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THE PROCESS FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The Government of Ghana is preparing a fisheries project with funding support from the World Bank. This project has triggered the involuntary resettlement policy (OP 4.12) and the environmental assessment policy (OP4.01) of the World Bank. This requires that appropriate instruments are prepared, consulted on, and disclosed as part of project preparation and approval processes. This process framework is one of two instruments prepared in response to the triggered OP 4.12. The other instrument is a resettlement policy framework (RPF) which has been developed separately. The process framework is developed because of the potential that project activities may lead to restriction of access to the natural resources.

The purpose of the process framework is to establish a process whereby members of potentially affected communities are able to participate in the design of fisheries resource restrictions, determine measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration and implement and monitor relevant project activities. This Process Framework is a response to the Regional Process Framework established under the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (WARFP) as a result of potential restriction of access to natural resources. In Ghana this NPF will apply to communities utilizing marine and/or inland waters and to two groups of fishers; artisanal and industrial. The Fisheries Commission and Ministry of Food and Agriculture in Ghana are responsible for developing a National Process Framework (NPF) for local co-management of fisheries resources as a condition of participation in the WARFP.

In Ghana, although it is estimated that few people will be affected by involuntary resettlement, there is still the need to outline a process for ensuring their involvement and search for solution to the impacts. In the context of fisheries management programmes in particular, the principles of resettlement policy apply to individuals who are adversely affected whilst pursuing their traditional livelihoods by the introduction of new fishing rules and regulations as per project activities. It is for this reason that an NPF is being developed. The NPF is to mitigate social impacts due to these restrictions in access to the economic resources.

Project Description

The project development objective is to sustainably increase the overall wealth generated for Ghana through the use of its fish and aquatic resources. This objective will be achieved through activities outlined in the project components below.

The project cost is estimated at US$53.8 million, of which IDA will finance US$50.3 million and US$3.5 million is being financed by the GEF. It has four components described as follows:

Component 1: Good Governance and Sustainable Management of the Fisheries. ($17.2 M IDA; $3.5 M GEF). This component aims to build the capacity of the Government and stakeholders to develop and implement policies through a shared approach that would ensure that the fish resources are used in a manner that is environmentally sustainable, socially equitable and economically profitable. It will comprise the following four sub-components: (i) developing the capacity, rules, practices and procedures for good governance of the fisheries; (ii) strengthening fisheries management, including fishing rights and co-management and ensuring necessary research activities for sustainable exploitation; (iii) aligning fishing capacity and effort to sustainable catch levels; and (iv) social marketing, communication and transparency.

Component 2: Reduction of Illegal Fishing ($11.8 m IDA). The component aims to reduce the illegal fishing activities threatening the sustainable management of the country’s fish resources by strengthening aquaculture and fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) systems.
Component 3: Increasing the Contribution of the Fish Resources to the Local Economy (US$19.4 m IDA). The component aims to identify and implement measures to increase the benefits to Ghana from the fish resources, by increasing the share of the value-added captured in the country. It will comprise the following sub-components: (i) value chain development (fresh/frozen product/trade facilitation); (ii) fish product trade, information and systems; (iii) marine and inland aquaculture development, including the establishment of a US$5 million Credit Guarantee Fund to support bank lending to profitable aquaculture projects.

Component 4: Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Management (US$1.9 m IDA). The component aims to support project implementation and regional coordination with the WARFP, ensuring that regular monitoring and evaluation is conducted, and the results are fed back into decision-making and project management.

Objective of the Process Framework

The objective of this PF is to establish an enabling environment in which PAPs participate in developing mitigation measures against negative impacts. It includes the PAPs providing input into project activities, determining measures to reduce impacts caused by limiting access, and developing management and monitoring plans. Under this project, there will be no reduction of size of fishermen in artisanal fishing. What the project seeks to do is introduction of access rights through the registration and licensing of all existing fishing operations. Thus the size of the artisanal fleet will not be reduced, but rather controlled at current levels. Conversely, for those in industrial fishing, there will be some loss of livelihood by some crew members as some semi-industrial and industrial trawl vessels will be reduced. This will be a gradual process over the life of the project. Details of addressing this are outlined in this process framework.

Preparation of the National Process Framework

This Process Framework has been prepared as part of developing the Draft Ghana Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Development Plan (FASDP). This plan (FASDP) covers the period 2010-2015. It recognizes the importance of Ghana’s fisheries which generate in the order of US$ 1 billion a year, contribute 4.5% to GDP and indirectly support the livelihoods of 2.2 million people. However, through over-fishing and lack of investment in management and value addition, the average income per canoe has dropped by up to 40% over the last ten years to the point where it costs as much to fish as the catch is worth. By comparison, well managed fisheries in other parts of the world are capable of generating economic returns of 30-60% on investment (equivalent to a potential income of US$ 300 million a year for Ghana’s fisheries).

The Draft FASDP acknowledges that the fishing sector is expected to make a substantial contribution towards doubling the size of the Ghanaian economy by 2015 (GPRS II) as part of the Republic of Ghana Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy. Seven targets are set in the draft FASDP:

1. Maintaining capture fisheries production at current levels,
2&3 Increasing revenue and profitability in capture fisheries by at least US$ 50 million a year after five years,
4. Increasing aquaculture production to 35,000 tonnes a year after five years,
5. Retaining Ghana as a landing and processing hub for the West Africa tuna industry,
6. Developing fisheries management to allow effective control of all commercial fishing effort in Ghanaian waters, and,
7. Ensuring fisheries management costs are sustainable and that the fisheries sector overall make a fiscal contribution to Government revenues.
There is an underlying presumption that the canoe sector will remain at the heart of Ghana’s fishing industry but the plan is not prescriptive and leaves open the ways of achieving the overall goals. At the same time there is an underlying assumption that the long term sustainability of Ghana’s fisheries will depend upon discouraging further entry by new operators. Overall, Ghana’s fisheries and aquaculture plan aims to improve the economic returns from fishing and fish culture, protect fish stocks and strengthen local fishing communities. The plan will take effect throughout Ghana and involve all marine and inland fisheries: referred to here as the affected fisheries (AF).

Criteria for Eligibility of Affected Persons

It is estimated that as many as 2.2 million people, 10% of the total population of Ghana, are dependent on the fisheries sector for their livelihoods, including some 135,000 fishers in the marine sector (of which 92% are artisanal fishers). It is estimated that a further 71,000 artisanal fishers operate in Lake Volta. These figures underscore the prominent role that fisheries currently play in the Ghanaian economy, as they have done for many generations past.

Ghana's artisanal fishing sector is based on between 10,000 and 12,000 wooden canoes. Fifty seven per cent of the fleet is powered by outboard motors supported by paddle and occasionally sail. Each Canoe carries a crew of between three and 20 men depending on size and length. There are over 334 landing sites along the 550 km coast of Ghana and the majority of fish caught by canoe (180,000 tonnes) is returned to these sites accounting for 70% of Ghana’s fish production. The principal landing sites are at Teshie, Jamestown, Chorkor, Shama, Axim, Elmina, Winneba, Mumford, Akplabonya, Adina, Atiteti, Abutiakope and More. Fishing is undertaken by men but the majority of canoes are owned by women who pre-finance fishing trips (purchasing gear and premixed fuel) and purchase the catch. Women also predominate in processing and marketing fish and fish products. Only about 20% of fish is sold fresh, a further 20% is salted and the majority (60%) is smoked. It is estimated that up to 30% of the catch is spoilt through lack of ice for storage or alternative processing facilities.

In the1998 frame survey of the Volta Lake conducted by the Fisheries Directorate of Ghana, the estimate of fishers on the Volta Lake was put at 71,861. Fishers on the Lake work in collaboration with a host of fishmongers or handlers who also function as wholesalers for individual fishing groups. Assuming that the fisher population on the lake has increased by a modest 3% in the ten years from 1998 to 2010, a fisher population of about 93,500 could be considered to be on the Volta Lake now. If again it is estimated that number of fishers on rivers in the country were to be a tenth of those on the lake, this would put the fisher population on inland waters (apart from the Volta Lake) at about 9,350 fishers. A very conservative estimate therefore puts the total number of individuals who are directly engaged in inland fishing at over 100,000. This excludes all directly associated groups, such as fish handlers, processors and traders. An estimate of secondary fisheries operators, such as, boat builders, out-board motor operators and mechanics as well as bulk salt and fuel wood sellers and those engaged in buying, selling and distributing fish would have to be considered in developing estimates for both direct and indirect employment in inland fisheries but the number can be assumed to lie between 125,000 and 150,000 people.

Aquaculture

Under Ghana’s legal framework aquaculture is defined as “any activity designed to cultivate or farm fish and other aquatic living resources”. Currently only fin fishes are involved in aquaculture in Ghana.

The main challenges facing aquaculture development in Ghana relate to:

- The absence of locally manufactured fish feed
• No availability of commercial fish hatcheries as enterprises
• Lack of a nation-wide distribution network for fish seed and cultured fish producers
• Absence of certification and monitoring to check the health and safety of aquaculture processes and products.
• The absence of regulations regarding establishment of an aquaculture enterprise until June, 2010. (In the absence of regulations only the large and medium scale commercial farms worked towards conforming to international performance. Standards and operational regulations for certification of farms and their products still remain in a draft state)
• Lack of national support for research to support expansion and systematic development of aquaculture.

The prospects for development of aquaculture as an industry in Ghana are good since a number of practical, policy and legal frameworks have been put in place to resolve the basic challenges to the industry listed above. These include:

• Construction of the first local fish feed plant by an international fish feed company with the expectation of having initial products on the Ghanaian market during 2011.
• A ‘Large scale commercial fish farm’ with great capacity for fingerling production is shifting emphasis to fish seed production. And several localized fish seed producers are expanding operations.
• Distribution strategies by cultured fish producers have started to emerge on a limited scale and are expected to evolve with increasing production as existing commercial farms expand and new ones join in.

Now that regulations regarding establishment of aquaculture enterprises have been gazetted there is likely to be a positive response amongst fish farmers of all size categories. New operational standards are being prepared which will introduce minimum standards for local certification. This should set the stage for preparation of fish culture products and allow consumers to choose what to invest in while also preparing producers to enter external markets.

The NPF recognizes that the way in which people will be affected by restrictions on fishing activity can only be determined at the local level when specific proposals for controlling access have been agreed by each participating fishing community. Consequently this NPF sets out general guidelines which will be discussed and modified as appropriate at local level before they are formally adopted. The number of potentially affected people under this process framework is estimated to be about 1,000 to 3,000 persons who might lose their livelihood as a result of a reduction of semi-industrial and industrial trawl vessels. Additionally, roughly 200,000 to 230,000 marine and inland fishers will be required to register their fishing vessels and obtain a fishing license, though this is not expected to adversely impact their activities, but rather provide them with a fixed asset that may not be available to future entrants to the sector.

If access to resources is limited as a consequence of project activities, the first step in preparing compensation and other mitigation measures is to identify who are the project-affected persons. Project Affected Persons (PAPs) are those who depend on access to the resources to maintain their standard of living. These persons will be determined by a participatory process. This diagnosis will serve as a point of reference to determine who the PAPs are at the project outset. It is critically important also to determine the identities and number of people who depend for their livelihood on fishing.

The criteria for determining who will be eligible for compensation or assistance as a result of project activity restriction will be based on these broad areas:

(a) Those who will lose part of their livelihood as a result of controlled access
(b) Those who will lose their livelihood as a result of loss of license for their boats/trawlers
(c) Those who may want to opt due to the challenges they perceive with the project

**Measures to Assist Affected**

A number of measures will be put in place to support those who will be affected by project implementation. These measures include compensation payments and social marketing activities.

**Direct Payment of Compensation**

Under this, the project will identify the people who will need this type of support, do an inventory and their specific qualification and amounts involved per criteria that will be developed subsequently as part of the process. Payment of compensation will also include guidance on options for other economic activities for PAPs.

**Social Marketing**

The project will provide significant support to social marketing and communication activities, in order to ensure that fishing communities fully understand the benefits of controlled access to the resources, and particularly licensing of canoes. In particular, the project would communicate the message that these licenses will become an asset with value for each of the fishers, created because the Government is controlling access to prevent further overfishing and decline in profitability.

**The Consultation Process**

The preparation of the Process Framework has been through different forms of stakeholder consultations. Three of these levels are (i) the consultation process for preparing the FASDEP, (ii) the consultation processes for preparing the Fisheries survey and (iii) the process of engaging institutions and personalities in the drafting of the process framework.

Under the Fisheries Survey, consultations were undertaken in four regions noted for fishing activities and involved a total of 2700 respondents made up of 1,200 non-fishing respondents and 1500 fishing respondents. Key issues discussed included views on licensing, controlling fishing, training, sustainable fishing, community fishing management among others. Respondents expressed positions and opinions which revealed their support for the project but wanted transparency and information sharing with the processes.

The consultation process for the FASDP, which is the basis for this investment and the key provisions requiring the process framework, included a series of 9 stakeholder consultations on the following dates and venues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Policy Makers</td>
<td>M-Plaza Hotel, Accra</td>
<td>15th – 16th September, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Civil Society represented by Media and Fisheries-based Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
<td>Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA), Accra</td>
<td>22nd – 23rd September, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Small Scale Fish Processors and Traders</td>
<td>Windy Bay Lodge, Winneba</td>
<td>30th November to 1st December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Marine Inshore Fishers</td>
<td>Stella Hotel, Tema</td>
<td>16th-17th December 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues raised included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Positive aspects of the FASDP</th>
<th>Concerns Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Makers</td>
<td>“Overall the draft plan was a good effort” (Quote from a participant at the policy makers’ workshop).</td>
<td>Lack of a clear framework for the development of aquaculture in the plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitation of large scale investments in fish processing to the canning of Tuna;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to justify the projected earnings from value addition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The fact that fleet rationalization as was captured in the plan would adversely affect revenue accruing to the Fisheries Commission, this consideration should be factored into the ambitious estimate of US$ 4 million per annum; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to state targets in measurable terms with clear baseline indicators for evaluation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>“We have noted that there are challenges facing the fishing industry and the Fisheries and Aquaculture Development plan is a bold initiative to address the challenges” (Quote from report presented by representatives of civil society at the stakeholder consultation);</td>
<td>Civil society participants cautioned that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The value addition component of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Development plan is a good idea i.e. fishermen going to sea with ice; provision of cold store facilities, processing and marketing (Quote</td>
<td>The Government of Ghana could seek grants rather than loans to fund the Fisheries and Aquaculture Development Plan given the high risk nature of the fisheries sub-sector;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil society participants cautioned that:</td>
<td>Challenges of the aquaculture sub-sector are so complex that Government should rather be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marine Canoe Fishers

“The plan would assure the well-being of fishermen” (Quote from report presented by representatives of marine artisanal canoe fishers);

“The plan would address illegal activities on our sea” (Quote from report presented by representatives of marine artisanal canoe fishers);

“We are happy about the plan to limit the operations of industrial vessels” (Quote from report presented by representatives of marine artisanal canoe fishers).

Marine Inshore Fishers

“The ideas in the plan are not new, these are recommendations that we have repeatedly made over the years without results, so these are very much acceptable to us” (Quote from report presented by representatives of inshore fishers at the stakeholder consultation).

“The plan would improve livelihoods in the industry, if the industry was well regulated and if the Fisheries Commission and the political leaders show commitment in implementing the proposed measures” (Quote from report presented by representatives of inshore fishers at the stakeholder consultation).

Marine Industrial Fishers

“The very idea to have a fisheries plan is good” (Quote from report presented by representatives of Tuna fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

“The plan gives a comprehensive overview of the nation’s agenda for sustaining...” (Quote from report presented by representatives of Tuna fishers’ stakeholder consultation).

Large scale investments in fish processing and marketing should not be limited to the Tuna fishery, there could be arrangements for example for improvements in the processing of anchovies; and off-shore demersal fisheries if that niche in the fisheries were assisted to develop.

Marine canoe fishers expressed resentment for the involvement of police in effecting the arrest of fishers using illegal methods.

Inshore fisheries participants were concerned that some of their peers had recently used bank loans to build new vessels and might be adversely affected by any vessel reduction plan.

Marine industrial fishers were concerned that the plan is much too late; is weak regarding the development of the Tuna sector; is silent on the development of the pole and line sector; and lacks detail on how Ghana could...
marine resources” (Quote from report presented by representatives of Tuna fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

“The plan has exposed industry players to the declining situation of the fish stock especially the shaky situation of the tuna catchers” (Quote from report presented by representatives of Tuna fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

“The plan provides for the proper management of the fisheries sector” (Quote from report presented by representatives of Tuna fishers’ during industrial fishers’ stakeholder consultation).

“The plan has useful information for the industry” (Quote from report presented by representatives of industrial trawlers during industrial fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

“Food would be assured when the plan is well implemented” (Quote from report presented by representatives of industrial trawlers during industrial fishers’ stakeholder consultation).

Inland Fishers

“We agree that the present numbers of canoes should be maintained” (Quote from report presented by representatives of inland fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

We agree that all canoes should be licensed (Quote from report presented by representatives of inland fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

“We have realized that the plan when well implemented will make the fishing business sustainable and profitable for the fisher folks and better than the current situation in which we find ourselves” (Quote from report presented by representatives of inland fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

“The plan would promote food security, livelihood sustainability and profitability” (Quote from report presented by representatives of inland fishers’ stakeholder consultation);

Inland fishers disagree with the suggestion that a broken down canoe could not be replaced by its owner. They further indicated that the plan was too marine-focused and was entirely silent on and unfair to the Lower Volta Basin Fisheries, which had collapsed very long ago as a result of the ecological changes, associated with the construction of the Akosombo dam in the 1960s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Scale Fish Processors and Traders</td>
<td>“Registration of canoes - will help reduce the issues of premix fuel in the fishing communities”</td>
<td>Notwithstanding their affirmation of the need for an improved fish processing technology, small scale fish processors and traders had some misgivings about the introduction of Liquefied Petroleum Gas - powered fish smoking technology because of: recent shortages in gas supply; the suspicion that the initial costs of procuring the new technology may be beyond their reach; the quality and taste of the gas smoked fish does not match the currently preferred taste and consistency and therefore might attract low market value. Beside this, small scale fish processors were concerned about the fact that some of their fishing communities (e.g. Kokrobite and Shama) were missed in the plan to provide or upgrade landing sites. They also raised the issue that there was no mention of a credit package for fish processors as the industry has become more capital intensive in the face of rising fish prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Importers, Exporters and Canneries</td>
<td>“What is good is not good for us alone but good for the next generation. What you are doing is good and we are looking forward to working hand in hand with you”.</td>
<td>The main concern of this category of stakeholders was the lack of specifics in how the number of trawlers would be controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture Operators</td>
<td>“The idea of having a plan for the development of the fisheries and aquaculture is satisfactory”</td>
<td>The key concerns of aquaculture operators were that the aquaculture aspect of the plan lacks detail; is centered on cages without any attention to ponds; is silent on how fish farmers would be assisted financially to achieve the set targets. There were also concerns about the government’s role in the establishment of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The plan demonstrates government’s interest in aquaculture” (Quote from report presented by representatives of aquaculture operators);

“Capacity building and support for various associations is good” (Quote from report presented by representatives of aquaculture operators);

Government is finally proactive about aquaculture (Quote from report presented by representatives of aquaculture operators).

hatcheries as this could undermine private hatcheries instead of assisting them to expand.

Some additional issues arising from the consultations of particular relevance to the process framework included those relating to industrial trawl fleet reductions:

- The need to reduce pressure on the fishing stocks was appreciated, but a cautious approach should be taken;
- Effort rationalization should be targeted, since not all fisheries require rationalization;
- Vessels could be bought back by the government to be refitted for other uses such as recreational fishing by tourists and for dredging;
- Existing trawl vessels in Ghana both birthed and operational could be audited and old, outmoded, depreciated vessels could be decommissioned, scrapped or removed from sea;
- New licenses and vessels should not be allowed by the Fisheries Commission;
- Incentives including fair compensation could be provided to encourage voluntary decongestion;
- Vessels could be allowed to phase out without any inducements given the dire situation of the nation’s fisheries;
- Replacement of worn out vessels should either be discouraged or made to go through re-registration;
- Vessels, which do not operate for 2-3 years should be made to re-apply for re-registration; and
- A quota system could be adopted, and monitored with catch transmission systems to ensure compliance; and
- Owners could be encouraged to combine two or more boats to create bigger boats.
- Additionally, marine canoe fishers suggested a total ban on bottom trawling as a way of conserving the marine environment for the regeneration of fish stocks.

Participants in the consultations included representatives from the Fisheries Commission, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, the Ghana National Canoe Fishermen Council, the Ghana Tuna Association, the Ghana Aquaculture Association, Ghana Inshore Fisheries Association, the University of Ghana, the University of Cape Coast, the Water Resources Institute, the Food Research Institute, the Ministry of Information, the Ministry of Tourism, a number of fishing companies in Accra, and a number of representatives from the media.

As part of continuous consultations, the project will scale up the Citizen’s Report Cards and Social Marketing strategies used during project preparation as part of implementation activities.
Grievance Redress Mechanism and Processes

The Ministry of Fisheries will establish an independent grievance mechanism supported by other agencies and comprising representatives of PAPs, implementing agencies including local authorities and community leaders. All PAPs will be informed about how to register grievances or complaints, including specific concerns about compensation and relocation. The PAPs should also be informed about the dispute resolution process, specifically about how the disputes will be resolved in an impartial and timely manner. The project will produce a report containing a summary of all grievances. The dispute resolution process may include Ghanaian Courts of Law, but traditional institutions can be an effective first step.
Administrative and Legal Procedures

The Fisheries Governance Framework in Ghana

The Ministry of Food and Agriculture: Preparation of Fisheries laws and policies fall under the responsibilities of the Minister of Food and Agriculture who in turn delegates functions, including implementation to a semi-autonomous body; the Fisheries Commission.

The Fisheries Commission was established under the Fisheries Commission Act (457, 1993). It oversees management, regulation and utilisation of the fisheries resources of Ghana drawing on powers set out in the Fisheries Law (PNDC 256, 1991).

Ten individuals constitute the Board which is led by a chairman (appointed by the President of Ghana in consultation with the Council of State) supported by three members drawn from the ministries of transport, defence and environment. There are three representatives from the following parastatal organizations - the Ghana Marine Fishing Officers Association, Water Research Institute and Ghana Irrigation Development Authority - and two representatives (one from the artisanal and one from the industrial sections) of the National Fisheries Association of Ghana. Finally, the tenth member is a person with requisite knowledge of the fishing industry or natural resources renewal management.

The day to day work of the Fisheries Commission is undertaken by the Department of Fisheries (MOFA) which serves as the implementation secretariat of the Fisheries Commission, as stipulated by the Fisheries Act 625 of 2002. Specific tasks that are undertaken by the Department of Fisheries include:

- preparing fishery resource management plans;
- developing regulations for the fishing industry;
- organizing monitoring, surveillance and enforcement for the national fishery resources and ensuring compliance with national fisheries law; and institutionalizing co-management concepts.

The MCS Division (established under the Fisheries Sub sector Capacity Building project), works in conjunction with the Ghana Navy and undertakes sea patrols to exclude industrial fishing vessels from the 30-metre depth IEZ, reserved for artisanal fisheries. The MSC also conducts inspection of industrial vessels at the fishing ports of Tema and Takoradi for:

- valid fishing licences,
- legality of fishing gear
- skipper’s certificate,
- log book and crew composition

The MCS undertakes similar functions for inland fisheries on Lake Volta.

The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD) is responsible for managing fishers, fish processors and fishery resources at district and sub-district levels which it undertakes through the District Assemblies. In 2002, the District Assemblies in collaboration with DoF, were mandated to facilitate fishery resource management by:

- helping to form and sustain Community Based Fisheries Management Committees (CBFMCs);
- cooperating with the DoF MCS units;
- providing legal and financial support to the CBFMCs; and,
• approving levies proposed by the CBFMCs

Community-Based Fisheries Management Committees: are charged with the responsibility of enforcing national fisheries laws at community level, as well as initiating and enforcing their own by-laws.

The Legal Framework

International Conventions: Ghana has ratified a number of international conventions and treaties which have an important bearing on the state of its marine and inland waters and the condition of the fisheries. These are listed in Box 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1</th>
<th>International Conventions, treaties and agreements to which Ghana is a signatory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the sea by Oil: 21 October 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Causalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitats: 2 February 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage: 16 November 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer: 24 July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Convention to Combat Drought and Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Framework Convention on Climate Change: June 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**National Legislation:** The principal national legislation that affects fisheries in Ghana is listed below:

1. Fisheries Regulation 1984 LI 1294;
2. Fisheries (Amendment) Regulation 1977
3. Maritime Zones (Delimitation) Law, 1986;
4. PNDC Law 256 of 1991;
5. Fisheries Commission Act of 1993; and
7. Fisheries Regulations passed in 2010, LI 1968

Other laws that have relevance to the fisheries sector include:

1. Wild Animals Preservation Act, 1961 (Act 43);
2. Volta River Development Act, 1961 (Act 46);
3. Ghana Water and Sewerage Corporation Act, 1965 (Act 310);
4. Oil in Navigable Waters Act, 1964 (Act 235);
5. Irrigation Development Authority Decree, 1977 (SMCD 85);
6. Minerals and Mining Law 1986 (PNDCL 153);
7. Environmental Protection Agency Act, 1994 (Act 490);
8. Ghana Highway Authority Act, 1997 (Act 540);
9. Timber Resources Management Act, 1998 (Act 547); and
10. Minerals and Mining Act, 2006 (Act 703)

Environmentally related conventions ratified by Ghana include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Date Ratified/Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the sea by Oil</td>
<td>21 October 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas</td>
<td>4 May 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources:</td>
<td>15 September 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage:</td>
<td>29 November 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Causalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitats</td>
<td>2 February 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty and Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof</td>
<td>11 January 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation of Oil Pollution Damage</td>
<td>18th December, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage</td>
<td>16 November 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on the Military or Any other Hostile Use of the Environmental Modification Techniques</td>
<td>10 December 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals</td>
<td>23 June 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer</td>
<td>24 July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies**

A number of Environmental related Policies exist in Ghana however there is no specific policy on the coastal zone. These include:

- The National Environment Policy
- National Wetlands Policy
- Agricultural Policy
- Tourism Development Policy
- Land Management Policy
- National Health Policy
- Energy Policy
- Minerals Policy
- Wildlife Conservation Policy

The main thrust and orientation of national policies on the protection, management and development of the marine and coastal environment focuses on the following three major areas:

- Integrated coastal zone management and sustainable development
- Marine environmental protection, both from land-based activities and from sea-based activities; and
- Sustainable use and conservation of marine living resources (both of the high seas and under national jurisdiction).

