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DEFINITIONS

**Affected Individual:** An individual who suffers loss of assets or investments, land and property and/or access to natural or economical resources as a result of the Project.

**Affected Household:** A household, which is affected when one, or more of its members are affected by the Project or sub-project activities, either by loss of assets or investments, land or denial of access to resources.

**Affected Community:** A community, which is affected by Project activities in terms of socio-economic and/or social-cultural relationships or cohesion.

**Community Mitigation Action Plans:** Community Mitigation Action Plans are developed by affected communities in order to mitigate adverse impacts resulting from the implementation of MPAs, CMAs or MMAs. These plans are prepared further to a consultation process with communities and are focused on generating alternative livelihood activities.

**Marine Protected Area:** Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are areas of the marine environment that are reserved under national, tribal, or local laws or regulations to provide long-term protection for part or all of the natural and cultural resources therein. In relation to the Process Framework, the reference to MPAs includes Marine Management Areas (MMA) and Community Management Areas (CMAs).

**Participation:** A process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, decisions and the management of resources which affect them. Participation can take different forms, ranging from information-sharing and consultation methods, to mechanisms for collaboration and empowerment that give stakeholders more influence and control.

**Process Framework:** The Process Framework is an instrument of the United Republic of Tanzania prepared in compliance with the World Bank Safeguard Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP4.12). The purpose of the Process Framework is to clarify operating principles, organizational arrangements and design criteria to be applied to the implementation of MPAs, CMAs or MMAs as supported by MACEMP.

**Public Consultation:** The process of engaging affected people and other interested parties in open dialogue through which a range of views and concerns can be expressed in order to inform decision-making and help build consensus.

**Shehia:** The Shehia is the lowest administrative unit within Zanzibar, with jurisdiction over 1-3 villages. It is headed by a government official or headperson called a Sheha.

**Stakeholders:** Stakeholders are those affected by the outcomes (negatively or positively) or those who can affect the outcome of a proposed intervention. Stakeholders can include: borrowers; directly affected groups including the poor and disadvantaged; indirectly affected groups such as NGOs and private sector organizations; and the World Bank management staff, and shareholders.

**Sub-Projects:** Sub-projects are initiatives undertaken as supported by the Coastal Village Fund (Component 3) of MACEMP, as implemented through TASAF. Sub-projects are aimed at supporting income generation within coastal communities. Initiatives may include the demand of technical, physical or social services, including alternative income generating activities (AIGAs). Sub-projects are important in relation to the Process Framework because they are an important means to mitigate negative impacts on affected individuals due to the implementation of MPAs, CMAs or MMAs.

**United Republic of Tanzania (URT):** The United Republic of Tanzania consists of Tanzania (the mainland and several near-shore islands, including Mafia Island) and Zanzibar (the islands of Unguja and Pemba).

**Vulnerable Persons:** Vulnerable persons are those characterized by higher risk and reduced ability to cope with change or negative impacts. This may be based on socio-economic condition, gender, age, disability, ethnicity, or criteria that influence people’s ability to access resources and development opportunities. Vulnerable persons in relation to the Process Framework will include the elderly, orphans, people with disabilities, HIV/AIDS affected or infected, widows, widowers, people suffering form serious illness, and women and children at risk of being dispossessed of their productive assets, land, or access to resources.
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1.0 BACKGROUND

The Project

This document outlines a Process Framework (PF) for the Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP) in the United Republic of Tanzania (URT). MACEMP is proposed as a six-year project that is to improve the management of coastal and marine resources, with a view to contributing to economic growth and poverty reduction in coastal communities. The Project emphasizes the establishment of an effective regulatory and institutional framework, participatory planning and the creation of an enabling environment for integrated coastal and marine resources management and private investment.

MACEMP will, amongst others: strengthen marine management institutions both in Zanzibar and on the Mainland, with a focus on creating a common governance regime for the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Component 1); support coastal area planning and the establishment of a network of marine protected areas (MPAs), community management areas (CMAs) and marine management areas (MMAs) for conservation of biodiversity and sustainable utilisation of coastal and marine resources (Component 2); and create an enabling environment for environmentally sustainable investment along the coast (Component 3).

Component 1: Sound Management of the EEZ

Component 1 aims to establish and implement a common governance regime for the EEZ that contributes to long-term sustainable use and management. This will be accomplished by: 1) supporting the creation of a common governance regime for the EEZ; 2) improving revenue generation from the EEZ; and 3) developing an EEZ resource management strategy. MACEMP will provide support for activities that contribute to an integrated system of marine resource management, focusing on institutional capacity building to enable the development of effective governance. The main implementing and collaborating agencies include: Kikosi Maalum cha Kuzuia Magendo (KMKM); the Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS); the Ministry of Trade, Industry, Marketing and Tourism (MTIMT); the Ministry of State, President’s Office, Regional Government and Local Authority; the Department of Environment; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the Vice President’s Office; fisheries departments; the Navy; the Tanzanian Fisheries Research Institute (TAFIRI); the Ministry of Trade and Industry; the Ministry of Lands and Human Development; the Ministry of Finance; the National Environment Management Council (NEMC); and the Meteorology Department.

Component 1 is split into several sub-components. These include: Planning a Common Governance Regime for EEZ; Implementation of EEZ Common Governance Regime; and Developing and Supporting Partnerships in EEZ Management.
Component 2: Sound Management of the Coastal Marine Environment

Component 2 of MACEMP aims to establish and support a comprehensive system of managed marine areas within the Territorial Seas (within 12 nm from the coast) of the URT, building on integrated coastal management strategies that empower and benefit coastal communities.

Specifically, the component aims to: 1) support integrated coastal management (ICM) planning at national and district levels; 2) support development of a comprehensive, effective and representative system of MMAs, MPAs and CMAs; and 3) increase the area under protection within MMAs, MPAs and CMAs to enable the URT to meet commitments made at the 2003 World Park Congress to increase its level of protection of the territorial seas from less than 4% now to 10% by 2012 and to 20% by 2025. This component will support activities leading to strengthening capacity of key agencies involved in marine management, supporting existing and emerging MMAs, MPAs and CMAs, and encourage cross-border, community and private sector partnerships in marine and coastal conservation.

The primary beneficiaries of this component will be existing MMAs, MPAs and CMAs, local communities at the project sites, and implementing and collaborating agencies, including the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit (Mainland Tanzania), MNRT, MANREC, National Protected Areas Board (Zanzibar), Vice President’s Office (NEMC, DoE), District Councils, relevant research institutions, CBOs, and NGOs.

Component 2 is split into three sub-components. These include: Integrated Coastal Management Planning Support; Implementation of Network of MMAs and MPAs; and Developing and Supporting Partnerships in ICM.

Component 3: Coastal Community Action Fund

The objective of Component 3 is to empower coastal communities to access opportunities so that they can request, implement and monitor sub-projects that contribute to improved livelihoods and sustainable marine management. This will be achieved through the establishment of a Coastal Village Fund, under TASAF II, and the enhancement of coastal community capacity. Component 3 has two sub-components which include: Coastal Village Fund, and Coastal Community Capacity Enhancement.

Policy Trigger

World Bank funding for MACEMP requires that the Project comply with World Bank Safeguard Policies to ensure that no undue harm is experienced by people and their environment as a result of the Project. MACEMP has been identified as triggering the World Bank’s Safeguard Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) (Appendix A) as a result of activities under Component 2: Sound Management of the Coastal Marine Environment. This component will involve support for the implementation of MMAs, MPAs and CMAs that will, in turn, affect coastal resource use and may lead to a “loss of assets or access to assets” for local households. In this case, triggering the Safeguard Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) requires the development of a PF, which will serve as a guide to help ensure participation of affected people in the design of project activities and to ensure affected communities have an opportunity to improve or at least restore their incomes and standards of living after displacement.

While the overall goal of MACEMP is to improve current economic, social and environmental conditions in the URT over the long-term (i.e., well beyond the 6-year lifespan of MACEMP), it is
recognized that some activities may negatively affect individuals and households. Resource management will be changing from what is currently an open access regime to a regulated or limited-access regime. Reducing the availability of or access to resources has the potential to place already impoverished populations at risk when the productive assets are lost. Other potential impacts include a weakening of community institutions and social networks, traditional authority, and potentially diminishing or removing mutual help systems that exist in communities.

All potential impacts of the Project are evaluated in a separate Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA).\footnote{Jacques Whitford Environment Limited. 2004. Environmental and Social Assessment of the Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP). Report prepared for the United Republic of Tanzania.} Although the PF and ESA are presented as separate documents, the mitigation measures described in the ESA and as represented by the PF are both important for the implementation of MACEMP.

