

**SUTAINABLE FISHERIES LIVELIHOODS PROGRAMME**

SFLP/DFID-FAO

**PLANNING WORKSHOP FOR THE SFLP STUDY ON  
CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH TO SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS OF  
ARTISANAL FISHEROLK IN WEST AFRICA**

**( 8-9 October 2001 – Cotonou, BENIN)**

**Workshop Outputs and Conclusions**

*By*

*Karim HUSSEIN (ODI) and Jean ZOUNDI (INERA)*

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

## **Background**

This planning workshop was organised by the SFLP Regional Support Unit in Cotonou and facilitated by the two international consultants commissioned to oversee the six-country study on research – user linkages. It brought together representatives from the SFLP RSU and representatives from each country chosen to participate in the study, including representatives from National Coordination Units, national fisheries research institutes and NGOs (see list of participants in Annex). The countries represented included : Mauritania, Nigeria, Guinea, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal. The workshop provided an opportunity for all study partners to contribute to the definition of the methodology and study outputs. This note provides a summary of the key conclusions of the workshop and a revised and agreed methodology and workplan for the overall study.

## **Workshop Objectives**

The workshop had four specific objectives.

- (i) To familiarise national teams with the overall objectives of the study, the subjects to be studied, the expected outputs and results, and the implications for policy and action.
- (ii) To recall the relevance and utility of sustainable livelihoods approaches (SLA) and SL principles to the analysis of research-user linkages.
- (iii) To share and review country experiences of research – resource user linkages in the aquatic sector (focusing on artisanal fishing).
- (iv) To debate and agree the overall approach and methodology for the study, the roles and responsibilities of different actors, the workplan and practical arrangements for implementation.

## **Workshop Process**

To facilitate the full contribution of all participants in the workshop, both plenary sessions and working group discussions were included.

- Plenary discussions included: introductory presentations on key topics to introduce concepts and approaches to participants (e.g. SLA and PIP analysis) and make them aware of the objectives of the study and methods to be used.
- Group work by country: national teams sharing insights about the types of actors involved in fisheries research, the types of collaboration that exist between research providers and the different livelihood groups involved in artisanal fisheries.

## **Workshop Results and Conclusions**

- i. Methodology and approach refined and agreed (see Sections 2 and 4).
- ii. Roles and responsibilities of different partners in the study process clarified and agreed (see Section 3).
- iii. Study outputs and intended results explained, discussed and finalised (Section 4).

- iv. Relevant experiences of research-user linkages identified in each country (where they exist).
- v. A start made to the identification of the range of actors involved in the fisheries sector in each country.
- vi. An overall workplan for the six-country study agreed (see Annex 2) and initial detailed workplans developed for each country by country teams.
- vii. A start made to discussions between the RSU and country teams on contractual and financial arrangements for implementation.

### **Immediate Action Points**

- Copies of this report sent out to all study participants/researchers by RSU
- TOR and contracts finalised between RSU and national teams
- Constitution of national teams by country coordinators
- National workplans for study finalised by country teams
- **RSU to supervise and ensure effective start to country studies according to overall workplan - taking into account national workplans.** This short visit to each country by the RSU should take place in November 2001.

**2. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY OF LINKAGES BETWEEN RESEARCH AND USERS OF FISHERIES RESOURCES  
(SFLP GCP/INT/735/UK)**

