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INTRODUCTION TO THE SELF-ASSESSMENT

The Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership (TCMP) has explicitly adopted a learning-based approach for carrying out its work of facilitating the establishment of effective coastal governance in Tanzania. Critical to all learning processes is the need to reflect upon experience, then use lessons from that reflection to guide subsequent actions.

The purpose of the TCMP Self-Assessment was to provide the space and time for group reflection and learning. Its timing was critical. It was designed to occur towards the end of the first year’s work plan, just prior to preparation of the Year Two Work Plan. The composition of the self-assessment team was also critical. It included the TCMP leadership, the leaders of key project components, a number of the technical advisers, as well as integrated coastal management (ICM) experts who are not involved in the TCMP on a day-to-day basis, and USAID personnel and partners involved in related natural resources projects globally and in Tanzania.

The self-assessment did not reconsider TCMP’s Life of Project Results; these were assumed to remain intact. Rather the focus was on strategies and annual results. Specific TCMP self-assessment objectives included the following:

1. Assist the TCMP in developing its Year Two Work Plan by considering the strategies, successes, failures and challenges of Year One, as well as identifying the current relevant external context in which the TCMP operates.

2. Draw lessons from TCMP’s implementation experience and apply it to the development and operation of a national ICM Program.

3. Build TCMP team cohesion and a shared view of the entire program and how each program element contributes to the whole.

THE PROCESS OF SELF-ASSESSMENT

The assessment process began in March 1999, when TCMP conducted a national meeting for locally based coastal management programs. The two-day meeting brought together representatives from each of Tanzania’s ongoing local coastal programs to review potential mechanisms for the national government to support coastal management activities being implemented at the regional, district and local levels. This information provided “customer” feedback about TCMP’s interaction with locally based programs and gave clear direction on the need to strengthen the local-national relationship in Year Two.

In April, the US-based members of the self-assessment team participated in an information session held at the University of Rhode Island (URI). This meeting helped prepare members of the group who were less familiar with TCMP activities for the in-country assessment workshop.
The self-assessment workshop was conducted as an intensive, three-day event from May 17-19, in the TCMP offices in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. The 21 individuals who participated in the workshop are listed at the beginning of this report. For the practical work of the Self-Assessment Workshop, participants were organized into small teams to consider the first four Life of Project Results (LOPR) from the Year One Work Plan (broadly described as Policy, Mariculture, Linking to Local Level and Capacity Building). TCMP’s fifth LOPR—sharing lessons—was not assessed. The crosscutting theme of science for management, which is part of the Policy Result Area, was treated like an LOPR. The teams were asked to respond to predetermined questions (see Annex B) designed to:

- Review Year One results and strategies (specific task completion information will be presented in the Year Two Work Plan and is therefore not repeated here)
- Suggest strategies and focus areas for Year Two
- Identify lessons from Year One that should be applied to Year Two

Working group outputs were recorded, then presented and discussed by the full self-assessment team in plenary session. The agenda for the workshop is contained in Annex A. This document attempts to summarize the lively discussions that occurred over this three-day period.

THE SELF-ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

LIFE OF PROJECT RESULT 1: Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) Policy/Program That is Effectively Applied to Coastal Problems at Both the National and Local Levels Developed

Looking Back

Anticipated Results for Year One

Critical national ICM issues identified and national ICM goals set. More specific anticipated results included:

- Core Working Group (CWG) established
- ICM issues and goals defined for presentation
- Policy meeting convened
- Awareness of ICM within national government raised

Strategies Used

The basic strategy was to form a CWG that consisted of technical personnel from government institutions key to formulation and implementation of an ICM program to
carry out the work of identifying ICM issues, goals and strategies. TCMP assigned a secretariat (half time, seconded from NEMC) to support this group. This core group drew information and expertise from key local stakeholders, and in a number of cases supplemented their expertise with specialist teams (e.g., socioeconomic team, legal team). The group’s work was organized to support a series of “director” workshops the input from which guides the substance and direction of the core team. Critical to this overall strategy is that the TCMP creates the context and process for policy implementers to draft policy. Key to the core working group’s progress has been:

- Utilizing the policy cycle as a road map
- Utilizing a participatory and transparent process
- Drawing ideas for ICM needs and solutions from lived experience (community/sectoral level)
- Recognizing integration as both the biggest challenge and reward

Actual Results

All of the anticipated results were achieved and the policy process moved more quickly than anticipated. After approval of the ICM Issues by Sectoral Agency Directors in October 1998, the core working group was able to develop and the TCMP to present goals, objectives and strategies for the major coastal issues at a second directors’ meeting in May.