**Objectives**

The PF will serve as a guide through which activities and procedures related to MACEMP can be enhanced to incorporate the interests and needs of coastal community members and affected stakeholders. It addresses the integral participation of people who may be affected when decisions are taken to restrict access to natural resources in coastal areas along the URT’s coast. The purpose of the PF is to ensure that coastal areas are both effectively managed for conservation of natural and cultural resources and, at the same time, to ensure that affected people have a meaningful role in those decisions and in deciding on and implementing alternatives to restore or improve livelihoods and incomes affected by those decisions. The goal is to ensure that no one is worse off as a result of the Project.

The specific objectives for the PF are three-fold (Appendix B):

(i) **Establish a Communication and Participation Framework.** Suggestions are provided regarding the operating principles, rules of associations, and organizational incentive structures for community participation to ensure that MPA decision-making authorities address, consult and substantively involve the broader community when making decisions that have potential direct or indirect impacts on the livelihoods of households or sub-groups in the community.

(ii) **Identifying Target Groups.** A targeting strategy is developed to ensure that affected households or sub-groups are identified for income generating sub-projects financed by MACEMP/TASAF or other potential windows. This includes the specification of criteria that can be used, as well as input regarding the types of sub-projects that may best target the groups at risk. Other strategies were also explored that increase the risk threshold of the identified households or sub-groups. A communication strategy is suggested to provide affected communities with information on the process and content of sub-projects associated with MACEMP/TASAF, which could assist with the diversification of livelihoods. This includes suggestions on innovative, but effective, communication methods, including working in collaboration with key resource persons in the community.
(iii) Monitoring and Evaluation. Indicators are developed for incorporation into a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to ensure that no one is worse off as a result of the Project’s support for the implementation of a network of MPAs. The indicators focus on specific sub-groups at risk, are informed by M&E systems developed for TASAF, and consider community-level and local government resources and existing monitoring mechanisms. To measure social development objectives of the Project, key performance indicators are recommended.

Because the potential negative impacts are due to restriction of access to marine resources, the emphasis in the PF is not one of direct compensation of a measurable asset that is lost (e.g., as would more clearly be the requirement if occupied land was acquired for the Project for which there were existing legal rights or claims). Indeed, the PF does not provide a mechanism for the valuation of income loss because there is no viable and consistent mechanism available. The focus of “compensation” for the displacement of livelihood activities is through seeking alternative income generating activities. Identification of compensation packages and valuation methodologies is, therefore, not part of the PF.

Methodology

The PF was developed through a consultative process with a number of stakeholders, including persons in coastal communities potentially affected by MACEMP (Appendix C). It is in accordance with relevant URT legislation and the World Bank Operational Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) requirements. It is also in concordance with the interests of URT, in that it seeks to reduce the risk of negative impacts on livelihoods for certain population groups as a result of the Project. Particular attention has been given to the identification of vulnerable groups within affected communities. In cases where co-operation is possible, elements of the PF have been integrated with other development and poverty-reduction programs in operation within the URT focused on livelihoods of coastal communities. The PF has also been developed and coordinated with other Project preparation activities including, in particular, preparation of the ESA, the Situational Analysis Report, and the Project Implementation Manual.

Research for the PF was undertaken by conducting community-based interviews and secondary literature reviews. The communities involved in the research (see Appendix C) were chosen based on a number of considerations. These included: administrative representation (i.e., locations in Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar); current or previous involvement in developing MPAs (i.e., need to consider both experienced and inexperienced communities); and socio-cultural and ecological representation (i.e., need to consider the diversity of conditions). Coastal communities were the focus, targeting both village-level government and sub-groups involved in livelihood activities that utilise marine and coastal resources (i.e., fishing, aquaculture and mangrove use). Appendix B provides a overview of the groups that were consulted during the research, as well as the general interview guide used during consultations. The Situational Analysis Report, developed as a part of MACEMP project preparation activities, was also an important source of information on coastal villages in the URT.

The findings from the interviews undertaken in relation to the PF have been incorporated throughout the document, and helped to establish best practices for identifying affected groups, communicating and consulting during program implementation, and resolving conflicts. Primary research for the PF was administered in conjunction with research for the ESA. The ESA report provides a detailed description of issues and items shared during the interviews and workshops (see Section 9).

Scope

The PF is applicable to, and focused on, activities that are developed under Component 2: Sound Management of the Coastal Marine Environment of MACEMP. The purpose of the PF is to clarify principles, organizational arrangements and design criteria to be applied to sub-projects during project implementation.

Target users for the PF include managers and implementers at the administrative and operational level within local governments and among communities in both Zanzibar and Mainland Tanzania. These include:

- The MACEMP Project Coordination Unit, the Project Management Units and relevant Central Government Departments who are involved in the overall management and co-ordination of the Project (Appendix D). These groups will use the PF to guide communication and consultation strategies related to the development of MPAs, MMAs and CMAs (hereafter collective referred to as MPAs) and will ensure all relevant stakeholders are made aware of MACEMP;
- The District Government who will be involved in the implementation of MACEMP and overseeing activities related to the PF;
- the Villages, Shehia (in Zanzibar) and Mtaa (on the Mainland), which includes Village Assemblies and Village Councils who will be directly involved in the implementation of activities related to MACEMP;
- Affected individuals, households and communities who are identified as beneficiaries of the PF and are responsible for participation and implementation of various aspects; and
- Other stakeholders who will potentially have a supportive role in various procedures under the PF.

The PF is divided into a number of inter-related sections which include: an overview of activities associated with the implementation of a network of MPAs; identification of affected groups and individuals; mitigation; communication and consultation strategy; grievances, disputes, and redress mechanisms; administration, responsibilities and legal procedures; and monitoring and evaluation.
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Types of Activities for Implementing a Network of MPAs

Under Component 2: Sound Management of the Coastal Marine Environment of MACEMP, there will be a number of envisaged activities (Figure 1). These will generally be focused primarily on improving conservation in coastal areas and building on integrated coastal management strategies to empower and benefit coastal communities.

Specific activities will include the following:

- Local government capacity-building for resource assessment and mapping in coastal areas, village-level integrated coastal management (ICM), and the development of spatial plans;
- Support for ICM planning and for developing collaborative resource management action plans;
- Management training and support for MPAs, including resource and inventory assessments, baseline studies, and equipment support for communities;
- Development of management plans, establishment of co-management agreements, and the implementation of plans;
- Development of regional partnerships for the conservation of marine areas (i.e., with Kenya and Mozambique);
- Development of community partnerships through support for negotiations and the consultative processes required to develop management agreements; and
- Support for the creation of an enabling environment for micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME) along the coast by promoting credit availability and small lending operations.

The PF, however, is to be applied specifically to those activities associated with the Implementation of a Network of MPAs. This includes:

- The development of MPA management plans (addressing such aspects as tourism, mangrove management, turtle conservation, village land use);
- The establishment of co-management agreements between villages, government agencies, and/or NGOs; and
- The implementation of MPA management plans in the form of boundary demarcation, site infrastructure, and start-up operations.
Figure 1: MACEMP Project Structure

MACEMP

Component 1

Component 2
Sound Management of the Coastal Marine Environment

Subcomponent 1: Integrated Coastal Management Support Planning
- Local Government Capacity Building
- ICM Planning Support

Subcomponent 2: Implementation of Network of MMAs and MPAs
- General MPA Management Training
- Support for Existing and Emerging MPAs
- Support for Management of Mangrove Ecosystems
- Support Rehabilitation of Cultural Sites

Subcomponent 3: Developing and Supporting Partnerships in ICM
- Regional Partnerships
- Community Partnerships
- Private Sector Partnerships
Identifying Affected Groups and Individuals

One of the primary objectives of the PF is to ensure that any individuals, households and communities with the potential to be impacted by activities related to the implementation of MPAs are identified for consultation and the implementation of appropriate mitigation. There are several elements to the identification process including: the consideration of current assets and livelihoods in communities which may be impacted by the Project; identifying general impacts that might be experienced by a Project activity; and providing a clear definition of affected groups and individuals and households, as well as ensuring criteria are in place which can be used during implementation to identify affected individuals and households.

Consideration of Current Assets and Livelihoods

Within coastal communities, there are a number of assets that may be affected by the development or expansion of MPAs. These should be identified early on in the design of any activities related to MPAs. Assets which may be impacted by MACEMP include: (i) land-based natural resources such as mangroves and beaches; (ii) marine-based natural resources such as fish and coral reefs; and (iii) marine infrastructure such as wharfs. Some of these assets may be newly regulated, developed or controlled for conservation and protection purposes through MPA-related activities. Other assets may be improved, developed or enhanced.