Specific plans have been developed to ensure the realization of prudent management of the marine and coastal environment. These include:

- Coastal Zone Management Indicative Plan, 1990
- National Environmental Action Plan, 1994
- Draft Integrated Coastal Zone Plan, 1998
- Coastal Zone Profile of Ghana 1998
- National Oil Spill Contingency Plan with specific reference to the marine environment, 2002
- Environmental sensitivity map of the coastal areas of Ghana, 1999 and 2004.

Despite the existence of these plans active integration and coordination has been lacking in practice at local level.

**Regulations**

Though several legislations exist on coastal protection and sustainable development, there is no omnibus legislation on the environment. Legislation relating to the area include the
The legal framework for coastal zones issues and management in the country are contained in the following documents:

- The 1992 constitution
- EPA Act, 1994 (Act 490)
- Environmental Assessment Regulations, 1999 (LI 1652)
- Local Government Act, 1993 (Act 462)
- Environmental Standards and Guidelines.

In addition, there are other specific legal frameworks, which include:

a) The legal framework for Fisheries Resources, which are:
   - Fisheries Law 1971 (PNDCL 256)
   - Fisheries Act 2000

b) The legal framework for Oil and Gas Industry
   - Petroleum (Exploration and production) Law 1984 (PNDCL 84)
   - Mineral (Offshore) Regulations 1963 (LI 257)
   - Mineral (Oil and Gas) Regulations 1963 (LI 256)
   - Oil and Mining Regulations, 1957 (LI 221)

**Monitoring Arrangements**

Monitoring of the process framework implementation will be done at different levels by the communities, local NGOs and by the project itself. The monitoring mechanisms to be applied will be further developed as part of the action plan. However, this will follow similar structures as outlined in the project M&E framework and institutional arrangements. The Project Coordinator and his team has responsibility for ensuring compliance with safeguards policies triggered by the project and implementation of the appropriate instruments. Oversight will be by the Secretariat of the Fisheries Commission. Monitoring indicators for the process framework will include status of implementation of outlined principles including follow up to ensure actions are prepared in specific case studies, social assessment/surveys are conducted where required and proper documentation prepared for actions taken. Cost for monitoring should be part of project costing.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Process Framework (PF) for the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (WARFP) establishes guidelines for the development of national PFs through a participatory process by which members of local fishing communities will, under the WARFP, be involved in the design and implementation of local fishery co-management, maintaining sustainability of local livelihoods, and local monitoring of fisheries efforts.

The demarcation of Territories for Use Rights to Fisheries (TURFs) in the countries participating in WARFP and the implementation of restrictions on marine resource use constitute significant social impacts under OP 4.01, Environmental Assessment. Although OP 4.12 is not be formally triggered by these initiatives, its sections on Process Framework (Annex A, Paragraphs 26-27) provide best-practice procedure on how to manage the impacts of these initiatives on the livelihoods of marine-resource users. WARFP therefore presents this PF to guide the participating Member States in the implementation of TURFs, co-management groups, marine resource restrictions and alternative livelihood programs, even though a PF is not formally required.

The purpose of the process framework is to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in design of marine resource restrictions, determine measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration, and implement and monitor relevant project activities (OP 4.12, Annex A, paragraph 26).

Section I briefly introduces the WARPF and its concordance with the stipulations of OP 4.12.

Section II of this regional PF describes the Program and its component activities, with emphasis on those initiatives that will necessitate restrictions on marine resource management. WARFP will undertake a number of interrelated activities: regional coordination, enactment of national legislation and legal frameworks, national management of industrial fishing, co-management of local fisheries, and investments to add value at the local level, as well as program monitoring. This regional PF, and the future national PFs, pertain specifically to the co-management activities, which include developing value added (i.e., alternative livelihoods) at the local level.

The co-management component of WARFP will support the introduction of area-based rights to the coastal fisheries. Area-based rights have a long history around the world for

1 Footnote 6 of OP 4.12 states that “the policy does not apply to restrictions of access to natural resources under community-based projects, i.e., where the community using the resources decides to restrict access to these resources, provided that an assessment satisfactory to the Bank establishes that the community decision-making process is adequate, and that it provides for identification of appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community.”
management of coastal fisheries by local communities, particularly multi-species fisheries such as those found in West Africa. These area-based rights will take the form of Territorial Use Rights to Fisheries (TURFs), areas of the sea usually within 1.5 – 2 kilometers of the coast that are managed by the local communities, and where local fishermen would have rights to use the resources and responsibility for managing those resources sustainably. To make the TURFs effective requires a process of co-management that establishes a legally-recognized partnership between the Governments and coastal fishing communities that will create areas in which the participating local communities will have exclusive fishing rights and therefore a long-term stake in the sustainability of the resources.

Instituting TURFs and sustainable management of local fisheries in the current context of open access could mean that some resource users might lose all or some of their present rights. Who will lose and the extent of their loss will vary in the particular case with the resource on which restrictions are imposed and the nature of the restrictions. For example, if a community decides to limit lobster harvesting during specified periods, lobstermen who work during those periods would be affected, but finfishermen would not. The extent of the impact of no-fishing periods for lobster on family income is, however, uncertain, for lobstermen might catch more product or larger product in the future, or they might exploit other fisheries during the closure periods. The basic point here is that the actual impact on fishermen and others must be assessed in the context of the expected impact -- both positive and negative -- of the restrictions. Moreover, it must be recognized that fishermen of all types may have the right or license to fish, but there is no guarantee to a particular level of income.

The new marine resource management approach may also have direct economic impact on those who service that industry locally. Licensing and limitations on the number of artisanal boats in a community could affect boat-builders, as well as out-board motor, fuel, and spare parts suppliers, and mechanics in the local area. At the processing and marketing end of the value chain, processors, wholesale buyers and retail sellers might have no supplies at specified times. Improvement of marine stocks can also have unanticipated impacts: for example, restrictions on shrimping can result in larger shrimp and greater exports, which could displace local processors and buyers of small or immature shrimp for the local market. In other words, not only fishermen but also those directly involved in other aspects of the local fishing industry may be affected by local resource restrictions, must be integrally involved in the deliberations and decisions about resource us, and therefore are covered by this policy.

Because the type and nature of restrictions adopted by the local community determine which groups will be affected and the extent of the impact on those groups, identification of the specific groups and estimation of the probable loss to them can only be assessed locally at the time the possible resource restrictions are discussed. For this reason, the national PFs, which will be developed on the basis of local consultation, will specify not only the restrictions each participating community is considering or has adopted but also the consequences of those restrictions on local fishermen and workers in fishery-allied occupations. In the WARFP, local participation at every step of the program -- from design through implementation to monitoring -- is taken as fundamental to success for
the fisheries co-management program. Local populations generally, and the PAPs in particular, have a key role to play throughout the Program, which will support actions under the national programs to ensure that PAP views and preferences are addressed adequately and incorporated meaningfully in community decision-making.

Section III outlines the process the participating member states will follow in developing their national PFs, which essentially constitute the development plan for locally co-managed fisheries. Overall, the role of the state and the local organizations are to mutually consult, advise, and cooperate. They assume both rights and responsibilities for the sustainability of fish stocks and livelihoods. Co-management responsibilities are based on agreements to adopt and enforce practices that promote sustainable fisheries, which may involve limiting the ability to harvest in an open-access manner.

In that context, the Commission Sous Regional de Peche Maritime will provide a coordinating role for the national initiatives that will be implemented under the WARFP. The Ministry in charge of fisheries in each participating State will be responsible for developing and implementing the WARFP, usually in collaboration with an NGO and/or other agency, such as a research bureau. In the local areas, there will be two levels of organization: The TURF Co-Management Association (or CMA; termed Comité local de peche artisanale [CLPA] in Senegal) is responsible for coordinating the activities of the local fishing communities in an area, or, where established, the Local Community Committees or Councils (LCC; termed CLP or Comité local de peche in Senegal) constituted in each village in the area. The CMAs could be defined as either (i) local private associations comprised of elected representatives of each of the fishing communities in each TURF, i.e. entirely private entities, or (ii) local councils composed of representatives of Government agencies, such as the representative of the Ministry of Fisheries, senior traditional leaders, and elected representatives of the CLPs, including artisanal fishermen, fish processors, marketers and other stakeholders, following the CLPA model in Senegal, i.e., more of a public-private partnership. (See Figure 1, page 8 in the text for the organizational structure of the project.)

Each national lead agency is required to develop a national Process Framework for local co-management as a condition for participation in the WARFP. The national PF will comply with the stipulations of OP 4.12, and its Annex A (paragraphs 26 and 27; see Annex A), and will be submitted to CSRP and subsequently to the World Bank for review. The purpose of the PF is “to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in the design of project components, determination of measures necessary to achieve resettlement policy objectives, and implementation and monitoring of relevant project activities “ (Annex A, paragraph 26). In the context of WARFP, the national PF will provide detailed guidelines, adapted to the national context, for the subsequent definition of national local fisheries co-management plan. (Because the national development plans need to define precisely and budget for the actions to be taken at the local level, these plans can only be presented after additional local consultations and decisions have been made. The facilitator or NGO providing technical assistance to the communities in these discussions and decisions will document the adequacy of PAP participation in these fora.)
The national PF will be developed in consultation with the participating villages. In this work, the lead agency and its collaborators (e.g., NGO) will work with the participating villages to assess the probable resource management rules that will be adopted and their likely impacts on marine stocks and on those people who exploit them. The developers will also consult intensively with those who may be affected adversely by the adoption of these rules in order to ascertain their willingness to abide by the new rules and their interest in alternative livelihoods programs. These consultations will inform the national PF, and the record of the consultations will be appended to the PF.

The subsequent sections of this PF (Sections IV- VII) provide specific guidance for the development of national PFs: Section IV delineates local determination of resources restrictions and thus the eligibility of project-affected people; Section V covers livelihood restoration measures; Section VI discusses conflict resolution procedures; Section VII outlines monitoring arrangements; and Section VIII outlines the project budget and timeline. The substance of each of these sections is presented in outline below.

**Section IV. Criteria for Eligibility of Affected Persons.** To be eligible for assistance in restoring livelihoods affected by the Program and its national projects, individuals must be resident members of participating villages. Interested villages will be selected on the basis of six factors: (1) long-term history of dependence on marine resources, although in countries that have suffered a civil war these histories may be more recent; (2) extent of exploitation of local resource area (number of locally owned and outside boats exploiting the area), with greater levels of exploitation giving higher priority to the community; (3) importance of marine-resource based activities in the community, including not only fishing, but also allied economic activities such as processing, transport and marketing, and linkages with Component 3 investments in local value addition; (4) existence of local co-management systems (e.g., customary restrictions on fishing, customary forms of enforcing these restrictions); (5) type of environment (estuarine or marine); and, (6) co-management of marine resources, which typically entails establishing property rights to harvest fish, whether an Individual Transferrable Quota (ITQ) or a Territorial Use Rights to Fish (TURFs).

In the villages selected, WARFP will assist in community development and the creation, where necessary, of local co-management organizations, the Local Community Councils (LCCs) and the Co-Management Associations (CMAs) that will regroup LLCs that exploit the same naturally defined ecological zone. Local co-management can impact some community members adversely, so the community generally and the PAPs themselves must carefully assess the implications of the possible marine-resource management options on members of the local community and the extent of those impacts. An integral facet of these community deliberations is the identification of adverse impacts on community members and the extent of those impacts on those people’s livelihoods (i.e., their significance). The identification of impacts can be done as part of the public discussion of the measures to be undertaken; indeed, that is a key consideration for the community in its decision on which marine resource management measures to adopt.
By contrast, the probable extent of the impact may be discussed in community fora, but the actual significance of particular measures for individuals affected is better determined through individual interviews and discussions with the PAPs.

Section V. Livelihood Restoration Measures. World Bank policy requires that livelihoods be restored at least to the extent that they are impacted directly by project activities, and preferably improved. This policy prescription is based on the principle that people who give up most for the public good – the PAPs – should not be penalized and impoverished as a result of their loss for the greater good. The aim, therefore, is to improve the public good (in this instance, marine resources) while also ensuring that those who lose access to resources and income because of restrictions on marine resources are assisted effectively to restore that part of their income that is affected through alternative livelihood measures.

Co-management of marine resources is likely to result in some displacement of people from fisheries. The process of identifying eligible participants in the Alternative Livelihoods Program will be undertaken in parallel with the development of the community’s co-management plan because these two initiatives are inextricably interrelated. The development of the co-management program defines who may lose access to resources and to what extent. These negative impacts not only inform the final decisions on the co-management plan, they also define who will be eligible under the Alternative Livelihoods Program and to what extent. Mitigation of these harvesting-contraction actions or capacity adjustments rests on sound knowledge of how participants in the fisheries will be affected and on their participation in decisions. Both general information about the fisheries and specific information about the affected families are needed.

In considering options for alternative incomes, it is important to provide the maximum range of opportunities to the PAPs in the assessment of options and the determination of specific choices. While it seems logical to assume that fisheries-related activities, such as input supply, processing, transport and marketing, would provide the most relevant opportunities, such may not be the case. Reduction in the number of boats would likely reduce demand for boats, motors, spare parts and fuel; restrictions on the size of net mesh could eliminate certain processors; greater catch size might increase value but eliminate specific processors, transporters and/or marketers. These impacts must be taken into account when considering potential alternative livelihood options, and where opportunities allied to fishing will become more limited, a wide range of other alternatives, with an emphasis on non-fishery-related opportunities, must be considered, publicly and individually.

Whatever the range of options considered, it is imperative that the PAPs develop a business plan. The NGO or other collaborating agency will be expected to conduct training sessions with the PAPs to familiarize them with the concept of a business plan, and will work with individual PAPs to develop their own plans. The plans will cover not only skills assessment and training needs, but also such considerations as equipment cost and maintenance, production needs (if any), transport facilities, marketing outlets.
and probable demand. The WARFP will also put in place, in those countries where the co-management program entails local livelihood loss, a micro-finance program through existing lending institutions.

Section VI. Grievance Resolution Procedures. Decisions to restrict access to marine resources may be made consensually, but some people who lose rights to resources may be dissatisfied and want to seek redress of their grievances. It is therefore necessary to establish an explicit procedure for hearing and resolving grievances. Inasmuch as grievance resolution is most efficient at the local level, this regional PF outlines the steps that can be taken at the local level to air and resolve disputes. However, in the instance that local-level resolution of issues is not possible in an informal manner, a formal procedure involving community and project leaders will be followed. If agreement is still not possible, the aggrieved have access to the juridical system, although formal juridical resolution of disputes is often costly and time-consuming.

Section VII: Monitoring Arrangements. Co-management rests on the ability of local communities to monitor developments— that is, participate in data collection and analysis, with the end result that they become partners in setting allowable catch levels and in enforcement and adjusting policies if recruitment or harvest trends continue downward. The monitoring program will establish both an environmental baseline and a socio-economic baseline for those adversely affected by co-management decisions. These dimensions will be studied closely throughout the life of the Program in order to provide the local communities and project officials key information about the progress of their initiatives.

Section VIII: Budget and Project Timeline. The last section of this regional PF provides guidance on the development of project budgets and timelines for the national programs and PFs.

Finally, it warrants mention that this PF annexes not only the World Bank policy but also several templates that may be useful in the development of national Process Frameworks, if adapted for the particular national purposes. Included here are: Fishing Area Survey questionnaires, Village Selection Criteria template, Community Agreements with the State Agency for Local Co-Management, and Grievance Registration Form. (Budget templates are provided in the text of this regional PF; see pp. 29-30.)
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### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Comité Locale de Peche (local fisheries committee or council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLPA</td>
<td>Comité Locale de Peche Artisanale (district area fishery management committee or council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>Co-Management Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUE</td>
<td>Catch Per Unit of Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRP</td>
<td>Commission Sous Regional de Peche maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITQ</td>
<td>Individual Transferable Quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Local Community Committee (or Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Operational Policy (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Project-Affected Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIU</td>
<td>Project Implementation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Process Framework (a policy guidance document required when a Bank-financed project entails restrictions on access to natural resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURF</td>
<td>Territorial Use Rights to Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARFP</td>
<td>West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (also referred to as ‘the Program’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

A. WARFP OBJECTIVES, COUNTRIES AND APPROACHES

The objective of the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (WARFP or the Program) is to sustainably increase the overall wealth generated by the exploitation of the targeted marine fish resources in the participating countries, and the proportion of that wealth captured by these countries. These objectives will be achieved by: (i) strengthening the countries' capacity to sustainably govern and manage their fisheries, not only at the government level but also through local co-management of resources; (ii) reducing illegal fishing; (iii) increasing the value and profitability generated by fish resources and the proportion of that value captured by the countries; and (iv) program monitoring.

The Program will be implemented in four countries (Cape Verde, Liberia, Senegal and Sierra Leone), and will extend to other member countries as conditions permit (Ghana, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Guinea and Mauritania). Program investments in these countries will be concentrated largely in the coastal fishing communities and waters of these countries. The safeguard analysis therefore takes into account the current situation of overexploitation of the resources and excess fishing effort by these communities in the region as a whole, and in particular in the four targeted countries, and the possible social ramifications of reducing fishing effort in certain cases to allow the fish stocks to rebuild.

WARPF will provide a menu of activities from which each country will select options based on its specific local context. These activities will be implemented at the national and the local level in collaboration with the Commission Sous Regional de Peche (CSRP) in order to enhance regional coordination and policy harmonization. In other words, a common approach is coordinated at the regional level, but implemented nationally and locally in order to show concrete results on the ground.

B. COMPLIANCE WITH OP 4.12 (PROCESS FRAMEWORK) IN THE CONTEXT OF WARFP

The demarcation of Territories for Use Rights to Fisheries (TURFs) in countries participating in WARFP and the implementation of restrictions on marine resource use constitute significant social impacts under OP 4.01, Environmental Assessment.
Although OP 4.12 is not be formally triggered by these initiatives\(^2\), its sections on Process Framework (Annex A, Paragraphs 26-27) provide best-practice procedure on how to manage the impacts of these initiatives on the livelihoods of marine-resource users. WARFP therefore presents this PF to guide the participating Member States in the implementation of TURFs, co-management groups, marine resource restrictions and alternative livelihood programs, even though a PF is not formally required.

The purpose of the process framework is to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in design of marine resource restrictions, determine measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration, and implement and monitor relevant project activities (OP 4.12, Annex A, paragraph 26).

Further, this regional PF accords with the WARFP principle of regional coordination of national implementation of regional initiatives for improved fishery sustainability and income. That is, this PF provides general guidelines for the development of national co-management PFs, which will effectively be the local fisheries development program for each country.

**C. OUTLINE OF THIS PROCESS FRAMEWORK**

To guide the development of national PFs for local co-management, this regional policy presents the WARFP, and then focuses on the specific activities that may entail restriction of access to natural resources (Section II). Section III then delineates the development and approval process for national PFs.

The subsequent sections provide guidance on specific aspects of a national PF:

- **Section IV:** Eligibility Criteria for Compensation Measures;
- **Section V:** Livelihoods restoration,
- **Section VI:** Conflict resolution,
- **Section VII:** Monitoring and evaluation, and,
- **Section VII:** National program budget and timeline..

\(^2\) Footnote 6 of OP 4.12 states that “the policy does not apply to restrictions of access to natural resources under community-based projects, i.e., where the community using the resources decides to restrict access to these resources, provided that an assessment satisfactory to the Bank establishes that the community decision-making process is adequate, and that it provides for identification of appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community.”
The emphasis in both this regional PF and in each of the national PFs is on local involvement and participation in the definition of options and initiatives, as well as on mitigation or compensatory actions when community decisions adversely impact a segment of the fishing community.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. PROJECT AND COMPONENT ACTIVITIES

WARFP will support four component activities, several of which have sub-components. The overall program is described immediately below.

Component 1: Good Governance and Sustainable Management of the Fisheries. The objective of this component is to build the capacity of Governments and stakeholders to implement a shared approach that would ensure that the marine fish resources are used in a manner that is environmentally sustainable, socially equitable and economically profitable. This component will support the following sub-components:

(i) Development of the Capacity, Rules, Procedures and Practices for Good Governance of the Fisheries

(ii) Introduction of Fishing Rights;

(iii) Adjustment of Fishing Effort and Capacity to more Sustainable Levels, Introduction of Alternative Livelihoods where Needed;

(iv) Social Marketing and Communication

Component 2: Reduction of Illegal Fishing. The objective of this component is to reduce the illegal fishing activities threatening the sustainable management of the marine fish resources. More specifically, this component improves the Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) systems of participating countries and adapts them to the needs of fisheries management, within the framework of a coordinated approach between the participating countries. This component will support the following sub-components:

(i) Enabling Environment for Reducing Illegal Fishing;

(ii) Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Systems
(iii) Strengthened Regional Collaboration for MCS.

Component 3: Increasing the Contribution of the Marine Fish Resources to the Local Economies. The objective of this component is to increase the benefits to West Africa from the marine fish resources, by increasing the share of the value-added captured in the region. This component will support the following sub-components:

(i) Fish Landing Site Clusters;

(ii) Fish Product Trade Infrastructure, Information and Systems – Regional Minimum Integrated Trade Expansion Platform (MITEP).

Component 4: Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation and Program Management. The objective of this component is to support the countries to implement the Program in the context of the CSRP Strategic Action Plan, and to monitor and evaluate results. This component will support the following sub-components: (1) National Implementation and (2) Regional Coordination.

In its component activities, WARFP will work simultaneously, but separately, with two major groups of fishermen: industrial fishermen who work on large trawlers that are often registered in foreign ports; and artisanal fishermen who work from local boats of often appreciable size (pirogues in French), as well as other, less capitalized marine resource users. Under WARFP the initiatives for each group, as well as the approaches to be used, are quite different. This regional PF, and the future national PFs, pertain specifically to the delimitation of TURFs, which will entail the establishment of co-management groups for the assessment and adoption of resource use measures, which themselves will require developing value-added and other alternative livelihoods measures at the local level.3

Further, WARFP will undertake a number of interrelated activities: regional coordination, enactment of national legislation and legal frameworks, national management of industrial fishing, co-management of local fisheries, and investments to add value at the local level, as well as program monitoring. While each of these major program components is distinct and important, all the components are interrelated such that success in one component area can affect the success in another, such as the co-management program. For example, the national legal framework sets the context for the local co-management program in that it establishes the juridical basis for, and

3 Because this PF pertains to co-management of marine resources, WARFP activities, such as licensing of industrial trawlers and enforcement of catch limits outside the area of local co-management, are not included in this policy. Those not covered by this policy who consider that they have legitimate grievances can seek redress of their issues through the administrative and legal processes available in the respective member state.
protects, co-management groups. Similarly, national management of industrial fishing can have consequences on local finfish stocks, regardless of co-management activities.

**B. COMPONENT ACTIVITIES THAT INVOLVE RESTRICTIONS ON NATURAL RESOURCE USE**

The co-management component of WARFP will support the introduction of territorial areas with local rights to the coastal fisheries. Such area-based rights have a long history around the world for management of coastal fisheries by local communities, particularly multi-species fisheries such as those found in West Africa. These area-based rights will take the form of Territorial Use Rights to Fisheries (TURFs), marine areas usually within 1.5 – 2 kilometers of the coast that are managed by the local communities, and where only local fishermen will have rights to use the resources and responsibility for managing those resources sustainably. These rights will be introduced through a process of co-management that establishes a legally-recognized partnership between the Governments and coastal fishing communities that will create areas in which the participating local communities will have exclusive fishing rights and therefore a long-term stake in the sustainability of the resources.

While the nature and form of TURFs will vary in each of the countries, they will all share four common characteristics. Local communities and resource users to whom these rights are conferred would

(i) have the right to manage the nature and extent of marine resource use in their TURF, provided practices comply with national regulations;

(ii) over time, assume increasing control over access to TURF resources and increasing responsibility for ensuring community compliance with regulations on fishing gear and methods;

(iii) retain benefits from rights to access the TURFs, and

(iv) assume responsibility for managing and monitoring the health of fish stocks, including shellfish, finfish, moluscs, and cephalapods; and of water quality from inshore to the extent of the TURF, including turbidity, dissolved oxygen, nutrients or other measures of water quality affect fisheries.

Delimiting marine territories exclusive to specific community co-management groups that will institute use rights for the sustainable management of local fisheries in the current

---

4 In the region, laws delimiting the extent of the national domain over marine resources generally extend control 6 km offshore. Thus a TURF could extend as much as 6 km offshore. Experience in the region with TURFs indicates that these marine management areas usually extend only 1.5 – 2 km offshore for reasons of resource use (lobsters), manageability and monitoring. The national PFs will specify the areal extent of the TURF in each country.
context of open access could mean that some resource users might lose all or some of their present rights. Who will lose and the extent of their loss will vary in the particular case with the resource on which restrictions are imposed and the nature of the restrictions. For example, if a community decides to limit lobster harvesting in their area during specified periods, lobstermen who work during those periods would be affected, but finfishermen would not.

The extent of the impact of no-fishing periods for lobster on family income is, however, uncertain. While the lobstermen would be unable to fish during specified periods, the moratoria on lobstering could mean larger future catches or future catches of larger specimens, either of which might translate into more income, thus off-setting the periodic loss during the no-fishing periods. In addition, lobstermen might switch to alternative species during periods of lobster closure, thereby maintaining their livelihood. The basic point here is that the actual impact on fishermen and others must be assessed in the context of the expected impact -- both positive and negative -- of the restrictions. Moreover, it must be recognized that fishermen of all types may have the right or license to fish, but there is no guarantee to a particular level of income.

Implementation of TURFs and the associated resource restrictions may also have direct economic impact on those who service that industry locally. Licensing and limitations on the number of artisanal boats in a community could affect boat-builders, as well as outboard motor, fuel, and spare parts suppliers, and mechanics in the local area. At the processing and marketing end of the value chain, processors, wholesale buyers and retail sellers might have no supplies at specified times. Improvement of marine stocks can also have unanticipated impacts: for example, restrictions on shrimping can result in larger shrimp and greater exports, which could displace local processors and buyers of small or immature shrimp for the local market. In other words, not only fishermen but also those directly involved in other aspects of the local fishing industry may be affected by local resource restrictions, must be integrally involved in the deliberations and decisions about resource use, and therefore are covered by this policy.

Because the type and nature of restrictions adopted by the local community determine which groups will be affected and the extent of the impact on those groups, identification of the specific groups and estimation of the probable loss to them can only be assessed locally at the time the possible resource restrictions are discussed. For this reason, the national PFs, which will be developed on the basis of local consultation, will specify not only the restrictions each participating community is considering or has adopted but also the consequences of those restrictions on local fishermen and workers in fishery-allied occupations.

C. LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT DESIGN

Local participation in project design must be considered at two levels: the community as a whole, and those segments of the community who are most impacted by the resource restrictions that may be adopted.

1. Community-wide Participation
Local participation at every step of the program – from design through implementation to monitoring – a key to success for the fisheries co-management program.

At the outset, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in each country will, under the WARFP, carry out an initial inventory of fishing villages. (Annex B provides the questionnaire forms used for the survey in Sierra Leone.) The communities themselves participate in this initial assessment of fishing in their village. Moreover, the villages must be willing to participate in the WARFP. (See Sections IV-A 1 and 2, below, for further detail.) This means, in part, that communities either have already organized a local group to manage their fishery or be willing to establish such a local fisheries organization. The village-based marine-resource management councils (here termed Local Community Councils (LCC) will define and implement the co-management program.

The Program will have two basic local level units for implementation: (i) a Co-Management Association (CMA) at the multi-community level, and in some cases (ii) a local marine resources management committee or association (LCC) at the community/village level. Whether a country or specific area establishes one or both of these types of organizations will depend on the local context. The CMAs and in some cases the LCCs will be charged with deciding on resource limitations, with implementing those rules, and with monitoring the consequences of those decisions. Decision-making by the LCCs is either by consensus or by representative voting. Multiple community meetings are usually necessary to ensure that all people in the community have the opportunity to learn about and understand the particular issues under consideration, and to voice their views on the matters. This is true for every step of the program – project design, project implementation, and project monitoring.

2. Directly Impacted People’s Participation and Ensuring Adequate Representation in Decision-making Councils

Within the context of local community decision-making, it is imperative that the voice of the most directly affected and the most disadvantaged groups in the community be heard in the local councils if the limitations on marine resource use are to be respected. Participation of those who will permanently lose access to resources and who may need to undertake other remunerative activities is therefore an integral aspect of the WARFP design and its implementation.

While community-wide consultation and participation are generally important, it is critical to ensure that the participation of specific segments of the local community groups (e.g., women, species collectors who are few in number, particular ethnic groups) who may be disadvantaged for any number of reasons. Special outreach efforts are commonly needed to ensure that their voices are heard in community councils and decision-making.
There are various approaches for ensuring that all directly impacted people have a strong voice in community decision-making. The LCC can be composed of a specified number of representatives from each resource users’ group. The organization rules can, where appropriate, further specify that the representatives be an equal number of men and women. A complementary action is to ensure that all relevant resource user groups in a community are consulted before any meeting, and that each group is accorded the opportunity to present its views in council and community meetings. The national PFs will spell out the local regulations supporting co-management and the manner in which LLCs and CMAs will take decisions. These stipulations will also be integrated into the local fishery co-management association by-laws.

The Facilitator or NGO will certify that the CMA and LLC decisions on resource management are meaningfully participative. For this, the PIU will engage an NGO or other agency to assist user groups to formulate their positions and ensure that all viewpoints are clearly heard and attended to in the community decision-making fora. The NGO or other agency engaged by the lead national agency will be responsible for verifying that community decision-making includes adequate representation of those directly impacted by the potential decisions. Because a multiplicity of approaches and actions is possible, the national PFs will specify precisely which actions to ensure adequacy of local decision-making processes will be adopted in their program.

Where people lose access to marine resources, whether or not they agree with the community decision, the Project-affected Persons (PAPs) will be provided the opportunity to consider a menu of options from which they can select their preferred activity or activities for restoring their livelihoods. PAPs also have the right to suggest additional activities, on the condition that the proposed activity is economically viable, creates no environmental threat, and is cost-effective.

Local participation in WARFP generally and of PAPs in particular is discussed throughout the body of this policy (see, in particular, Sections IV, V and VII).

### III. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF WARFP, NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS, AND THE PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING NATIONAL PROCESS FRAMEWORKS

This regional Process Framework provides principles and guidelines for the subsequent development of national PFs under WARFP. This section will, therefore, lay out the responsibilities of each agency at the regional, national, supra-local (district) and community levels. This section also provides an outline for the presentation of national PFs, and describes the development, approval and dissemination process for national PFs.

#### A. THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF WARFP
Overall, the role of the state and the local organizations are to mutually consult, advise, and cooperate. They assume both rights and responsibilities for the sustainability of fish stocks and livelihoods. Co-management responsibilities are based on agreement to adopt and enforce practices that promote sustainable fisheries, which may involve limiting the ability to harvest in an open-access manner.

Figure 1 (below) depicts the general organizational structure of the WARFP.

1. **The Commission Sous Regional de Peche (CSRP)**

The Commission Sou Regional de Peche Maritime (CSRP) is the agency for regional coordination of national maritime fisheries initiatives. The CSRP was established by 6 member states in 1983 with the mandate to provide a forum to harmonize fisheries policy and management in the West Africa region. The CSRP consists of a Secretariat, based in Dakar, which carries out the directives of its Council of Ministers, which is composed of the Ministers in charge of fisheries in each member state, and more frequently the Coordinating Committee of the Directors of Fisheries of each member state.

In the context of WARFP, CSRP will act as the coordinating agency for the national Ministries of Fisheries, or their equivalent, in each of the participating member states. In the specific context of this PF, CSRP is responsible for ensuring that the principles established in this policy document are integrated into the national PF action plans for local co-management and for ensuring that innovations in one country or countries are disseminated to the other participating member states. To that end, CSRP will review and, with the relevant national Ministry amend each national PF before submitting it to the World Bank for review. CSRP, in consultation and collaboration with the national Ministries, will supervise implementation of the program, and ensure that local access restrictions and their consequent mitigative measures accord with the principles of this policy.

2. **The National Ministries of Fisheries**

The lead agency in each member state is distinct. In Cape Verde, the lead agency is the Department of Fisheries of the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources. In Liberia, the Bureau for National Fisheries, which is within the Ministry of Agriculture, will serve as the lead agency. In Senegal, the lead agency is the Ministère de l'Economie Maritime, Direction de Pêche Maritime (DPM), which has a Cellule d'opération de mise en œuvre (COMO) which was established under the current GirMAC project. And, in Sierra Leone, the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources will be the implementation agency. Each agency is expected to establish and staff a district office in each of its project areas for the supervision and coordination of activities in that area.

The lead agency in each country will be responsible for:

1. Development of the National Process Framework as part of the national co-management development plan;
2. Inventorizing fishing villages in the project area,

---

5 The CSRP now includes 7 member states: Mauritania, Senegal, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Cape Verde and Sierra Leone.
3. Selection of villages to collaborate in WARFP in consultation with the villages themselves, (Section III of this PF);
4. Facilitating village organization, where necessary (Section III);
5. Assisting in the registration of villages as formal juridical entities (Section III);
6. Providing all available baseline information to the participating villages (Section VII);
7. Providing technical assistance to the local co-management groups in the definition and implementation of marine-resource restrictions (Section IV);
8. Providing technical assistance and financing for all mitigation measures (Section V);
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CMA: Co-Management Association (District Area Fishery Council; Conseil local de peche artisanal in Senegal)
LCC: Local Community Fishery Committee (Comite local de peche in Senegal)
9. Implementing the informal and formal grievance resolution process (Section VI); and,
10. Collaboration in and support for local efforts to monitor the co-management program.

Importantly, in the context of the local agreements that will be signed between the Ministry and the local communities, the Minister will sign any Ministerial decrees (e.g., arrêtes) necessary to support the implementation of the co-management initiatives, such as, for example, restrictions on (i) the use of certain types of fishing gear and motors; (ii) level of fishing harvest; (iii) fishing areas or periods open to fishing; (iv) processing of fish products.

3. NGO or Other Collaborating Agency

In this work, the lead agencies may choose to engage outside assistance, as they deem advisable. In some instances, a research bureau may collaborate under contract to the lead agency for specified services. In other instances, a Non-governmental Organization (NGO) may be engaged to assist in community development, fishermen group organization and operation, implementation of the Alternatives Livelihood program, as well as in implementation and monitoring of the co-management program. The reliance on collaborating agencies will be defined in the national PF. Whatever agency or agencies contracted by the lead ministry unit, the firm will be responsible for daily oversight of a number of district- and local-level activities, including:
   o Community development activities
   o Co-management activities
   o Alternative livelihood activities
   o Conflict resolution support; and
   o Monitoring.

Each of these component activities itself involves a number of sub-component activities such as training, public meetings, social surveys, individual consultations, and monitoring studies and reports. The contract between the lead agency and the collaborating agency will specify which of these activities will be undertaken by each contractor, develop a timeline for these activities, and provide an adequate budget for them.

4. TURF Co-Management Associations (CMAs)

The TURF Co-management Association (termed Comité local de pêche artisanale [CLPA] in Senegal) is responsible for coordinating the activities of the local fishing communities, or, where established, the Local Community Committees or Councils (LCC; termed CLP or Comité local de pêche in Senegal) in its area. The CMAs could be defined as either (i) local private associations comprised of elected representatives of each of the fishing communities in each TURF, i.e. entirely private entities, or (ii) local councils composed of representatives of Government agencies, such as the representative of the Ministry of Fisheries, senior traditional leaders, and elected representatives of the CLPs, including artisanal fishermen, fish processors, marketers and other stakeholders, following the CLPA model in Senegal, i.e. more of a public-private partnership. In Senegal, the CLPAs were established by Government in order to advise the Ministry of Fisheries on management and conservation measures for coastal fisheries.
The TURF CMAs may compose fisheries or species-specific working groups (e.g., shrimp, lobsters, cephalopods, demersal fish) whose members will be representatives from those communities or fishing groups that exploit that resource. It is important to note that CLPAs already exist in Senegal, but no such organizations or associations are present in the other three countries. In either case, the national PF will describe how the CMA is composed or will be composed, its operating rules, and its domains of action.

5. Local Community Fishery Councils (LCC)

At the local level, the Local Community Fisheries Councils (Comité local de pêche [CLP] in Senegal) are the village-level co-management groups. The LCCs are legally-recognized private associations that regroup fishermen and others working in fishery-related activities at the community level. The LCC is the deliberative body for local decision-making, assessing the options available to it for limitations on marine resource restrictions, determining which segments of the community will be adversely impacted by those restrictions, resolving grievances in the first instance, and monitoring local conditions. The LCCs will work in collaboration with the NGOs and Fisheries Ministry staff to develop their co-management initiatives.

The co-management initiatives proposed by the LCCs will be consolidated into one sub-project for that community, describing the necessary implementation budget and support activities for each of the management or conservation measures proposed, such as (1) participatory research, (ii) training; (iii) education and awareness raising (iv) infrastructure and equipment needs; (iv) surveillance and enforcement of management and conservation measures; (v) monitoring and evaluation; and (vi) any other necessary activities.

The community co-management program will be submitted to the Ministry of Fisheries, after having been reviewed by the CMA representing that particular LCC (provided that the CMA has been legally established and is functioning effectively). The agreements will then be signed by the Minister and by the President of each LCC, and implemented by the respective LCCs with the support of the Government.

The national PF will detail further the particular structure envisioned for its co-management program, the responsibilities of each level of agency, and how the local and district-level councils will be composed and operate.

B. NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL CONTEXT

Co-management of local fisheries is premised on the effective collaboration of Ministry and the local communities at every stage of the process.

A separate but allied responsibility of the lead agency in each country is the enactment of the necessary legal framework for local fisheries co-management. At the outset, the Ministry can sign formal agreements with local communities in order to initiate the co-management program. The purpose of co-management is to conserve the fishing stocks on which villages depend for subsistence and commerce. Co-management can be established through a formal agreement between a local organization or association.
of harvesters and the Ministry of Fisheries (and/or a regional office). When the agreement or charter is signed, it constitutes a legal document that identifies the shared responsibilities for managing, monitoring and harvesting fisheries, usually by species of fish, shellfish, mollusks, or marine mammals. In addition, the responsibilities of local groups are specified. These may include: management of harvesting, inspection and reporting of catch and harvest, research on target species, and funding of the costs of representatives activities, where applicable.

Over time, however, there will need to be a legal framework vested in law or in directives that encourage co-management and provide authority for the voice and participation of village organizations and individuals. This legal framework has various aspects. It will clearly define the boundaries of the TURFs, the communities, organizations and associations recognized to have this territorial right, and the level of ownership and/or management responsibility that accompanies conferral of this right. It will specify how the State will support local institutions and devolved authority and decision-making. Likewise, if there is customary marine tenure, these customary rights must be recognized and reconciled with any new system of management through participatory decision-making. Also, boundaries of the fishery must be clearly agreed upon and defined, so that the stocks are not shared with other villages or regional bodies, for exclusivity is a critical component of co-management and also rights-based fisheries. The law also needs to make clear enforcement responsibilities in collaboration and cooperation with the local co-management group.

As for the last point, it warrants mention that there are important limits to co-management. The state retains legal authority for management and enforcement if provisions of the law if broken. Local communities manage and supervise their local areas, but infractions must be reported to the responsible state authorities for prosecution. Local communities do not and cannot assume the police or enforcement role.

C. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PROCESS FRAMEWORKS FOR LOCAL CO-MANAGEMENT

Each national lead agency will develop a national Process Framework for local co-management as a condition for participation in the WARFP. The national PF will comply with the stipulations of OP 4.12, and its Annex A (paragraphs 26 and 27; see Annex A), and will be submitted to CSRP and subsequently to the World Bank for review. The purpose of the national PFs is to specify, for that country’s program under WARFP, the “process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in the design of project components, determination of measures necessary to achieve resettlement policy objectives, and implementation and monitoring of relevant project activities” (Annex A, paragraph 26).

The national PFs will follow the guidelines of this regional PF, and will constitute an addendum to this PF that provides further, country-specific detail needed for the development of the national plan for the implementation of TURFs, co-management groups, resource restrictions and alternative livelihood implementation. For this reason, the national PF (together with this regional PF) will be included in the Program Operational Manual for each country. Also, an updated version of the budget (Costab) and procurement plan for the country will be included in the Operational Manual, so that
any cost implications of the draft National Action Plan will be covered. The Operational Manual will be completed before the Program is effective.

The national PF spells out the process by which resource restrictions will be adopted and implemented, and compensation measures (i.e., alternative livelihoods options) defined and selected. Importantly, the national PF will be further refined through consultations with the participating villages. In this work, the lead agency and its collaborators (e.g., NGO) will work with the participating villages to assess the viability and impact of various resource management rules and, for those that might be adopted, to assess their likely impacts, on marine stocks and on those people who exploit them. A key aspect of this consultation process will be group and individual discussions with those who may be affected adversely by the adoption of these rules. These discussions will ascertain not only the willingness of those most affected to abide by the new rules but also their interest in alternative livelihoods programs. These consultations will provide a basis for the national development plan for local fisheries management.

The national PF will follow the outline below, which is in large measure the outline used to organize this regional PF.

(a) Project Description.
   - The PF will briefly describe the national program.
   - The PF will specify the project components or activities that may involve new or more stringent restrictions on natural resource.
   - It will also describe the process by which potentially persons participate in project design and how their views will be adequately represented in community deliberations.

(b) Eligibility Criteria (Determination of affected persons
   - The national PF will identify the communities that will collaborate in the program.
   - It will assess the capacity of those communities to undertake co-management activities, and will include community development measures, where necessary.
   - It will detail how communities will identify adverse impacts, estimate the number of people affected and the probable extent of the impact on affected households.
   - And it will establish the criteria for eligibility for mitigating adverse impacts and implementing compensatory measures such as alternative livelihoods programs.

(c) Income Restoration Measures.
   - The PF will describe the methods and by which communities and individuals will identify and choose potential or compensating measures to be provided to those adversely affected.
   - It will describe the procedures by which adversely affected community members will decide among the options available to them.
   - It will describe the training programs that will be offered to PAPs, and how individual and group business plans will be developed and approved.
   - It will describe the micro-financing arrangements for supporting alternative livelihoods programs at the outset.
(d) Conflicts or Grievances Resolution.
  o The PF will describe mechanisms for resolving intra-community disputes relating to resource use restrictions. The Grievance Resolution procedure will give priority to local-level dispute resolution, but will detail the levels of dispute resolution that will be available, the composition of the committees or councils that will hear disputes, and their operating rules.
  o The PF will also describe resolution procedures for grievances that may arise from fishermen and others outside the participating communities.

(e) Administrative and Legal Procedures.
  o The PF will discuss all pertinent legislation, including pending initiatives, that pertain to fishing rights, TURFs and other issues of marine fisheries that are pertinent to the program proposed. The discussion will identify any gaps in the legislation, and discuss how such gaps will be filled, in at least a temporary manner, by administrative measures.
  o The PF will describe the distinct levels (e.g., LCC, CMA, Ministry, CSRP) that will implement the WARFP, taking into account the country context.
  o The PF will detail how the collaborating communities, relevant jurisdictions and line ministry(ies) will implement the program, with clear specification of administrative and financial responsibilities under the project.

(f) Monitoring Arrangements.
  o The PF will develop participatory monitoring of project activities as they relate to
    o Establishment of baseline environmental conditions in the co-management area
    o Implementation of periodic monitoring of baseline indicators
    o Estimation for PAPs of household income from lost marine marine resources due to locally mandated restrictions; and
    o Monitoring the effectiveness of measures taken to improve(or at minimum restore) incomes and living standards.
  o This section will detail the rights and responsibilities of each party (LCC, CL:PA, NGO, Ministry, CSRP) in carrying out the monitoring program.
  o And, this section will detail how monitoring findings will be communicated to both regional and national program officers and to community members in an actionable manner.

(g) Program Timetable.
  o The PF will provide at least a global calendar of activities.
  o It is preferable that a project timetable also be provided for each project site.

(h) Program Budget
  o The PF will detail the project budget for each participating community and collaborating agency, as well as agency costs, including a contingency.
  o The PF budget will specify the sources of funds for each activity.

This regional PF will be provided to all relevant lead agency staff, and will be made available in the CSRP regional offices and the national offices of each lead agency. In addition, this regional PF will be incorporated into the Program Operations Manual, and
the WARFP launch workshop will include a session on PF development for key lead agency staff.

To assist each lead national agency in the development of its PF, CSRP, the regional coordination agency, will assist the lead agency in each participating country to identify and hire qualified agencies and consultants to carry out the local consultation process and to develop the PF. Once the national PF is reviewed and approved by CSRP and the World Bank, the national lead agency will disseminate its PF, in the relevant national language, to all participating communities, will make the policy available in its regional offices, and will grant authorization to the World Bank to distribute the PF through its InfoShop.

IV. CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY OF AFFECTED PERSONS

A. COMMUNITY SELECTION

1. INVENTORY OF POTENTIAL SITES

Under WARFP, the Ministry in charge of fisheries will inventory fishing villages and the state of the marine environment in the area and the biological resources there, and eventually legally register all fishing vessels.

A useful first indicator of the extent of dependence on marine resources in local villages is the per capita number of boats (pirogues) based in the locality. This initial indicator requires refinement, however. If the local community group is to function effectively and implement marine resource rules, as well as monitor the local catch, the group members must be resident throughout most of the year. Put otherwise, if marine stocks in the area are scant and the fishermen go great distances to their fishing grounds, they will be away for long periods of time, which would weaken participation in the co-management group and make local rules and monitoring irrelevant. In short, in the first instance, the project must focus on fishing communities where the economically active population is resident during the fishing season.

Communities for consideration in collaboration in the WARFP must have the following features:

- Important marine resources in the near-shore and marine areas contiguous to the community
- Long-term history of dependence on marine resources, although in countries that have suffered a civil war these histories may be more recent
- Extent of exploitation of local resource area (number of locally owned and outside boats exploiting the area), with greater levels of exploitation giving higher priority to the community
- Importance of marine-resource based activities in the community, including not only fishing, but also allied economic activities such as processing, transport and marketing, and linkages with Component 3 investments in local value addition
- Existence of local co-management systems (e.g., customary restrictions on fishing, customary forms of enforcing these restrictions)
- Type of environment (estuarine or marine).
Once the inventory of potential collaborating villages is completed, the project staff can compile a prioritized list of sites where co-management can be successfully implemented.

2. SELECTION OF COLLABORATING VILLAGES

Four considerations inform the final selection of collaborating villages:

- Strong community interest in implementing co-management initiatives
- Proximity of key species (shrimp, lobsters, cephalopods, demersal fin-fish stocks) to the village
- Benefits of implementing local co-management regimes
- Potential risks of co-management initiatives.

Local interest in implementing a co-management program is a fundamental requirement for the WARFP. Fishermen are well aware of recent trends in catches, but may be uncertain about how to redress the situation. WARFP will give emphasis to areas where fishermen and other workers are sensitive to the issue of declining fish stocks and want to implement local actions. There is no need – indeed, it might be inimical at the outset— to force uninterested communities to collaborate in the program.

Proximity of marine resources is another basic requirement for collaboration in WARFP. As mentioned, if local fishermen go long distances to fish, there is little or no opportunity for the local co-management group to improve stocks locally through careful management of their marine resources. The resources used by the community have to be in the proximate area if local co-management is to be feasible and effective.

It is important to underscore that the nature of the proximate area is a key consideration in the developing the strategy for the implementation of use rights in open access areas. Where the shoreline has coves (for example, Sierra Leone) or estuarine areas (Senegal), the villages along that part of the shore line should constitute a TURF that covers the naturally defined eco-zone. A similar approach could be taken where a small set of villages are based on an island (Cap Vert). By contrast, where the shoreline is largely long stretches of sandy beach (Liberia), there may be no natural demarcation so that WARFP might start work in a single village or set of villages and later extend its zone of activity.

The benefits of implementing local co-management regimes are various. In the first instance, the aim is to increase marine resources. Over time, as stocks increase, off-take limits can be raised, and further input supply, processing and marketing initiatives may become possible.

The potential risks of co-management are also various. Villages that have a history of internal conflict over resources such as agricultural lands or other resources may not be good candidates for early inclusion in WARFP because the factionalism, although typical of most villages, could make more difficult the organization and operation of a co-management group. Even where the villages are relatively homogeneous and harmonious, adoption of marine-resource use regulations can cause local dissention. (See Section VI for mechanisms on dispute resolution at various levels of the WARFP system.)
B. Fishing Community Organization for Co-management

1. Community Development

Although marine fishing communities are thought of by some as homogeneous and harmonious communities, fishing villages today are often composed not only of fishermen with generations of experience but also of relatively new arrivals who lack experience, may not participate in traditional fishing practices and who may not respect traditional village authorities. These situations arise because where marine fisheries are managed as open access resources, anyone who wants to take advantage of the opportunity may do so. The result can be villages that are composed of distinct, and sometimes antagonistic, segments. Even where there is little generational or ethnic diversity in a village, the community may not understand or initially be willing to participate in a marine resources management program.

In such instances, the critical first step is development of a sense of community among diverse fishermen so that they know each other and are willing to work together. WARFP recognizes this need to develop community cohesion, and, where necessary, is ready to implement a program of community social development as a first step towards developing community co-management.

2. Developing Community and District Fishery Organizations

Where villages are ready and willing to undertake co-management projects, project staff will be tasked at the outset with determining whether traditional organizations with customary management rules already exist and what fishery management issues they have experience in dealing with, such as the delimitation of domains, customary restrictions on access, territorial disputes over traditional fishing grounds by particular families or ethnic groups, or overharvesting. If such private associations exist, project staff will work with them and their existing regulatory systems as a basis for a co-management. Co-management establishes an arena for stakeholders (local organizations and the state) to deliberate and implement sustainable management; and to be innovative about how law can be made more effective and socially just in particular situations.

If local fishing groups do not exist, the NGO, cooperatively with the Ministry, will need to establish groups through community-wide and participatory informational meetings. All fishing families, businessmen, marketers and other stakeholders with a substantial
interest in harvesting fish must be involved in the discussions and decisions on the formation of a community co-management committee.

During the period of establishment and operation, the Ministry will provide a mid-level official on-site who will collaborate with the NGO to provide consultation and advice on technical matters, and to provide guidance on administrative and legal frameworks, as needed. Also, the NGO will provide TA for basic cooperative or association operation, including literacy and numeracy training, and basic fisheries management skills.

Finally, where several villages are implementing resource management programs, it will be necessary to associate the groups into one community organization, and to provide an umbrella organization with a legal charter under national law. The contracted NGO and Government will collaborate with the local communities (LCCs) in order to develop the umbrella organization. It is expected that, in most cases, the umbrella organization would be the CMA, as in the Senegal model but tailored to each national context.

C. AFFECTED COMMUNITIES PARTICIPATION IN IDENTIFYING ADVERSE IMPACTS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

Co-management associations are empowered to make decisions on the most equitable and effective manner to conserve fish. Use rights are incentivizing options, rather than incentive-blocking policies. They promote village stewardship of marine resources, as well as a way to rationalize the fishery in terms of controlling excess capacity.

Nonetheless, local co-management can impact some community members adversely, so the community generally and the PAPs themselves must carefully assess the implications of the possible marine-resource management options on members of the local community and the extent of those impacts. This section therefore reviews types of measures that might be implemented, such as establishing rights over marine resources and limiting catch totals, and presents an illustrative matrix of possible measures, by species.

An integral facet of these community deliberations is the identification of adverse impacts on community members and the extent of those impacts on those people’s livelihoods (i.e., their significance). The identification of impacts can be done as part of the public discussion of the measures to be undertaken; indeed, that is a key consideration for the community in its decision on which marine resource management measures to adopt. By contrast, the probable extent of the impact may be discussed in community fora, but the actual significance of particular measures for individuals affected is better determined though individual interviews and discussions with the PAPs. These interviews will be conducted by the NGO or other collaborating agency, and the overall results will be provided to the LCC and CMA, without identification of individual situations in order to preserve privacy and confidentiality.
1. Establishing Rights over Marine Resources

Establishing Territorial Use Rights to Fish (TURFs) is one of several management options that a co-management association can use to provide incentives to conserve and provide exclusive rights for the entire village and association. In some cases, it may be necessary to establish a TURF for a series of contiguous communities, such that three or four communities participate in the same TURF.

TURFs enclose a geographically demarcated sea territory area, established by the co-management organization, with consultation from the Minister, in which only village co-management members can legally fish and/or set of management rules. A TURF demarcates the boundaries for village fishing and it excludes non-association members and/or non-community members. TURFs are essential building blocks in rights-based fishing, but are not necessarily a sufficient limitation on harvesting.

There are two major options for delimiting TURF boundaries: (a) follow established land-based administrative units of the local village, extended into the territorial sea out to a certain meters depth or kilometers distance (usually about 1.5 – 2 km, though it could extend farther out), or both; (b) base TURF boundaries on customary fishing areas, from local ecological knowledge. In this approach, the NGO will work with local fishing leaders and co-management leaders to identify (through mapping, interviews) areas where species are fished traditionally. Traditional knowledge includes areas where particular species are found and fished; specific locations that should be reserved for reproductive purposes; and other locally salient knowledge about fishing and fishery areas.

