level managers from both the international and Rhode Island-focused teams) decided to adopt a catalytic approach to raise the profile of gender equity issues. The initial focus—as evidenced by the acronym used in the initiative—was on women's leadership. They did not intend to entirely focus on women but liked the positive and energetic image of the word "wild." They decided, at least during their initial activities, to keep their group small and include only female members. They began by identifying and networking with a selected group of potential new gender/women's leadership partners and donors and re-connecting with their former gender advisor (the author). The initiative to explore coastal management-gender-population linkages was launched with the help of small grants from two of CRC's existing donors.

In June 2001, the first two-day WILD workshop (WILD I) brought together a diverse group of 22 academics, scientists, field practitioners, advocates, and donors from around the world who shared a common interest—discussing both the challenges of and the solutions for better mainstreaming of gender and population considerations into coastal programs and vice versa. Throughout the workshop, there was an extraordinary give-and-take of substantive information, sharing of resource materials, discussion of experiences, and individual thinking about answers to the question, "What can I change in my own program to better address issues around gender and population?" After the workshop, CRC focused on getting the word out about the critical linkages between gender, population and coastal management and their influence on ICM field programs. (See Box 4.) In addition, CRC strengthened their relationship with two national groups in East Africa (Tanzania Women

BOX 4: WILD 1 WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

GETTING THE WORD OUT

CRC used several means to disseminate the conclusions about ICM-gender-population linkages:

- Publishing a second gender-focused issue of *InterCoast Network* (Winter 2002)
- Writing a policy paper for and providing a presentation to the December 2001 Oceans and Coasts preparatory meeting of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Paris
- Disseminating the policy paper and workshop summary at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg
- Publishing journal articles in *Tropical Coasts* and *Marine Policy*

MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN CRC'S FIELD PROGRAMS

- CRC's co-managers for the Mexico program were able to form new gender-related partnerships with the gender staff in the Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Women's Affairs, a state-level Women's Institute and two local gender consultants. They expanded income-generating/business leadership training and activities for community women
- An economist with expertise in gender issues was part of a recent assessment team that was tasked with planning the next phase of CRC

Leaders in Agriculture and Environment and the Kenya Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment). Both groups provide a pool of females who are potential candidates for professional positions, appointments or internships. CRC also formed an important new partnership with a World Conservation Union-IUCN global gender advisor, who became part of the WILD team and provided her services and extensive training materials. She also facilitated gender partnerships for CRC's Mexico activities and helped CRC form a collaborative relationship with the Population Reference Bureau, an international non-governmental organization (NGO) with demographic expertise. The WILD team's work had expanded considerably to address more than only women's leadership—as was implied by the name of the initiative. While the name was retained, the initative now looked at broader issues of gender equity and sought to understand the links between demographics, population and gender and ICM.

Based on the positive accomplishments of the initial WILD work, the WILD team began a second phase of activities in the spring of 2002. The goal of this second phase was to move beyond networking and awareness raising and undertake activities on the ground that would impact the field activities of CRC and other ICM projects. CRC obtained a second and much larger grant from a private foundation for an ambitious 22-month program. As well, the USAID program officer for CRMP continued to show support for these efforts by providing the initiative with technical assistance from USAID Water Team members. The second phase began with a nine-day workshop, "Strengthening coastal conservation and management programs: gender and demographic dimensions" (WILD II) in February 2003. When planning the workshop, ICM, gender and demographic experts worked together to identify, adapt and create mainstreamed ICM tools appropriate for each stage of the ICM cycle.

Workshop participants were carefully selected to include 15 representatives from CRC and other coastal projects in six countries (Fiji, Mexico, Indonesia, Philippines, Tanzania and Kenya). Participants represented gov-

ernment agencies, NGOs, universities and CRMP, and IUCN gender specialists, as well as host country gender and demographic experts. By the end of the workshop, the country teams had built their capacity for understanding not only approaches and tools for gender and demographic mainstreaming, but also for how they could apply these in a practical way in their field projects. Participants created individual and group action plans for mainstreaming gender and demographic issues into their existing project work plans and learned how to capture their experiences in case studies that will be finalized during a final workshop and then circulated within the WILD learning network. CRC hopes that these efforts will catalyze a critical mass of coastal managers who recognize the importance of gender and demographic linkages and have the skills to create new relationships and program synergies.

Conclusions

While CRC has begun to address not only gender mainstreaming, but also the need for understanding demographics, the rest of this chapter will focus on the Center's program on mainstreaming gender.