Coastal communities in the URT are involved in a number of activities for economic and subsistence purposes. Households generally undertake more than one activity to meet their food and material needs. Further information on livelihood activities is documented in the ESA and Situation Analysis reports. Traditional livelihood activities in coastal communities include:

- Artisanal fishing (e.g., nearshore, non-mechanised fishing);
- Maricultural activities (e.g., seaweed farming, shell collection, shrimp farming);
- Mangrove activities (e.g., mangrove harvesting, beekeeping);
- Agriculture – subsistence (e.g., cassava, bananas, rice, maize, sweet potatoes, groundnuts, tomatoes, pineapples, pulses, simsim);
- Agriculture – cash crops (e.g., coconuts, cashew nuts, mangoes, cloves);
- Livestock keeping (e.g., cattle, goats, sheep, poultry, donkey/horse); and
- Mining (e.g., salt, sand, and coral).

It is likely that many of these activities will be affected by the development of MPAs. This is particularly true for marine-based and coastal forest use livelihood activities. Impacts can be directly or indirect, as well as positive and negative (see ESA).

Consideration of Project Impacts

Impacts experienced as a result of the Project will vary in nature and degree depending on the social, economic, administrative and environmental context of the specific MPA-related activity and implementation area. Over the course of MACEMP, the Project could potentially involve activities focused anywhere within the coastal zone or the broader EEZ. Individual opportunities will be
identified as the Project proceeds based on results achieved in initially selected project target areas. For the first two years of the Project, the geographical areas of focus will include:

- The Rufiji-Mafia-Kilwa-Complex;
- A trans-boundary MPA with Mozambique;
- Latham Island;
- Mnemba Island Marine Conservation Area;
- Menai Bay Marine Conservation Area; and
- Pemba Channel Marine Conservation Area (includes Misali Island).

As coastal communities vary in their composition, their experiences with MACEMP may differ. Factors such as: available infrastructure, the natural resources in the area, and local differences in terms of history, types of natural resource use activities (e.g., fishing methods used, the amount of migratory fishing in the area), and history or previous experience with local conservation efforts in each village should be considered. For example, in an area where villages already have a positive and inclusive experience with MPA implementation, activities such as the expansion of existing MPA boundaries may have less impact than establishing a new MPA in an area where villages have no previous experience with conservation activities.

It is also important to address the possible clash between administrative and MPA boundaries. The general tendency is to determine MPA boundaries based primarily on the spatial extent and distribution of marine and coastal ecosystems, as environmental conservation is the primary objective. However, spatial patterns of use and informal administrative boundaries established between villages with respect to the use of marine and coastal environments (i.e., as part of the traditional management system) often will not coincide with ecosystem-based boundaries. Existing MPAs in the URT (e.g., Misali Conservation Area; Menai Bay Conservation Area) have been established in areas frequented by a number of communities (i.e., those groups distinguished by a village unit boundary), as well as migratory fishermen. Resource use, interests, and attitudes will vary between communities. Therefore, when considering MPA activities, it is important to scope potentially affected communities and groups (i.e., migratory fishermen) and consider all those that frequent or depend on the area in question.

The management of MPAs should be focused on enhancing positive impacts and minimising negative impacts. General impacts that may be experienced by communities and should be considered when identifying affected individuals and groups include:

**Positive impacts**
- Increased and improved welfare of communities through poverty alleviation;
- Enhanced financial sustainability in the community;
- Improved social capital within communities as a result of planning;
- Increased capacity for co-management and reduction of vulnerability in communities to impacts;
- Ensured longevity to the resource base for financial and livelihood sustainability; and
- Ecological protection for key coastal areas.

**Negative impacts**
- Loss of access to marine resources in a particular area (i.e., displacement);
- Loss of habitual land and water uses;
• Change to the quantity and/or quality of a resource a household can access;
• Change in the seasonal access of the resource;
• Change in the nature of access (e.g., unregulated to regulated); and
• Change to the types of assets needed to access resources (e.g., banning certain fishing gear).

Identifying Affected Individuals, Households and Communities

Further to defining the types of assets and livelihoods potentially affected by MPA implementation activities, criteria can be provided for the identification of affected individuals, households and communities. The eligibility of groups and individuals as “affected” are defined by World Bank Safeguard policies as those who may “have a loss of assets or access to assets”. In relation to MACEMP and activities under Component 2 (Sound Management of the Coastal Marine Environment), eligible groups include:

(i) Members of a community who have settlement and/or access rights (e.g., for fishing) under restriction. These will be directly affected people whose access to natural resources (i.e., marine resources, land and other assets) will be restricted and/or lost. This group also incorporates vulnerable persons; and

(ii) The wider community that includes those multiple users who access specific areas for shorter periods of time or who have economic links to resources in an area. This includes migratory fishermen who seasonally move down the coast to different regions. 3

From these categories, three types of affected groups can be defined for inclusion under the PF. These include:

• Affected Individual. An individual who suffers loss of assets or investments, land and property and/or access to natural and/or economical resources as a result of the Project. For example, an affected individual who normally has access to water resources that are now required by the Project for purposes other than fishing. These individuals include vulnerable persons (e.g., elderly, youth, women, disabled);

• Affected Household. A household that may be affected as one or more of its members are impacted by MPA implementation activities, either by loss of property, land or denial of access to resources. This includes: any members of the household such as men, women, children, dependent relatives and friends and tenants, and/or other members of the extended family; vulnerable individuals who may be no longer able to access resources for livelihood activities as a result of project activities; and relatives who depend on one another for their well-being. Households include the concept of co-resident groups of people whose labour contributions are critical to the functioning of a household.

3 There is a tradition of migratory fishing along the coast of the URT. During seasonal fluctuations, migratory fishermen can double the local fishing populations in certain areas such as within the Rufiji-Mafia-Kilwa complex.
• **Affected Local Community.** A community that is affected by MPA implementation activities as a result of changes experienced in relation to traditional socio-economic and/or social-cultural relationships or cohesion.

### Information on Affected Groups

In order to identify affected individuals, households and communities, it is important for administrators to access the necessary information. The extent and quality of village-level information that is available for the coastal regions of the URT varies considerably by region and site. For MACEMP activities related to any specific MPA, a baseline social assessment will be required to describe local social characteristics and resource uses. Affected groups are then identified based on the spatial overlap of livelihood activities with the MPA area of interest. The beneficiary unit (i.e., the logical grouping of differently affected individuals, households, and communities) should be defined based on the similarity of asset interests and user characteristics. In many cases, it is anticipated that logical groupings will emerge based on those previously defined by stakeholders (e.g., fishing organizations based on method of fishing).

The required social assessments should draw on existing secondary information. Once the specific characteristics and extent of proposed MPA implementation activities have been determined, it will be possible to collect and analyse relevant secondary data on affected communities from a number of sources. This will include government-generated data such as community census data, regional reports and data from NGO-sponsored programs (see Section 2.7 Monitoring and Evaluation). Examples of information of interest in identifying affected groups includes:

- Number of households (census information, election registry);
- Gender and age distribution of communities;
- Types of livelihood activities and participation levels; and
- Migration rates and characteristics of migrants.

Once the existing secondary information is evaluated with regard to the applicability to the MPA area of interest, the specific requirements for primary data collection via a baseline social assessment can be identified. The information required to identify affected groups is as described in Section 2.7 (Monitoring and Evaluation). Social assessment work should be coordinated through the PCU.
Mitigation Measures

Once affected groups are identified and impacts assessed, mitigation measures will be designed to ensure communities are not made worse-off as a result of MACEMP-related MPA implementation activities. The types of negative impacts likely experienced by coastal communities through Component 2 are associated with access to resource use and effects on livelihoods. Mitigation measures will, therefore, be focused on identifying alternative livelihood opportunities. They should ensure that affected communities have an opportunity to participate in deciding which options shall be available to them. A range of alternative livelihood opportunities should be available for consideration. The process for developing mitigation measures related to the establishment of MPAs includes two elements: (i) identifying options for alternative livelihood opportunities; and (ii) facilitating the development of action plans within affected communities. Mitigation activities as they relate to alternative livelihood opportunities will be considered in relation to Component 3: Coastal Community Action Fund under MACEMP.