Individual rights to fish may be established within the TURFs. Each TURF may set or receive allocations of a certain number of permits or licenses to fish particular species or fisheries. Individual Transferrable Quotas (ITQs) involve the setting of annual total allowable catch in a fishery or within a TURF or with a particular species, and the distribution of limited, tradable shares of the catch to individual fishing families, vessels, or other stakeholders. The granting of quotas is done on a basis decided by the co-management association as the most equitable manner. As such, ITQs are a use right or the right to fish, rather than the right to the stock. They fundamentally change incentives for fishing and for private investment in the stock. The value of the ITQ depends upon the condition and value of the stock, and as owners of rights to it, fishermen are motivated to conserve it a manner not found under open access. ITQs may be cost effective relative to ownership of the stock (rights to harvest) or part of the ocean, when migratory species are involved, when associated measurement and enforcement costs are large, and when political opposition to sole ownership is intense.
2. Establishing Overall Catch Rates

The CMA may eventually set a total allowable catch amount for the TURF or specific fisheries, or a fixed number of inputs (e.g., licensed boats, number of fishermen, types of gear) after receiving training on data collection and analysis in the initial years. Once the catch ceiling is set by the LCC or CMA, shares of the quota will be allocated to eligible vessels by the appropriate co-management unit. Criteria for allocating portions of the ITQ can be based on historical participation in the fishery (through registration of vessels), size of vessel, amount of historical catch reported (in logbooks or dockside observers or monitoring). Affected communities and families must participate in community meetings and discussions held by LCC on the issue of allocations. The likely case is that some individuals or families will have to restrict their harvest to levels much lower than they historically fished; or that they may lose the ability to fish for certain species. These families will participate in continued discussions, mediated by the NGO as necessary, to determine appropriate and equitable compensation through the alternatives livelihood program.

Yearly decisions on fishing rights and species to be regulated will be preceded by series of meetings with the local fishing association(s) to discuss options and pros and cons of various management decisions. But in the end the association makes their own decisions with input from the state. Mitigative measures where individuals are denied access to the fishery or a livelihood based on fishing must also be discussed at the community level, and preferences communicated to the NGO and Minister of Fisheries.

Establishing harvest ceilings and rates is a collaborative endeavor between the Ministry and the local communities. The Ministry in charge of fisheries will, through the Program, support CMAs to monitor fish catch and effort in their TURFs, to help establish trends and inform management.

3. Matrix of Possible Restrictions

There are multiple ways to limit fishing effort to solve the problem of overharvesting. They range from maintaining open access but limiting the number of vessels (pirogues) or types of gear or seasons for fishing, among the most-often used options. On the property rights end of the spectrum, typical restrictions are assigning individual vessel rights to harvest fish (ITQs) or geographically-based rights to fish (TURFs).

Tables 1 and 2 (below) provide illustrative matrices of management options and how they would be applied across the high priority stocks for small scale fishermen:
TABLE 1:

**ILLUSTRATIVE MARINE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS UNDER OPEN ACCESS CONDITIONS**

*WHERE NO COMMUNITY-BASED RESTRICTIONS EXIST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictions under open access conditions</th>
<th>High Priority Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shrimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demersal Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap (freeze) or limit the # of vessels participating --limit access</td>
<td>License and limit # vessels; require permits for each type of cephalopod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal restrictions (issue licenses for restricted time periods during which the fishery is closed to all)</td>
<td>Limit trawling or harvesting by season (e.g. summer only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear restrictions</td>
<td>Increase size of mesh on nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall catch limit</td>
<td>Bushels landed (metric?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length and size restrictions (e.g. length of fish, carapace, or body)</td>
<td>Require larger mesh on nets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indigenous management restrictions may be observed by local populations, even if they do not formally acknowledge their existence. For example, fishermen may throw back immature lobsters as a matter of course. This is a management principle, even if the local population does not recognize it as such. It is critical that new marine management regulations and limits recognize and validate any such already respected local management restrictions.

TABLE 2:

**MARINE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS UNDER PROPERTY RIGHTS REGIMES**
### Restrictions under Property Rights Regimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial Use Rights to Fish (TURFs)</th>
<th>Shrimp harvesting limited to TURF area; limited to village association members</th>
<th>Cephalopod harvesting limited to TURF area and to association members</th>
<th>Demersal fish harvesting limited in same manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Transferrable Quotas (ITQs).</td>
<td>Right to harvest shrimp, cephalopods, or finfish is distributed to co-management members. Each vessel receives a limited portion (quota) of the overall TAC to harvest.</td>
<td>Right to harvest shrimp, cephalopods, or finfish is distributed to co-management members. Each vessel receives a limited portion (quota) of the TAC to harvest.</td>
<td>Right to harvest shrimp, cephalopods, or finfish is distributed to co-management members. Each vessel receives a limited portion (quota) of the TAC to harvest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priority Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal Fish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**D. Affected Communities’ Participation in Establishing Eligibility Criteria for Mitigation Measures.**

Once the participating communities have discussed fully and publicly the range of options available to them and weighed the benefits and disadvantages of each option, the community can decide which actions it intends to undertake. When the adoption of a specific measure means that some segment or segments of the local community will incur adverse impacts on their livelihood, that fact establishes those individuals’ eligibility for mitigative measures to at least restore their livelihood. An important operative principle here is that the livelihood restoration measures are intended to restore the income foregone by respecting the measures adopted. That is to say, they are not intended to be a general rural development or small business development program even though the options available may be very similar.

The specific mitigation measures (Section V) are the responsibility and option of the individual PAP him or herself. Because fishermen and people working in fishery-related enterprises may not be cognizant of the range of alternatives possible, the NGO or other collaborating agency must work closely with the PAPs, individually and in groups, in
order to determine the feasibility of the various options. The PAPs may decide to undertake alternative livelihood options as a group or groups, or individuals may prefer to work on their own; the approach to livelihood restoration is their option. The main considerations are that (i) the PAPs themselves decide what activities they want to undertake individually or as a group; and (ii) the option or options selected have sufficient promise that whatever income was lost will be replaced.

1. Eligibility is Commensurate with Adverse Impacts

Adoption of marine-resource restrictions will adversely impact people in the local community to different extents. Some people may have to exit the activity; others can continue, but with seasonal or catch limitations that reduce but do not eliminate their livelihood; others may not be affected at all.

If the number of vessels (pirogues) is capped or reduced, then some families will be restricted from fishing in the TURF. These groups of individuals must participate in determining equitable compensation measures. This will require the assistance of an NGO, with support from the Ministry and the CMA, where functioning, to identify, weigh, select and implement potential new livelihood activities.

Where livelihoods are not entirely eliminated, supplementary income generation activities will be called for. For example, if the CMA determines that fishing for shrimp must be done with nets with larger mesh, or that there must be a bag limit (catch limit) per day for octopus, or that finfish of different species can be harvested only during specified months, the families affected can identify and undertake part-time remunerative activities that will enable them to at least maintain their current standard of living.

2. Impact Mitigation is an On-going Activity

The integral participation of communities in identifying probable impacts and of the affected community members in verifying the individual impacts and selecting alternative livelihood measures helps ensure the accuracy of the original assessment and its impact. Nonetheless, it can happen that some impacts are overlooked at the outset or that new impacts arise over time. These are matters that the LCC and the CMA need to monitor in order to ensure that all PAPs are assisted in restoring their livelihoods.

For example, if after several years of local fisheries co-management, there is continued decline in catch-per-unit-of-effort (CPUE), as shown through CMA logbooks and monitoring, and decline in biomass, as shown through Ministry and LCC stock assessments, the LCC (with the participation of CMA and the Ministry of Fisheries delegate) must consider property rights regimes. This consideration will have a major effect on the number of people eligible for livelihood restoration assistance, because it entails a reduction in the number of vessels fishing for certain species. The possibility of such future impacts will be treated in the national PFs.

V. LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION MEASURES
World Bank OP 4.01 sections on social impacts note that fisheries management can have significant adverse local impacts, and, therefore, that livelihoods be restored at least to the extent that they are impacted directly by project activities, and preferably improved. This policy prescription is based on the principle that people who give up most for the public good – the PAPs – should not be penalized and impoverished as a result of their loss for the greater good. The aim, therefore, is to improve the public good (in this instance, marine resources) while also ensuring that those who lose access to resources and income because of restrictions on marine resources are assisted effectively to restore that part of their income that is affected through alternative livelihood measures. For, only in this manner can development for all people in the communities concerned be assured.

As part of their support to the implementation of the co-management initiatives, the CMAs and/or LCCs will help identify sources of alternative livelihoods to fishing and related endeavors, as well as – and perhaps more importantly – to non-fishery-related opportunities. In fact, the CMAs and/or LCCs play a central role in working with the communities to identify participants and beneficiaries of alternative livelihood activities and the micro-credit initiative. The CMAs and/or LCCs will also help monitor and evaluate the progress of these initiatives, and play an important role in ensuring that the beneficiaries of these programs respect the terms of their agreements and the co-management agreements signed with the Minister.

A. PROCESS OF IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING LIVELIHOOD MEASURES.

The process of identifying eligible participants in the Alternative Livelihoods Program will be undertaken in parallel with the development of the community’s co-management plan because these two initiatives are inextricably interrelated. The development of the co-management program defines who may lose access to resources and to what extent. These negative impacts not only inform the final decisions on the co-management plan, they also define who will be eligible under the Alternative Livelihoods Program and to what extent.

Once the co-management plan is decided upon, some individuals, families or communities will have limited access to resources or be denied access to those resources. Mitigation of these harvesting-contraction actions or capacity adjustments rests on sound knowledge of how participants in the fisheries will be affected and on their participation in decisions. Both general information about the fisheries and specific information about the affected families are needed.

General background information includes:
  o The social and economic structure of harvesting, processing, marketing and distributing of fish, shellfish, molluscs and their products by fishing families in the small scale fleets is critical.
  o The roles of men and women and other family members;
  o Knowledge of the role of religion and religious status in the organization of the artisanal fleets;
  o How these efforts are capitalized locally.
  o How catches are divided among the crew (e.g., owner, captain, crew members)
Knowledge of customary patterns of marine tenure, such as village rights to geographic areas or seasonal or species-based harvesting.

Much of this information will have been gathered during the initial surveys of coastal fishing communities. To verify and supplement this available background information, the NGO or other agency working in an area will undertake a rapid appraisal in cooperation with local fishing families and students in order to identify economic interactions and involvement in the fishing industry. This supplementary data are usually collected in the course of village-wide discussions in public meetings that are chaired by the local fishery committee and facilitated by the NGO or other collaborating agency.

The impacts of specific restrictions on particular families can also be identified during these meetings. The public meetings will identify both the segments of the community who will benefit from the actions proposed and the segments of the community who likely will be negatively by the different restrictions under consideration (e.g., limiting the numbers of vessels and catch).

This general impact information must be complemented with information about the specific families who will be adversely affected. This information can only be gathered from the families themselves. The specific family information basically covers family demographic and economic characteristics, including:

- Resident family members, gender, age, education and skills, and occupation (both primary and secondary, noting any seasonality) of each person in the family
- Non-resident family members (if any)
- Sources of income, by family member, including remittances
- Preferred alternative occupations of the directly affected family member(s)
- Their training needs or other assistance necessary for them to undertake this activity.

This information on individual families is private information, and is usually collected through individual interviews persons directly concerned and is done by the NGO or other collaborating agency. In this work, it is useful to conduct separate interviews with the family members to ensure that women have the opportunity to express their concerns and preferences fully. The agreement, however, is between the individual and the local fishery council or district fishery council, depending upon which level of local organization is responsible for resource restrictions and for financing the alternative livelihoods program in each country.

B. LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION OPTIONS

That co-management and the introduction of property rights may result in displacement of families from fishing and from economic activities related to fishing necessitates alternative income programs.

Typically, artisanal fishermen and families rely on strategies of multiple sources of income from different sectors such as agriculture, wage labor, family-based sale of fishery products or fishery related activities such as net-repair, and opportunistic sources.
such as occasional tourism. The alternative livelihoods program aims to restore lost fishery-related income through a specific project component for income restoration. Thus, when a boat is decommissioned, crew members will be eligible for assistance to the extent that their livelihood is affected. In other words, the alternative livelihoods program has limited aims and is not designed to be a community-wide development program, although the WARFP will provide some support to community-wide initiatives, but under different circumstances.

In considering options for alternative incomes, it is important to provide the maximum range of opportunities to the PAPs in the assessment of options and the determination of specific choices. While it seems logical to assume that fisheries-related activities, such as input supply, processing, transport and marketing would provide the most relevant opportunities, such may not be the case. Reduction in the number of boats would likely reduce demand for boats, motors, spare parts and fuel; restrictions on the size of net mesh could eliminate certain processors; greater catch size might increase value but eliminate specific processors, transporters and/or marketers. These impacts must be taken into account when considering potential alternative livelihood options, and where opportunities allied to fishing will become more limited, a wide range of other alternatives, with an emphasis on non-fishery-related opportunities, must be considered, publicly and individually.

Whatever the options selected, it is imperative that the PAPs develop a business plan. The NGO or other collaborating agency will be expected to conduct training sessions with the PAPs to familiarize them with the concept of a business plan, and will work with individual PAPs to develop their own plans. The plans will cover not only skills assessment and training needs, but also such factors as equipment cost and maintenance, production needs (if any), transport facilities, marketing outlets and probable demand.

The development of a coherent and workable business plan is a requisite for any micro financing loan for small-scale businesses. Loans to the fishing sector are in some countries considered highly risky in the micro-finance sector due to low repayment rates. For this reason, it may be necessary, in some countries or in some areas, to define carefully the types of loans that will be considered. For example, loans to cover the costs of refurbishing a pirogue or of installing a refrigeration unit in boat may facilitate absconding with the capital, and therefore would be eliminated from the microfinance portfolio of options. But fishery loans that cover the cost of buying a drying rack to dry fish (instead of drying them on the ground) or of some elementary forms of packaging (e.g., to keep flies off the catch) have higher repayment rates, and therefore can be included in the microfinance portfolio of options, along with various non-fishery related activities. The point is that the experience with fishery loans has generally been negative where the program capitalizes technology and more highly efficient vessels. But fishery loans related to the secondary sectors of fishing activity (e.g., processing) can involve small technical improvements and be productive. Where that is not the case, the range of options must be limited to – or at least strongly focused on – loans for non-fishery related opportunities defined and accepted by the PAPs.

Whatever options are considered and implemented at the local level, it is imperative that the initiatives be closely monitored. The objective here is to ensure that the PAPs accomplish all the steps necessary for successful alternative livelihood development, i.e., develop their business plans, gain the skills and buy any necessary equipment, and
sell their services or products remuneratively, among other considerations. Where difficulties are encountered generally, the program authorities will need to adjust the program in order to enhance the probability of success. (See also Section VII, Monitoring, below.)

Finally, the national PFs will specify, and budget for, the activities to be undertaken under the Alternatives Livelihoods program. It may not be possible even at that point to specify what restrictions (if any) each community has decided to adopt, how those restrictions will impact segments of the local communities, and what alternative livelihoods programs will be adopted. Nonetheless, the national PF will provide, at least in outline, the marine resources in each area, the level of local exploitation (or overexploitation), the sorts of restrictions and limits that could be adopted locally to improve the marine resources, the likely impact of those limits in those communities (i.e., an estimate of the number of PAPs by category of resource and role in the value chain), the extent of impact (e.g., total or partial, year-round or seasonal), and thus the nature and cost of mitigative measures, even though these cannot be detailed at the time of national PF development.

VI. GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

A. INTRA-COMMUNITY CONFLICT RESOLUTION

In general outline, complaints will be considered and resolved at the lowest possible level, and are to be taken to the next-higher level only when it proves not possible to resolve the issue at lower level. Also, informal processes are preferred to formal administrative or juridical processes in the first instance. However, where a complaint cannot be resolved informally, the complainant always has the perogative of raising his or her issue with the appropriate administrative or juridical officials in the manner prescribed in the relevant national legislation.

As a general rule, it is recommended that complaints or grievances within a community be resolved as quickly as possible and at the local level, using traditional mechanisms for conflict resolution wherever possible. Where differences are resolved through local palaver, it is important to ensure that sufficient time is allotted for the community to discuss and resolve the issue or issues. The NGO or other agency can act as an intermediary in this process, helping to ensure a fair hearing for the complainant(s). The national PFs will be better positioned to detail such local mechanisms since the areas where WARFP will be working and the communities that will participate in the WARFP will be known.

Although the CMAs and LCCs generally reach decisions by consensus after much community discussion and many meetings or ‘hearings’ on topics of restrictions, there may not be unanimity among all the many families in the village. For this reason, the NGO may serve as a mediator in order to reconcile differences in views and attempt to resolve the matter at the local level.

When an issue cannot be resolved at the community level, it may be referred to the district co-management group (CMA) which, if it is functioning, represents all local fishing industry interests. The CMA will constitute from its members a Grievance Committee to hear and decide on community disputes. If no district fishing council yet exists, the
complaint would go directly to the Project Implementation Unit for consideration. (See Annex E for a template for Grievance Registration and Resolution.)

**B. INTER-COMMUNITY CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

Two categories of conflict between communities need to be distinguished: grievances between adjacent communities, and grievances between the local communities and outside fishermen.

1. **Conflict between Adjacent Communities**

Conflicts between adjacent communities may arise because of limitations on access to formerly open access resources. As a general principle, it is preferable to resolve such issues at the district level, if at all possible.

Therefore, under WARFP, the aggrieved community has the right of raising its complaint with the local CMA. The Association has a range of options at its disposal: the complainant community could join its neighbors in management of the TURF, the council could recommend economic rehabilitation investments as compensation in the complainant community even though it is not a member of the TURF group, or the council could reject the claim.

In the latter instance, the complainant community would have recourse to the court system for adjudication of its complaint.
2. Conflict between Local Communities and Outsiders

Conflicts that arise when outside fishermen poach in local communities’ fishing grounds are to be dealt with by the appropriate authorities through the law. Local communities may note the infractions, and they can report the incidents to the appropriate authorities for action. The responsible agents must then take appropriate action in a timely manner. The local community, however, has no authority to enforce the rules and regulations of the TURF on outsiders.

VII. MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS

Co-management rests on the ability of local communities to participate in monitoring -- data collection and analysis, with the end result that they become partners in setting allowable catch levels and in enforcement and adjusting policies if recruitment or harvest trends continue downward. In this context, there are three areas where local communities will play a key role in monitoring project activities, in collaboration with the Ministry and its facilitation agent (NGO or other agency): (1) baseline data; (2) environmental conditions; and (3) livelihood restoration.

A. BASELINE INFORMATION.

Monitoring is a collaborative effort of the local communities and the responsible national agencies. As the first step, a baseline of survey data on individual species abundance (or at least high value species) is necessary. The Ministry’s databases, where available, need to be made available to the community, and training provided for the community members to understand the nature and importance of the information. The Ministry may engage an NGO to provide elementary fishery biology training, and to train community individuals to be data collectors for small scale fisheries. For example, community members can, with appropriate training, do sampling for water quality. Where feasible, the LCC or CMA can do simple analyses (summaries, trends), while the Ministry does more sophisticated analyses and modeling, and laboratory analyses as necessary. For example, the LCC might monitor dissolved oxygen and nutrient loading, but send water samples to the Ministry for chemical analyses for organic compounds such as pesticides, PCBs, or other toxins. Sites and seasonal sampling regimes need to be chosen for sampling the juveniles or young of year need to be selected by the association using traditional local knowledge, with advisory role of the Minister.

Monitoring requires establishment of baseline conditions of key concerns (i.e., pre-project), with periodic assessment of conditions once the project is underway. An illustrative list of baseline dimensions for monitoring would include, at a minimum:

- In shore environmental conditions
  - In-shore resources
  - Beach hygiene
  - Water quality

- Off-shore environmental conditions
  - Pollution of ocean bed (debris)
  - Water quality
  - Fish stocks (by species)
B. ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

WARFP will support local-level monitoring of baseline marine conditions and of compliance with the co-management agreements as well as national regulations.

The community monitoring program can only be defined once the communities have adopted their co-management plans, which should be detailed in the national PFS. For illustrative purposes, a logical first step for communities that adopt limitations on demersal fisheries is for the Ministry, in collaboration with local fishing associations, to establish a vessel registry system and vessel licensing. Working with NGOs and fishing captains in the local villages, the CMA and/or LCC would then develop a catch reporting system dockside or along beaches. Daily catch is observed, logged and reported to the co-management association (and ultimately the data is transferred to the Ministry). It is also important to establish stock monitoring capabilities in cooperation with local fishing villages—a key to co-management is local ability to participate in data collection and management decisions and the ability to establish a baseline from which people can track improvement or decline in species. This element requires training of local fishermen or family members would be an investment in the future of the demersal fisheries. Such data would be useful at the national and regional levels as well. Associations have been able to track year-to-year classes of fish in order to be able to see trends in growth of demersal stock. The realization that fewer and fewer fish are reaching harvestable size becomes important in their deliberations about harvesting levels or quota levels.

While local communities participate integrally in all of this basic monitoring work, some of the more sophisticated analyses and modeling of fish stocks will have to be done by the Ministry and in laboratories. In such instances, it is important that the scientific results be provided to the community in regular meetings by the NGO and the co-management association. The organization can then discuss the meaning and management implications of the findings of the monitoring program, and revise their co-management plan accordingly. In this, the village co-management organization will require technical assistance of both the NGO and the Ministry to assess the implications of the findings and the range of options available for redressing any adverse situations.

C. LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION

In addition to the biological monitoring program, the communities, with the assistance of the collaborating NGOs, must monitor the success of the Alternative Livelihoods Program. Here, both processual and outcome indicators are to be monitored.

Processual indicators cover the different stages of the Alternative Livelihoods Program, while outcome indicators track the restoration of PAP incomes. An illustrative list of monitoring dimensions would include (but is not limited to)

- Process Indicators
  - Number of training sessions
  - Participant attendance
  - Participant satisfaction
  - Business plan development (number of PAPs successfully developing plans)
- Loan approval rate
- Enterprise establishment
- Outcome Indicators (Fishermen Living Standards)
  - Enterprise income (gross and net)
  - Number of employees
  - Family Household Equipment
  - Family Income (disaggregated by activity or source and gender)

VIII. BUDGET AND PROJECT TIMELINE

Although a PF defines the participatory process through which a local development plan will be defined, it is helpful to include both a budget and a program timeline in the national PF. This section provides guidance for the presentation of a national program budget and timeline (please see subsections ‘g’ and ‘h’ of the Process Framework outline provided in Section III-C, above).

A. BUDGET

1. Program Budget

The basis for local marine resources co-management is the community’s activity budget (Figure 2), which may be appended to the national PF. The National Community Co-Management Budget (Figure 3) compiles and summarizes the community budgets, and is presented in the text of the national PF.

![Figure 2]

**Figure 2**

**Budget Template for Community Fisheries Development Programs (for each activity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 3]

**Figure 3: Illustrative National Budget Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Livelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO or Other Agency Assistance *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The cost of contracting an NGO and/or other agency may be included in the budget line for each program activity (community development, co-management development, alternative livelihoods development, grievance resolution, monitoring). Where that approach is adopted, it will be important to provide the estimated amount(s) for underwriting the costs of NGO and other agency collaboration in the text of the national PF.

### 2. Sources of Funding

WARPF is implemented through agreements with Government in each country, with the CSRP providing regional coordination financed through a contribution from each national ministry. In this context, the budget for each national program will come from the national WARFP budget and be distributed by the national Ministry in charge of fisheries or its equivalent.
B. NATIONAL PROGRAM TIMELINE

The national PF will provide a general timetable for each of the activities in the budget. The general or global timeline will detail the activities to be undertaken, and provide the expected sequencing of activities over the life of the program.

If possible, detailed work plans for each project area in a participating country can be presented in the national PF, but this level of detail may not be possible at that point. In that instance, a general summary of the likely detailed workplans will be presented.
ANNEX A:

POLICY REQUIREMENTS FOR A PROCESS FRAMEWORK

IN OP 4.12 AND ITS ANNEX A
Involuntary Resettlement (Revised April 2004)

OP 4.12 (Revised April 2004) applies only to projects that are governed by OP / BP 6.00, Bank Financing - that is, those in countries with approved country financing parameters. Other operational policy statements governing Bank financing that have been amended to reflect OP/BP 6.00 also apply to these projects, click to view a full Table of Contents (blue).

Projects in countries without approved country financing parameters continue to be subject to other operational policy statements governing Bank financing; click here for a full Table of Contents (yellow) that includes these statements.

Note: OP and BP 4.12 together replace OD 4.30, Involuntary Resettlement. This OP and BP apply to all projects for which a Project Concept Review takes place on or after January 1, 2002. Questions may be addressed to the Director, Social Development Department (SDV).

1. Bank experience indicates that involuntary resettlement under development projects, if unmitigated, often gives rise to severe economic, social, and environmental risks: production systems are dismantled; people face impoverishment when their productive assets or income sources are lost; people are relocated to environments where their productive skills may be less applicable and the competition for resources greater; community institutions and social networks are weakened; kin groups are dispersed; and cultural identity, traditional authority, and the potential for mutual help are diminished or lost. This policy includes safeguards to address and mitigate these impoverishment risks.

Policy Objectives

2. Involuntary resettlement may cause severe long-term hardship, impoverishment, and environmental damage unless appropriate measures are carefully planned and carried out. For
these reasons, the overall objectives of the Bank's policy on involuntary resettlement are the following:

(a) Involuntary resettlement should be avoided where feasible, or minimized, exploring all viable alternative project designs.  
(b) Where it is not feasible to avoid resettlement, resettlement activities should be conceived and executed as sustainable development programs, providing sufficient investment resources to enable the persons displaced by the project to share in project benefits. Displaced persons should be meaningfully consulted and should have opportunities to participate in planning and implementing resettlement programs.  
(c) Displaced persons should be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least to restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher.

Impacts Covered

3. This policy covers direct economic and social impacts that both result from Bank-assisted investment projects, and are caused by

(a) the involuntary taking of land resulting in
   (i) relocation or loss of shelter;
   (ii) lost of assets or access to assets; or
   (iii) loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected persons must move to another location; or

(b) the involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of the displaced persons.

4. This policy applies to all components of the project that result in involuntary resettlement, regardless of the source of financing. It also applies to other activities resulting in involuntary resettlement, that in the judgment of the Bank, are (a) directly and significantly related to the Bank-assisted project, (b) necessary to achieve its objectives as set forth in the project documents; and (c) carried out, or planned to be carried out, contemporaneously with the project.

5. Requests for guidance on the application and scope of this policy should be addressed to the Resettlement Committee (see BP 4.12, para. 7).