Looking Ahead

*Result One:* Consensus exists on the substance and implementation mechanism for Tanzania’s national coastal policy. By the end of Year One, the following components of a coastal program will be developed: issues, policy/program goals and strategies, institutional and legal frameworks and implementation strategy. Key outputs include:

- Draft a Green Paper to include finalized goal objectives and strategies for coastal management as well as options for implementation structures. The “do nothing” option should be included in the Green Paper. The paper will require endorsement from a broad cross-section of Tanzanian society from the grassroots to national government directors, to politicians

- Draft a White Paper to include policy statements, selected policy implementation structure, and required legal authorities at the central/local level

- Submit the White Paper to the Permanent Secretary for submission to the Cabinet

Anticipated Strategies

- Maintain all Year One strategies and also increase linkages among working groups

- Throughout the Green Paper, use case studies and examples to make problems and
proposed solutions tangible, highlighting constraints in the existing governance arrangements. The Green Paper should be compelling, clear and readable

- Link the coastal policy initiative with ongoing Government of Tanzania reforms including IFLEM/CSR/LGJR
- Explain the socioeconomic implications of various courses of action and communicate the urgency of addressing problems and opportunities now

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

Some confusion exists over the TCMP process (who does what) and the definition of key terms (e.g., policy, goals, objectives, strategy, etc.). Hence, some clarification is needed. A lack of specificity on the institutional framework for decisionmaking and power allocation could create a problem, particularly if policy debate becomes focused on winning or losing power. There will be a need to generate a sense of urgency for an ICM initiative. Good progress has been made and the Year Two strategies conform to TCMP principles, but it is recommended that the TCMP address specifics quickly.

Critical preconditions for long-term success include sustained collaborative relationships (both horizontal and vertical), ownership of initiatives at national and local levels, and securing sustained resources and funding to maintain the initiative.

**LIFE OF PROJECT RESULT 2: Intersectoral Mechanism for Addressing Emerging Coastal Economic Opportunities Demonstrated**

**Looking Back**

**Anticipated Results for Year One**

Intersectoral mechanisms are developed to promote a sustainable, diversified mariculture industry that links wise and profitable development with national and local needs. Specific anticipated tasks included:

- Intersectoral, public/private Mariculture Working Group (MWG) established and strengthened through training and learning-by-doing
- Feedback and discussions between MWG and CWG (including specialist teams) occurring regularly
- Mariculture issue profile prepared
- Action strategy developed and initial actions taken

---

*TCMP Self-Assessment*
Strategies Used

The strategy of an intersectoral, public/private-working group supported by a secretariat seconded (half time) to work at the TCMP was used for accomplishing work. Since mariculture is largely under the jurisdiction of the Fisheries Department, the TCMP overtly channeled working group outcomes through the director of fisheries; i.e., the directors’ meeting on mariculture was convened with the director of fisheries as chairperson. Based on feedback from directors, priority is now being given to the development of mariculture guidelines and further widening intersectoral involvement in MWG.

Actual Results

All of the anticipated MWG tasks have been completed as follows:

- MWG established and orientation training held
- Issue Profile document prepared (in press)
- Learning document about current mariculture development experiences near completion (draft)
- Guideline document in early draft form
- Directors’ Workshop (Jan. 1999) endorsed MWG’s Strategic Action Plan for Mariculture
- Awareness raised among directors

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

There was a general lack of information to assist issue profiling, and a general lack of public awareness, even among government decisionmakers regarding mariculture. Due to time constraints and the "volunteer" nature of MWG, the level of individual commitment to MWG was highly variable. An intersectoral approach is seen as necessary, but this diversity can sometimes slow progress.