THEME FROM TOR	AREAS OF STUDY	PROCESS	RESPONSIBILITIES
1. Identifying diversity, assets and livelihood strategies of fishing communities and livelihood groups using fisheries resources	<p>(a) <i>Existing livelihoods groups</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of livelihood groups that use fisheries resources</li> <li>- Characteristics and core assets (human, social, natural, physical and financial) of livelihoods ; traditional knowledge and management of fisheries</li> <li>- Importance of fishing to livelihoods and related activities (analysis of diverse livelihood strategies and relative importance of fishing for each livelihood group concerned – disaggregating by gender, ethnic group, wealth status....)</li> </ul> <p>(b) <i>Brief overview of actors involved in fishing</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Vulnerability: context and factors affecting the capacities of different groups</i></p> <p>(d) <i>Identification of the areas in which policies, institutions and processes intervene</i></p>	<p>(a) Review of secondary literature complemented by :</p> <p>(b) selected interviews with key actors</p>	<p>(a) <b>National teams</b> : Data collection and analysis</p> <p>(b) <b>NCU, RSU</b> : Logistical and technical support</p>
2. Fisheries research : Potential and eventual contribution to sustainable livelihoods (SL)	<p>(a) <i>Fisheries research providers : Current situation and evolution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification : name of institution, type of organisation (NGO, state/public, private sector, producer organisation...), mandate concerning fisheries</li> <li>- Potential and capacities : Institutional resources and capacities (critical mass of researchers and technical staff, scientific infrastructure, equipment and logistical infrastructure ; financial resources ...)</li> <li>- Organisation approach / intervention strategy : principles and rules ; user participation; local knowledge and innovations taken into account ; use of participatory methods ; links &amp; partnerships with other organisations (NGOs, private sector, universities, other research bodies) ; incentives for researchers to take a demand driven approach</li> <li>- Contributions of strategic and adaptive research</li> <li>- Outputs : Identify available results relating to fishers livelihoods and key sources</li> </ul> <p>(b) <i>Opportunities, constraints and limits</i> : What are the key constraints faced by research – particularly in the area of promoting sustainable livelihoods? What possibilities exist for improvement ?</p>	<p>(a) Surveys/ semi-structured interviews with key informants in fisheries research institutions (Public sector, private sector, NGO, International Research Institutions,...)</p> <p>(b) <b>Case study</b> (partnerships between research and livelihoods groups): Surveys and interviews with different categories of actors involved in partnerships (Use focus group discussions as the entry point, ensuring that all socio-economic categories and gender groups are covered : women, men, small-scale producers, large-scale producers, fisherfolk, people involved in processing,...)</p> <p>(c) Surveys/interviews among decision-makers and development</p>	<p>(a) <b>National teams</b> : Data collection and analysis</p> <p>(b) <b>NCU, RSU</b> : Logistical and technical support</p> <p>(c) <b>International Consultants</b> : Supervision, support on methodology / methods</p>

	<p><i>(c) Other specific factors affecting the contribution of research to the sustainable livelihoods of fishing communities ?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nature of factors: institutions and organisations, markets, upstream and downstream constraints to technology development and uptake, decentralised service provision &amp; finance mechanisms, capacity strengthening support,...</li> <li>- How do these factors influence the contribution of research ? (in terms of the use of results by community groups, strengthening community capacities to participate in defining priorities,...)</li> </ul>	<p>actors / partners (international institutions, bilateral &amp; multilateral aid agencies,...)</p> <p>(d) Surveys/interviews with other research institutions (social, economic,...) which focus in some way on issues related to sustainable livelihoods</p> <p>(e) Identification of and surveys/interviews with institutions or organisations that affect or condition the contribution fisheries research can make to SL: e.g. providing training and strengthening the capacities of community level partners or producer organisations, decentralised finance mechanisms,...</p>	
--	--	--	--