Required Measures
6. To address the impacts covered under para. 3 (a) of this policy, the borrower prepares a resettlement plan or a resettlement policy framework (see paras. 25-30) that covers the following:

(a) The resettlement plan or resettlement policy framework includes measures to ensure that the displaced persons are

(i) informed about their options and rights pertaining to resettlement;

(ii) consulted on, offered choices among, and provided with technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives; and

(iii) provided prompt and effective compensation at full replacement cost\textsuperscript{11} for losses of assets\textsuperscript{12} attributable directly to the project.

(b) If the impacts include physical relocation, the resettlement plan or resettlement policy framework includes measures to ensure that the displaced persons are

(i) provided assistance (such as moving allowances) during relocation; and

(ii) provided with residential housing, or housing sites, or, as required, agricultural sites for which a combination of productive potential, locational advantages, and other factors is at least equivalent to the advantages of the old site.\textsuperscript{13}

(c) Where necessary to achieve the objectives of the policy, the resettlement plan or resettlement policy framework also include measures to ensure that displaced persons are

(i) offered support after displacement, for a transition period, based on a reasonable estimate of the time likely to be needed to restore their livelihood and standards of living;\textsuperscript{14} and

(ii) provided with development assistance in addition to compensation measures described in paragraph 6(a) (iii), such as land preparation, credit facilities, training, or job opportunities.

7. In projects involving involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas (see para. 3(b)), the nature of restrictions, as well as the type of measures necessary to mitigate adverse impacts, is determined with the participation of the displaced
persons during the design and implementation of the project. In such cases, the borrower prepares a process framework acceptable to the Bank, describing the participatory process by which

(a) specific components of the project will be prepared and implemented;

(b) the criteria for eligibility of displaced persons will be determined;

(c) measures to assist the displaced persons in their efforts to improve their livelihoods, or at least to restore them, in real terms, while maintaining the sustainability of the park or protected area, will be identified; and

(d) potential conflicts involving displaced persons will be resolved.

The process framework also includes a description of the arrangements for implementing and monitoring the process.

8. To achieve the objectives of this policy, particular attention is paid to the needs of vulnerable groups among those displaced, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation.

9. Bank experience has shown that resettlement of indigenous peoples with traditional land-based modes of production is particularly complex and may have significant adverse impacts on their identity and cultural survival. For this reason, the Bank satisfies itself that the borrower has explored all viable alternative project designs to avoid physical displacement of these groups. When it is not feasible to avoid such displacement, preference is given to land-based resettlement strategies for these groups (see para. 11) that are compatible with their cultural preferences and are prepared in consultation with them (see Annex A, para. 11).

10. The implementation of resettlement activities is linked to the implementation of the investment component of the project to ensure that displacement or restriction of access does not occur before necessary measures for resettlement are in place. For impacts covered in para. 3(a) of this policy, these measures include provision of compensation and of other assistance required for relocation, prior to displacement, and preparation and provision of resettlement sites with adequate facilities, where required. In particular, taking of land and related assets may take place only after compensation has been paid and, where applicable, resettlement sites and moving allowances have been provided to the displaced persons. For impacts covered in para. 3(b) of this policy, the measures to assist the displaced persons are implemented in accordance with the plan of action as part of the project (see para. 30).

11. Preference should be given to land-based resettlement strategies for displaced persons whose livelihoods are land-based. These strategies may include resettlement on public
land (see footnote 1 above), or on private land acquired or purchased for resettlement. Whenever replacement land is offered, resettlers are provided with land for which a combination of productive potential, locational advantages, and other factors is at least equivalent to the advantages of the land taken. If land is not the preferred option of the displaced persons, the provision of land would adversely affect the sustainability of a park or protected area, or sufficient land is not available at a reasonable price, non-land-based options built around opportunities for employment or self-employment should be provided in addition to cash compensation for land and other assets lost. The lack of adequate land must be demonstrated and documented to the satisfaction of the Bank.

12. Payment of cash compensation for lost assets may be appropriate where (a) livelihoods are land-based but the land taken for the project is a small fraction of the affected asset and the residual is economically viable; (b) active markets for land, housing, and labor exist, displaced persons use such markets, and there is sufficient supply of land and housing; or (c) livelihoods are not land-based. Cash compensation levels should be sufficient to replace the lost land and other assets at full replacement cost in local markets.

13. For impacts covered under para. 3(a) of this policy, the Bank also requires the following:

(a) Displaced persons and their communities, and any host communities receiving them, are provided timely and relevant information, consulted on resettlement options, and offered opportunities to participate in planning, implementing, and monitoring resettlement. Appropriate and accessible grievance mechanisms are established for these groups.

(b) In new resettlement sites or host communities, infrastructure and public services are provided as necessary to improve, restore, or maintain accessibility and levels of service for the displaced persons and host communities. Alternative or similar resources are provided to compensate for the loss of access to community resources (such as fishing areas, grazing areas, fuel, or fodder).

(c) Patterns of community organization appropriate to the new circumstances are based on choices made by the displaced persons. To the extent possible, the existing social and cultural institutions of resettlers and any host communities are preserved and resettlers' preferences with respect to relocating in preexisting communities and groups are honored.

Eligibility for Benefits

14. Upon identification of the need for involuntary resettlement in a project, the borrower carries out a census to identify the persons who will be affected by the project (see the Annex A, para. 6(a)), to determine who will be eligible for assistance, and to discourage inflow of people
ineligible for assistance. The borrower also develops a procedure, satisfactory to the Bank, for establishing the criteria by which displaced persons will be deemed eligible for compensation and other resettlement assistance. The procedure includes provisions for meaningful consultations with affected persons and communities, local authorities, and, as appropriate, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and it specifies grievance mechanisms.

15. **Criteria for Eligibility.** Displaced persons may be classified in one of the following three groups:

(a) those who have formal legal rights to land (including customary and traditional rights recognized under the laws of the country);

(b) those who do not have formal legal rights to land at the time the census begins but have a claim to such land or assets—provided that such claims are recognized under the laws of the country or become recognized through a process identified in the resettlement plan (see Annex A, para. 7(f)); and

(c) those who have no recognizable legal right or claim to the land they are occupying.

16. Persons covered under para. 15(a) and (b) are provided compensation for the land they lose, and other assistance in accordance with para. 6. Persons covered under para. 15(c) are provided resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for the land they occupy, and other assistance, as necessary, to achieve the objectives set out in this policy, if they occupy the project area prior to a cut-off date established by the borrower and acceptable to the Bank. Persons who encroach on the area after the cut-off date are not entitled to compensation or any other form of resettlement assistance. All persons included in para. 15(a), (b), or (c) are provided compensation for loss of assets other than land.

**Resettlement Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring**

17. To achieve the objectives of this policy, different planning instruments are used, depending on the type of project:

(a) a resettlement plan or abbreviated resettlement plan is required for all operations that entail involuntary resettlement unless otherwise specified (see para. 25 and Annex A);

(b) a resettlement policy framework is required for operations referred to in paras. 26-30 that may entail involuntary resettlement, unless otherwise specified (see Annex A); and

(c) a process framework is prepared for projects involving restriction of access in accordance with para. 3(b) (see para. 31).
18. The borrower is responsible for preparing, implementing, and monitoring a resettlement plan, a resettlement policy framework, or a process framework (the "resettlement instruments"), as appropriate, that conform to this policy. The resettlement instrument presents a strategy for achieving the objectives of the policy and covers all aspects of the proposed resettlement. Borrower commitment to, and capacity for, undertaking successful resettlement is a key determinant of Bank involvement in a project.

19. Resettlement planning includes early screening, scoping of key issues, the choice of resettlement instrument, and the information required to prepare the resettlement component or subcomponent. The scope and level of detail of the resettlement instruments vary with the magnitude and complexity of resettlement. In preparing the resettlement component, the borrower draws on appropriate social, technical, and legal expertise and on relevant community-based organizations and NGOs. The borrower informs potentially displaced persons at an early stage about the resettlement aspects of the project and takes their views into account in project design.

20. The full costs of resettlement activities necessary to achieve the objectives of the project are included in the total costs of the project. The costs of resettlement, like the costs of other project activities, are treated as a charge against the economic benefits of the project; and any net benefits to resettlers (as compared to the "without-project" circumstances) are added to the benefits stream of the project. Resettlement components or free-standing resettlement projects need not be economically viable on their own, but they should be cost-effective.

21. The borrower ensures that the Project Implementation Plan is fully consistent with the resettlement instrument.

22. As a condition of appraisal of projects involving resettlement, the borrower provides the Bank with the relevant draft resettlement instrument which conforms to this policy, and makes it available at a place accessible to displaced persons and local NGOs, in a form, manner, and language that are understandable to them. Once the Bank accepts this instrument as providing an adequate basis for project appraisal, the Bank makes it available to the public through its InfoShop. After the Bank has approved the final resettlement instrument, the Bank and the borrower disclose it again in the same manner.

23. The borrower's obligations to carry out the resettlement instrument and to keep the Bank informed of implementation progress are provided for in the legal agreements for the project.

24. The borrower is responsible for adequate monitoring and evaluation of the activities set forth in the resettlement instrument. The Bank regularly supervises resettlement implementation to determine compliance with the resettlement instrument. Upon completion of the project, the borrower undertakes an assessment to determine whether the objectives of the resettlement instrument have been achieved. The assessment takes
into account the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring. If the assessment reveals that these objectives may not be realized, the borrower should propose follow-up measures that may serve as the basis for continued Bank supervision, as the Bank deems appropriate (see also BP 4.12, para. 16).

Resettlement Instruments

Resettlement Plan

25. A draft resettlement plan that conforms to this policy is a condition of appraisal (see Annex A, paras. 2-21) for projects referred to in para. 17(a) above. However, where impacts on the entire displaced population are minor, or fewer than 200 people are displaced, an abbreviated resettlement plan may be agreed with the borrower (see Annex A, para. 22). The information disclosure procedures set forth in para. 22 apply.

Resettlement Policy Framework

26. For sector investment operations that may involve involuntary resettlement, the Bank requires that the project implementing agency screen subprojects to be financed by the Bank to ensure their consistency with this OP. For these operations, the borrower submits, prior to appraisal, a resettlement policy framework that conforms to this policy (see Annex A, paras. 23-25). The framework also estimates, to the extent feasible, the total population to be displaced and the overall resettlement costs.

27. For financial intermediary operations that may involve involuntary resettlement, the Bank requires that the financial intermediary (FI) screen subprojects to be financed by the Bank to ensure their consistency with this OP. For these operations, the Bank requires that before appraisal the borrower or the FI submit to the Bank a resettlement policy framework conforming to this policy (see Annex A, paras. 23-25). In addition, the framework includes an assessment of the institutional capacity and procedures of each of the FIs that will be responsible for subproject financing. When, in the assessment of the Bank, no resettlement is envisaged in the subprojects to be financed by the FI, a resettlement policy framework is not required. Instead, the legal agreements specify the obligation of the FIs to obtain from the potential subborrowers a resettlement plan consistent with this policy if a subproject gives rise to resettlement. For all subprojects involving resettlement, the resettlement plan is provided to the Bank for approval before the subproject is accepted for Bank financing.

28. For other Bank-assisted project with multiple subprojects that may involve involuntary resettlement, the Bank requires that a draft resettlement plan conforming to this policy be submitted to the Bank before appraisal of the project unless, because of the nature and design of the project or of a specific subproject or subprojects (a) the zone of impact of subprojects cannot be determined, or (b) the zone of impact is known but precise sitting alignments cannot be determined. In such cases, the borrower submits a
resettlement policy framework consistent with this policy prior to appraisal (see Annex A, paras. 23-25). For other subprojects that do not fall within the above criteria, a resettlement plan conforming to this policy is required prior to appraisal.

29. For each subproject included in a project described in para. 26, 27, or 28 that may involve resettlement, the Bank requires that a satisfactory resettlement plan or an abbreviated resettlement plan that is consistent with the provisions of the policy framework be submitted to the Bank for approval before the subproject is accepted for Bank financing.

30. For projects described in paras. 26-28 above, the Bank may agree, in writing, that subproject resettlement plans may be approved by the project implementing agency or a responsible government agency or financial intermediary without prior Bank review, if that agency has demonstrated adequate institutional capacity to review resettlement plans and ensure their consistency with this policy. Any such delegation, and appropriate remedies for the entity's approval of resettlement plans found not to be in compliance with Bank policy, are provided for in the legal agreements for the project. In all such cases, implementation of the resettlement plans is subject to ex post review by the Bank.

Process Framework

31. For projects involving restriction of access in accordance with para. 3(b) above, the borrower provides the Bank with a draft process framework that conforms to the relevant provisions of this policy as a condition of appraisal. In addition, during project implementation and before enforcing the restriction, the borrower prepares a plan of action, acceptable to the Bank, describing the specific measures to be undertaken to assist the displaced persons and the arrangements for their implementation. The plan of action could take the form of a natural resources management plan prepared for the project.

Assistance to the Borrower

32. In furtherance of the objectives of this policy, the Bank may at a borrower’s request support the borrower and other concerned entities by providing

(a) assistance to assess and strengthen resettlement policies, strategies, legal frameworks, and specific plans at a country, regional, or sectoral level;

(b) financing of technical assistance to strengthen the capacities of agencies responsible for resettlement, or of affected people to participate more effectively in resettlement operations;

(c) financing of technical assistance for developing resettlement policies, strategies, and specific plans, and for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of resettlement activities; and
(d) financing of the investment costs of resettlement.

33. The Bank may finance either a component of the main investment causing displacement and requiring resettlement, or a free-standing resettlement project with appropriate cross-conditionalities, processed and implemented in parallel with the investment that causes the displacement. The Bank may finance resettlement even though it is not financing the main investment that makes resettlement necessary.

1. "Bank" includes IDA; "loans" includes credits, guarantees, Project Preparation Facility (PPF) advances and grants; and "projects" includes projects under (a) adaptable program lending; (b) learning and innovation loans; (c) PPFs and Institutional Development Funds (IDFs), if they include investment activities; (d) grants under the Global Environment Facility and Montreal Protocol, for which the Bank is the implementing/executing agency; and (e) grants or loans provided by other donors that are administered by the Bank. The term "project" does not include programs under adjustment operations. "Borrower" also includes, wherever the context requires, the guarantor or the project implementing agency.

2. In devising approaches to resettlement in Bank-assisted projects, other Bank policies should be taken into account, as relevant. These policies include OP 4.01 Environmental Assessment, OP 4.04 Natural Habitats, OP 4.11 Safeguarding Cultural Property in Bank-Assisted Projects, and OD 4.20 Indigenous Peoples.

3. The term "displaced persons" refers to persons who are affected in any of the ways described in para. 3 of this OP.

4. Displaced persons under para. 3(b) should be assisted in their efforts to improve or restore their livelihoods in a manner that maintains the sustainability of the parks and protected areas.

5. Where there are adverse indirect social or economic impacts, it is good practice for the borrower to undertake a social assessment and implement measures to minimize and mitigate adverse economic and social impacts, particularly upon poor and vulnerable groups. Other environmental, social, and economic impacts that do not result from land taking may be identified and addressed through environmental assessments and other project reports and instruments.

6. This policy does not apply to restrictions of access to natural resources under community-based projects, i.e. where the community using the resources decides to restrict access to these resources, provided that an assessment satisfactory to the Bank establishes that the community decision-making process is adequate, and that it provides for identification of appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community. This policy also does not cover refugees from natural disasters, war, or civil strife (see OP/BP 8.50, Emergency Recovery Assistance).

7. For purposes of this policy, "involuntary" means actions that may be taken without the displaced person's informed consent or power of choice.

8. "Land" includes anything growing on or permanently affixed to land, such as buildings and crops. This policy does not apply to regulations of natural resources on a national or regional level to promote their sustainability, such as watershed management, groundwater management, fisheries management, etc. The policy also does not apply to disputes between private parties in land titling projects, although it is good practice for the borrower to undertake a social assessment and implement measures to minimize and mitigate adverse social impacts, especially those affecting poor and vulnerable groups.

9. For the purposes of this policy, involuntary restriction of access covers restrictions on the use of resources imposed on people living outside the park or protected area, or on those who continue living inside the park or protected area during and after project implementation. In cases where new parks and protected areas are created as part of the project, persons who lose shelter, land, or other assets are covered under para. 3(a). Persons who lose shelter in existing parks and protected areas are also covered under para. 3(a).

10. The Resettlement Sourcebook (forthcoming) provides good practice guidance to staff on the policy.

11. "Replacement cost" is the method of valuation of assets that helps determine the amount sufficient to
replace lost assets and cover transaction costs. In applying this method of valuation, depreciation of structures and assets should not be taken into account (for a detailed definition of replacement cost, see Annex A, footnote 1). For losses that cannot easily be valued or compensated for in monetary terms (e.g., access to public services, customers, and suppliers; or to fishing, grazing, or forest areas), attempts are made to establish access to equivalent and culturally acceptable resources and earning opportunities. Where domestic law does not meet the standard of compensation at full replacement cost, compensation under domestic law is supplemented by additional measures necessary to meet the replacement cost standard. Such additional assistance is distinct from resettlement assistance to be provided under other clauses of para. 6.

12. If the residual of the asset being taken is not economically viable, compensation and other resettlement assistance are provided as if the entire asset had been taken.

13. The alternative assets are provided with adequate tenure arrangements. The cost of alternative residential housing, housing sites, business premises, and agricultural sites to be provided can be set off against all or part of the compensation payable for the corresponding asset lost.

14. Such support could take the form of short-term jobs, subsistence support, salary maintenance or similar arrangements.


16. See OP 4.04, Natural Habitats.

17. As a general principle, this applies if the land taken constitutes less than 20% of the total productive area.

18. Paras. 13-15 do not apply to impacts covered under para. 3(b) of this policy. The eligibility criteria for displaced persons under 3 (b) are covered under the process framework (see paras. 7 and 30).

19. Such claims could be derived from adverse possession, from continued possession of public lands without government action for eviction (that is, with the implicit leave of the government), or from customary and traditional law and usage, and so on.

20. Resettlement assistance may consist of land, other assets, cash, employment, and so on, as appropriate.

21. Normally, this cut-off date is the date the census begins. The cut-off date could also be the date the project area was delineated, prior to the census, provided that there has been an effective public dissemination of information on the area delineated, and systematic and continuous dissemination subsequent to the delineation to prevent further population influx.

22. For projects that are highly risky or contentious, or that involve significant and complex resettlement activities, the borrower should normally engage an advisory panel of independent, internationally recognized resettlement specialists to advise on all aspects of the project relevant to the resettlement activities. The size, role, and frequency of meeting depend on the complexity of the resettlement. If independent technical advisory panels are established under OP 4.01, Environmental Assessment, the resettlement panel may form part of the environmental panel of experts.

See BP 17.50, Disclosure of Operational Information (forthcoming) for detailed disclosure procedures.

24. An exception to this requirement may be made in highly unusual circumstances (such as emergency recovery operations) with the approval of Bank Management (see BP 4.12, para. 8). In such cases, the Management's approval stipulates a timetable and budget for developing the resettlement plan.

25. Impacts are considered "minor" if the affected people are not physically displaced and less than 10% of their productive assets are lost.

26. For purpose of this paragraph, the term "subprojects" includes components and subcomponents.
ANNEX A OP 4.12:
INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT INSTRUMENTS

(Note: Please see Paragraphs 26 - 27 for the sections relevant to a Process Framework.)

These policies were prepared for use by World Bank staff and are not necessarily a complete treatment of the subject. OP 4.12 - Annex September, 1997

1. This annex describes the elements of a resettlement plan, an abbreviated resettlement plan, a resettlement policy framework, and a resettlement process framework, as discussed in OP 4.12, paras. 17-31.

Resettlement Plan

2. The scope and level of detail of the resettlement plan vary with the magnitude and complexity of resettlement. The plan is based on up-to-date and reliable information about
   (a) the proposed resettlement and its impacts on the displaced persons and other adversely affected groups, and
   (b) the legal issues involved in resettlement. The resettlement plan covers the elements below, as relevant. When any element is not relevant to project circumstances, it should be noted in the resettlement plan.

3. Description of the project. General description of the project and identification of the project area.

4. Potential impacts. Identification of
   (a) the project component or activities that give rise to resettlement;
   (b) the zone of impact of such component or activities;
   (c) the alternatives considered to avoid or minimize resettlement; and
   (d) the mechanisms established to minimize resettlement, to the extent possible, during project implementation.

5. Objectives. The main objectives of the resettlement program.

6. Socioeconomic studies. The findings of socioeconomic studies to be conducted in the early stages of project preparation and with the involvement of potentially displaced people, including
   (a) the results of a census survey covering
      (i) current occupants of the affected area to establish a basis for the design of the resettlement program and to exclude subsequent inflows of people from eligibility for compensation and resettlement assistance;
      (ii) standard characteristics of displaced households, including a description of production systems, labor, and household organization; and baseline information on livelihoods (including, as relevant, production levels and income derived from both formal and informal economic activities) and standards of living (including health status) of the displaced population;
(iii) the magnitude of the expected loss--total or partial--of assets, and the extent of displacement, physical or economic;
(iv) information on vulnerable groups or persons as provided for in OP 4.12, para. 8, for whom special provisions may have to be made; and
(v) provisions to update information on the displaced people's livelihoods and standards of living at regular intervals so that the latest information is available at the time of their displacement.
(b) Other studies describing the following
i) land tenure and transfer systems, including an inventory of common property natural resources from which people derive their livelihoods and sustenance, non-title-based usufruct systems (including fishing, grazing, or use of forest areas) governed by local recognized land allocation mechanisms, and any issues raised by different tenure systems in the project area;
(ii) the patterns of social interaction in the affected communities, including social networks and social support systems, and how they will be affected by the project;
(iii) public infrastructure and social services that will be affected; and
(iv) social and cultural characteristics of displaced communities, including a description of formal and informal institutions (e.g., community organizations, ritual groups, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)) that may be relevant to the consultation strategy and to designing and implementing the resettlement activities.

7. Legal framework. The findings of an analysis of the legal framework, covering
(a) the scope of the power of eminent domain and the nature of compensation associated with it, in terms of both the valuation methodology and the timing of payment;
(b) the applicable legal and administrative procedures, including a description of the remedies available to displaced persons in the judicial process and the normal timeframe for such procedures, and any available alternative dispute resolution mechanisms that may be relevant to resettlement under the project;
(c) relevant law (including customary and traditional law) governing land tenure, valuation of assets and losses, compensation, and natural resource usage rights; customary personal law related to displacement; and environmental laws and social welfare legislation;
(d) laws and regulations relating to the agencies responsible for implementing resettlement activities;
(e) gaps, if any, between local laws covering eminent domain and resettlement and the Bank's resettlement policy, and the mechanisms to bridge such gaps; and
(f) any legal steps necessary to ensure the effective implementation of resettlement activities under the project, including, as appropriate, a process for recognizing claims to
legal rights to land—including claims that derive from customary law and traditional usage (see OP 4.12, para.15 b).

8. Institutional Framework. The findings of an analysis of the institutional framework covering
(a) the identification of agencies responsible for resettlement activities and NGOs that may have a role in project implementation;
(b) an assessment of the institutional capacity of such agencies and NGOs; and
(c) any steps that are proposed to enhance the institutional capacity of agencies and NGOs responsible for resettlement implementation.

9. Eligibility. Definition of displaced persons and criteria for determining their eligibility for compensation and other resettlement assistance, including relevant cut-off dates.

10. Valuation of and compensation for losses. The methodology to be used in valuing losses to determine their replacement cost; and a description of the proposed types and levels of compensation under local law and such supplementary measures as are necessary to achieve replacement cost for lost assets.

11. Resettlement measures. A description of the packages of compensation and other resettlement measures that will assist each category of eligible displaced persons to achieve the objectives of the policy (see OP 4.12, para. In addition to being technically and economically feasible, the resettlement packages should be compatible with the cultural preferences of the displaced persons, and prepared in consultation with them.

12. Site selection, site preparation, and relocation. Alternative relocation sites considered and explanation of those selected, covering
(a) institutional and technical arrangements for identifying and preparing relocation sites, whether rural or urban, for which a combination of productive potential, locational advantages, and other factors is at least comparable to the advantages of the old sites, with an estimate of the time needed to acquire and transfer land and ancillary resources;
(b) any measures necessary to prevent land speculation or influx of ineligible persons at the selected sites;
(c) procedures for physical relocation under the project, including timetables for site preparation and transfer; and
(d) legal arrangements for regularizing tenure and transferring titles to resettlers.

13. Housing, infrastructure, and social services. Plans to provide (or to finance resettlers' provision of) housing, infrastructure (e.g., water supply, feeder roads), and social services (e.g., schools, health services); plans to ensure comparable services to host populations; any necessary site development, engineering, and architectural designs for these facilities.

14. Environmental protection and management. A description of the boundaries of the relocation area; and an assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed resettlement and measures to
mitigate and manage these impacts (coordinated as appropriate with the environmental assessment of the main investment requiring the resettlement).

15. Community participation. Involvement of resettlers and host communities, including
   (a) a description of the strategy for consultation with and participation of resettlers and hosts in the design and implementation of the resettlement activities;
   (b) a summary of the views expressed and how these views were taken into account in preparing the resettlement plan;
   (c) a review of the resettlement alternatives presented and the choices made by displaced persons regarding options available to them, including choices related to forms of compensation and resettlement assistance, to relocating as individuals or as parts of preexisting communities or kinship groups, to sustaining existing patterns of group organization, and to retaining access to cultural property (e.g. places of worship, pilgrimage centers, cemeteries);
   and
   d) institutionalized arrangements by which displaced people can communicate their concerns to project authorities throughout planning and implementation, and measures to ensure that such vulnerable groups as indigenous people, ethnic minorities, the landless, and women are adequately represented.

16. Integration with host populations. Measures to mitigate the impact of resettlement on any host communities, including
   (a) consultations with host communities and local governments;
   (b) arrangements for prompt tendering of any payment due the hosts for land or other assets provided to resettlers;
   (c) arrangements for addressing any conflict that may arise between resettlers and host communities; and
   (d) any measures necessary to augment services (e.g., education, water, health, and production services) in host communities to make them at least comparable to services available to resettlers.

17. Grievance procedures. Affordable and accessible procedures for third-party settlement of disputes arising from resettlement; such grievance mechanisms should take into account the availability of judicial recourse and community and traditional dispute settlement mechanisms.