CRC has made considerable progress since 1994 with gender mainstreaming. The WILD initiative has helped to consolidate previous efforts, reach out to new partners, develop capacity, fill information gaps and create momentum at CRC and elsewhere for gender mainstreaming. The WILD team has now expanded to include three male staff members at CRC, and added a number of male members to the project teams. Furthermore, the WILD initiative has served as an organizational model for future cross-cutting topical efforts and has helped CRC to make significant strides in its efforts to address equity issues writ large. CRC staff have made the time and given the commitment to addressing gender issues and have realized that it need not be overly onerous to do so. One WILD team member noted, "It's the right thing to do and it's been fun." CRC's lessons learned about gender mainstreaming include the following:

Experts and partners

Coastal projects benefit from multiple sources of gender expertise, including both international and host country advisors. The timing of assistance is also important. The ICM and environmental community may not know where to find gender and social science/social service expertise for other field activities so it is necessary for ICM projects to conduct their own institutional searches for host country and international partners and share information. These searches should identify civil society and government partners that share both a social science and/or a social service agenda for community development (including livelihood and health concerns). They also need to be creative about finding free sources of gender-related technical assistance and materials—e.g., using donor-funded gender experts, sharing costs for the technical assistance, or sharing gender experts with other coastal projects. Gender experts appear to have the greatest impact when they are involved in the early stages of program, project and activity planning. However, their initial input must be reinforced by periodic assistance, adequate budget and support from senior management and staff. It is also helpful to have the consistency of the same advisors over time.

Capacity building

Coastal project staff, counterparts and partner organizations need capacity building. For example, gender training is often necessary for ICM partners and ICM training may also be necessary for gender partners. Gender-related training is most effective when it is tailored to specific locations and cultures. Coastal managers need tools and concepts and whenever possible, these aids should be integrated into topical ICM training rather than taught in stand-alone workshops and modules. It is also helpful to have female and male gender trainers, to take time to address participant concerns and to focus on the practical ICM payoffs resulting from addressing gender issues. In addition, foreign female professionals may also need additional support for English language training to qualify for international training. To balance training opportunities among women and men, projects should ask communities or organi-

zations to first nominate women candidates and then add male candidates for remaining slots.

Knowledge and Data

ICM professionals need to build their capacity to undertake and manage social research and to translate research findings into operational strategies. Basic social information, including gender and demographic variables, has not always been analyzed. Nor has there been good analysis of coastal training needs assessments with an eye towards understanding the different needs and interests by gender. In terms of methodologies for primary data collection, coastal projects should consistently collect data from both male and females in the same households to understand differences in knowledge, attitudes and priorities of resource use. Meaningful gender-disaggregated indicators can also help guide program directions.

Operational Choices

Every coastal project or program has the opportunity to make small but significant operational adjustments that can make a huge difference in women's lives. For example, holding separate male and female group meetings before or as a substitute for a mixed-sex meeting can provide critical information and build a constituency for coastal management. It is important to schedule meetings and project activities during free times for women. Employing female extension workers can enable coastal projects to more easily hear women's voices and concerns. Coastal managers can help communities identify which activities will benefit women and men by making decisionmaking criteria more transparent and participatory. Selecting new gender-neutral income-generating activities can also provide women with greater opportunities than activities that are already assigned to one sex or the other. In addition, ICM projects can avoid a male bias by broadening their focus to both sea and land and focusing on supplemental livelihoods.

Costs

While some dedicated resources are extremely helpful for gender mainstreaming, the costs involved are not necessarily high. For around US $40,000 in staff time over 18 months (approximately 1 percent of the overall annual CRMP budget during that same period), CRC staff were able to launch the WILD initiative. These funds enabled staff to plan and attend meetings and the WILD I workshop; plan and conduct a panel session at the bi-annual Coastal Zone meeting; prepare for, attend and deliver a key presentation at the preparatory meeting for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD); and attend the WSSD, conduct research, co-author articles and prepare a successful, follow-up grant proposal. This staff time contribution leveraged approximately US $200,000 in private foundation money (US $1:$4 ratio).

Message

Gender issues need to be consistently addressed by communications within projects and in external communications. Organizational policies on gender are quite helpful as are consistent messages about the importance of gender equity from senior staff to junior staff and from staff to counterpart organizations. Gender issues and equity must also be consistently addressed in external publications and media campaigns.

Teamwork

Gender champions are needed at different levels within an organization or a project. Having a critical mass of these champions is important. Gender mainstreaming progressed more rapidly at CRC when there was senior management support and a small, dedicated "engine" team that created momentum and allowed for rapid consensus and action. Lone gender officers often burn out and other team members do little. While some male CRC staff felt excluded from early WILD efforts, the all-female team felt this initial period was necessary for them to build their intellectual capital, confidence, momentum and critical mass before they became more inclusive. Gender mainstreaming at CRC headquarters has

had the added benefit of helping CRC staff to understand matrix management and has created new opportunities for cross-team communication, learning and synergies.