THEME FROM TOR	AREAS OF STUDY	PROCESS	RESPONSIBILITIES
<p>3. Policies, Institutions and Processes in relation to research: Effects on sustainable livelihoods and contribution of fisheries research on policies and processes</p>	<p><b>1. Effects of PIPs with regard to research on sustainable livelihoods</b></p> <p><i>(a) Evolution of recent government policies regarding research (from 1990 to present) (linked with macro-economic policies such as structural adjustment) and their effects on the sustainability of livelihoods of artisanal fishing communities and poverty reduction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regulatory framework (Key texts, legislation,...) regarding fisheries research and their effects on SL of fishing communities</li> <li>- Existence and performance of fisheries research institutions</li> <li>- National priority given to fisheries research (resources allocated as compared to those allocated to other sectors such as agriculture,...)</li> <li>- Focus of national policies (regarding research and development), particularly in fisheries and poverty reduction (e.g. PRSP)</li> <li>- Legal standing of fisheries research institutions</li> <li>- Organisation &amp; coordination of research at the national level</li> </ul> <p><i>(b) Institutions and influence on SL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organisations involved in research provision (number, diversity, performance, complementarity,...)</li> <li>- principles governing each institution's interventions and approach (e.g. principle of « <b>Demand Driven Research</b> », promotion and use of participatory methods, mechanisms to ensure « downward accountability »,...)</li> </ul> <p><i>(c) Processes and their influence on SL for those involved in fishing</i></p>	<p>(a) Identification of Ministerial Departments, technical partners and funders involved</p> <p>(b) Application of the SFLP analytical framework on PIPs complemented by :</p> <p>(c) Surveys / interviews with Ministries, government departments and other relevant institutions at two levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level 1 : Decision-making</li> <li>- Level 2 : Executive (units responsible for programme implementation)</li> </ul>	<p>(a) <b>National teams:</b> Data collection and analysis</p> <p>(b) <b>NCU, RSU :</b> Logistical and technical support</p> <p>(c) <b>International Consultants :</b> Supervision, support on methodology / methods</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research institutions' capacities to implement their policies (e.g. real availability of resources, effectiveness in implementation of research programmes)</li> <li>- Implementation of a regulatory framework for research (level at which rules are applied,...)</li> <li>- Financing mechanisms and their sustainability (ease of mobilising funds, sustainability of finance sources, competitive research funds,...)</li> <li>- Culture, social rules and traditional practices</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Contribution of fisheries and socio-economic research regarding policies and processes</b></p> <p><i>(a) Linkages between research, public policy and communities that depend totally or partially on fisheries : Do linkages exist and what evidence of linkage mechanisms exists?</i></p> <p><i>(b) Existence of linkage mechanisms (Chambers of Agriculture, Local authorities, District committees or other bodies ....) through which local people can influence fishery sector policies : Are these mechanisms effective ?</i></p> <p><i>(c) Direct contributions of research to policy and decision making and development processes : What concrete contributions do research providers make to policy formulation and decisions? (for example : influence in creating new laws, instigation of institutional reorganisation or reform...)</i></p> <p><i>(d) Objective or external limitations (violent conflict, weak approach to participation in decision making, limited local or community capacities,...) on the contribution of fisheries or social research regarding PIPs : identify the principle obstacles in order of importance</i></p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p><i>(e) Ways forward for improving the contribution of fisheries and social research regarding PIPs and to the livelihoods of communities involved in fishing : To what extent and in what ways can the contribution of fisheries research to the reduction of poverty among fishers be strengthened? (pilot activities and initiatives to strengthen partnerships between research and artisanal fisherfolk, strenghtening the capacity of research providers regarding participatory approaches, mechanisms to ensure the participation of diverse livelihood groups in research management bodies,...)</i></p>		
--	---	--	--

THEME FROM TOR	AREAS OF STUDY	PROCESS	RESPONSIBILITIES
<p>4. Key lessons and identification of small-scale activities or initiatives to improve the contribution of fisheries research to the reduction of poverty among those using fisheries resources</p>	<p>(a) <i>Lessons: Effects of PIPs regarding fisheries research and SL</i>  (b) <i>Formulation of innovative activities aimed at strengthening the impact of research on SL and poverty reduction</i>  (c) <i>Formulation of recommendations</i></p>	<p>(a) Synthesis and analysis  (b) Participatory feedback with all stakeholders and identification of innovative activities to strengthen the contribution of research to poverty reduction among artisanal fisherfolk  (c) Final feedback workshop to discuss the results of the study  (d) Production and distribution of the results of the study</p>	<p>(a) <b>National teams</b> : Analysis of all the cases and situations studied, identification and validation of ideas for activities and initiatives (feedback workshop) – by the livelihood groups involved in fishing, and identification of roles of other actors (NGOs, Private sector,...). Drafting final country reports.  (b) <b>NCU, RSU</b> : Logistical and technical support for national analysis  (c) <b>International Consultants</b>(in consultation with RSU) : Overview and analysis of the case studies and national reports, finalisation of the content of proposals for pilot activities and modalities for implementation, formulation of recommendations, drafting and completion of synthesis report.  (d) <b>RSU</b> : Production and dissemination of study results.</p>