Complimentary to the processes defined in the PF, mitigation may be realised by taking into account levels of resource use and use patterns in the development of the management plans for protected areas. On the Mainland, the Marine Parks and Reserves Act (1994) includes a requirement for consultation with affected villages regarding all aspects of the development of parks and reserves, including any amendments to regulations, zoning and general management plan, and management and conservation issues. Under the Local Government (Urban Authorities) Act (1982) and the Local Government (District) Authorities Act (1982), local authorities have responsibilities for resource management and for proposing areas for establishment as protected areas (proposals may be based on the advice of others, including other levels of government, NGOs, etc.). Local authorities are also involved in the management of marine parks and reserves, typically through advisory committees as specified by legislation. The creation of protected areas under the Zanzibar Environmental Management for Sustainable Development Act (1996) provides for the prescription of activities to be permitted or restricted in specific zones. In both jurisdictions, there is a duty to consult with affected communities and consider resource uses in designation and management decisions. The MACEMP PF is consistent with this legislation, and supports the fulfillment of URT legislated objectives with respect to MPAs.

In addition to specific legislative provisions for the establishment and management of MPAs, national EIA procedures may also serve to mitigate impacts in certain circumstances. In Zanzibar, EIA screening and approval of Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) are also the responsibility of the Department of Environment, and EIA procedures are detailed in regulation. Activities that are explicitly excluded from EIA, and those that specifically require an EIS are provided in the schedules to the Act (see details in the ESA). All other activities that are “likely to have a significant impact on the environment” are to be screened. Relevant to MACEMP, excluded activities include: domestic, private and non-commercial activities; small-scale businesses employing fewer than 10 people; operating tours (other than dive tours); rain-fed agriculture operations of less than 10 ha; and small-scale warehousing (Schedule 1). Activities that explicitly require an EIS include: developing an area in a port, harbour and marina; and aquaculture operations. Thus, the development of certain livelihood activities, as mitigation for impacts associated with MACEMP support for MPAs, may be subject to Zanzibar EIA procedures.
Similarly, under the *Environmental Management Act* (2004) of Mainland Tanzania, EIAs are to be undertaken for certain activities specified in the Act (see discussion in ESA). Relevant to MACEMP, this may be applied to forest related activities, agriculture, processing industries, and any activity “out of character with its surroundings” or as may be prescribed by regulation. The legislated process defines the roles of government as including prescription of the issues that must be addressed, and required consultations and public participation. In addition to the projects listed, the Minister may require preparation of an impact statement for any activity likely to have an impact on the environment. Mainland EIA procedures are not likely to come into play regarding MACEMP MPA-related activities, but again may apply to certain Component 3 sub-projects. Determination of any national EIA requirements is ultimately determined through referral to the appropriate government agency, notably the Department of Environment in Zanzibar, and NEMC in Mainland Tanzania. The referral process is identified in MACEMP sub-project environmental assessment process and procedures described in the ESA.

**Alternative Livelihood Opportunities**

Determining alternative livelihood opportunities will be the responsibility of communities, but will require the support and facilitation of MACEMP. Some communities will have strong ideas regarding the activities they would like to pursue, while other communities may benefit from an introduction to other viable options. Facilitation at the community level with respect to the identification of alternative livelihood opportunities is currently an identified MACEMP activity (under Component 3). In keeping with the Project’s goals of poverty alleviation and conservation, alternative livelihood opportunities should seek to integrate the promotion of sustainable resource use while providing secure livelihood alternatives for the community.

Alternative livelihood opportunities, which could be explored by communities, include investment, planning and education related to the *enhancement of current economic activities* (*e.g.*, developing offshore fishing through new gear and practices) and/or the *development of new types of economic activities* (*e.g.*, mariculture). Alternative livelihood opportunities will be inclusive of all affected individuals including men, women, the elderly and youth. Examples of activities that may be adopted include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Enhancing current economic activities:**
- Providing new nets, mechanized boats, and cold storage facilities;
- Developing fish processing and markets for fish catches to enhance economic returns; and
- Developing a supply chain for fisheries in remote coastal villages.

**Developing new types of economic activities:**
- Introducing mariculture activities such as seaweed harvesting, shellfish culture, fish cage aquaculture, or fish pond aquaculture;
- Developing local infrastructure and markets to take advantage of ecotourism and cultural tourism opportunities;
- Involvement in managing MPAs and MPA programmes as a direct alternative livelihood;
- Enhancing local crafts and trade activities; and
- Developing credit and savings to promote the development of small business.
Community Mitigation Action Plans (CMAPs)

As mitigation, affected groups should be offered alternative sources of funding and support for the development of alternative livelihood activities. Funding will be made available through the Coastal Village Fund under Component 3 of MACEMP. However, reliance on this mechanism alone will not be sufficient. For each affected village, a Community Mitigation Action Plan (CMAP) is to be prepared. This plan will outline the measures required to mitigate impacts on affected groups. CMAPs are community-driven, focused on facilitating alternative livelihood activities, and are to be submitted for approval by the MACEMP PMUs. They may be created as part of the management plan for the protected area in question, but serve as a separate and independent administrative requirement.

A CMAP should include the following information in order to ensure the plans are workable:

- Proposed income restoration activities;
- Organizational responsibilities and accountabilities;
- Community participation (including vulnerable groups);
- Implementation schedule;
- Cost and budget; and
- Monitoring and evaluation.

Communities need to demonstrate that the plan is in keeping with MACEMP’s goals and that all affected groups in the community were consulted on the plan. This can be ensured by following the consultation processes as outlined in the PF (see Section 2.4). The preparation of CMAPs will be the responsibility of the Community Management Committees (CMCs) established for Component 3 of MACEMP, as assisted by the Local Service Provider (LSP).

MACEMP Component 3 (Coastal Community Action Fund) and TASAF

Mitigation activities related to the implementation of MPAs and the PF are primarily focused on alternative livelihood opportunities. Funding for required training or investments for affected groups to take advantage of these opportunities will be considered under Component 3 of MACEMP (Coastal Community Action Fund). As they relate to the implementation of MPAs, these community-driven demands will be identified in CMAPs. Sub-component 3b provides for Coastal Community Capacity Enhancement to assist coastal communities in accessing the Coastal Village Fund (Sub-component 3a), and to facilitate identification, assessment, and monitoring of sub-projects. This is to be managed through CCAF Coordinators assigned to each PMU.

The Coastal Village Fund will be implemented through the institutional and operational mechanisms of TASAF. TASAF is focused on social service delivery infrastructure in health, education, water and sanitation, banking and markets, which seeks to benefit service-poor communities, food insecure
communities, and vulnerable persons or disaffected groups. Specifically, the linkages between MACEMP and TASAF include the following provisions:

1) MACEMP will follow the TASAF sub-project cycle;
2) MACEMP will target coastal geographic areas and define additional service packages to correspond to MACEMP objectives, and MACEMP will include additional safeguard screening criteria for its sub-projects (see ESA);
3) The MACEMP Coastal Village Fund (Sub-component 3a) will be ring-fenced within a single TASAF Special Account, and applies a simple resource allocation method to distribute it to MACEMP target districts and islands; and
4) MACEMP implements Coastal Community Capacity Enhancement (Sub-component 3b) through the MACEMP PMUs.

The access procedures for the Coastal Village Fund will be the same as for TASAF, and communities will not know that they are accessing regular TASAF or MACEMP funds. As such, the types of groups that will be targeted to improve livelihoods reflect TASAF targets and include: service poor households who will avail themselves of improved services; food insecure households with able-bodies adults who will increase their incomes from working of Coastal Village Fund-financed public works programmes; and vulnerable individuals who will work through community-based organisations to access resources for increasing incomes at the household level.

**Communication and Consultation Strategy**

The operational structure and institutional mechanisms associated with the implementation of MPAs are sometimes exclusionary with respect to local communities, especially when driven by national and international interests. In such cases, there may be little involvement by local communities and little local input to decisions on user or access rights to the resources within the MPA. To avoid this type of model, which can result in hardship and conflict in local communities, MPAs should be developed with greater attention to community participation, seeking to ensure a long-term sustainability of programs and promoting an integration of conservation and development. As the goal of MACEMP is to establish this type of inclusive activity within coastal communities and to ensure that the economic well-being of local communities remains the same or is improved as a result of activities under Component 2, clear mechanisms for communication and consultation with affected local communities are vital.

A communication and consultation strategy is an important element of the PF as it is a mechanism for dialogue, decision-making and empowerment for coastal communities. Consultation activities for activities under the PF are related to two elements:

(i) Consultation for the design of MPAs and assessment of impacts, and
(ii) Consultation for mitigative activities. Communication activities are ongoing and are co-ordinated with general communication activities for MACEMP. They will be focused on general awareness building and are directly related to consultation processes. Figure 2 provides a general overview of key consultation activities.
Figure 2: Consultation Framework and Responsibilities
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Consultation and Communication in the Design and Assessment of MPAs

In relation to MACEMP-funded support for emerging and existing MPAs, there are number of consultation and communication activities required. These include undertaking general awareness-building on MACEMP in communities, and consulting with communities on activities to disseminate information and explore impacts and alternatives with affected groups.