Looking Ahead

Result One: Guidelines for the promotion of a sustainable, diversified mariculture industry that links wise and profitable development with national and local needs will be applied and an intersectoral approach to managing mariculture will be clearly defined and accepted by government and the private sector. Specific tasks and outputs include:

- Complete learning document; distribute as appropriate
- Complete Guidelines documents
- Present guidelines to directors and seek their support for inclusion of existing sectoral policies into a national ICM framework
- Determine the appropriate future role for MWG
Proposed Strategies

- Follow the same process that was used for gaining consent by the directors on the Issues Profile
- Present/discuss learning document in the relevant national, regional, and international forums (as appropriate)
- Consider possible evolution of MWG into an ongoing "technical consultation team" supported by and providing service to government, industry and NGOs. It could also evolve into a monitoring team or contribute to capacity building
- Develop a strategy for disseminating and promoting adoption of mariculture guidelines (e.g., work with the Fisheries Department to identify and support pilot projects; train government officials and the private sector on using the guidelines for framing new development proposals and in permit review; etc.)

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

It will be a challenge to identify an intersectoral institutional arrangement acceptable to all, as well as the appropriate future role for MWG. A legal instrument should be considered to clarify rights and responsibilities of the mariculture industry and to effectively apply the guidelines. MWG members are drawn from many sectors; this diversity should allow long-term success. Two members from the mariculture industry are already on MWG (from the prawn industry), but more interactions with the industry are needed. MWG should move to obtain representation from the seaweed industry. Close communication with directors, and continued public outreach and education, is extremely important.

LIFE OF PROJECT RESULT 3- Enabling Conditions for ICM Implementation Improved

Looking Back

Anticipated Results for Year One

*Result One:* National/local implementation interface improved to ensure that local issues are adequately represented in national policy discussion. More specifically TCMP worked to:

- Link national and local levels of government during issue identification
- Powerfully show the human face of national issues as experienced by local people in order to build a constituency for a national ICM policy
**Result Two:** Experience and learning was shared among existing ICM activities in Tanzania by:

- Developing a national network for ICM practitioners
- Periodically bringing together coastal management programs to share concerns/address issues

**Strategies Used**

- Use of working groups to ensure national representatives communicate to local level
- Use of field trips and videos to bring local problems into the national discussion
- Emphasis on simple but frequent communication techniques to share information
- All tasks connected to the TCMP policy process
- Use of environmental awards scheme in six coastal districts to raise ICM awareness at the local level

**Actual Results**

All tasks were completed with the exception of the establishment of a worldwide web site. The impact of the Coastal Environmental Awards Scheme (CEAS) to date has been less than desired (see observations below).

**Challenges/Constraints/Observations**

National/local level links have been primarily achieved by working group field trips to local programs, but the importance of coordinating such visits beforehand to reduce the burden at the local level should be kept in mind.

The production of the video, “Voices from the Field,” involved working with a partner (GreenCOM), which provided added value but also involved high transaction costs. The production process for the video also helped to stimulate the link between local and national levels, and promoted cross-project communication. During an informal discussion with Brian Day, Project Director of GreenCOM, it was revealing to note that only seven percent of Tanzanian households have TV sets. This suggests that there exists a need to reassess the process used to disseminate this product.

The TCMP focus on policy and issue identification has resulted in less than optimal attention to the need to document both what is being learned at the local level, and how national policy will positively impact local initiatives and/or replicate positive experiences occurring in certain areas. This needs to be addressed in Year Two.

In the development of national networks, more contributions from field programs and other institutions involved with the work of TCMP are needed.
The implementation of the CEAS awards program stimulated much discussion. It was an expensive and time-consuming effort to get the activity off the ground. It is now recognized that in that process there was no conscious effort to connect the CEAS to the policy process.