## EXPECTED OUTPUTS

THEMES	EXPECTED OUTPUTS
1. Identifying diversity, key assets and livelihood strategies of fishing communities and livelihood groups using fisheries resources	Note describing livelihood groups involved in fisheries, the key assets on which they draw (social, human, natural, physical and financial), the vulnerability context in which they are situated, and the relative importance of fishing to the livelihoods of these groups (compared to other sources of livelihoods)
2. Fisheries research: Potential and eventual contribution to SL	<p>(a) Notes reviewing the current status of each fisheries research provider (activities, capacities and performance – format provided), and the key factors influencing their contribution to livelihoods artisanal fisherfolk and the contribution of social science research to fisheries.</p> <p>(b) Case study notes providing lessons on collaboration between fisheries research providers and artisanal fisherfolk communities including identification of areas for improvement (ideas for pilot activities and initiatives, specific recommendations,...)</p>
3. PIPs in relation to research : Effects on SL and contribution of fisheries research to policies and processes	Note on the influence of PIPs regarding research on SL and poverty reduction of artisanal fishing communities, as well as the contribution of fisheries and social science research to policies and processes
4. Key lessons and pilot activities and initiatives to improve the contribution of fisheries research to the reduction of poverty among communities using fisheries resources	<p>(a) Country reports reviewing : the state of fisheries research, its contribution to SL and poverty reduction in artisanal fishing communities, links with social research, relationship with PIPs; lessons from case studies of collaboration between research and artisanal fishing communities and ideas for small-scale initiatives to strengthen collaboration in order to achieve poverty reduction; and providing a number of specific recommendations.</p> <p>(b) Final synthesis report providing a comparative analysis of country situations and experiences, providing key lessons from the case studies of collaboration between research providers and artisanal fisherfolk as well as recommendations, and presenting ideas for a number of small-scale activities to strengthen the contribution of research to poverty reduction among poor people involved in artisanal fishing.</p>

### 3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDY PARTNERS

The following division of roles for study partners was agreed at the October 2001 workshop in Cotonou.

<b>RSU</b>	<b>NCU</b>	<b>National study team</b>	<b>International consultants</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organise the logistics for the whole study and for the international consultant supervision / advisory missions</li> <li>• Arrange contract for national teams</li> <li>• Provide and monitor funds</li> <li>• Organise the regional multi-country workshops</li> <li>• Share information on interim and final results between country teams, NCUs and international consultants</li> <li>• Monitor national teams and international</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate the work of the national study team and international consultants throughout the study</li> <li>• Monitor progress and feed country team results to the RSU and international consultants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and contract national team / specialists for the country study (lead institution)</li> <li>• Organise implementation of and conduct study following methodology agreed at planning workshop in Cotonou</li> <li>• Report regularly to NCU and RSU which will together monitor progress</li> <li>• Organise the supervision missions for the international consultants and integrate them into ongoing work</li> <li>• Take into account suggestions for change or improvement to implementation made by the international consultants</li> <li>• Observe the agreed deadlines and workplan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide / lead development of overall study methodology and workplan</li> <li>• Advise national teams on implementation and analysis</li> <li>• Conduct one short supervision mission to each country during the execution of the study (as planned in Cotonou)</li> <li>• Prepare materials for and facilitate launch and final feedback workshops in Cotonou</li> <li>• Draft a synthesis report drawing together key lessons and recommendations from the outputs of the six national teams</li> <li>• Finalise a succinct synthesis report with priority</li> </ul>

<p>consultants, and their progress in completing outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide translation services if needed</li> <li>• Assure overall coordination of the 6-country study</li> <li>• Approve, publish and disseminate final outputs</li> <li>• Identify and facilitate further activities that emerge from the study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver country outputs to NCU, RSU and international consultants by dates agreed in the workplan</li> </ul>	<p>recommendations and activities at the national and programme levels</p>
--	---	--

---

#### **4. REVISED OUTLINES FOR OUTPUTS AND COUNTRY REPORTS**

---

##### **INTRODUCTION**

*THE FOLLOWING OUTLINES ARE FOR INTERIM OUTPUTS DESIGNED TO HELP THE COUNTRY TEAMS WORK TOWARDS THE FINAL NATIONAL REPORT AND PROVIDE A COMMON FOUNDATION FOR DRAFTING THE OVERALL SYNTHESIS REPORT. AN INDICATIVE STRUCTURE FOR THE FINAL NATIONAL REPORT IS INCLUDED AT THE END AND FORMATS FOR INTERIM OUTPUTS ARE PROVIDED.*

*THESE OUTLINES GIVE AN IDEA OF THE MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR EACH COUNTRY BUT LEAVE ROOM FOR NATIONAL TEAMS TO ADD ELEMENTS APPROPRIATE TO THEIR CONTEXT.*