Recommendations: Creating a Gender Vision of the Future

The next steps and opportunities for CRC staff include:

- Creating their own vision, agenda and priorities for gender mainstreaming over the next three to five years as part of CRC-wide and country project gender program that sends clear and consistent signals about the value of equity and inclusiveness to all staff, partners and colleagues

- Matching committed funding and routine technical assistance to an organization-wide gender policy

- Developing incentives for, and buy-in from field staff and others who are implementing coastal management programs (e.g., incentive funds, small grant programs, performance-based funding), as well as gender mainstreaming accountability strategies

- Devoting additional attention to the hiring and capacity building of more female staff at all levels in the field, including chiefs of party and staff in counterpart organizations

- Building leadership capacity for women in communities, particularly for youth, young women and those without literacy skills

- Making coastal management decisionmaking tools and participation procedures more transparent and standardized (e.g., develop guidelines) so that gender and demographic/population issues can be more easily mainstreamed into coastal management decisionmaking

- ❖ Filling gender-related data gaps, and then collecting and using gender-disaggregated information and cultivating gender-related contributions to CRMP publications

- ❖ Identifying more meaningful gender-related internal indicators and establishing targets that aim to improve women's participation beyond one-third of the total and improve their access to benefits, resources and decisionmaking

- ❖ Devoting more attention to gender mainstreaming at the town/municipality and provincial levels of governance and identifying gender-related barriers to participation and benefit distribution for ICM national policies

- ❖ Building gender-sensitive strategies for future CRC work on poverty alleviation, economic development and legal literacy, including greater attention to health and integrated water management

In sum, gender mainstreaming is much more than a simple matter of adding more female staff (who are given extra responsibilities for gender issues) or adding one female member to a committee or tagging on a small women's income-generating activity to an ICM program that devotes most of its funding and effort towards fishermen. It is important to recognize differences among women and among men, rather than lumping women into one stakeholder group. Coastal management practitioners need to understand that equity is not an optional choice. It is a much-needed transformative perspective for forms of coastal management that are both integrated and inclusive.

For over three decades CRC has worked with partners to develop strategies for effective management of coastal environments—formulating and refining policies and actions to promote a better balance between coasts and the people who inhabit them. Core to this work has always been the underlying principles of participatory democracy, equity and sustainable

development. Yet, CRC has also recognized that the challenge of achieving sustainable coastal resource use, conserving biodiversity, and enhancing the quality of life of coastal people is made much more difficult by the reality of rapidly expanding coastal populations and the lack of equity for certain segments of the population, especially women. The challenge for CRC until now has been understanding how to take the next steps—i.e., how to translate this understanding of the reality into meaningful action on the ground. The WILD initiative has helped CRC begin to make this translation.

References

Cook, J. 2000. *Beyond assumptions of men and mangroves, women and welfare: an investigation of gendered dimensions of Proyek Pesisir Interests in Pematang Pasir.* Proyek Pesisir. Jakarta. Unpublished draft, August 2000.

Core Working Group – Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership. 2002. *Guidelines for District ICM Action Planning.* Tanzania Coastal Resources Management Partnership. Dar es Salaam.

Crawford, B.R., R.B. Pollnac and A. Sukmara. 2000. *Community-based coastal resources management: an interim assessment of the Proyek Pesisir field site in Blongko, North Sulawesi, Indonesia.* Technical Report TE-00/03-E. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.

Diamond, N.K., L. Squillante and L.Z. Hale. 2002 (July). Cross-currents: Navigating Gender and Population Linkages for Integrated Coastal Management. *Tropical Coasts 9* (1): 28-35.

Diamond, N.K. with the University of Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Center Working Group on Gender and Population. 2001. *Cross-currents: Navigating Gender and Population Linkages for Integrated Coastal Management.* University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.

Diamond, N. K. 2001. *Summary of the workshop proceedings: Mainstreaming gender, population and leadership into coastal management programs.* University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.

Diamond, N. K., S.M. Machfud and R. Kinseng. 1998. *Proyek Pesisir gender assessment: a review of gender issues, project activities, resources and strategic priority activities for 1998-2004.* Proyek Pesisir. Jakarta. Unpublished final report.

InterCoast Network # 41 (Winter 2002). Mainstreaming gender, population and the environment. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.

InterCoast Network # 28 (Fall 1996). Integrating social and gender realities into coastal management. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.

Olsen, S.B., K. Lowry and J. Tobey. 1999. *The Common Methodology for Learning: A Manual for Assessing Progress in Coastal Management.* Coastal management report #2211. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI.

Pollnac, R.B., F. Sondita, B.R. Crawford, E. Mantjoro, C. Rotinsulu and A. Saihainenia. 1997. *Baseline assessment of socioeconomic aspects of resource use in the coastal zone of Bentenan and Tumbak.* Draft technical report. Proyek Pesisir. Jakarta.

Towle, E., Costello, G., Katz, A., Diamond, N. K. and T. Rhodes. 1994. *Coastal Resources Management Project Evaluation 953-5518, Final Report, December 3, 1994.* Management Systems International. Washington, DC.

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

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 filed 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.