Looking Ahead

Result One: Support mechanisms developed and applied to local programs:

- Create forums for resolving local/national conflicts
- Develop guidelines for coastal activities of concern to local programs (e.g., mariculture)
- Increase awareness-raising and general communication on national and international policies and conventions
- Continue information dissemination on TCMP results
- Link local ICM program needs to the research community through the Science for Management initiative
- Convene an annual meeting of donors to coordinate support
- Assist new ICM activities as they are developed

Result Two: Inputs to policy development process from local programs facilitated by:

- Continued field trips
- Facilitating national workshops for local programs (every six months)
- Building constituency at the local level

Result Three: Experience between ICM programs shared through:

- Continued support of national network of ICM practitioners
- Completed development of a worldwide web-site

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

When considering strategies to support constituency building at the local level, two options were considered:

Option A: Focus on district level decisionmakers

Tasks: - “Video Voices” as an information piece
- National meeting for all coastal districts
- Case study to show how the Tanga Program has approached district-level planning

Option B: Continue CEAS (although the current lack of connection to the policy process is perceived as a weakness).
Tasks:  
- Assess current activity
- Make it more locally based
- Increase participation by private sector and central government
- Make it a key vehicle for highlighting the role of individual and group voluntary action in achieving coastal management objectives

Experience indicates that intersectoral cooperation has improved through working groups and there remains a need for the TCMP to stay connected with the local level. It is important to recognize that each local program is unique and has its own identity.

**LIFE OF PROJECT RESULT 4 - Human and Institutional Capacity for ICM Built**

The framework for TCMP’s capacity-building effort is:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Necessary precondition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term training</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of key implementors</td>
<td>* Individuals who can be obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Implementors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>*Next generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Looking Back

Anticipated Results for Year One

Result One: Capacity within all the entities that are essential for successful ICM implementation strengthened through active participation on working groups, primer course and participation in coastal management training events by selected TCMP staff and partners.

Result Two: In-country training capacity development initiated.

Strategies Used

Two basic strategies were pursued by TCMP for capacity building:

- Learning-by-doing, particularly in the CWG and MWG, has been a major and successful way of building capacity. This practical experience has been complemented by sending selected working group members to specific trainings (e.g., URI Summer Institute, WIOMSA Regional ICM Course, selected SEACAM courses)

- The second strategy was to contract the Institute of Marine Science (IMS) to take the first steps towards establishing ICM training capacity in Tanzania. IMS was selected because of both its university connection and the fact it is the home to WIOMSA, which is building capability in ICM capacity building at a regional (Eastern Africa and Western Indian Ocean) level. It was anticipated that these initiatives would be complementary and synergistic. IMS took the initial steps of conducting a broadly conceived ICM capacity needs assessment, largely targeted at the national level, and convening a Review Panel consisting mainly of individuals from academic-related institutions to provide input to and review the results (including an initial short course design) of the needs assessment

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

The objective of the LOPR is very broad, while the activities planned for Year One were narrow, as they were mainly geared towards the provision of a one-time ICM training course. The focus of the human capacity-building activities was on technical staff at the national level, and minimal effort was directed towards assessing needs of, or training staff from, ICM local programs, local government or the district level.

It is important to differentiate between training and awareness activities as well as between the planning process for a training course and the actual delivery of the training course.

An explicit objective of national capacity building should be the gradual replacement of the external technical support with indigenous institutions and experts.
Over the course of last year, strong regional programs in ICM training (WIOMSA, SEACAM) are emerging which target ICM practitioners and sectoral technical staff. These regional programs can be used to provide services originally anticipated to be provided by the TCMP.