18. Organizational responsibilities. The organizational framework for implementing resettlement, including identification of agencies responsible for delivery of resettlement measures and provision of services; arrangements to ensure appropriate coordination between agencies and jurisdictions involved in implementation; and any measures (including technical assistance) needed to strengthen the implementing agencies' capacity to design and carry out resettlement activities; provisions for the transfer to local authorities or resettlers themselves of responsibility for managing facilities and services provided under the project and for transferring other such responsibilities from the resettlement implementing agencies, when appropriate.
19. Implementation schedule. An implementation schedule covering all resettlement activities from preparation through implementation, including target dates for the achievement of expected benefits to resettlers and hosts and terminating the various forms of assistance. The schedule should indicate how the resettlement activities are linked to the implementation of the overall project.

20. Costs and budget. Tables showing itemized cost estimates for all resettlement activities, including allowances for inflation, population growth, and other contingencies; timetables for expenditures; sources of funds; and arrangements for timely flow of funds, and funding for resettlement, if any, in areas outside the jurisdiction of the implementing agencies.

21. Monitoring and evaluation. Arrangements for monitoring of resettlement activities by the implementing agency, supplemented by independent monitors as considered appropriate by the Bank, to ensure complete and objective information; performance monitoring indicators to measure inputs, outputs, and outcomes for resettlement activities; involvement of the displaced persons in the monitoring process; evaluation of the impact of resettlement for a reasonable period after all resettlement and related development activities have been completed; using the results of resettlement monitoring to guide subsequent implementation.

**Abbreviated Resettlement Plan**

22. An abbreviated plan covers the following minimum elements:
(a) a census survey of displaced persons and valuation of assets;
(b) description of compensation and other resettlement assistance to be provided;
(c) consultations with displaced people about acceptable alternatives;
(d) institutional responsibility for implementation and procedures for grievance redress;
(e) arrangements for monitoring and implementation; and
(f) a timetable and budget.

**Resettlement Policy Framework**

23. The purpose of the policy framework is to clarify resettlement principles, organizational arrangements, and design criteria to be applied to subprojects to be prepared during project implementation (see OP 4.12, paras. 26-28). Subproject resettlement plans consistent with the policy framework subsequently are submitted to the Bank for approval after specific planning information becomes available (see OP 4.12, para. 29).

24. The resettlement policy framework covers the following elements, consistent with the provisions described in OP 4.12, paras. 2 and 4:
(a) a brief description of the project and components for which land acquisition and resettlement are required, and an explanation of why a resettlement plan as described in paras.
2-21 or an abbreviated plan as described in para. 22 cannot be prepared by project appraisal;
(b) principles and objectives governing resettlement preparation and implementation;
(c) a description of the process for preparing and approving resettlement plans;
(d) estimated population displacement and likely categories of displaced persons, to the extent feasible;
(e) eligibility criteria for defining various categories of displaced persons;
(f) a legal framework reviewing the fit between borrower laws and regulations and Bank policy requirements and measures proposed to bridge any gaps between them;
(g) methods of valuing affected assets;
(h) organizational procedures for delivery of entitlements, including, for projects involving private sector intermediaries, the responsibilities of the financial intermediary, the government, and the private developer;
(i) a description of the implementation process, linking resettlement implementation to civil works;
(j) a description of grievance redress mechanisms;
(k) a description of the arrangements for funding resettlement, including the preparation and review of cost estimates, the flow of funds, and contingency arrangements;
(l) a description of mechanisms for consultations with, and participation of, displaced persons in planning, implementation, and monitoring; and
(m) arrangements for monitoring by the implementing agency and, if required, by independent monitors.

25. When a resettlement policy framework is the only document that needs to be submitted as a condition of the loan, the resettlement plan to be submitted as a condition of subproject financing need not include the policy principles, entitlements, and eligibility criteria, organizational arrangements, arrangements for monitoring and evaluation, the framework for participation, and mechanisms for grievance redress set forth in the resettlement policy framework. The subproject-specific resettlement plan needs to include baseline census and socioeconomic survey information; specific compensation rates and standards; policy entitlements related to any additional impacts identified through the census or survey; description of resettlement sites and programs for improvement or restoration of livelihoods and standards of living; implementation schedule for resettlement activities; and detailed cost estimate.

**Process Framework**

26. A process framework is prepared when Bank-supported projects may cause restrictions in access to natural resources in legally designated parks and protected areas. The purpose of the process framework is to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in design of project components, determination of measures necessary to achieve resettlement policy objectives, and implementation and monitoring of relevant project activities (see OP 4.12, paras. 7 and 31).
27. Specifically, the process framework describes participatory processes by which the following activities will be accomplished

(a) Project components will be prepared and implemented. The document should briefly describe the project and components or activities that may involve new or more stringent restrictions on natural resource use. It should also describe the process by which potentially displaced persons participate in project design.

(b) Criteria for eligibility of affected persons will be determined. The document should establish that potentially affected communities will be involved in identifying any adverse impacts, assessing of the significance of impacts, and establishing of the criteria for eligibility for any mitigating or compensating measures necessary.

(c) Measures to assist affected persons in their efforts to improve their livelihoods or restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels, while maintaining the sustainability of the park or protected area will be identified. The document should describe methods and procedures by which communities will identify and choose potential mitigating or compensating measures to be provided to those adversely affected, and procedures by which adversely affected community members will decide among the options available to them.

(d) Potential conflicts or grievances within or between affected communities will be resolved. The document should describe the process for resolving disputes relating to resource use restrictions that may arise between or among affected communities, and grievances that may arise from members of communities who are dissatisfied with the eligibility criteria, community planning measures, or actual implementation. Additionally, the process framework should describe arrangements relating to the following

(e) Administrative and legal procedures. The document should review agreements reached regarding the process approach with relevant administrative jurisdictions and line ministries including clear delineation for administrative and financial responsibilities under the project).

(f) Monitoring arrangements. The document should review arrangements for participatory monitoring of project activities as they relate to beneficial and adverse) impacts on persons within the project impact area, and for monitoring the effectiveness of measures taken to improve (or at minimum restore) incomes and living standards.

1. With regard to land and structures, "replacement cost" is defined as follows: For agricultural land, it is the pre-project or pre-displacement, whichever is higher, market value of land of equal productive potential or use located in the vicinity of the affected land, plus the cost of preparing the land to levels similar to those of the affected land, plus the cost of any registration and transfer taxes. For land in urban areas, it is the pre-displacement market value of land of equal size and use, with similar or improved public infrastructure facilities and services and located in the vicinity of the affected land, plus the cost of any registration and transfer taxes. For houses and other structures, it is the market cost of the materials to build a replacement structure with an area and quality similar to or better than those of the affected structure, or to repair a partially affected structure, plus the cost of transporting building
materials to the construction site, plus the cost of any labor and contractors' fees, plus the cost of any registration and transfer taxes. In determining the replacement cost, depreciation of the asset and the value of salvage materials are not taken into account, nor is the value of benefits to be derived from the project deducted from the valuation of an affected asset. Where domestic law does not meet the standard of compensation at full replacement cost, compensation under domestic law is supplemented by additional measures so as to meet the replacement cost standard. Such additional assistance is distinct from resettlement measures to be provided under other clauses in OP 4.12, para. 6.

2. Provision of health care services, particularly for pregnant women, infants, and the elderly, may be important during and after relocation to prevent increases in morbidity and mortality due to malnutrition, the psychological stress of being uprooted, and the increased risk of disease.

3. Negative impacts that should be anticipated and mitigated include, for rural resettlement, deforestation, overgrazing, soil erosion, sanitation, and pollution; for urban resettlement, projects should address such density-related issues as transportation capacity and access to potable water, sanitation systems, and health facilities.

4. Experience has shown that local NGOs often provide valuable assistance and ensure viable community participation.

5. OPN 11.03, Management of Cultural Property in Bank-Financed Projects.

6. In case some of the displaced persons lose more than 10% of their productive assets or require physical relocation, the plan also covers a socioeconomic survey and income restoration measures.
ANNEX B:

COASTAL FISHING COMMUNITY

SURVEY FORMS

(Sierra Leone)
## SIERRA LEONE SURVEY ON FISHERIES ISSUES

**RESPONDENTS WORKING IN THE FISHING SECTOR AS FISHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiefdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Name: …………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban (Rural=1, Urban=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of residence:**
- Apartment
- Free standing house or villa
- Row house
- Number of separate cottages/huts clustered together

**Date of interview:**

**Supervisor’s code:**

**Interviewers code:**

**Time at start of interview**

**Time at end of interview**

| Respondent ID |  

(All instructions to the interviewer are in bold italics and are in parentheses. Please make sure to follow all instructions completely – including directions for screening for appropriate respondents in the household. We are interviewing a household member 18 years and older. Read all questions exactly as written and use only the probes and explanations reviewed during)
training. Write any anecdotal information on the blank page attached to the end of the questionnaire—you should be recording everything said even if it does not seem related to the question itself).

(Note to interviewer: please use the following codes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>DON’T UNDERSTAND:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>REFUSED TO ANSWER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE TO RESPONDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>DON’T KNOW / DIFFICULT TO ANSWER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello. My name is _____________. The World Bank is working with the government of Sierra Leone to obtain new, statistically representative, data and information on issues related to the fishing sector. The information will be used in developing policy for this sector. Your address was one of several thousand chosen randomly to participate in this survey. I represent Statistics Sierra Leone who was contracted to do the interviews. We will keep your answers confidential so that no one will know what your answers were. The questions are asked in a standardized and structured manner. This ensures that all respondents understand and respond in the same way. If you still do not feel comfortable answering any question for any reason, we would prefer you to tell us you don’t want to answer it. Any questions? May I begin? Thank you.
SECTION 2: PERSPECTIVES ON THE FISHING SECTOR

GROUP A:
RESPONDENTS WORKING IN THE FISHING SECTOR AS FISHERS

F1. Do you work as a fisherman?
   1. Yes, fishing is my main job
   2. I spend equal amounts of time as a fisher and in doing other work
   3. I fish occasionally, and spend most of my time doing other work
   4. I only do other work (Don’t interview – resample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F2. During which months do you fish?</th>
<th>F3. During which months do you work in other activities?</th>
<th>F4. During which months do you catch the most fish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>All Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F5. Do you earn income from fishing as:
   1. As money
   2. In-kind (food, etc.) *(go to F7)*
   3. Money and in-kind

F6. Last month what was your income from fishing?________

F7. Which of the following other activities do you work in to earn a living?
   1. Small Scale Farming
   2. Small businesses (e.g. petty trading, hairdressing, cloth dying)
   3. Selling your labor to a firm or individual for income (e.g. stone crushing)
   4. None of these

F7a. Please specify what kind of work you do other than fishing.
   ____________________________

F8. Do you earn income from these other activities as:
   1. As money
   2. In-kind (food, etc.) *(go to F9)*
   3. Money and in-kind

F8a. Last month, what was your income from activities other than fishing? ______

F9. Why did you become a fisherman?
   1. My family are all fishermen
   2. I wanted to be a fisherman
   3. I did not have the education or training to do another job
   4. There was no other work available
   5. Other reason *(specify)*
F10. What type of fisherman are you?

1. On boat  2. On beach *(Go to F18)*

The next several (F11 – F17) questions are about your LAST fishing trip.

F11. What was/is the date of your last fishing trip *(DD/MM/YYYY)*?___________

F11a. On that trip, did the boat you worked on come in to shore:

1. At a port or harbor
2. At a landing site that has been constructed
3. On the beach
4. The boat does not come in to shore and remains out at sea
5. Other *(specify)*___________

F12. What work did you do on the boat?

1. Boat captain
2. Motor operator
3. Net worker or general crew member
4. Oar operator
5. Other *(specify)*___________

F13. How much money did you earn working on a fishing boat on that trip? *(specify amount)*___________

F14. How long did the trip last (in days)? ______________

F15. Did the boat you worked on transport the fish caught to another bigger ship?

1. Yes  2. No *(go to F17)*
F16. What was the nationality of this “bigger ship”?

1. Sierra Leone  2. Foreign country (specify if possible)  99. I don’t know

F17. During your last fishing trip, did you work for someone else or for yourself?

1. I worked for someone else
2. I worked for myself
3. My form of employment was different (specify) ______________

F18. How long have you been working as a fisherman (in years)? ______________

F18a. How many trips do you make each month during the high fishing season?________

F18b. How many trips do you make each month during the low fishing season?________

F19. Where do you fish? (Circle all that apply)

1. In areas close to your community
2. In areas away from your community but which you can reach and return from in one day
3. In Sierra Leone, but in areas which require that you stay away from your community for a number of days or weeks at a time
4. In other countries (specify) ______________

F20. Do any children (aged 17 or younger) living in your household work on fishing boats or do beach seining?
F21. Does working as a fisherman provide you with a good source of income?
1. Yes 2. No 3. No opinion

F22. How much money do you usually earn a week from fishing during the low or rainy season? (specify amount)____________

F22a. How much money do you usually earn a week from fishing during the high fishing season? (specify amount)___________

F23. Do you usually have to pay some of the money you earn each day to fish transporters or fish processors?
1. Yes
2. No (go to F25)
3. Not applicable (go to F25)

F24. What share of your daily earnings do you pay during low/rainy fishing season to fish transporters and processors? (Report percent paid.) ______________

F24a. What share of your daily earnings do you pay during the high fishing season to fish transporters and processors? (Report percent paid.)_____________

We now have a few questions (F25-F29) about what you caught during your LAST fishing trip.

F25. Did you work to catch a few specific species of fish and/or shellfish?
1. Yes
2. No, I fish for any type of species I can catch

<p>| Sierra Leone Local Name | F26. What types of fish and/or shellfish did you catch? | F27. What types of fish/shellfish did you not catch on your last trip that you use to catch regularly? | F28. What types of fish and/or shellfish do you catch most frequently? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(number all caught)</th>
<th>(number all caught)</th>
<th>(number all caught)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Barracuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bearbear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bonga, Awefu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bonita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Butterfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Catfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Crab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Crocus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Crupa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cuttlefish, Choco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Cowrehe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Flyfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Grouper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Gwangwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Herring, Mina, Sardine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Joefish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Kiortfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kondo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Kowrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Kuta, Keni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ladyfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Lagi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Langa-mina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Lobster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Longneck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fish or Shellfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Mackerel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Madame Smile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mixed assortment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Moko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Molite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Oyster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Pargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Rogie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Snapper (red)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Snapper (black)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Shark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Sheephead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Shine Mackerel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Shinenose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Skeete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Snail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Sole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Tenny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Threadfin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Other <em>(please specify)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F29. Over the past 3 years, have you changed the species of fish and/or shellfish that you catch?

1. Yes
2. No  (if No, go to F31)

F30. What has caused you to change the species of fish you catch?

1. It has become more difficult to catch the original species
2. The equipment and costs involved in catching the original species has become too expensive
3. The fish I catch now sell for a higher price than the fish I used to catch
4. Other (specify) ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishing Nets</th>
<th>F31. During the last fishing trip, which of the following nets did you use?</th>
<th>F32. Which methods do you use most frequently?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beach seine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bottom grill net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cast nets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Channel net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Couta net (or couta chain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. English net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hook and line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Long line (murrell)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mackerel net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mina net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Morel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Purse seine (Ring net, herring chain, bonga chain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pin chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Set net (legochain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shark fishing net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Two finger slack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Trap (for lobsters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F33. If you use nets, what type of nets do you use?

1. Monofilament / nylon  
2. Cotton  
3. Other (specify) 

F34. Do you work as a beach fisherman?

1. Yes  
2. No (if No, go to F39)

F35. How much money did you earn last week working as a beach fisherman? (specify amount) 

__________

F36. Does working as a beach fisherman provide you with a good source of income?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don’t Know

F37. Do you usually have to pay a fish transporter or fish processor each day?

1. Yes  
2. No (go to F39)

F38. What share of the money you earn in a day from beach fishing in the high fishing season do you usually pay to fish transporters or fish processors? (Report percent paid.) 

__________
F38a. What share of the money you earn in a day from beach fishing in the low/rainy fishing season do you usually pay to fish transporters or fish processors? (Report percent paid.)

F39. How has your work as a fisherman changed over the last 3 years?

1. The work has become easier
2. The work has become more difficult
3. The work has not changed
4. No opinion

F40. Do you think that working as a fisherman is a good occupation?

1. Yes
2. No
3. No opinion

F41. Do you think that fishing will be a good occupation for your children when they grow up?

1. Yes
2. No
3. No opinion

F42. Do you know about government laws and regulations on the fishing sector?

1. Yes
2. No (go to F45)

F43. How did you learn about these laws and regulations?

1. From the local government fisheries officer
2. From other fishermen
3. From the radio/TV
4. Newspaper
5. Other source (specify) ____________________
F44. Do you follow the laws and regulations established by the government?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Sometimes  
99. Don’t Know

F45. Have you ever been fined for not following the laws and regulations?

1. Yes  
2. No

F46. Do you think the government needs to pass more laws and do more to protect the fish and marine resources?

1. Yes  
2. No  
99. Don’t Know

F47. Do you think it would be a good idea if all fishing boats were registered with the government?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. No Opinion

F48. Do you think it would be a good idea for the government to limit the number of boats and fishermen fishing in the localities where you fish?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. No Opinion

F49. Do you think the government should enforce controls against boats and fishermen using illegal or harmful fishing gear?
1. Yes
2. No
3. No Opinion

F50. Do you think that the government should prohibit fishing in a few areas along the coast where important fish species go to reproduce?

1. Yes
2. No
3. No opinion

F51. Do you think the government should control foreigners fishing in Sierra Leone waters?

1. Yes
2. No
3. No opinion

F52. In the last 6 months, have you lost a fishing net because inshore trawlers caught them?

1. Yes
2. No

End of module. Go to closing or next interview in household.

SIERRA LEONE SURVEY ON FISHERIES ISSUES

RESPONDENTS WORKING IN THE FISHING SECTOR AS FISH PROCESSORS
(All instructions to the interviewer are in bold italics and are in parentheses. Please make sure to follow all instructions completely – including directions for screening for appropriate respondents in the household. We are interviewing a household member 18 years and older. Read all questions exactly as written and use only the probes and explanations reviewed during training. Write any anecdotal information on the blank page attached to the end of the questionnaire—you should be recording everything said even if it does not seem related to the question itself).
Hello. My name is _____________. The World Bank is working with the government of Sierra Leone to obtain new, statistically representative, data and information on issues related to the fishing sector. The information will be used in developing policy for this sector. Your address was one of several thousand chosen randomly to participate in this survey. I represent Statistics Sierra Leone who was contracted to do the interviews. We will keep your answers confidential so that no one will know what your answers were. The questions are asked in a standardized and structured manner. This ensures that all respondents understand and respond in the same way. If you still do not feel comfortable answering any question for any reason, we would prefer you to tell us you don’t want to answer it. Any questions? May I begin? Thank you.
GROUP B:

RESPONDENTS WORKING IN THE FISHING SECTOR AS FISH PROCESSORS

P1. Do you work as a fish and/or shellfish processor?

1. Yes
2. No *(If No, don’t interview, resample.)*

*(Interviewer: Only ask P2 if female.)*

P2. Are any male members in your household involved in the fishing sector?

1. Yes, my husband is
2. Yes, other male members (NOT husband) are
3. Yes, my husband and other male members are
4. No, no male members of my household are in the fishing industry.

P3. For how many years have you been working as a fish processor? *(Specify time in years)*

___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P4. During which months do you process fish?</th>
<th>P5. During which months do you work in other activities?</th>
<th>P6. During which months do you process the most fish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P7 Do you earn income processing as:

1. As money
2. In-kind (food, etc.) (go to P8)
3. Money and in-kind

P7a. Last month, what was your income from processing?______

P8. Which of the following other activities do you work in to earn a living?

1. Small Scale Farming
2. Small businesses (e.g. petty trading, hairdressing, cloth dying)
3. Selling your labor to a firm or individual for income (e.g. stone crushing)
4. None of these

P8a. Please specify what kind of work you do other than processing._____________________________

P9. Do you earn income from these other activities as:

1. As money
2. In-kind (food, etc.) (if only in-kind, go to P9a)
3. Money and in-kind

P9a. Last month, what was your income from activities other than processing?______
P10. Do any children (aged 17 or younger) living in your household work to process fish?

1. Yes  
2. No  
99. Don't Know

P11. Have you ever received formal training on how to process fish?

1. Yes  
2. No

Next, we will ask you a number of questions (P12 – P34) about the LAST time you processed fish.

P12. What was/is the date of your last fish processing event (DD/MM/YYYY)? _____________

P12a. Did you travel more than 3 miles from your village to get fish to process?

1. Yes  
2. No

P13. Where did you get the fish that you processed?

1. From fishers at a port or harbor
2. From fishers at a landing site
3. Directly from boats on the beach
4. Directly from beach fishermen on the beach
5. From fish transporters
6. From people selling them at the market
7. From family members
8. Other (specify) _____________

P14. What species of fish / shellfish did you process? (Circle all that apply.)

1. Barracuda  
2. Bearbear  
3. Bonga, Awefu Chima  
4. Bonita  
5. Butterfish  
6. Catfish

7. Crab  
8. Crocus  
9.  
10. Crupa  
11. Cuttlefish, Choco  
12. Cowreh  
13. Flyfish  
14. Grouper  
15. Gwangwa  
16. Herring, Mina, Sardine Kuta, Keni  
17. Ladyfish  
18. Kente

19. Kiortfish  
20. Kondo  
21. Kowrel, Longneck  
22. Mackerel  
23. Madame  
24. Lagni  
25. Langa-mina  
26. Lobster  
27.  
28.  
29.  
30. Mixed assortment

31. Moko  
32. Molite  
33. Oyster, Snapper  
34. Pargo  
35. Pollock  
36. Pump

37. Rogie  
38. Snapper  
39.  
40. Shark  
41. Sheephead  
42. Shine
P15. How many fresh fish did you process? (Circle all that apply)

1. Dozens of medium size fish
2. Bowls/Pans of small fish (herring, etc.)
3. Number of large fish (shark, etc.)
4. Kilo of large fish

P16. Did you buy the fish you processed?

1. Yes, I bought them from people in my family
2. Yes, I bought them from people outside my family
3. No, I got them free from family members (go to P19)
4. No, I got them free from other people who pay me to process them (go to P19)

P17. How did you pay for the fish you bought to process?

1. I paid the full amount in cash when I get them
2. I made some of the payment for the fish in cash immediately, and made the rest of the payment in cash later
3. I paid cash for the fish once I processed and sold them
4. I paid for the fish once I processed and sold them, partly in cash and partly in-kind
5. Other (specify) __________________________

P18. Approximately how much did you pay for the fish (specify amount) _________

1. Per dozen of medium fish
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish
3. Per large fish
4. Per kilo of large fish

P19. How did you transport the fish you bought to the place where you process them?

1. I carried them myself (go to P21)
2. Family members helped me to carry them (go to P21)
3. I paid someone/fish transporter to carry them
4. Other (specify) __________________________

(Interviewer: If paid transporter to carry, ask next question, else go to P21.)
P20. Approximately how much did you pay someone/fish transporter in the high season to carry fish to the place where you process them? *(specify amount for every applicable batch of fish)*

1. Per dozen of medium fish________ 
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish______ 
3. Per large fish______ 
4. Per kilo of large fish _______

P20a. Approximately how much did you pay someone/fish transporter in the high season to carry fish to the place where you process them? *(specify amount for every applicable batch of fish)*

1. Per dozen of medium fish________ 
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish______ 
3. Per large fish______ 
4. Per kilo of large fish _______

P21. Where did you process the fish?

1. At my home 
2. At a group processing site in my village 
3. At an informal location on the beach which most processors use 
4. At a formal fish processing site where facilities have been constructed 
5. Other *(specify)*_____________

P22. Who cleaned and prepared the fish for processing?

1. I prepared them all myself *(go to P24)*
2. Other family members helped me to prepare them *(go to P24)*
3. I paid other family members to prepare them 
4. I paid someone outside the family to prepare them 
5. Other *(specify) *(go to P24)*_________

*(Interviewer: Ask next question if pay someone to prepare:)*

P23. Approximately how much did you pay someone else to prepare the fish *(specify amount per applicable batch)*

1. Per dozen of medium fish________ 
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish______ 
3. Per large fish______ 
4. Per kilo of large fish _______
P24. What did you do with the scales and refuse from the fish prepared for processing?

1. Threw it away
2. Used it for cooking
3. Used it for fertilizer for agriculture
4. Other (specify) _______________________

P25. How did you process your fish for selling?

1. I only smoked it
2. I only dried it (go to P28)
3. I smoked some fish and dried some fish
4. Other (specify) (go to P28)________________

P26. What fuel did you MAINLY use to smoke your fish?

1. Wood, mainly from mangrove trees that I cut or buy cut
2. Wood from other trees that I cut or buy cut
3. Fallen branches and sticks from trees that I collect or buy
4. Straw and other material that I collect or buy
5. Other (specify)________________

P27. If you bought fuel to smoke your fish, approximately how much did you need to pay to smoke each applicable batch of fish?

1. Per dozen of medium fish________
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish_____
3. Per large fish_______
4. Per kilo of large fish _________

(If only smoked fish, go to P30.)

P28. Did you use salt to dry your fish?

1. Yes
2. No (go to P30)
P29. Approximately how much did you spend on salt to dry each applicable batch of fish?

1. Per dozen of medium fish ______
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish ______
3. Per large fish ______
4. Per kilo of large fish ______
5. Nothing, I or my family collected the salt

P30. Did you, or the people who process the fish for you, lose fish because they went bad while they were being processed?

1. Yes, quite a lot
2. Yes, a little
3. No (go to P32)

P31. Approximately how much fish did you lose when you tried to sell the fish because they went bad while being processed?

1. Almost none of what we processed and tried to sell
2. Less than ¼ of what we processed and tried to sell
3. Between ¼ and ½ of the fish we processed and tried to sell
4. More than ½ of what we processed and tried to sell

P32. What did you mainly do with the fish you processed?

1. The family ate it all (go to P34)
2. I sold it to people in my community
3. I exchanged it for some other goods or services (go to P34)
4. I sold it in other villages and towns
5. I sold it to fish traders
6. I sold it in other countries
7. Other (specify) ______

P33. For approximately how much did you sell each applicable batch of your best processed fish? (specify monetary amount)

1. Per dozen of medium fish ______
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish ______
3. Per large fish ______
4. Per kilo of large fish ______
P34. Has it becomes harder and/or more expensive to get fuel to smoke your fish over the last 3 years?