*A MENU OF RESEARCH METHODS THAT NATIONAL TEAMS MAY WISH TO DRAW ON DURING THE STUDY IS INCLUDED AS AN ANNEX.*

*[MATERIALS DEVELOPED BY PROVIDED BY KARIM HUSSEIN (ODI) AND JEAN ZOUNDI (INERA)]*

## **OUTLINE FOR OUTPUT 1**

**Note describing livelihood groups involved in fisheries, the vulnerability context in which they are situated, and the relative importance of fishing to the livelihoods of these groups (compared to other sources of livelihoods)**

(maximum 10 pages)

### ***Core themes:***

- Identification of key livelihood groups using fisheries resources
- Brief description of key livelihood groups drawing on fisheries resources (e.g. according to the role of fisheries in their lives compared to other activities)
- Place of fisheries in their livelihoods and contribution to livelihood assets (e.g. financial, social, human capital.... )
- Table comparing the key characteristics of these livelihood groups
- Vulnerability context for each livelihood group: susceptibility to external shocks (e.g. deterioration of environmental resources, natural disaster, conflict, macro-economic shocks etc)
- Community based institutions and organisations that exist for management of fisheries resources (including producer organisations) affecting fisheries
- Gender roles
- *etc*

## OUTLINE FOR OUTPUT 2

**Note reviewing the current status of each research provider (activities, capacities and performance – format provided below), and the key factors influencing their contribution to the livelihoods of artisanal fisherfolk**

### *1. Description of each institution/organisation's current situation and analysis of recent evolution (1-2 pages each – fact sheet format provided below)*

- Type of organisation (non-governmental organisation (NGO), national research institute, private sector...) : name, year created, and mandate
- Coverage (geographical, population groups and categories concerned such as: poor and rich, women and men, migrants and settled populations...)
- Type of organisation (International or national research institute, NGO, private)
- Types of fisheries of interest to the organisation and key research themes
- Finance (amount allocated for fisheries research)
- Number of researchers and range of disciplines (social science capacity?)
- Contribution to national policy formulation in fisheries sector (how ?)
- Contribution to strengthening capacities of fisherfolk and their organisations
- Contribution/place of social science research
- Capacity for development-oriented research (demonstrated by.....incentives, training and experience for researchers in participatory methods, etc )
- Partnerships with other organisations/ groups (particularly: with NGOs, private sector or social science research institutions (research centres; NGOs, universities), groups of producers / decentralised local authorities
- Approach and intervention strategy (links with users and development contexts, procedure for needs identification, “on-farm” research, ... use/promotion of participatory approaches and at which stages of research project cycle from needs assessment to implementation and monitoring.)
- Constraints, limits and opportunities
- Key research results available on fisherfolk livelihoods (listing location on website if exists )

### *2. Overall analysis of key factors influencing research provider contribution to the livelihoods of artisanal fisherfolk*

#### ***Length: Maximum 5 pages***

- Producer and processor
  - Access to markets, credit and financing mechanisms
  - Access to training and capacity strengthening support
  - Other
- Consequences of these factors on access to and use of fisheries-related knowledge and technologies
- Etc.

**Output 2: Fact sheet format for analysis of research providers**

<b>ORGANISATION</b> (name, year created, mandate)	
<i>Coverage (geographical, population groups and categories concerned such as: poor and rich, women and men, migrants and settled populations...)</i>	
<i>Type of organisation (International or national research institute, NGO, private)</i>	
<i>Types of fisheries covered and key research themes</i>	
<i>Finance (amount allocated for fisheries research)</i>	
<i>No. research staff (by discipline)</i>	
<i>Contribution to policy in fisheries sector (how ?)</i>	
<i>Contribution to strengthening capacities of fisherfolk and their organisations</i>	
<i>Contribution/place of social science research</i>	
<i>Capacity for development-oriented research (demonstrated by.....incentives, training and experience for researchers in participatory methods, etc )</i>	
<i>Partnerships with other organisations / groups of producers / decentralised local authorities</i>	
<i>Approach and intervention strategy (links with users and development contexts, procedure for needs identification, “on-farm” research, ....)</i>	
<i>Constraints, limits et opportunities</i>	
<i>Key research results available on fisherfolk livelihoods</i>	