**Looking Ahead**

*Result One:* Implementation of TCMP-developed strategies and guidelines is improved through capacity-building efforts:

- Translate ICM policy/mariculture guidelines into training requirements/training programs. Use working groups and their materials for development of training materials and curriculum for short course training. Supplement this, as needed, with training/curriculum specialists

- Over the short term (one-two years) rely on regional training for general ICM capacity building at the national level; strengthen the relationship between regional and national training initiatives to ensure they are meeting TCMP needs

- Continue learning-by-doing through working groups

*Result Two:* A foundation for development of a more ”educational track” in the ICM capacity-building efforts is laid. *(Some of the output from working groups could feed into academic programs at the college and university levels. This is a long-term, rather than short-term emphasis, but should start now. The first task is to identify an appropriate entry to the academic institutions.)*

- Complete the draft Needs Assessment Report

- Organize a meeting of the Review Panel to discuss the results of the Year One as well as the planned activities for Year Two, particularly the long-term strategy for capacity building

- Develop an “in-service” university/college training link (with a long-term purpose of institutionalizing the training) to short-term training initiatives carried out through Result One

**Challenges/Constraints/Observations**

Target implementors at both national and district levels, as well as individuals who can be obstacles (awareness/general training).

Recognize that training needs at the district level are not yet identified. It is important that the priority areas for training are strategically selected. Design of training should build capacity for policy implementation. This is to be based on anticipated training needs since
the policy development process is not yet complete.

Existing information/knowledge for development of training course materials needs to be made available. Efforts should be made to link short-term training needs to longer-term education goals, as well as linking with other training initiatives.

**Science for Management: This is a Crosscutting Theme That Relates to Several LOPR**

**Looking Back**

**Anticipated Results for Year One**

There is no program result in the Year One Work Plan on “science for management.” Task 6 in LOPR 1 is about a coastal baseline and is very general. Originally a “State of the Coast” report was considered, but it was not initiated.

The work on science for management arose as a new opportunity following the July workshop at IMS on “Marine and Coastal Risk Assessment: An Approach for Linking Science and ICM.” This workshop was co-facilitated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Following the workshop, an interim Science for Management (MEAMCOT) team was established and held three meetings (January, March, May). The anticipated results for Year One are defined in the URI-IMS contract that established the mechanism for the group to conduct its work.

Anticipated results listed in the contract include:

- Directory of marine scientists
- Review of the literature
- Monitoring plan

**Strategies Used**

The basic strategy was to turn to IMS to take responsibility for this element, as the government institution that is the most appropriate home and champion for this work facilitated by the TCMP.

Beyond that, the operational strategy was to:

- Establish an interim science working group (MEAMCOT)
- Carry out specific jobs led by the members of the group
- Hold meetings

The work carried out addressed:

- What is known? (bibliography, annotated bibliography, synthesis reports)
• Who are the scientists and current monitoring efforts? (directory, reports of ongoing monitoring)

• Monitoring plan (starting with the draft monitoring plan prepared in 1998 that was a follow-up to the July workshop)

The work on “what is known” and the monitoring plan were broken into resource categories identified in the July workshop. The categories were selected based on the priority management issues. The categories used by MEAMCOT are: water quality and coastal pollution; coastal erosion; fisheries; coral reefs; mangroves; and other living resources.

Actual Results

• First draft bibliography/annotated bibliography on the six resource categories
• Six synthesis reports and summary maps, each responding to seven standard questions
• Directory of marine scientists
• Seven ongoing monitoring reports prepared with standard questionnaire
• Draft monitoring plan
• Draft terms of reference for a Scientific and Technical Advisory Team (STAT)
• Elements of a Year Two Work Plan sketched out
• Recommendations to URI on its nutrient monitoring project

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

There is a need to define the most effective use of the group’s time and effort. There are so many things that a science for management group could do, and it is important to establish priorities for the TCMP. The sizing of a monitoring plan to existing capacity in terms of monitoring stations and human and institutional resources is also important. It will also be necessary to be aware of discipline-driven research interests.