1. Yes, a lot
2. Yes, a little
3. No, no change
4. Don’t Know

End of module. Go to closing or next interview in household.
**SIERRA LEONE SURVEY ON FISHERIES ISSUES**

**RESPONDENTS WORKING IN THE FISHING SECTOR AS FISH TRANSPORTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiefdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Name: …………………………</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban (Rural=1, Urban=2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of residence:**
- Apartment
- Free standing house or villa
- Row house
- Number of separate cottages/huts clustered together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewers code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time at start of interview | Time at end of interview |  |
Hello. My name is _____________. The World Bank is working with the government of Sierra Leone to obtain new, statistically representative, data and information on issues related to the fishing sector. The information will be used in developing policy for this sector. Your address was one of several thousand chosen randomly to participate in this survey. I represent Statistics Sierra Leone who was contracted to do the interviews. We will keep your answers confidential so that no one will know what your answers were. The questions are asked in a standardized and structured manner. This ensures that all respondents understand and respond in the same way. If you still do not feel comfortable answering any question for any reason, we would prefer you to tell us you don’t want to answer it. Any questions? May I begin? Thank you.
**SECTION 2: PERSPECTIVES ON THE FISHING SECTOR**

**GROUP C: RESPONDENTS WORKING IN THE FISHING SECTOR AS FISH TRANSPORTERS**

T1. Do you work as a fish transporter?
   1. Yes
   2. No *(Conclude. Resample.)*

T2. For how long have you been working as a fish transporter? __________ years. *(If less than one year please specify months or weeks as applicable)_____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T3. During which months do you transport fish?</th>
<th>T4. During which months do you work in other activities?</th>
<th>T5. During which months do you transport the most fish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T6. Do you earn income from transporting fish as:

1. As money
2. In-kind (food, etc.) (go to T7)
3. Money and in-kind

T6a. Last month, what was your income from transporting?____-

T7. Which of the following other activities do you work in to earn a living?

1. Small Scale Farming
2. Small businesses (e.g. petty trading, hairdressing, cloth dying)
3. Selling your labor to a firm or individual for income (e.g. stone crushing)
4. None of these

T7a. Please specify what kind of work you do other than transporting fish.
______________________________

T8. Do you earn income from these other activities as:

1. Money
2. In-kind (food, etc.) (go to T9)
3. Money and in-kind

T8a. Last month, what was your income from activities other than transporting?______
Next, we will ask you a number of questions (T9 – T17) about the LAST time you transported fish.

T9. Please tell me the date you last transported fish (DD/MM/YYYY). ___________

T9a. Did you transport fish only within the village where you live?
   1. Yes
   2. No

T10. Where did you get the fish that you transport? (Circle all that apply)
   1. Directly from fishing boats at a port or harbor
   2. Directly from fishers at a landing site
   3. Directly from boats on the beach
   4. Directly from beach fishermen on the beach
   5. Directly from fish processors
   6. From people selling fresh fish at the market
   7. From people selling processed fish at the market
   8. From family members
   9. Other (specify) __________________________

T11. If you transported fish between villages, what was the furthest distance you traveled to transport fish?
   1. Less than 3 miles
   2. Between 3 and 10 miles
   3. Between 10 and 25 miles
   4. More than 25 miles, but within Sierra Leone
   5. To other countries

T12. What were the main species of fish and/or shellfish that you transported (check 5 main species)
   1. Barracuda
   2. Bearbear
   3. Bonga, Awefu, Chima
   4. Bonita
   5. Butterfish
   6. Catfish
   7. Crab
   8. Crocus
   9. Choco
   10. Crupa
   11. Cuttlefish, Choco, Joefish
   12. Cowreh
   13. Flyfish
   14. Grouper
   15. Gwangwa
   16. Herring, Mina, Sardine
   17. Kente
   18. Kiortfish
   19. Kondo
   20. Kowrel
   21. Kuta, Keni
   22. Ladyfish
   23. Laki
T13. How did you carry the fish that you transported?

1. I carried them by hand
2. I carried them by bicycle
3. I carried them in a cart which is pulled by myself
4. I carried them in my own boat
5. I carried them in a rented bus
6. I carried them in a rented boat
7. I carried them in my own car/truck
8. I carried them in a rented car/truck
9. Other (please specify) __________

We are still talking about the last time that you transported fish.

T14. How many batches of applicable fresh fish did you transport?

1. Per dozen of medium fish __________
2. Per pan/bowl of small fish __________
3. Per large fish __________
4. Per kilo of large fish __________

T15. How many applicable batches of processed fish did you transport?

1. Small weave baskets ______
2. Large weave baskets ______
3. Standard box __________
4. Basket/bag ______

T16. If you own a car/truck/boat, how much did you purchase your car/truck for?

1. Car/truck/boat #1 __________
2. Car/truck/boat #2 __________
3. Car/truck/boat #3 __________

T17. If you own a car/truck/boat, how many dozen fish can you transport on each journey?

T18. If you own a car/truck, how many dozens of fish can you transport?

1. Each day (specify #)__________
2. Each week (specify #)__________

T19. Do you buy the fish that you transport?

1. Yes, I buy them
2. No, I don’t buy them -- people simply pay me to transport them (go to T21)

T20. How do you usually pay for the fish that you buy?

1. I pay the full amount in cash when I get the fish
2. I make some of the payment for the fish in cash immediately, and then make the rest of the payment in cash sometime later
3. I pay cash for the fish once I’ve transported and sold them
4. I pay for the fish once I’ve transported and sold them, partly in cash and partly in-kind
5. Other (specify) ________________

DURING THE LAST TIME YOU TRANSPORTED FISH,

T21. How much were you paid each batch of fresh applicable fish you transported?

1. Dozens of medium size fish________
2. Pans/bowl of small fish___________
3. Number of big fish________________
4. Kilo of big fish__________________

T22. For how much did you sell each batch of applicable processed fish?

1. Small weave baskets_________
2. Large weave baskets___________
3. Standard box_________________
4. Basket/bag
5. I don’t sell, I only transport
6. Other *(please specify)*

End of module. Go to closing or next interview in household.
### SIERRA LEONE SURVEY ON FISHERIES ISSUES

#### GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE HOUSEHOLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiefdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Name: …………………………</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural/Urban (Rural=1, Urban=2)**

**Household ID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of residence:</th>
<th>Date of interview:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Supervisor’s code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free standing house or villa</td>
<td>Interviewers code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of separate cottages/huts clustered together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time at start of interview**

**Time at end of interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Respondent ID</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(All instructions to the interviewer are in bold italics and are in parentheses. Please make sure to follow all instructions completely – including directions for screening for appropriate respondents in the household. We are interviewing a household member 18
Hello. My name is ____________. The World Bank is working with the government of Sierra Leone to obtain new, statistically representative, data and information on issues related to the fishing sector. The information will be used in developing policy for this sector. Your address was one of several thousand chosen randomly to participate in this survey. I represent Statistics Sierra Leone who was contracted to do the interviews. We will keep your answers confidential so that no one will know what your answers were. The questions are asked in a standardized and structured manner. This ensures that all respondents understand and respond in the same way. If you still do not feel comfortable answering any question for any reason, we would prefer you to tell us you don’t want to answer it. Any questions? May I begin? Thank you.

Screener Questionnaire

S1. How many persons age 18 and older live in this household most of the time as a primary residence? ____________

(If fishing sample ask the following):

S2. Of the people at least age 18 and regularly living in this household, how many work in the fishing industry as either fisherman, fish processors, or fish transporters? ____________

S3. How many work primarily as fishermen? ________

S4. How many work primarily as fish processors? ________

S5. How many work primarily as fish transporters? ________
We’d like to conduct X interviews (one with a fisherman, processor and transporter, if available.). We will start with some questions about your household and then would like to talk with a fisherman/processor/transporter.

(If no fisherman, processors, or transporters in household, say thank you and go to next sampled household.)

(If non-fishing sample say the following):

We’d like to conduct 1 (or 2 if more than 4 adults) interviews. We will start with some questions about your household and then would like to talk with one (or two) person(s) in more detail.
### SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE HOUSEHOLD

*(Household portion of interview is conducted with head or another knowledgeable adult.)*

**Section 1.A. Household questions**

#### HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>H1a. Person name (list head first)</th>
<th>H1b. What is their status in household (1 = regular resident, 2 = non-regular resident)</th>
<th>H1c. What is their sex? (1 = male, 2 = female)</th>
<th>H1d. What is their completed age? <em>(Note YYYY/MM)</em></th>
<th>H1e. What is the highest level of school attained? (0 = none, 1 = primary, 2 = secondary, 3 = tertiary)</th>
<th>H1f. Were they employed last week (1 = Y, 2 = N)</th>
<th>H1g. Does__ Work mostly as a fisher, processor or transporter? (1 = fisherman, 2 = processor, 3 = transporter, 0 = none)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CONSUMPTION OF FISH & SHELLFISH PRODUCTS IN HOUSEHOLD**

H2. Does this household eat fish and/or shellfish?

1. Yes, both fish and shellfish
2. Yes, fish
3. Yes, shellfish
4. No *(if No, go to H7)*
(Questions 2 through 4 should be asked separately for fish and shellfish and recorded in the table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Shellfish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3. How many times was fish and/or shellfish served and eaten during the last seven days?</td>
<td>(Indicate number in columns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Where do household members mainly get the fish or shellfish?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Household members catch it (go to H6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Buy it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other (specify) (record letter/answers in columns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5. If bought, where is it bought from?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Open market (Formal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fish transporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fish processors/transformers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Directly from the fishing boats(Wharf) (record letters/answer in columns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H6. What are the 3 main species of fish and/or shellfish that are currently eaten in your household?

H7. Has the quantity of fish and/or shellfish consumed by this household changed over the past 3 years?

1. No, no change (go to H9)  
2. Yes, we eat more fish  
3. Yes, we eat more fish and shellfish  
4. Yes, we eat less fish and shellfish  
5. Yes, we eat more shellfish  
6. Yes, we eat less fish  
7. Yes, we eat less shellfish  
99. Don’t know

H8. What has caused a change in the quantity of fish and/or shellfish that is consumed by the household?

1. Harder or easier to get the fish or shellfish  
2. Costs more or less to buy the fish or shellfish  
3. Other reason (specify) ____________________________

(Skip to H12 if respondent is not eating fish/shellfish now and/or over the past three years.)

H9. Have your household changed the types/species of fish and/or shellfish that is eaten over the past 3 years?

1. Yes  
2. No (go to H12)  
99. Don’t Know (go to H12)

H10. What has caused your household to stop consuming the previous types/species of fish and/or shellfish that were eaten over the past three years?

1. Harder to get the previous fish or shellfish  
2. The previous fish or shellfish is now too expensive for us to buy  
3. We no longer see the fish or shellfish in the market  
4. Other reason (specify) ____________________________
H11. What three types/species of fish and/or shellfish you eat most frequently three years ago?

1. Barracuda  
2. Bearbear  
3. Bonga, Awefu Chima  
4. Bonita  
5. Butterfish  
6. Catfish  
7. Crab  
8. Crocus  
9. Chima  
10. Crupa  
11. Cuttlefish, Choco Joefish  
12. Cowreht  
13. Flyfish  
14. Grouper  
15. Gwangwa  
16. Herring, Mina, Sardine Kuta, Keni Mackerel  
17. Joefish  
18. Kente  
19. Kiortfish  
20. Kondo  
21. Kowrel  
22. Longneck  
23. Ladyfish  
24. Laki  
25. Langa-mina  
26. Lobster  
27. Longneck  
28. Mackerel  
29. Madame Smile  
30. Mixed assortment  
31. Moko  
32. Molite  
33. Oyster Snapper (red)  
34. Pargo  
35. Pollock  
36. Pump  
37. Rogie  
38. Snapper (black)  
39. Skeete  
40. Shark  
41. Sheephead  
42. Shine Mackerel  
43. Shinenose  
44. Shrimp  
45. Skeete  
46. Snail  
47. Sole  
48. Spanish  
49. Tenny  
50. Threadfin  
51. Whiting  
52. Other (please specify)__  

H12. Does someone in your household own a fishing boat or boats either fully or partly?

1. Yes  
2. No (go to H33)

H13. How many boats are owned by the household either fully or partly? ________

H13a. Did you pay any money to register your boat(s)?

1. Yes  
2. Yes, all the boats that we own.  
3. Yes, some of the boats that we own  
4. No (go to H14)

H13b. How much did you pay to register the boat(s)?

1. Boat # 1__________  
2. Boat# 2__________  
3. Boat# 3__________  
4. Boat # 4__________  
5. Boat # 5__________
(Use a row in the table for each boat owned by the household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kru canoe (dug-out canoe)</td>
<td>1. 1-3 persons</td>
<td>1. if motor</td>
<td>88. Not applicable</td>
<td>88. Not applicable</td>
<td>1. boat owned jointly by full household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana boat</td>
<td>2. 3-5 persons</td>
<td>2. if non-motor (go to H20)</td>
<td>99. Don’t know</td>
<td>99. Don’t know</td>
<td>2. owned by few members of the household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard d. Bonga Canoe (yele fu)</td>
<td>3. 5 – 10 persons</td>
<td>3. Standard d. Bonga Canoe (yele fu)</td>
<td>3. Owned jointly by persons in the household and outside the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I own it</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I own it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Owned by one person in the household (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Owned by one person in the household (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H21. On average, how much did the household pay for the boats?

1. Specify amount: 
2. Nothing – we made it/them ourselves (go to H23)
3. Nothing – it was given to us (go to H23)
99. Don’t know
H22. For the last boat/s you bought, how did the household finance the purchase?

1. A household member bought it with his/her own money, in cash
2. We borrowed money from a Bank or microcredit agency or donor-funded project to buy the boat
3. Family members contributed money to help buy the boat/s
4. People outside my family contributed money to help buy the boat/s
5. The boat/s were paid for in part and the household/individual is continuing to pay for it in cash
6. We contributed cash and borrowed money from a bank or microcredit agency or donor-funded project to buy the boat.
7. Borrowed money from private individual
8. Other means *(specify)*

H23. How long do you expect the boats you own to usually remain in service?

1. Less than 1 year
2. 1 – 2 years
3. 3 – 5 years
4. 6 – 10 years
5. 11 – 20 years
6. Longer than 20 years

H24. Approximately how much do you spend each year fixing and maintaining a single boat?

1. Specify amount: ___________
2. I trade catch for the repairs
3. Nothing – I don’t maintain them
4. Nothing – the boat is new
5. Don’t know

*(If boat does not have motor go to H28)*

H25. On average, how much did you pay for the motors?
1. Specify amount: ___________  3. Nothing – we did not pay for it/them
2. I traded catch for the motors  99. Don’t know

H26. Approximately how much do you spend each year to fix or maintain a single motor?

1. Specify amount: ___________  3. I trade catch for repairs
2. Nothing – I don’t maintain them  4. Nothing – the motor is new
99. Don’t know

H27. How long do you usually manage to keep a motor working effectively?

1. Less than 1 year  5. 11 – 20 years
2. 1 – 2 years  6. Longer than 20 years
3. 3 – 5 years  7. The motor is new
4. 6 – 10 years

(We next ask about any boats owned and used by the household)

H28. How many of the boats owned by the household are used by the household?

__________

(If household members do not use any of the boats that they own, go to H31)

H29. Does your household, or someone in your household, hire fishing crew (boat captain, person to manage the motor, fishers)?

1. Yes
2. No (go to H31)
H30. On average how many crew members do they hire? ______________

(We next ask about any boats owned by the household and used by someone else.)

H31. How many boats owned by the household are used by someone outside of the household? ___

(If none of the boats owned by the household are used by someone else, go to H33)

H32. How does your household get payment from other people using its boat/s?
   1. Get paid a flat amount each month for rent
   2. Get paid for the boat with a proportion of the catch each day
   3. Other, please specify____________
   99. Don’t know

(We next ask about any boats that are rented or borrowed by the household)

H33. Do any members of the household use fishing boats that belong to someone else?
   1. Yes
   2. No (go to H37)

H34. How many boats does the household use now that belong to someone else? __________

H35. How many boats of each type that belong to someone else are used by the household?
   (Fill in numbers as appropriate. Circle the type(s) of boat and indicate the number if more than one boat of each type)
H36. How does your household pay for the use of someone else’s fishing boats?

1. Pay a flat amount each month for rent
2. Pay for the boat with a proportion of the catch each day
3. Other, please specify
99. Don’t know

H37. Do you or members of your family own fishing equipment such as nets, lines, scuba equipment, etc.?

1. Yes, we own all the fishing equipment we use
2. Yes, we own some of the fishing equipment we use and rent the rest
3. No, we do not own any fishing equipment and rent it all
4. No, we do not own any fishing equipment and do not rent it (Go to H45)
99. Don’t know

(The questions in the table should be answered for each type of net used by household members.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H38. How many of these nets of each type are used by members of the household? (report numbers)</th>
<th>H39. How many are owned? 1 = owned 2 = non owned</th>
<th>If owned: H40. On average, how much did you pay for the nets you own?</th>
<th>If owned: H41. On average, how old are the nets that you own?</th>
<th>H42. How long does this type of net usually remain in service or in your possession? (specify in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beach seine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bottom grill net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cast nets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Channel net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Couta net (or couta chain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hook and line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Long line (murrell)  
8. Mackerel net  
9. Mina net  
10. Purse seine (Ring net, herring chain, bonga chain)  
11. Set net (legochain)  
12. Shark fishing net  
13. Trap (for lobsters)  
14. Yelefufu net  
15. English net  
16. Two finger slack  
17. Monofilament  
99. Don’t know  

H43. How did you obtain the net that you obtained most recently?

1. I bought it myself with my own money  
2. I paid some of the cost of the net in cash to the person selling the net and I’m continuing to pay that person when I have money available.  
3. We borrowed money from a bank or microcredit agency or donor-funded project to buy the net  
4. Family members contributed money to help buy the net  
5. People outside my family contributed money to help buy the net  
6. Government provided the net  
7. Donor agency or nongovernmental organization provided the net  
8. I am a member of a cooperative from which I borrowed money  
9. My spouse bought it,  

H44. What type of other fishing equipment is owned or rented by you or members of your household? (Circle all letters that apply)
1. Scuba diving equipment with tanks/bottles
2. Diving mask and snorkel
3. Lights for night fishing
4. GPS for boat
5. Boat radio
6. Life jackets for boat
7. Drift chain
8. Others (please specify)________
9. None
99. Don’t know

H45. Are there, or were there once, mangrove forests around your community?

1. Yes, there are or were mangrove forests
2. No, there are no mangrove forests (go to H50)
99. Don’t know (go to H50)

H46. Has the mangrove area been reduced in size over the last 3 years?

1. Yes
2. No (go to H50)
99. Don’t know (go to H50)

H47. What do you think has caused this reduction in the size of mangrove forest?

1. Wood used for building
2. Wood used for burning or smoking
3. Wood used for charcoal
4. Land used for farming

H48. Do you think that the removal of the mangroves has been a problem for the community?

1. Yes
2. No (go to H50)

H49. If yes, what do you think the problems are? (Circle all that apply. Do not read the options to respondents. Check answer(s) that best approximates or write down what they say.)

1. Loss of a place where fish can reproduce
2. Has meant that some fish species can no longer be found in the area
3. Loss of a place where oysters grow
4. Land around the mangroves is no longer good for agriculture
5. Loss of fuel wood source
6. Other (specify) _______________________

HOUSEHOLD POSSESSIONS

We would now like to ask you some questions regarding the physical structure of your house and household consumption.

H50. What is the number of rooms/huts occupied by the household? (Please include rooms/huts use for sleeping and any other purpose)

1. If rooms: _______________
2. If huts: _______________

H51. What is the main composition of the walls?

3. Clay bricks 7. Mud bricks 11. Other (specify) _______________________
4. Sandcrete 8. Poles/reed

H52. What is the main composition of the roof?

1. Concrete 5. Tarpaulin
2. Asbestos 6. Tiles
3. Zinc 7. Other (specify) _______________________
4. Sandcrete 8. Poles/reed
5. Zinc 9. Tarpaulin
6. Tiles 10. Mud & wattle
7. Other (specify) _______________________
8. Poles/reed 11. Other (specify) _______________________
4. Thatch

H53. What is the main composition of the floors?

1. Stone
2. Tiles
3. Cement
4. Wood
5. Mud
6. Mud & Cement
7. Other (specify) ______________

H54. What is the main type of lighting used?

1. Electricity through national grid
2. Electricity through generator
3. Candles
4. Kerosene
5. Wood
6. Oil
7. Battery
8. Solar
9. Other (specify) ______________

H55. What is your main source of water?

1. Taps/running water in the house or yard
2. Running water/taps outside the house and yard
3. Manual pump in house or yard
4. Manual pump outside the house or yard
5. Stream or river
6. Protected ordinary well
7. Unprotected ordinary well
8. Mechanical well
9. Water vendor/bowser
10. Other (specify) ______________

H56. How do you currently dispose of your solid waste/rubbish? (Circle main method only)

1. Public collection
2. Drop at public dump
3. Burn it in yard
4. Drop it in open land/sea/river away from house
5. No means of removal
6. Other (specify) ______________

H57. What type of Toilet/WC do you have?

1. Household toilet connected to sewage system
2. Communal toilet connected to sewage system
3. Pit latrine in yard
4. Communal pit latrine
5. Use the bush/open land
6. Use the river bed
7. Other (specify) ______________
H58. What type of fuel is mainly used by the household for cooking etc.?

1. Electricity
2. Kerosene or diesel products
3. Gas
4. Charcoal
5. Coal
6. Wood
7. Other (specify) ______________

H59. What is the ownership status of the house/dwelling?

1. Full ownership
2. Employer provided
3. Tenant/renter
4. Free housing, no title, on community owned land
5. Other (specify) ______________

H60. Does the household possess any of the following items? (Circle all that apply)

1. Car
2. Motorbike/scooter
3. Bicycle
4. Cart [omolanke]
5. Television
6. Tape recorder or Hi Fi system
7. Radio
8. Computer
9. Mobile phone
10. Refrigerator
11. Electric or gas stove
12. Generator
13. Electric fans
14. Land phone
15. Electric iron
16. None

Thank you very much for your participation.

C1. Would you like to know the results of this survey?

1. Yes
2. No

C2. If Yes, how would you like to receive the information?

1. At a community meeting
2. On the radio
3. In the newspaper
4. Another way (specify) ______________
ANNEX C:

VILLAGE SELECTION CRITERIA TEMPLATE
AND METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

(GirMAC, Senegal)
# PROGRAMME DE GESTION INTÉGRÉE DES RESSOURCES MARINES ET CÔTIÈRES

## ATELIER DE SELECTION DES SITES PILOTES

Fiche de cotation des sites pilotes

Nom du site : Zone d’intervention :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base d’évaluation</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>coeff.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critère I : Proximité de stocks démersaux principalement exploités par la communauté</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Importance ressource démersale côtière et sédentaire exploitée (potentialités, diversité…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Importance de l’exploitation de la ressource démersale côtière et sédentaire pour la communauté locale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Etat de dégradation de la ressource démersale côtière</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sédentarité des pêcheurs du site (dépendance au site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Importance des menaces et des facteurs de dégradation des ressources halieutiques locales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critère II : Marques d’intérêt de la communauté à mettre en œuvre des initiatives locales de cogestion pour ces ressources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Existence d’initiatives locales passées, récentes ou en cours de gestion des ressources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Force du lien communautaire (cohésion, …)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critère III : Bénéfices escomptés par la communauté dans la mise en place d’initiatives locales de cogestion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Prise de conscience de l’importance de l’augmentation attendue des revenus au niveau individuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Prise de conscience de l’importance de l’augmentation attendue des revenus au niveau de la collectivité</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critère IV : Nature et étendue des risques liés aux initiatives de cogestion locale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Risques de conflits entre différents métiers de la pêche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Risques de conflits entre autochtones et allochtones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Risques pour l’organisation sociale locale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critère V : Caractère structurant du site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Appartenance à un CLPA fonctionnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Notes :

Critères I, II, III et V (éléments 1 à 9 et 13) :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Échelle</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très fort</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Très faible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critère IV (éléments 10 à 12) :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Échelle</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très fort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Très faible</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note méthodologique sur l’identification des sites-pilotes pour la promotion des initiatives locales de cogestion des pêcheries artisanales
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Introduction

Le Programme de gestion intégrée des ressources marines et côtières (GIRMaC) va concentrer ses efforts dans des zones pilotes afin d’atteindre le double objectif (i) d’améliorer la gestion durable des ressources marines et côtières par les communautés et le Gouvernement du Sénégal, la gestion durable impliquant à la fois, l’exploitation responsable des ressources et la protection des écosystèmes et des processus écologiques critiques pour leur régénération, (ii) de promouvoir la conservation et la gestion des écosystèmes marins et côtiers, qui influencent d’une manière significative la durabilité des conditions d’existence des communautés vivant dans les zones côtières du Sénégal.

Les trois (3) zones pilotes d’intervention du Programme (le Delta du fleuve Sénégal, la presqu’île du Cap Vert - étendue au sud de la région maritime de Thiès - et le Delta du Saloum) ont ainsi été choisies sur la base des critères suivants:

- Elles constituent des écosystèmes critiques eu égard aux espèces endémiques ou menacées ;
- Elles sont habitées par des communautés de pêcheurs qui ont une forte identité culturelle et qui sont fortement engagées dans la gestion durable des ressources marines et côtières ;
- Elles renferment les aires protégées existant sur le littoral.

Pour la gestion durable des pêcheries à l’échelle locale, le programme vise à promouvoir la cogestion des ressources démersales dans 12 sites-pilotes répartis dans les trois zones-pilotes d’intervention du Programme sur la base des initiatives des communautés de pêcheurs.

Dans les zones pilotes, les efforts de gestion durable des pêcheries porteront notamment sur la promotion et la coordination des initiatives locales de cogestion des ressources démersales côtières dans 12 sites-pilotes. La première phase-test portera sur quatre (4) sites-pilotes initiaux et sera supportée, au plan institutionnel, par des communautés de pêcheurs organisées en comités locaux (CLP) et les conseils locaux de pêche artisanale (CLPA).

L’identification des sites-pilotes, selon une démarche appropriée et des critères pertinents, constitue ainsi une étape-clé du processus de mise en œuvre d’un système de cogestion locale des pêcheries.

Critères de sélection des sites-pilotes

Pré-sélection de sites : Compte tenu de la multitude de sites de pêche, le processus opérationnel de sélection ne pourra porter que sur une liste restreinte de sites potentiels où les communautés peuvent mettre en œuvre avec succès des initiatives locales de cogestion. Le choix des sites d’intervention doit prendre en compte les aspects d’ordre bio-écologique (état de la ressource et des habitats, etc).