### **OUTLINE FOR OUTPUT 3:**

**Case study notes providing lessons on experiences of collaboration between fisheries research providers and artisanal fisherfolk including identification of areas for improvement (ideas for activities to improve partnership, specific recommendations,...)**

*Length: maximum 2 pages each case study*

Title of case study

- Types of actor involved in the partnership (e.g. formal producer groups, other actors) and size (number, including who is represented, e.g. women, poor)
- Origins of the collaboration (who initiated, how, why...)
- Objective of partnership
- Other partners involved in the collaboration (e.g. private sector, NGO...)
- Description of activities undertaken in partnership: role and responsibility of each partner
- Process (use of participatory methods?...)
- Principle responsibilities and roles of fisherfolk in the process (demand, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation...)
- Results and impacts from the collaboration: strengths and weaknesses and improvements possible
- Sustainability and replicability of the experience
- Summary of key lessons (factors favouring or working against partnership, including e.g. adequate incentives, participatory methods, upstream/downstream issues etc...)
- Ideas for activities and interventions to improve partnership

### Output 3 : Partnership case study format

-1-2 pages max

<b>Title of case study of partnership</b>	
<b>1. Types of actor involved</b>	
<b>2. Origins of the collaboration</b>	
<b>3. Principle objectives of the partnership</b>	
<b>4. Other partners involved</b>	
<b>5. Key activities in partnership</b>	
<b>6. Process (approach, use of participatory methods...)</b>	
<b>7. Roles of fisherfolk in the process</b>	
<b>8. Results and impacts</b>	
<b>9. Sustainability and replicability of the partnership</b>	
<b>10. Key lessons</b>	
<b>11. Ideas for activities and initiatives to encourage partnership</b>	

**NOTE:**

*These case study sheets should be attached as annexes to the country report (and provided in electronic format as well as hard copy).*

### **Output 3: Alternative to detailed case studies of partnerships**

In countries where no cases of research-fisheries resource user linkages currently exist, teams should focus on why and what can be done to change this situation.

#### ***Guide***

1. Analyse the key factors that limit or work against linkages or partnerships in the particular country context. For example, identify:

- factors linked to producers and other fisheries resource users and their organisations (e.g. weak capacities, insufficient organisation, lack of control over upstream and downstream issues surrounding production – such as input supply and marketing etc.);

- factors linked to research providers (e.g. limited researcher capacities; low level of training for researchers in participatory methods and approaches; absence of appropriate incentive mechanisms; limited access to skills and services in social science/social analysis etc. );

- factors linked to policies and institutions (e.g. absence of an appropriate legislative framework encouraging the development of producer, processing and trader organisations: lack of a legal right to association and avenues for legal recognition; persistence of centralised service provision; ineffective local and national coordination bodies which provide a space for users to express their demands / needs to service providers).

2. How can linkages be encouraged in the country context (e.g. specific legal reforms, decentralised service provision, support to strengthen organisation capacities...)?

3. What role can research providers play in this process?

#### **OUTLINE FOR OUTPUT 4:**

**Note on the influence of PIPs regarding research on SL and poverty reduction of artisanal fishing communities, as well as the contribution of fisheries and social science research to policies and processes**

*Length : 5 pages*

##### *(i) Analysis effects of PIPs with regard to research on sustainable livelihoods*

- Evolution of recent government policies regarding research (from 1990 to present) and their effects on the sustainability of livelihoods of artisanal fishing communities and poverty reduction
  - regulatory framework and key legislation regarding fisheries research and their effects on SL of fishing communities
  - macro-economic policies such as structural adjustment
  - national priority given to fisheries sector (resources allocated as compared to those allocated to other sectors such as agriculture,...)
  - link with poverty reduction strategy
  - status of fisheries research institutions within the ministerial framework
- Institutions involved in fisheries research and their influence on SL/poverty reduction
  - variety of organisations involved (public, private, NGO, producer organisation etc)
  - importance accorded to: the principles of '**Demand Driven Research**', the use of participatory methods, establishing mechanisms to ensure 'downward accountability',...)
- Processes and their influence on SL
  - Research institutions' capacities to implement their policies (e.g. availability of resources to undertake research activities and participatory research, effectiveness in implementation of research programmes)
  - Existence of adequate incentives for collaborative research
  - Financing mechanisms and their sustainability (ease of mobilising funds, sustainability of finance sources, competitive research funds,...)
  - Impacts of culture, social rules and traditional practices