Looking Ahead

Anticipated Results for Year Two

Result One: Baseline of what is known and how it is used for management completed:

• Complete bibliography/annotated bibliography, synthesis reports and maps

• Assess how this information is “used” for management. Are managers using the data and information that exists to guide formulation of policy and management guidelines/plans? Inculcate a culture of information use. Currently, management makes little use of information, partly because it is in a crisis mode in which the use of information is not a priority. “Shock” people with the amount of information that has not been used for management
• Conduct a practical exercise to demonstrate how existing information can be applied to inform management, and to demonstrate how scientists and managers can work together

Result Two: Science and information needs for management identified and prioritized:

• Repeat approach of the July workshop of “backtracking” to management issues to develop a monitoring plan. Start with issues, define the most urgent science/information questions and needs to inform decisionmaking on the issues, assess gaps in information to answer the questions, specify what should be monitored, and how the data will be assessed and used. Include science group and CWG. This time the coastal management issues are very clear and knowledge on what is known and gaps is advanced. The workshop would define the needs for a monitoring plan. The workshop would also result in an “indicative report card” for policy-makers on the state of the coastal and marine environment, tied to coastal issues.

Result Three: National/local network of scientists engaged in field sampling and monitoring of the coastal ecosystem established:

• Build a network of ongoing monitoring efforts through sharing of information and collaboration with scientists in the field

• Coordinate URI nutrient monitoring project

• Complete first round of Directory of Marine Scientists and place information on IMS worldwide web site

Anticipated Results for Year Three

Develop long-term monitoring plan and seek funding for it:

• Develop sampling methodology and data collection “models” for both citizen and scientific monitoring

• Pilot test collection of secondary information methodology as defined in MEAMCOT monitoring plan

• Review survey methodology using questionnaires targeted at resource users in villages, and local government authorities with knowledge of resource conditions and enforcement of government use guidelines

• Formulate implementation and a financial plan for the long-term national monitoring plan. Seek sources of funding for implementation
Anticipated Strategies

- Establish a “Scientific and Technical Working Group” (STWG) whose role is to take care of the interests of science for the TCMP (as CWG takes care of the policy for the TCMP). During the policy development time frame this group provides input on the science side to help write the Green Paper
- After adoption of the policy, this group would help with the implementation process, and in this second time frame it could become a standing committee of the type sketched out in the STAT terms of reference
- The sector “home” of the STWG is the Institute for Marine Sciences
- Second an individual to act as secretariat based primarily in Dar es Salaam at the TCMP office for the science for management work

Challenges/Constraints/Observations

The science agenda is very large and there are many urgent needs in three areas: investigative research, descriptive science (monitoring) and science for management. Clear instructions from the national coastal management program will be defined on what specific management questions a monitoring plan should inform, and instruction on the time scale required for the information.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM EXPERIENCE

The discussions went much deeper than what was done last year and what needs to be done next year. A great deal of time was spent looking at what lessons have been learned, how closely the TCMP is following the Common Methodology, and what strategies and tactics should be applied to move ICM forward in Tanzania. The highlights from these discussions have been captured below.

Policy Development

- Involvement and participation in policy formulation creates a sense of ownership for the policy
- Bottom-up rule formulation brings about voluntary compliance
- People at the grassroots level are aware of the issues and how to solve them; it is beneficial to listen to them and consult with them
- High quality leadership and consistency are important to success
Mariculture

- The case study approach has been successful in framing key questions on issues (e.g., permitting, intersectoral coordination, environmental impacts, economic outputs, etc.)

- Identification of critical stakeholders was an important step in the process. (Lands Dept.; Water Dept.; Investment Center; Fisheries Dept.)

- Early communication with directors led to a feeling of acceptance by MWG members, and promoted free and open communications with directors and key decisionmakers

Linking to Field Programs

- Intersectoral cooperation can be significantly enhanced by multi-sectoral working groups

- It is important to stay connected to the local level in policy development to appropriately reflect the issues

- When linking with local programs, it is important to recognize that each has its own identity and will need separate consideration

Capacity Building

- The successful achievement of the capacity-building LOPR 4 has shown the need for a strong secretariat based at the TCMP. This also provides an opportunity for linkage of this LOPR and other TCMP LOPRs

- Planning for effective targeted training takes a long time

Science for Management

- Strong two-way feedback loops are needed to the science team and the TCMP

- It is important to pay attention to the lessons learned from experience in science for management (e.g., lessons from EPA Estuary Management Program; GESAMP report)

- Understanding what is already known in terms of topics and geographic coverage is critical