(i) General Awareness Consultations. Developing and implementing a general awareness campaign will help sensitize the communities about the Project, its objectives and activities. General awareness activities are identified as a key element of MACEMP planning and preliminary consultations have begun in relation to the Situational Analysis and ESA of the Project. However, for the purposes of diminishing its potential negative impacts, further awareness-building activities are necessary and have been outlined as sub-component activities under Components 2 and 3.

In communities that have been recently subjected to other development research activities, implementers should be wary of “consultation burnout” among communities and should focus on clear messaging and direct benefits to communities. Benefits to good communication and consultation include the potential to avoid grievances related to the administration that emerge later in the Project.

General awareness sessions should be organized through the District Councils and/or at the Village Council/Shehia Advisory Council/Mtaa Committee level. Education on the Project, the implementation arrangements and processes, and the expected outcomes should be part of the awareness sessions. Information for the sessions should come from the MACEMP PCU through the MACEMP PMUs located in both Zanzibar and in Mainland Tanzania to ensure consistency in messaging. Training or targeted sessions for local government officials involved in the Project should be implemented.

(ii) Activity Consultations/Disclosure Meetings. Further to the general awareness sessions, it will be important to consult with individual communities or affected individuals and households specifically in relation to proposed MPA implementation activities. Activity consultation or disclosure meetings should be held to ensure affected groups receive notification of proposed access and resource use changes. Consultations should include an information dissemination element (e.g., information on the nature and scope of activities, and the natural resources or assets affected) and provide a forum for dialogue with the community on the design and potential impacts.

Affected groups need to be fully informed about the details of the expected activity and their input received to ensure mitigation for expected negative impacts. Negative impacts will be assessed for their magnitude and are an important factor as they influence sub-projects developed under Component 3. This consists of developing CMAPs to support alternative income generating activities and/or advising communities on their mitigation options related to CMAPs under Component 2 and Coastal Village Fund plans under Component 3. Consultations are also an important method to encourage communities to provide comment on potential monitoring activities and to identify how they might be involved in monitoring.

Consultations on MPA activities can be undertaken through public meetings with communities. The District Council, Village-level authorities (i.e., Village Council/Shehia Advisory Council/Mtaa Committee level) and local NGOs and CBOs will be informed before public meetings are held. Correspondence (written information on the MPA-related activity) will be sent to these
representatives, to relevant government departments and to other interested stakeholders, providing notification and inviting their comment. This type of consultation serves as a disclosure meeting for potentially affected groups. It should be conducted through the Village Council and co-ordinated through the MACEMP PMUs.

Consultation for Mitigative Activities and Exploring Alternative Livelihoods

After communities have been made aware of the Project, invited to comment on specific MPA-related activities, and have consulted and decided on potential impacts, communities are to be facilitated to develop action plans focused on alternative income generating activities to ensure they are not made worse-off as a result of the Project. Awareness creation and coastal community training in facilitation of the process has been incorporated as an activity of MACEMP (Coastal Community Capacity Enhancement within Component 3: Coastal Community Action Fund). As previously discussed, Sub-component 3b provides for Coastal Community Capacity Enhancement to assist communities in the identification and assessment of sub-projects.

Consultations for affected groups on mitigative activities should include individual group meetings and community meetings.

(i) Individual Group Meetings. Meetings focused on individual groups based around key activities, gender or age should be held following the disclosure meeting. These sessions can be targeted at sub-groups and/or vulnerable groups such as women, elders, and youth. They can also be developed based on economic activity such as fishermen associations/groups, or those involved in small trade or agricultural activities. Groups by livelihood activity can even be further divided depending on activity type. For example, fishing groups could be sub-divided by fish catches (e.g. prawn, lobster, deep-sea fish) or gear type (e.g., divers, boat fishermen, net, long line). Individual meetings will be conducted by persons at the village level designated by the community. Individual meetings with various interest groups will help ensure that all groups have a voice in the consultation process. They will be targeted at discussions about alternative income generating activities. The groups with which meetings are required are those identified as being directly or indirectly impacted during the initial consultations for the design and assessment of MPA implementation.

(ii) Community Meetings. In addition to individual group meetings where groups are able to discuss various mitigative activities and formulate their own ideas, the entire community should be invited to convene and discuss MPA-related activities and alternative income generating opportunities collectively. These sessions will allow the options to presented by individual groups and allow for consensus-based decision-making on desired future actions. Following the community meeting, planning for CMAPs can proceed (see section on Mitigation Measures).

Considerations

There are a number of considerations that should be taken into account during any consultation or communication related to the PF. These include:

- Role of vulnerable groups;
- Effective methods for consultation and communication;
- Differences in community types; and
Rules of association.

Information pertinent to the above considerations should be collected as part of the required community-level social assessments, as recommended by the ESA. It is necessary to collect this information prior to the initiation of any MACEMP activity related to the support of existing or emerging MPAs.

(i) Vulnerable Groups. Vulnerable groups may require specific assistance during consultation and communication processes. Efforts such as holding individual group consultation meetings related to mitigation activities are one way in which vulnerable individuals may be integrated into the consultation process. In particular, such an approach is useful for consulting with women in coastal communities where women might not have a traditional role in decision-making or in voicing opinions in public sessions. In trying to identify vulnerable groups in a community, it may also be useful to engage a community representative to identify vulnerable persons for participation. Processes should seek to engage vulnerable persons at all stages of activity planning, and ensure monitoring systems are in place to demonstrate involvement.

(ii) Methods for Communication and Consultation. To ensure that communication and consultation activities related to the PF are effective, certain factors should be taken into account. These include: illiteracy levels in communities (which are lower in more remote coastal communities); local language requirements of communities (local dialects, Swahili, Arabic etc.); and general access issues for communities based on economic activities and infrastructure. Persons conducting communication and consultation activities should be competent and knowledgeable in the language and culture of the target communities. LSPs, in particular, should be selected that can demonstrate these competencies.

Communities in the URT have experience with Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) that is a consultation approach used for participatory research projects on sustainable livelihoods. PRA is useful as it offers a number of techniques for administrators that can ensure valuable community feedback. Central to PRA is semi-structured interviewing, with sensitive topics addressed in interviews with individuals or individual groups. MACEMP should take advantage of existing structured and community-level experiences in PRA processes in the URT (e.g., as done to support Mangrove Management Plans).

(iii) Types of Communities. During consultations with communities, those with different levels of awareness and varying experiences with development assistance and aid programs will be encountered. Consultations will take place within what can be categorized as two types of communities – “enhanced” and “Greenfield”. Enhanced Communities are typified by their strong knowledge of conservation issues, experience with development aid initiatives and engagement processes (e.g., PRA). This is often most advanced where there is a previous presence of NGOs or CBOs in the community. Examples of such communities are those located in areas where there are existing MPAs (e.g., Mafia Island, Chumbe Bay). Greenfield Communities are those that they have little to no experience with consultation and likely do not have any affiliations with an NGO or CBO in the community. By defining the type of community at the outset, implementing organizations can tailor their consultation and communication approaches to ensure they are more effective.

(iv) Rules of Association. Community consultations can be strengthened by engaging key individuals within communities (e.g., religious leaders, unofficial village leaders, chairs of village committees) who are knowledgeable about the community, potential sub-project impacts, and
local interests. These individuals may assist in disseminating information on MACEMP and may be able to reach vulnerable groups within communities.

Consultations should also, where applicable, include the involvement of locally active NGOs and CBOs. There are a number of NGOs collaborating with and managing MPAs in the URT. These organizations could provide key support to MACEMP initiatives, assisting in disseminating information to communities and assisting with the implementation of sub-projects. In fact, it is anticipated that NGOs will be actively involved in the development of proposals for funding under Component 2 of MACEMP. NGOs can also assist villages in their efforts to develop CMAPs, operating through the CMCs. Keeping them informed on the Program and actively involving them in planning should encourage their involvement.

Grievances, Disputes and Redress Mechanisms

Grievances and disputes may arise at several stages of the Project’s planning and implementation and may be related to project administration, or may be a result of conflicts between groups affected by the Project. Affected groups or individuals identified under the Project should be made aware at every stage that grievance procedures are in place and be advised on how they can access this mechanism.
Sources of Grievances

Potential sources of grievances and conflicts as a result of administration of the Project include:

- Poor communication and facilitation;
- Inadequate or lack of consultation;
- Concern over exclusion in decision-making;
- Dissatisfaction with development of CMAPs and failure to address issues of affected groups;
- Discontentment regarding performance of mitigation measures (e.g., support from alternative livelihoods); and
- Continuing concern over changes in the management of an MPA (e.g., restrictions on access to resources).