##### *(ii) Contribution of fisheries and socio-economic research regarding policies and processes*

- Linkages between research, public policy and communities that depend totally or partially on fisheries : Do mechanisms exist to demonstrate such linkages?
- Existence of linkage mechanisms (Chambers of Agriculture, local authorities, District committees or other bodies ...) through which local people can influence fishery sector policies : Are these mechanisms effective ?
- Direct contributions of research to policy and decision making and development processes : What concrete contributions do research providers make to policy formulation and decisions? (for example : influence in creating new laws, instigation of institutional reorganisation or reform...)
- Objective or external limitations on research (conflict, weak approach to participation in decision making, limited local or community capacities,...) on the contribution of

fisheries or social research regarding Policies Institutions and Processes (PIPs) :  
Principle obstacles in order of importance

- Ways forward for improving the contribution of fisheries and social research regarding PIPs and the nature of the livelihoods of fisherfolk: To what extent and in what ways can the contribution of research to poverty reduction be strengthened? (pilot activities or initiatives to strengthen partnerships between research and artisanal fisherfolk, strengthening the capacity of research providers regarding participatory approaches, mechanisms to ensure the participation of diverse livelihood groups in research management bodies).

## OUTLINE FOR FINAL COUNTRY REPORTS

Drawing on the notes produced during the study, the country team should draft a single concise country report.

*Length : 20 pages maximum (annexes to be attached to the report)*

***Content :***

This national report should be analytical and reflect all the analysis provided in the short notes produced during the study.

Each national report should include an executive summary (maximum 2 pages) and as a minimum provide analysis of :

- the overall state of fisheries research in the country
- the contribution of social science research
- the contribution of research to SL and poverty reduction among artisanal fisherfolk
- the lessons from case studies of partnerships between research and artisanal fishing communities
- the effects of PIPs
- ideas for activities to strengthen collaboration between research and users in order to achieve sustainable livelihoods and poverty reduction for artisanal fisherfolk
- recommendations
- etc.

## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1: INDICATIVE METHODS FOR DATA COLLECTION IN SFLP RESEARCH-USER LINKAGES STUDY

Method	Examples of themes and data to be collected (see study's analytical framework)	Target group
Secondary data / document review	All themes – identification of livelihood groups	N/a
Semi-structured interviews with key informants using pre-established interview guides	Identification of livelihood groups, research roles and structure, ideas for linkage case studies, PIPs etc	Officials in ministries, research institution officials, training bodies, representatives of NGOs, private sector, etc
Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions	Details of research system, partnerships, PIPs etc	Communities/groups of fisheries resource users, processors or traders
Other PRA tools if seen as useful to obtaining information for case studies: e.g. venn diagrammes; impacts matrix; wealth ranking	Case studies of partnerships; relative importance of institutional linkages; impact of research on livelihoods; identifying whether poor groups have linkages with research	Communities, local organisations, livelihood groups, fishers, traders and processors, men, women, etc
SFLP methodology / analytical framework	PIPs	Various

#### Notes

This is a guide to assist teams in data collection as they work towards producing the various outputs required in this study. It focuses on qualitative rather than quantitative methods. It is not intended to be restrictive or limiting: teams should use other data collection methods or approaches where appropriate. Some additional notes on data collection follow.

1. Careful identification of the most appropriate sources of information is critical before starting work. Discussions with key informants will help here.

2. Avoid simply requesting respondents to fill in forms – and favour face to face interviews with all actors where possible (especially important with users and their organisations). These should, however, be based on pre-established interview guides or an analytical framework (e.g. that for PIP analysis).

3. Use secondary data as much as possible, but confirm the validity of information through triangulation with key informant interviews, focus group discussions with user groups and livelihood groups.

4. To ensure accuracy of data and validity of the analysis, on completing the partnership and research provider case study frameworks, care should be taken to confirm that analysis is correct by strong teamwork, triangulating with co-interviewers and holding feedback discussions with respondents / organisations.