Des études réalisées dans le cadre du programme ont permis de sélectionner des « sites principaux » c’est-à-dire où l’activité de pêche est plus ou moins présente du point de vue du nombre de pirogues originaires ou de l’importance des débarquements (nombre de pirogues présentes) qui constituent les bases de sorties de la quasi-totalité des unités de pêche artisanale sénégalaises mais également où l’espace maritime adjacent constitue un enjeu pour les populations.
Partant des objectifs du programme, des « sites prioritaires » ont été choisis en prenant comme critères l'importance de la richesse des éléments bio-écologiques des espaces halieutiques adjacents aux sites principaux composant chacune des régions maritimes, le niveau des menaces qui pèsent sur ces espaces et les spécificités socioéconomiques de chacun des sites. D'une manière plus détaillée, partant du diagnostic de l'état actuel de l'environnement bio-écologique des espaces adjacents à chacun des « sites principaux » et de leur structuration socioéconomique, le choix des sites prioritaires s’est fondé sur les critères suivants :

- Importance des ressources halieutiques sur les espaces adjacents ;
- Permanence des activités de pêche dans le centre ;
- Niveau de pression sur les espaces (nombre d'unité en présence dans les eaux adjacentes : autochtones/allochtones) ;
- Importance des activités dans le site (Nombre de pirogues présentes sur le site, débarquement, système de valorisation) ;
- Existence ou non de formes de cogestion locale (Modèle exemplaire et/ou appropriation de l’espace).
- Le type de milieu (estuarien ou maritime)

Dans les deux zones pilotes concernées du GIRMaC, 12 sites prioritaires ont été sélectionnés dont 5 dans le Delta du Saloum et 7 au Cap Vert.

Une réunion élargie aux services régionaux et départementaux des pêches a permis de retenir, sur la base d'une évaluation rapide des critères de sélection du GIRMaC de sélectionner 22 sites pilotes potentiels dont 10 dans le Delta du Saloum et 12 au Cap Vert (y compris Thiès Sud). La liste des sites potentiels est indiquée en annexe.

**Sélection des sites pilotes** : Les 4 sites pilotes initiaux sont ensuite sélectionnés à partir des 22 sites potentiels et classés selon les critères suivants :

(i) La proximité de stocks démersaux principalement exploités par la communauté ;
(ii) Un fort désir de la communauté de mettre en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion locale pour ces ressources ;
(iii) Les bénéfices escomptés des initiatives de cogestion locale ;
(iv) Les risques potentiels associés aux initiatives de cogestion locale.

D'autres critères non moins importants seront également pris en compte lors du choix définitif des sites pilotes. Ils sont liés aux infrastructures, biens et services publics de base (réserve foncière, eau, électricité, téléphone, services gouvernementaux (poste de pêche, station de surveillance, service de sécurité, ...), etc) qui sont importants pour la mise en œuvre des mesures d’accompagnement prévues dans chaque site-pilote (Maison du pêcheur, affectation de facilitateurs, etc). Il sera également tenu compte du Conseil Local de pêche artisanale (CLPA) d’appartenance du site-pilote ainsi que de son accessibilité.

**Principes méthodologiques**

La sélection des sites-pilotes d'intervention sera réalisée sur la base d'une évaluation rapide qui permet de collecter auprès des communautés, et sur une période relativement limitée, des informations pertinentes sur les sites potentiels. Celles-ci seront utilisées pour la sélection des sites-pilotes de mise en œuvre de la composante « gestion durable des pêcheries » tout comme pour l’identification des objectifs de gestion.
Méthodologie de sélection :

L'approche méthodologique du processus de sélection est articulée sur plusieurs entrées principales : biologique (ressources adjacentes), socio-politique (volonté de décider et d’agir en commun), socio-économique et culturelle (bénéfices escomptés de la cogestion locale) et sociale (minimiser les risques de conflits).

Détermination des cibles :

Les acteurs à cibler seront constitués en majorité de pêcheurs, particulièrement ceux encore en activité. Il est tout aussi nécessaire de viser les acteurs impliqués dans les activités socio-économiques en relation avec l’exploitation et l’utilisation des ressources halieutiques (propriétaires de pirogues, mareyeurs, transformatrices, etc), y inclus les activités de cueillette. Les piliers des principaux métiers des pêcheries locales (démersales en particulier) ainsi que des leaders locaux (chefs de villages, élus, notables...) sont également importants.

Principes d’entretien :

Les entretiens avec les communautés se dérouleront selon une approche semi-structurée et sur la base de questions-clés indicatives des critères pré-définis (cf. guide d’entretien, en annexe). La présence des personnes-leaders en matière de prise de décision au niveau local est importante même si le principe-clé de ce type de consultations reste la liberté de l’expression individuelle et la construction de consensus. La participation active et la capitalisation de l’expertise et de l’expérience des acteurs (sur leur terroir et les ressources adjacentes) en dépendent. L’entretien doit en effet permettre de mettre en évidence les diverses perceptions et représentations que se font les acteurs concernés de leurs ressources adjacentes ainsi que des modèles de gestion qui leur semblent les plus appropriés.

La forme d’entretien qui sera retenue au niveau des sites sera de type semi-structuré compte tenu des limitations de temps qu'imposent les techniques d’évaluation rapide. Les questions et sujets à aborder avec les communautés seront listés dans un ordre prédéterminé (selon les critères). Ils passeront du plus général au plus détaillé pour chaque catégorie de critère ou de thème d'entretien. Les informations seront consignées dans des imprimés/formulaires communément appelés « guides d’entretiens ». Noter que le Chef d’équipe peut parallèlement faire collecter des données précises en dehors du cadre d’entretien défini [=> appel aux personnes-ressources du site].

Équipe de sélection :

L’équipe de supervision, responsable de la sélection, comprendra :

---

7 Huîtres, coquillages...

8 Les métiers liés à l’exploitation des espèces ‘pélagiques’ ne sont pas à exclure.
le Coordonnateur de la Cellule Opérationnelle de Mise en Œuvre du programme GIRMaC (COMO-pêche) ;
le Chef du Service Départemental des Pêches et de la Surveillance de chacune des localités concernées ;
le Chef de la Division Pêche Artisanale de la Direction des Pêches Maritimes (DPM) ;
le Spécialiste en aménagement des pêcheries (UCP_GIRMaC). 
Elle sera appuyée par les responsables des Services Régionaux des Pêches et de la Surveillance et par les Chefs de postes des localités concernées.

Dans chaque zone- pilote, il a été constitué une équipe chargée de l’exécution de la campagne d’identification. Elle devra comprendre :

- un chef de mission qui sera chargé de (i) conduire les consultations avec les acteurs, (ii) rédiger un rapport final (de mission) après avoir supervisé : - la saisie et l’analyse des données ; - le résumé des résultats et - la diffusion des résultats aux membres de l’équipe en vue de recueillir leurs observations ;
- des personnes-ressources issues des communautés cibles (y compris des responsables d’organisations professionnelles) pour une meilleure introduction de l’équipe d’identification en leur sein ;
- un scientifique ayant une bonne connaissance des ressources halieutiques et des systèmes d’exploitation de la zone d’intervention.

**Critères de sélection**

Les sites pilotes potentiels sont étudiés puis classés en fonction des critères suivants :

(i) La proximité de stocks démersaux principalement exploités par la communauté (du site pilote potentiel) ;
(ii) Un fort désir de la communauté de mettre en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion locale pour ces ressources (citées ci-dessus) ;
    L’évaluation est ainsi conçue (a) pour jauger l’intérêt des communautés locales qui sont actuellement dans une dynamique de prise de décision en matière de gestion des ressources, et (b) pour faire prendre conscience aux communautés l’impact de leurs pratiques locales sur les ressources marines ;
(iii) Les bénéfices escomptés des initiatives de cogestion locale ;
(iv) L’identification des risques potentiels pouvant être associés aux initiatives de cogestion locale, incluant les causes des conflits antérieurs, et la formulation de mesures d’atténuation.

**Traitement et analyse des données**

La méthodologie de traitement et d’analyse des données vise à permettre la classification des sites-pilotes selon une grille de cotation et de pondération des critères pré-définis et des questions-clés correspondantes.

Il est ainsi retenu de procéder, au cours d’un atelier technique, à la définition d’un système de cotation des critères par les deux équipes de sélection. Cet atelier pourra être élargi à des personnes-ressources et à certains partenaires (WWF, UICN, CRODT….):
• Chaque critère sera ainsi affecté d’une cote et d’un coefficient tenant compte de son poids dans l’atteinte des objectifs de cogestion locale visés dans les sites-pilotes ;

• Chaque site-pilote potentiel fera ensuite l’objet d’une évaluation–cotation globale par les membres de l’équipe d’identification ;

• Les sites-pilotes potentiels sont ensuite classés, dans chaque zone-pilote, en fonction de leur poids global.

L’atelier technique prendra également en considération les études de base disponibles sur les différents sites d’intervention9.

Un deuxième niveau d’analyse, tenant compte des « critères secondaires », permettra de faire un choix définitif des sites pilotes 10 où les initiatives de cogestion locale pourraient être mises en œuvre avec succès.

**Exploitation des résultats des campagnes d’identification :**

Les résultats des campagnes de sélection des sites-pilotes feront l’objet :

• D’un atelier de restitution et de validation des résultats de sélection COMO+COC « pêche » + CRODT+Organisations Professionnelles + partenaires (WWF, UICN, Océanium) ;

• D’une campagne de restitution aux communautés des sites-pilotes retenus et informations nécessaires sur les étapes ultérieures du processus devant conduire à la reconnaissance officielle de leurs initiatives (ateliers de restitution sur sites).

Deux rapports seront élaborés à l’issue des campagnes de sélection :

✓ Un rapport succinct sur les 04 sites-pilotes sélectionnés sera finalisé par la COMO-pêche et l’UCP-GIRMaC pour transmission officielle à la Banque mondiale avant le 15 janvier 2005 ;

✓ Un rapport détaillé, incluant les données de base des sites, sera élaboré et diffusé au cours de la seconde quinzaine de janvier 2005.

9 Il s’agit de i) l’Etude de base sur la pêche, ii) l’Etude sur les ressources du Parc National des Îles de la Madeleine (PNIM), iii) les études antérieures disponibles sur le Delta du Saloum (UICN).

10 En tenant compte du fait que les contraintes liées à ces « critères secondaires » peuvent trouver des solutions immédiates auprès des autres bailleurs ou partenaires voire du Gouvernement.
**Annexe 1 :** liste des sites pilotes potentiels par région administrative

1. **Région de Fatick**
   - 1. Foundiougne
   - 2. Diamniadio
   - 3. Fambine
   - 4. Djirnda
   - 5. Dionewar
   - 6. Niodior
   - 7. Bétenty
   - 8. Missirah
   - 9. Ndangane Sambou
   - 10. Palmarin
   - 11. Djifère

2. **Région de Dakar**
   - 1. Yoff
   - 2. Ngor
   - 3. Ouakam
   - 4. Soumbédioune
   - 5. Hann
   - 6. Thiaroye
   - 7. Grand Mbao
   - 8. Petit Mbao
   - 9. Rufisque
Annexe 2 : GUIDE D’ENTRETIEN AVEC LES COMMUNAUTES DES SITES PILOTES POTENTIELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERES</th>
<th>QUESTIONS-CLES</th>
<th>AUTRES OBJECTIFS A ATTEINDRE PAR L’ÉQUIPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principes de base</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • L’équipe devra d’abord s’assurer de la présence effective des principaux usagers ou acteurs concernés, y compris les piliers des pêcheries démerinales locales et des métiers, les chefs de village, les chefs coutumiers et notables qui ont une expérience sur les ressources locales (espèces, distribution, engins...). Les autres usagers doivent être présents (mareyeurs, propriétaires de pirogues, transformatrices, chefs de village, responsables coutumiers...). Les questions de légitimité et de représentativité seront réglées lors de la constitution des Comités Locaux de Pêcheurs (CLP) et/ou des Conseils locaux de pêche artisanale (CLPA). | Il sera demandé aux pêcheurs présents, notamment aux vieux, la délimitation géographique de la mer adjacente au site et traditionnellement exploitée et gérée par ses communautés de pêcheurs (« Gueedjou tengeej »)  
L’équipe devra ensuite faire avec les acteurs du site une liste exhaustive  
(i) des ressources adjacentes à leur terroir,  
(ii) des engins de pêche,  
(iii) des exploitants (autochtones, allochtones, étrangers). |
| • L’équipe devra ensuite expliquer aux communautés (i) les objectifs du programme (Gouvernement, BM et FEM), (ii) les buts de l’exercice d’identification de sites-pilotes, (iii) les groupes cibles (tous les acteurs directement concernés par la gestion durable ont droit à la parole mais il faudra toujours pousser les leaders locaux à s’exprimer s’ils ne s’impliquent pas dans les débats) |                                                                                     |                                                                                                          |

1. □ La proximité/contiguïté de stocks démersaux principalement exploités par la communauté (y compris les espèces sédentaires) (poissons démersaux, crustacés, espèces benthiques (coquillages, langoustes, raies, soles...), céphalopodes (seiches, poulpes))

   1. Quelles sont les ressources halieutiques adjacentes au site-pilote potentiel ?
   2. Quelles sont les ressources halieutiques adjacentes dont l’exploitation est saisonnière ?
   3. Par qui elles sont exploitées (autochtones ?, allochtones ?, étrangers ?). Combien sont-ils ?
   4. Est-ce que les centres ou villages de pêche voisins ont accès et exploitent la même ressource ?
   5. Quels sont les modes d’exploitation existants (pêche, cueillette...), ?
   6. Quels sont les principaux types de pêche (engins et espèces-cibles) ?
   7. Quels sont les enjeux et les menaces qui pèsent sur les ressources adjacentes ?
   8. Quels sont les problèmes (liés aux ressources ou aux activités de pêche) auxquels les communautés doivent apporter des solutions pertinentes, immédiates et durables ?

2. □ Un fort désir/intérêt de la communauté de mettre en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion locale pour ces ressources

   Après avoir recherché un large consensus sur l’état de la ressource et sur les menaces pesant sur elle, il s’agira de mesurer le besoin ainsi que le degré d’engagement et/ou la volonté affichée par les communautés (y compris les pêcheurs migrants) dans la gestion durable .
### D'où les questions-clés suivantes :

9. Existe-t-il des initiatives locales de cogestion dans le passé (lointain et/ou récent) ?
10. Avez-vous déjà des expériences réussies en matière d’initiatives locales de cogestion ?
11. Quelles sont les causes de réussite ou d’échec des tentatives de cogestion locale (absence fréquente de consensus, dissensions intra-communautaires, blocages administratifs... ?)
12. Avez-vous un « Code de conduite local » pour une pêche responsable ?
13. Avez-vous déjà initié un plan de développement local des pêches ? (ou existe-t-il un plan local de développement intégrant les problèmes de la pêche ?).
14. Avez-vous présentement un projet d’initiatives en matière de cogestion locale pour apporter des solutions à l’état de la ressource et à la levée des menaces ?
15. Avez-vous initié une institution locale pour prendre en charge la mise en œuvre des initiatives locales de cogestion ?
   Si oui, avez-vous bénéficié d’appuis préalables de partenaire(s) ?

### 3. Les bénéfices escomptés par la communauté dans la mise en œuvre d’initiatives locales de cogestion

16. Quels types d’initiatives de cogestion les communautés sont-elles prêtes à prendre à l’avenir ?
17. Quels sont les objectifs recherchés à travers les initiatives ?
18. **Quels sont les bénéfices attendus ?** (sociaux, économiques, politiques, culturels, bioécoligiques, etc)
   
   (i) pour les divers groupes socio-professionnels (pêcheurs, les transformatrices, les acteurs faisant de la cueillette de produits halieutiques, etc)
   
   (ii) pour le développement économique du site.
19. Où sont débarqués les espèces qui sont exploitées (pêche ou

---

L’équipe d’identification devra d’abord s’assurer d’abord que les communautés ont une claire conscience des impacts négatifs à court terme, mais positifs à moyen et long termes, des mesures de gestion à prendre (Exemple : réduction de l’effort de pêche) et dont le but est de « **pêcher de manière responsable aujourd’hui, pour pêcher plus et mieux demain** ».
20. Existe-t-il d'autres activités économiques alternatives auxquelles s'adonnent les pêcheurs (cueillette, maraîchage...) ?
21. Quelles sont les attentes des acteurs, vis-à-vis du gouvernement ou des partenaires, pour mettre en œuvre de manière réussie leurs initiatives locales de cogestion ?

4. **Les risques potentiels associés aux initiatives de cogestion locale**

22. Existe-t-il des tensions réelles ou potentielles inter-communautaires dans l’exploitation des ressources halieutiques ? (de quel ordre ?)

23. Evaluer avec la communauté les risques pouvant apparaître lors de l'identification et de la mise en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion locale :
   - Risques de conflits entre les divers métiers ou engins de pêche (ou de cueillette) ?
   - Risques de conflits entre autochtones et migrants ?
   - Risques de conflits entre autochtones et étrangers de la sous région ?
   - Risques liés à l'Organisation sociale locale ?

24. Comment êtes-vous organisés actuellement pour gérer ensemble vos problèmes de pêche ?

25. Comment les conflits de pêche (internes au village) sont-ils réglés actuellement (méthode traditionnelle ?, services de sécurité ?....)

26. Comment les conflits de pêche (avec des allochtones ou des étrangers) sont-ils réglés actuellement (méthode traditionnelle ?, services de....)
| sécurité ?, service des pêches ....) |   |
## DONNEES GENERALES SUR LE SITE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Réserve foncière</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau courante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricité (Courant continu, groupe ou panneaux solaires)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Téléphone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services de sécurité (gendarmerie, police)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service des pêches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station ou centre secondaire de surveillance des pêches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations locales de pêche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLPA d’appartenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEME D’EXPLOITATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parc piroguier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engins et pratiques de pêche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pêcheurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autres statistiques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTRES INFORMATIONS PERTINENTES SUR LE SITE :
ANNEX D:

MINISTRY – COMMUNITY AGREEMENT

TO IMPLEMENT A CO-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
 Accord de Cogestion
Ministère de l'Économie Maritime des Transports Maritimes de la Pêche et de la Pisciculture
&
Comité Local des Pêcheurs de BETENTY

Entre, le Ministère de l'Économie maritime, des Transports maritimes, de la Pêche et de Pisciculture, représenté par le Ministre d'État, ci-après dénommé <<l'État>> ou << Ministère>>;

Et, le Comité Local des Pêcheurs de BETENTY, représenté par son Président Monsieur Yaya DIAME, ci-après dénommé << le Comité>>.

IL A ÉTÉ CONVENU CE QUI SUIVIT :

PREAMBULE :

Reconnaissant l'importance de la pêche dans l'économie et la vie sociale du Sénégal;
Conscients des menaces qui pèsent sur la viabilité à long terme des ressources marines côtiers;

Reconnaissant le rôle important du droit traditionnel, majoritairement accepté au Sénégal qui permettait aux communautés familiales et villageoises de gérer les ressource naturelles, même si même si ce rôle n'est pas expressément défini en l'état actuel de la législation sénégalaise ;

Reconnaissant les nombreuses initiatives locales pour la préservation des ressource halieutiques et de l'environnement marin;

Prenant en compte l'engagement de l'État du Sénégal, à travers le Programme de Gestio intégrée des Ressources marines et côtières (GIRMaC), consigné dans l'Accord de crédit d'États pour le Développement et le liant à la Banque mondiale.

Les deux parties conviennent d'œuvrer ensemble pour mettre en place un système de cogestion locale des pêcheries.

OBJET :

Le présent accord a pour objet de définir le cadre d'intervention du Comité local de Pêcheurs de BETENTY dans la mise en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion portant sur l'« institution d'arrêts périodiques de la pêche crevettière et le remplacement de filet non réglementaire par des filets de maille érigée 24 millimètres et le contrôle du marché pour protéger les petites crevettes, et celui de l'État dans ses action d'appui » : (Réf : sous projet en annexe).

1. Substance de l'Accord :
- l’instauration de périodes de repos biologique (NIOKOC) coïncidant avec les périodes d’affluence des juvéniles de crevettes dans les eaux adjacentes à l’île en vue d’en améliorer la taille marchande ;

- le remplacement des filets à crevettes non réglementaires pour la protection des juvéniles et la restauration du stock de crevettes.

De plus, il est reconnu au Comité le pouvoir :

de d’élaborer un code de conduite en conformité avec les normes législatives et réglementaires en vigueur ;

de formuler des mesures de gestion de nature à renforcer les performances des initiatives de cogestion des pêcheries ;

de mettre en place un comité de surveillance placé sous l’autorité du Chef de poste qui procède au constat et à la verbalisation des infractions, et jugera de l’opportunité de saisir les services de répression ;

de formuler de nouvelles initiatives de cogestion et de les soumettre à l’approbation du Conseil local de pêche artisanale (CLPA) du ressort.

Obligations des parties :

a- Obligations du Comité local des Pêcheurs (CLP) :

- le Comité local des pêcheurs est chargé, notamment :
  
  - gérer les conflits liés à la mise en œuvre des initiatives en jouant un rôle de conciliateur et de modérateur ;
  
  - fournir des rapports trimestriels sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre des initiatives ;
  
  - respecter les procédures de financement des activités et se soumettre aux contrôles de gestion ;
  
  - prendre en charge la pérennisation des activités du sous projet par la mise en œuvre d’activités génératrice de revenus ;
  
  - entretenir et bien gérer les ouvrages et équipements financés dans le cadre du programme GIRMaC.

b- Obligations de l’État :

- cadre du présent Accord, l’État est chargé, notamment, de :

  - immatriculer des pirogues des sites pilotes ;
  
  - évaluer et suivre les ressources ciblées par les initiatives locales de cogestion ;
  
  - mettre en œuvre un système de surveillance des mouvements des navires industriels et sanctionner leurs activités de pêche dans la zone de cogestion ;
  
  - appuyer la surveillance participative ;
  
  - faciliter les moyens de la recherche participative ;
  
  - prendre en charge la dimension sociale des initiatives de cogestion ayant des impacts négatifs sur les populations afin de favoriser la cohésion sociale. En outre, l’État s’engage à veiller à l’exécution effective des engagements visés par les textes de la présente convention.
- financer à travers le programme GIRMaC, la construction d'une « **Maison du Pêcheur** » à BETENTY, tenant lieu de siège administratif au Comité local des Pêcheurs et de centre d'informations et de formation pour les communautés de pêche ;
- assurer, au besoin, la formation des pêcheurs pour la mise en œuvre des initiatives locales ;
- accompagner, à travers ses démembrements au niveau local, la mise en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion retenues en apportant au Comité tout l’appui nécessaire.

3. **Responsabilités :**
Les parties, chacune dans les limites des obligations mises à sa charge, partagent la responsabilité de la non-exécution ou de la mauvaise exécution des initiatives retenues.

4. **Entrée en vigueur**
Le présent accord prend effet à compter de la date de sa signature.

5. **Litiges :**
Tout litige entre le Comité et les autorités locales, résultant de l'interprétation ou de la mise en œuvre du présent accord est soumis à conciliation au Conseil local de Pêche artisanale (CLPA) ou du chef de circonscription du Commandement Territorial du ressort ; en cas d'échec, l'arbitrage du Ministre chargé de la Pêche est requis.

A défaut d'entente, le présent Accord peut être résilié à la demande de l'une des parties.

6. **Fin de l'accord :**
Au terme du présent accord, les biens acquis pour la mise en œuvre du projet susmentionné, sont laissés au bénéfice du Comité. En cas de rupture avant terme imputable au Comité, lesdits biens restent propriété de l'État.

**DISPOSITIONS FINALES :**

Le présent accord est établi en deux exemplaires originaux faisant foi.

Copie en est envoyée au Président du Conseil régional de Fatick, au Président du Conseil rural de Toubacouta, au Gouverneur de la Région de Fatick, au Préfet du Département de Foudioungne, au Sous-Préfet de l’arrondissement de Toubacouta, au Conseil local de Missirah, au Chef du Service régional de la Pêche et de la Surveillance de Fatick, au Chef du Service départemental de la Pêche et de la Surveillance de Foudioungne, au Chef du poste de contrôle de Missirah, au Chef du village de BETENTY.

**Fait à Dakar le** 07 MARS 2008

Pour le Comité local des Pêcheurs de BETENTY
Le Président

Pour le Ministère de l'Économie maritime, des Transports maritimes, de la Pêche et de la Pisciculture
Le Ministre d'État.
ANNEX E:

TEMPLATE GRIEVANCE REGISTRATION FORM
GRIEVANCE REGISTRATION FORM  
(ILLUSTRATIVE TEMPLATE)

Plaintiff : __________________________________________

ID Number : __________________________________________

Contact Information : __________________________________
(Village ; mobile phone)

Nature of Complaint : __________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

Record of Prior Contacts and Discussions of Issues to Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Individuals Contacted</th>
<th>Summary of Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed (Plaintiff) ;  ______________________________________

Date :    ______________________________________

Signed (Filer of Complaint) :  ______________________________________

Name of Person Filling in Complaint : ________________________________
(if different from Plaintiff)
Position or Relationship to Plaintiff: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
Date of Conciliation Session: __________________________________________

Was Plaintiff Present?: Yes    No

Topic ________________:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Was field verification of complaint conducted?: Yes    No

Findings of field investigation:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Summary of Conciliation Session Discussion:
Issue ________________:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Issue ________________:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Issue ________________:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Issue ________________:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Was agreement reached on the issues?: Yes  No

If agreement was reached, detail the agreement below:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

If agreement was not reached, specify the points of disagreement below:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Signed: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________
President, LCC         Plaintiff

Signed: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________
Member, LCC            Member, LCC

Signed: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________
Member, LCC            Member, LCC

Signed: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________
Member, LCC            Member, LCC

Signed: ___________________________
NGO Representative

Date: _____________________________
Review of Complaint
by
Co-Management Association (CMA)

Date of Conciliation Session: ________________________________

Was Plaintiff Present?: Yes  No

Topic _______________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Was field verification of complaint conducted?: Yes  No

Findings of field investigation:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Summary of Conciliation Session Discussion:

Issue ________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Issue ________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Issue ________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Was agreement reached on the issues?: Yes No

If agreement was reached, detail the agreement below:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

If agreement was not reached, specify the points of disagreement below:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Signed: ________________
CMA President Plaintiff

Signed: ___________________________

Date: ____________________________
Review of Complaint
by
WARFP National Coordinator

Date of Conciliation Session :   ________________________________
Was Plaintiff Present ? :    Yes  No

Topic _______________ :    ____________________________________________

_______________________________________________________

Was field verification of complaint conducted ?:  Yes  No

Findings of field investigation :

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________

Summary of Conciliation Session Discussion :
Issue _______________ :
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Issue _______________ :
____________________________________________________________________________
Issue _______________ :
____________________________________________________________________________
Issue _______________ :
____________________________________________________________________________
Was agreement reached on the issues?:  Yes  No

If agreement was reached, detail the agreement below:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________

If agreement was not reached, specify the points of disagreement below:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Signed: ________________
WARFP National Coordinator  Plaintiff

Signed: ___________________________
Other

Date:  
____________________