Sources of Conflicts

Potential conflicts, which may arise between affected groups as a result of the Project may include:

- Competition for use of resources or disputes over access to a resource use area as a result of the Project;
- The identification and disagreement on boundaries; and
- Competition over the sale or marketing of products.

For example, in the coastal areas of the URT, conflicts have arisen between villages over rights to fish specific coral reefs that are known to be particularly productive. Migratory fishermen, who may not seek permission to fish local waters from appropriate village authorities or who may use destructive fishing practices, have come into conflict with local fishermen. Conflicts have also arisen between tourism operators and local villages, primarily associated with access and use of the foreshore and beach areas. There has also been conflict between fishermen and dive operators over preferred coral reef sites. The development of an MPA network has the potential to exacerbate such conflicts, as certain marine-based livelihood activities are displaced and move to new areas. A redress mechanism is required in the event that the previously-described provisions of the PF (as well as the mitigation measures described in the ESA) are not effective.

Redress Mechanisms

There are a number of ways in which grievances and conflicts related to MACEMP can be addressed. The first approach is to identify and implement appropriate mitigation measures at the outset of any sub-component activity, to avoid problems as a result of failures in planning and administration. However, in the event that planned mitigation is not perceived as adequate or appropriate, redress mechanisms will need to be put in place. Measures to address conflicts that may arise between affected groups as a result of the Project include both formal and informal mechanisms:

(i) Informal mechanisms are those that are in place within coastal communities in the URT where villages are currently able to address conflicts (e.g., resource use conflicts) internally. Some villages have established traditional means of handling conflicts. For example, in some cases, villages in coastal communities have held social events (e.g., sporting activities) to improve relationship between groups in conflict. The improvement in the relationship has, in turn, allowed for subsequent dialogue and resolution of the conflict.
(ii) *Formal mechanisms* are those in which institutional bodies are used to resolve disputes related to resource use conflicts. Such formal mechanisms require the involvement of the local village government structure. An affected individual, household or community may appeal to this redress mechanism anytime where informal mechanisms are viewed as inadequate.

**Grievance Procedures**

In relation to MACEMP and grievances or disputes related to MPAs, certain formal redress measures should be put in place. There are four main steps related to the grievance procedures (see Figure 3). Any affected individuals or group (the claimant) is free to submit a grievance notice either verbally or in writing through the Village Council (Step 1). The Village Council will consider any grievance and try to resolve it through discussion and adjustments. If the issue cannot be resolved, or the affected individual or group are still not satisfied, then the grievance will go to the District Commission level to present the issue (Step 2). The District Commission will attempt to resolve the issue, and if they cannot or the claimant is not satisfied with the decision, the issue can be referred to the MACEMP PCU (Step 3). If the issue still remains unresolved, there may be a need to develop a Grievance Committee with members from relevant government departments (Step 4).

**Considerations**

The following are a number of considerations that should be integrated into any grievance process:

(i) *Administration.* It is important that grievance procedures, administered at the local level, are simplified to ensure participation of all groups, especially vulnerable individuals. Grievance procedures should also take into account local culture community characteristics. This includes the time it takes for people to formulate, decide and express their grievances, literacy rates in coastal communities, and requirements for timely resolution to grievances.

(ii) *Engagement.* The most effective way to resolve disputes is to engage the village government. Coastal communities in the URT, for the most part, have actively engaged civil organizations and village level government have experience with resolving disputes and conflicts. The use of NGOs and CBOs to mediate disputes and address grievance issues may also be considered in areas where there is a tradition of community-NGO/CBO involvement (*e.g.*, such as in existing MPA areas).

(iii) *Review and Improvement.* If a noticeable complaint pattern emerges as a result of the grievance process, efforts to redress the issue must be examined in relation to the Project to avoid further grievances or conflicts.
Figure 3: Grievance Procedure
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Responsibilities and Legal Procedures

Establishing institutional roles and responsibilities related to the implementation of the PF is important to ensure activities are carried out. The following provides a broad overview of organizations and individuals as they relate to MACEMP and aspects of the PF. Relevant legal procedures are also reviewed to ensure they are observed during the application of the PF.

Responsibilities

A number of government departments, local governments, community groups and stakeholders will be called on to participate in the planning and implementation of activities identified in the PF. Those groups are expected to play an active role include:

National
1. MACEMP PCU and PMUs
2. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), Mainland Tanzania
3. Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environment and Cooperatives (MANREC), Zanzibar

District
1. District Government, including District Environment Officer

Local
1. Village Council, Shehai and Mtaa
2. Affected Groups and Individuals
3. Community Management Committee (CMC)

Other Stakeholders
1. NGOs and CBOs

Roles

There will be a number of institutional roles and responsibilities related to the PF. Responsibilities in relation to administrative, management and implementation activities as outlined as follows:

MACEMP PCU and PMUs
- Provide day-to-day project implementation and activity planning
- Will support sensitization of stakeholders on the PF;
- Will support the development of communication and consultation activities and grievance procedures related to MPAs;
- Will review and approve the developed Community Mitigation Action Plans (CMAPs);
- Oversee monitoring and evaluation development related to MACEMP;
- Oversee disbursements and procurement related to Component 2; and
- Co-ordinate inter-governmental activities and collaborating with relevant government agencies regarding the Project.

MNRT and MANREC
- Generally support the implementation of MACEMP’s technical programs;
- Will support the implementation of the PF;
• Participate in the MACEMP Technical Committee which provides guidance to the Project; and
• Will provide an enabling environment for the system to be implemented.

**District Authorities**
- Will sensitize communities on the PF;
- Will participate in communication and consultation activities for MPAs;
- Will participate, where necessary, with grievance procedures;
- Will provide support in the preparation of CMAPs; and
- Will assist with the monitoring of CMAPs.

**Village Council, Shehia and Mtaa**
- Will participate in consultations and communication activities;
- Will help identify impacts related to MPA-related activities;
- Will participate in monitoring activities; and
- Will be responsible for the implementation of CMAPs.

**Affected Groups and Individuals**
- Will participate in consultation and communication activities related to the PF;
- Will identify impacts from MPA-related activities, identify alternative options and participate in monitoring activities; and
- Will be responsible for the implementation of CMAPs as it relates to mitigation of impacts on the group.

**CMCs**
- Will participate in consultation and communication activities related to the PF; and
- Will prepare the CMAPs as supported by the LSP.

**NGOs and CBOs**
- May be engaged to participate in the process as witness to grievance and redress mechanisms;
- Will participate, where applicable, in consultation and communication processes; and
- Assist, where applicable, with the development of CMAPs

**Other Village-level Authority Figures**
(Example: Religious Leaders, Traditional Leaders, School Teachers, Traditional Birth Attendants)
- Will participate through consultation and communication processes;
- Will participate in the development of CMAPs; and
- May participate, where applicable, in monitoring activities.

It is critical that detailed implementation responsibilities, procedures and guidelines be elaborated to fully operationalise the PF. This involves the further development of this PF into an operational manual and its associated guidelines. Particular attention should be paid to defining roles and responsibilities as they relate to linkages with: the Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF)-financed Tanzania Community Based Coastal Resources Management and Sustainable Livelihood Project (which supports the enhancement of the livelihoods of the poor and vulnerable groups in the coastal communities of Zanzibar and the Kilwa area); MACEMP Component 2 investments and capacity
building for local communities (including the development of CMAPs); and MACEMP/TASAF operational modalities.

**Legal Procedures**

Activities under the PF will be conducted in keeping with legal procedures related to government management of natural resources. There are several policies and legislation regarding land use and natural resource management within the URT (i.e., covering environmental management, coastal zone management, fisheries management, coastal forest management, and land management). Relevant government policies and legislation are discussed in the ESA.

Of particular relevance to the PF are those related to MPAs. For Mainland Tanzania, this includes the *Marine Parks and Reserves Act* (1994). For Zanzibar, this includes the *Environmental Management for Sustainable Development Act* (1996) and the *Establishment of Zanzibar Nature Conservation Areas Management Unit Act* (1999). These pieces of legislation define processes and procedures for the establishment, management and monitoring of MPAs. Particular attention should be paid to the following procedures:

- Timely consultations must be held with local authorities and affected individuals and communities before and during MPA implementation;
- Notification of intentions or plans to restrict access to natural resources must be made public as required and in keeping with the PF;
- Determination of alternative livelihood measures will be made by affected individuals and communities, with the assistance of MACEMP, relevant government departments, and other stakeholders such as NGOs and CBOs in keeping with the PF; and
- Alternative livelihood planning must be completed before MPA-related activities are implemented.