- Build on existing resources first
CONCLUSIONS

The three-day self-assessment achieved what it set out to do—provide a "health check" for the TCMP. The assessment brought together the key people from the TCMP's working groups, consultants and local partners, matched them with representatives from CRC and USAID, and encouraged them to have open and frank discussions about past successes and failures, as well as future directions. Here are some highlights:

- The TCMP is healthy and heading in the right direction
- The TCMP achieved most of the targeted results for Year One, and in several cases exceeded expectations
- The self-assessment resulted in “instrumental adjustments” to the TCMP. In a number of the LOPR areas, only marginal adjustments were made; while in others, such as capacity building and science for management, substantial adjustments were made in both strategies and anticipated results. More specifically:
  - A national policy will be submitted to the government early in 2000. The hope and expectation is that the policy will be approved before Parliament recesses in June 2000. The CWG will remain at the center of this activity
  - Mariculture guidelines will be developed and in place by late 1999. The MWG will continue in its present role
  - The connection between central and local governments will continue to be strengthened. The TCMP will pay increased attention to drawing relevant local experience into the national policy process, and serve as a forum for managing conflict between the two tracks of government
  - General awareness and networking activities (E-Pwani listserver, Pwani Yetu newsletter, newspaper articles) will continue. Increased effort will be spent on explaining the urgency and importance of coastal management to high-level decisionmakers
  - Capacity-building activities will continue to focus on giving people an opportunity to learn by doing. The national short course that was planned will now be delivered by WIOMSA as part of their growing regional capacity-building program. The TCMP will focus its formal capacity-building efforts on a series of topical and applied short courses targeted directly at those responsible for implementing new coastal policy and guidelines. For example, district officers will be responsible for implementing the mariculture guidelines. To do this successfully, they will need training and skill building. This will be the focus of the TCMP's formal capacity-building efforts. The training will be delivered through the working groups matched with training experts from appropriate institutions in Tanzania (e.g., technical institutes)
- Science for Management activities continues to evolve and are becoming an important result area for the TCMP (although it is still a sub-result under the policy element). The Science for Management group (MEAMCOT) will formally become a TCMP working group and will spend Year Two putting up systems that link science and scientists to management decisions. They will also spend some effort on developing a national monitoring system (mainly by linking existing monitoring efforts).

- The TCMP will continue to explicitly share its experience with the region and global ICM community. The TCMP will also continue to collaborate with the CRC/Sida common methodology process, working closely with CRC/Sida staff.

In assessing the self-assessment itself, participants felt that they had indeed met the objectives they had set out to achieve; that taking time out to reflect was useful. There was universal recognition that the TCMP had come a long way over its first year. There was also an underlying sense of excitement that the window of opportunity for the TCMP is now open and that it must take full advantage of that open window over this next year by pushing forward the best policy options it can before these very favorable circumstances change. Having outsiders experienced with coastal programs elsewhere validate much of the work done by TCMP was satisfying and motivating to the TCMP staff. At the same time, having TCMP partners who were usually concerned about only one aspect of the partnership understand the full agenda and strategy was extremely useful. This “looking at the whole” allowed both internal and external questioning and brainstorming about how to make a well-functioning project function even better. The self-assessment helped actualize a large number of the TCMP’s principles for operation, including transparency, sharing, learning and adaptive management.

Perhaps the key indicator of the utility of the TCMP’s self-assessment process is that all participants believed it should be included as an activity to be included in the Year Two Work Plan.

**ANNEXES:**

A – Agenda for Self-Assessment Workshop
B – Questions for Self-Assessment
Annex A - Agenda for Self-Assessment Workshop

Monday, 17 May – Introductions and Overview

8:30 a.m. Assessment introduction and orientation.
  Introduce the TCMP team.

9:30 a.m. Courtesy visits to the National Environmental Management Council
  (NEMC), Vice Presidents Office/Department of Environment (DOE), Vice
  Presidents Office (PS) and United States Agency for International
  Development Mission to Tanzania (USAID/T).