More broadly, the *Environmental Management Act* (2004) for Mainland Tanzania provides for the overall management of potential negative impacts on marine and coastal ecosystems due to MACEMP project activities, particularly those involving physical works or livelihood activity investments. The Act defines the functions to be performed by the NEMC, as well as Environmental Management Officers and Environmental Management Committees that are appointed at the district, municipal, ward, mtaa and village levels. The roles and responsibilities of the various bodies include:

- Overseeing the preparation and implementation of EIA;
- Facilitating public participation in decision-making;
- Identifying requirements for environmental audits and environmental monitoring;
- Ensuring compliance with national environmental quality standards, pollution control and waste management (including various enforcement functions for violations under the Act);
- Undertaking programmes for public environmental education and awareness;
- Preparing and implementing Environmental Action Plans (EAPs); and
- Providing environmental advice and technical support to other government staff at various levels.

Administration of the Zanzibar *Environmental Management for Sustainable Development Act* (1996) is through the Department of Environment, which is broadly responsible for ensuring that environmental concerns are integrated into nation development planning and project implementation; specifying standards, norms and criteria for the protection of the environment; managing and regulating EIA requirements; promoting public awareness of environmental issues through education
programmes; co-ordinating the monitoring of trends in the use of natural resources; preparing and co-ordinating the implementation of environmental actions plans at the national and local levels; and co-ordinating the preparation and implementation of community environmental management plans and integrated coastal area management plans.

Specific details regarding the roles and responsibilities of the government agencies in MACEMP is elaborated upon in the PAD. The project implementation arrangements are consistent with the PF and the legislated responsibilities of government agencies.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are fundamental components of projects involving affected individuals, households and communities. As the implementation of the Project may lead to a change in access to natural resources in areas as a result of conservation practices, building capacity for improved monitoring activities is essential. Monitoring should be participatory and include the monitoring of beneficial and adverse impacts on persons within project impact areas. M&E requirements are also identified in the ESA, and the more complete development of a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will occur separately as part of the project preparation activities.

The overall goal of the M&E process under the PF is to:

- Ensure effective communication and consultation takes place;
- Report any grievances that require resolution;
- Document the performance of CMAPs; and
- Allow program managers and participants to evaluate whether affected groups or individuals have experienced a change in their living standard (*i.e.*, in keeping with the World Bank Safeguard Policy that no one is worse off as a result of the project).

M&E has a number of key elements including: (i) defining key performance indicators, (ii) identifying evaluation processes, and (iii) providing guidance on collecting and compiling data. Specifically, to support the PF this will also include:

- Development of indicators at the community level disaggregate by gender, age, and livelihood to track risk potential and mitigation of risk;
- Recommendations for co-ordination with TASAF M&E systems to avoid duplication and help ensure efficiency in the system;
- Recommendations regarding how community and local government resource persons and existing mechanisms can be used to feed the M&E system;
- Recommendations for ensuring that there is a feedback mechanism into the Project implementation to address M&E findings.

**Defining Key Performance Indicators**

The PF will require that key performance indicators be developed in relation to MPA-related activities. Indicators can be grouped as those that: (i) will demonstrate whether or not the PF is meeting performance expectations; and (ii) demonstrate the status of livelihoods in communities (through household-level indicators). The following indicator groups are suggested as a basis to measure the success and weakness of activities related to affected groups.

**Process Framework Indicators**

*To measure: Effectiveness of the PF*
• Number of participants in consultation process
• Number and types of vulnerable groups participating in consultation process
• Number of affected communities included in developed CMAPs relative to total number of affected communities
• Number of grievances or conflicts recorded
• Number of remedial activities implemented in response to recorded grievances
• Time taken to resolve grievances
• Number of individuals with a positive perception over the level of empowerment in natural resources management
• Number of individuals with a positive perception over the level of empowerment in natural resources management, disaggregated by vulnerable group and user sub-group categories

**Community Livelihood Indicators**

*To measure: Livelihood status of households and changes in resource use*

• Change in livelihood activities of households, by type of activity and amount
• Change in livelihood activities of households, by type of activity and amount, disaggregated by vulnerable group and user sub-group categories
• Change in type and location of natural resources use

A more comprehensive list of recommended indicators, as it related to the impacts of MACEMP, is provided in the ESA.
Collecting and Compiling Data

Information for monitoring programs can be obtained from a number of sources. Data is being collected through a number of existing programmes and activities in the URT. These include government data sources such as annual surveys, community census, and data obtained through local organizations that conduct surveys as part of their programmes. Where possible, the integration of existing data sources should be considered. Examples of data collection programs at the coastal community level in the URT that may be incorporated include, but are not limited to, the following:

- District Planning Offices have quarterly reports on standards indicators for communities in their region;
- The Mangrove Management Program have community-generated information on harvesting and livelihood activities in mangroves at the coastal community level;
- Existing NGO and conservation programs in MPAs in the URT have monitoring and evaluation programs related to their annual operation and funding reports (e.g., CARE and the Ngezi Forest Project); and
- The Global Socioeconomic Monitoring Initiative currently has community-level programs in Mtwara and Tanga, with future expansion of the programme planned in the URT.

However, the above sources are not sufficient. The collection of information for the key performance indicators will rely on MACEMP operation records, but will also require primary data collection within affected communities. For each indicator, the data source, responsible agency, schedule for data collection, and cost estimate is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants in consultation process</td>
<td>Data from MACEMP operation records.</td>
<td>CMCs</td>
<td>Annual.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and types of vulnerable groups participating in</td>
<td>Data from MACEMP operation records.</td>
<td>CMCs</td>
<td>Annual.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of affected communities included in developed CMAPs</td>
<td>Data from MACEMP operation records.</td>
<td>CMCs</td>
<td>Annual.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative to total number of affected communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of grievances or conflicts recorded</td>
<td>Data from MACEMP operation records.</td>
<td>CMCs</td>
<td>Annual.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of remedial activities implemented in response to</td>
<td>Data from MACEMP operation records.</td>
<td>CMCs</td>
<td>Annual.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded grievances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken to resolve grievances</td>
<td>Data from MACEMP operation records.</td>
<td>CMCs</td>
<td>Annual.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals with a positive perception over the level of empowerment in natural resources management</td>
<td>Will require survey of a sample of villages.</td>
<td>PCU (contracted)</td>
<td>Baseline survey, and annually thereafter.</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals with a positive perception over the level of empowerment in natural resources management, disaggregated by vulnerable group and user sub-group categories</td>
<td>Will require survey of a sample of villages.</td>
<td>PCU (contracted)</td>
<td>Baseline survey, and annually thereafter.</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in livelihood activities of households, by type of activity and amount</td>
<td>Will require social assessment of livelihood activities.</td>
<td>PCU (contracted)</td>
<td>Baseline survey, and annually thereafter.</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in livelihood activities of households, by type of activity and amount, disaggregated by vulnerable group and user sub-group categories</td>
<td>Will require social assessment of livelihood activities.</td>
<td>PCU (contracted)</td>
<td>Baseline survey, and annually thereafter.</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in type and location of natural resources use</td>
<td>Will require social assessment of livelihood activities.</td>
<td>PCU (contracted)</td>
<td>Baseline survey, and annually thereafter.</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All monitoring activities are ultimately the responsibility of the PCU. The village-level social assessment of livelihood activities and the perceptions survey will require the contracting of specialised services. All contracting should be coordinated through the PCU. The objective of the social assessment is to detect undesirable changes in the types of livelihood activities as reflected in increases in livelihood vulnerability due to movements to less sustainable or sufficient activities, or a concentration of activities in particular areas or that rely on particular resources. The assessment should collect, at a minimum, information on: the livelihood activities of households, by type of activity, amount and the number of households involved; the households and user groups involved in use of the coastal and marine environment; the scale and frequency of use of the coastal and marine environment for each livelihood activity; and spatial use patterns. Information collection should allow for disaggregation by identified vulnerable groups and user sub-groups. A sufficient sample of villages should be selected for the social assessment work, using a select combination of focus group sessions and quantitative surveys.

Information for indicators on the level of participation in the consultation process, inclusion in developed CMAPs, grievances, and remedial activities should ultimately be the responsibility of
CMCs. This data will be available from MACEMP operation records, as it should be routinely tracked. The Village Council, Shehia Advisory Council, or Mtaa Committee (as applicable) will have ultimate responsibility regarding supervision of the CMC to ensure that this work is conducted. The PMUs will be responsible for compiling the data and auditing for completeness of the records, and they will be responsible for providing compiled M&E information to the PCU.

**Evaluation Process**

The objectives of evaluation include:

- An assessment of the compliance of activities undertaken in relation to the objectives and methods identified in the PF;
- An assessment of the consultation procedures that have taken place at the community and individual level;
- An assessment on whether the affected communities have had access to mitigation activities;
- The occurrence of grievances and extent of resolution of disputes;
- An evaluation of the impact of the Project on income and standard of living within communities; and
- Identification of actions that can improve the positive impact of the Project and mitigate potential negative impacts.

PMUs have the responsibility of reporting to the PCU on the results of monitoring. The M&E Advisor, within the PCU, consolidates the data obtained from the PMUs into a report that evaluates both the effectiveness of the PF and the livelihood status of households.

**Considerations for Monitoring and Evaluation**

The following are a number of considerations that should be integrated into M&E activities:

(i) *Coordination with Other Monitoring and Evaluation Programmes.* The PF is directly related to the M&E recommendations being developed under other MACEMP preparation activities (e.g., the ESA) which will measure achievements of project objectives, and monitor project impacts in support of adaptive management practices. TASAF also has an M&E programme to support the evaluation of project performance. The MACEMP PCU will be responsible for the overall monitoring and evaluation of activities under MACEMP, and may sub-contract some of this monitoring work to appropriate research institutes, NGOs or social research firms. The PF recommends the measurement of specific implementation activities and livelihood indicators as it relates to the establishment of MPAs.

(ii) *Local Community Involvement.* For monitoring programs to be effective, engaging affected groups or local participants in monitoring programs should be encouraged. For this reason, reliance on the CMCs for the collection and compilation of community-level information, as supported by LSPs, is recommended. During consultation processes, communities will have an opportunity to identify the types of measures they believe should be evaluated, and can identify how they might participate in monitoring programmes. Working within communities should take into account that a number of monitoring programmes may be underway in various communities,
and therefore new programmes should be, if possible, co-ordinated with existing programmes so data collection responsibilities are within local capacities.
Case example

In order to demonstrate how the PF can be applied under MACEIMP in relation to support for existing and merging MPAs, the following case example for the Misali Island Marine Conservation Area (MIMCA) is presented. This section provides overview of MIMCA, its structure and successes, and includes a hypothetical description of how the PF may be triggered and applied to an existing MPA such as MIMCA under MACEIMP.

Misali Island Marine Conservation Area (MIMCA)

In 1998, Misali Island and its surrounding reefs were protected as a conservation area through the establishment of the MIMCA. The conservation area covers 21.58 km² in total, of which 20.68 km² is a marine area and 0.90 km² is a terrestrial area. MIMCA has two main zones, an extractive use zone where legal fishing is permitted, and non-extractive zone (approximately 1.4 km²) where no uses except snorkelling, swimming, boating and research are permitted.

Misali Island is located off the southwest coast of Pemba Island, in the Pemba Channel between Zanzibar and Mainland Tanzania. The area is characterized by unique marine and terrestrial ecosystems. It has abundant species diversity with about 350 fish species and 40 genera of hard corals. The island also supports endangered nesting turtles and coastal thickets, which are home to green monkeys and endangered Pemba flying fox.

Misali Island is an important location for fishing as it supports the direct livelihood of over 11,400 people who fish in and around Misali annually. An estimated 36 of 50 communities on Pemba fish the waters of Misali and up to 7,000 people can be considered dependent on its resources (based on the average family size of 5 persons per household). Misali Island has no permanent population, although some seasonal camps are set up on the east side of the island for short periods. The area is characterized as a migratory fishing area.

Consultations procedures applied in setting up MIMCA involved a number of activities including the establishment of a community organization to manage and support the area - the Misali Island Conservation Association (MICA). MICA is an NGO formed of local fishermen to help community organizations assist with managing and monitoring the protected area and support the livelihoods of the communities using the island.

In addition to MICA, communities and vulnerable groups (e.g., women, elders and youth) can participate in the management and activities related to MIMCA through three key levels of committee. These include: the Shehia level, the district level and the Misali Island Management Committee. The Misali Island Management Committee consists of nominated individuals from district-level committees. The Committee meets every six months and is the main decision making organ of the protected area.

MIMCA serves as an interesting example of MPA/CMA establishment. The following are some examples of successes and/or key characteristics for the protected area initiative:
• **Formalized participation of the local community through the Misali Island Conservation Association.** MICA is a network of local fishermen who represent the users from the Shehias that most utilize Misali Island. The conservation association has the distinct function to assist in coordinating the management and monitoring of the area and to provide communities with a means of getting involved with the management of the park at the local level.

• **Support from environmental NGOs and government agencies for the ongoing development and management of the area.** Organizations such as CARE Tanzania and the Department of Commercial Crops, Fruits and Forestry (DCCFF) provide ongoing support to programs in the area.

• **Communities have been consulted regarding the protected area although there is no clear community delineation related to the protected area boundary and the majority of users are migratory fishermen.** Compared to other protected areas near shore, defining community boundaries for Misali Island is complex as the island is inhabited for most of the year and a large number of communities access the area from various places in Pemba. Planning and management activities related to the Misali Island Management Committee and MICA support informing communities on MIMCA and encouraging their participation.

• **Alternative livelihood activities and programs have been facilitated through the Misali Island Conservation and Community Development (MICODEP).** MICODEP is a project initiated by CARE Tanzania focused on improving the income and food security of the families of 34 villages of Pemba dependent on the natural resources of MIMCA and the Ngezi Forest. Community-based projects include savings and credit programs, promoting cultural and eco-tourism, and improving community organizations and management of eco-tourism and tourist revenues.

• **Experimentation with the application of Islamic environmental ethics to promote marine conservation.** The Islamic Foundation for Ecology and Environmental Sciences in collaboration with CARE and WWF implemented a project related to MIMCA to sensitize communities to marine resource use using Islamic conservation ethic. The program is applied using teachings from the Qu’ran to emphasize the management and protection of resources.

**Process Framework Applications to MIMCA**

Figure 4 provides an overview of how the PF may be applied to MACEMP-supported initiatives associated with an existing MPA such as MIMCA. In the given scenario, a development has been proposed to expand the current non-extractive use zone from its current size of 1.4km² (approximately 8.5% of the total conservation area) to protect additional valuable habitat. Figure 4 outlines the processes that would be followed to satisfy the requirements of the PF and the stakeholders that would be involved in that process, including consultation with affected groups or individuals.
Figure 4: Application of the Process Framework Under MACEMP to the Misali Island Marine Conservation Area (MIMCA)

**MACEMP PROJECT ACTIVITY PROPOSED**

**PROCESS FRAMEWORK TRIGGERED**
- Lead Responsibility: Zanzibar Project Management Unit
- Consultations With: MACEMP Project Coordination Unit

**CONSULTATIONS - General Awareness Meetings**
- Lead Responsibility: Zanzibar Project Management Unit
- Consultations With: Pemba District(s), Misali Island Management Committee, Misali Island Conservation Association, CARE International Tanzania, DCCFF

**CONSULTATIONS - Disclosure Meeting with Communities and Affected Groups**
- Lead Responsibility: Pemba District(s) and/or Misali Island Management Committee
- Consultations With: Shehias and villages using the Misali Island area. These include: Makombeni, Wamhaa, Wesha, Muanbe Shehias and Koiani and Micheweni villages.

**CONSULTATIONS - Individual Group Meetings**
- Lead Responsibility: Shehias and Mtaa-level Leaders (Initiators), Community Representatives by Sub-Group or Vulnerable Group (Group leaders)
- Consultations With: Members of Villages by Sub-Group, including vulnerable groups (e.g., women, elders, youth)

**CONSULTATIONS - Community Meetings**
- Lead Responsibility: Shehias and Mtaa-level Leaders
- Consultations With: All members of Shehias and Village Communities, including vulnerable groups or user sub-groups

**DEVELOPMENT OF CMAPS**
- Lead Responsibility: Misali Island Management Committee
- Consultations With: Shehias, CARE International, Other locally active NGOs, CBOs or LSPs

**MONITORING**
- Lead Responsibility: Misali Island Management Committee
- Consultations With: Shehias, Village Committees and User Groups, MACEMP PCU (re: MACEMP M&E Reporting System)

**DETECTION OF AFFECTED GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS**

**Impacts or affects on livelihoods?**
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- NO
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