12:30 p.m. Lunch (Self-assessment team, location TBA)

2:00 p.m. TCMP overview (M. Amaral and J. Daffa)
  USAID Strategic Objective Two Results Framework
  TCMP Life of Project Results Framework
  TCMP operating principles
  TCMP Year One Work Plan
  Proposed TCMP Year Two Work Plan

3:00 p.m. TCMP partners who have been leading key elements will be asked to
  answer pre-selected self-assessment questions and prepare a 20-minute
  presentation. A member of the self-assessment team will be assigned to
  work with one element to answer the questions and develop the
  presentation (40 min.) for plenary.

  TCMP partners that will present include:
  • Core Working Group – J. Daffa, TCMP Support Unit Leader and Lewis
    Nzali, working group secretariat (with Stephen Olsen). Also invited are
    Robert Makaramba (TCMP legal consultant) and Dr. M. K. Ngoile
    (NEMC).
  • Mariculture Working Group – Dr. Y. Mgaya, Chair and Godlove
    Mwamsojo, working group secretariat (with Richard Volk)
  • Constituency Building and linking to field programs – G. Luhikula,
    TCMP and Solomon Makoloweka, Tanga Coordinator. (with Mark
    Amaral)
  • Capacity Building – M. Kyewalyanga and J. Francis, IMS (with Lynne
    Hale)
  • Science for Management – A. Mmochi and J. Francis, IMS (with Jim
    Tobey).

5:00 p.m. Break

7:30 p.m. Dinner for self-assessment team and visiting partners
**Tuesday, 18 May - Presentation and Reflections by TCM Partners**

Each element “team” will present a 20-minute presentation that addresses the self-assessment questions. Some time (60 min.) in the morning will be provided for the teams to finalize their presentation. Following each presentation, there will be a question and answer period to clarify and probe more deeply into the questions. A facilitator will track the key points (in terms of progress and lessons for the future). Joining the self-assessment team will be the USAID SO2 core team (Zainabu Liganga, Gilbert Kajuna and Flora Majebelle) and members of the SO2 SOT representing the coastal management regime working group (B. Bakobi and A. Kiaga).

5:30 p.m.  Reception at Sea Cliff Hotel for self-assessment team, TCMP partners, SOT members, and other invited guests including the Permanent Secretary from the Vice Presidents Office.

**Wednesday, 19 May – Advancing Coastal Management in Tanzania**

Review the national coastal management issues and proposed strategies for a national coastal management program. Recognizing that TCMP seeks to test national CM strategies before they are formally adopted by policy, compare previous day’s conclusions with proposed strategies and consider the following:

- What lessons can be projected forward based on TCMP’s operating experience?

- What strategies from the national policy need immediate action by TCMP?

- What strategies need to be reviewed and revised based on understanding of the coastal management challenge and implementation context?
Annex B - Questions for Self-Assessment

Tuesday – Building a Work Plan

Looking Back

- What were the anticipated results for Year One?
- What strategies were used to achieve the results?
- What results were realized?
- What were the barriers or challenges to achieving results?

Looking Ahead

- What are the anticipated results for Year Two?
- What are the proposed strategies for achieving those results?
- What are the critical barriers or challenges to achieving the results?
- How does the selected strategies overcome these barriers?

Drawing Experience

- What are the critical preconditions for longer-term success?
- List three lessons learned to date that may be useful for the coastal management effort in the future. These may be the conditions that led to success, or the lessons learned from an activity that was not as effective as expected.
- How is the theme dependent upon, and supportive of, other themes—what are the interdependencies and interrelationships? Given the interdependency among themes, is progress in the theme moving too slowly, too fast?
- Do year one and the proposed year two strategies conform to the TCMP principles?

Wednesday – Building a Coastal Management Program

(1) Based on your understanding of TCMP’s implementation experience (lessons learned), the coastal management challenge in Tanzania and critical pre-conditions identify barriers and challenges to policy adoption and application?

(2) What policy strategies need to be reviewed and revised or added, based on the challenges and barriers?

(3) What actions need immediate attention by TCMP to overcome barriers and challenges?