## ANNEX 2 : OVERALL WORKPLAN

### Key dates and deadlines for the overakllsix-country study

Activity / output	Date
Planning workshop (Benin)	8-9 October, 2001
Distribution of agreed methodology / plan	20 October, 2001
Constitution of teams and start of national studies	10 November, 2001
Advisory missions by international consultants (one visit per country)	<i>First stage :</i> Mid November – Mid December, 2001 <i>Second stage :</i> Mid-January - end February, 2002
Submission of Outputs 1 and 2	31 December, 2001
Submission of Outputs 3 and 4	28 February, 2002
Submission of final country reports	31 March, 2002
Drafting of synthesis report	April, 2002
Final feedback workshop	End May 2002
Publication, dissemination of results to a range of partners and users, and planning / implementation of further activities	July 2002, onwards

## **ANNEX 3 : SFLP PIP METHODOLOGY USED IN THE STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF PIP ON THE LIVELIHOODS OF FISHERIES COMMUNITIES – UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUES AND DEVELOPING PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES TO SOLUTIONS**

### **A. Methodology used in Ghana PIP Case Study**

*(Ghana NCU- Under the coordination of Barry Blake (SFLP consultant) : results and final reports available from Christophe Breuil, RSU, SFLP, Benin)*

#### **Impact of PIP on the livelihoods of fisheries communities: Draft guide for discussions at macro level**

##### **1. General**

- Name of institution
- Location
- Legal status: public, private, quasi and civil service
- If no legal instrument establishing your institution, indicate why
- Official mandate / functions
- Are there any other functions performed by the institution which would not be stipulated in the mandate, and if yes give precisions
- Do you have prerogatives in relation to poverty alleviation

##### **2. Impact upon the fisheries community**

- What are the main responsibilities in the fishing industry (production, utilization, management, etc.)
- In particular, how does your institution impact upon livelihoods of fisheries communities
- Do you use any indicators for the monitoring of such impact

##### **3. Institutional Links**

- With which institutions do you have official relationship (with reference to legal texts)
- In particular, what is the relationship between your institution and DoF
- With which institutions do you have informal relationship
- What are the institutions with which you have strong and functional links
- For all the above mentioned institutions what is the nature and purpose of the links/relationship with your institution
- Are there any fishing-related institutions/communities with which you have relationship

##### **4. Policies**

- What are the major policies for guiding your institution
- What are the procedure for policy formulation

- Do these procedure include participation of fisheries communities – if no, explain why
- What are the major policy tools (e.g., decrees, recommendations, programmes, etc.)

### **5. Processes**

- What are the strategies used and what are the channels taken to implement your policies/programmes
- What are the major laws and regulations used by your institution to implement its work
- What are the human and financial means available to support work implementation
- What measures have you taken to ensure that policies are implemented on the ground
- Are the fisheries associations represented on your board/executive/management committee
- Do you meet sometimes the fisheries communities to explain your policies and programmes

### **6. Monitoring and evaluation**

- What are the data/information/indicator collected and used by your institution, in particular those in relation to the livelihoods of fisheries communities
- Are there any direct channel of communication between your institution and
  - 1) the fisheries communities - if yes, how? and
  - 2) producer's associations (including post-harvest sector) - if yes, how?
- Do you involve DoF and/or fisheries communities in the evaluation of your policies and programmes
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the monitoring and evaluation system

### **7. Strengths of your institution**

- What are the strengths of your institution
- How did they develop
- Do you think that they are beneficial for the improvement of the livelihoods of artisanal fisheries communities and, if yes, at which level/entry point (with reference to the SL framework)
- What should be done to further enhance your ability to improve the livelihoods of artisanal fisheries communities

### **8. Constraints of your institution**

- What are the major internal constraints which hamper the functioning of your institution
- What are the major constraints which hamper the effectiveness of your actions
- What are the major constraints which hamper the development of closer relationships with other institutions
- What are those constraints which could be “easily” removed

## **9. Other**

- When considering the global results/performance of your institution, do you think that the latter are in accordance with expected objectives
- Is your institution intended to improve its impact in the future upon the livelihoods of fisheries communities – if yes, specify
- In this context, how will lessons learnt/experiences, strengths and weaknesses of your institution be taken into consideration in the future for improved decision-making and action in relation to the livelihoods of fisheries communities
- What could be the major repercussions of the on-going decentralization process on the mandate, functioning and actions of your institution
- What are those measures which have already been taken or are ready to be taken in relation to the decentralization process
- What are the major items which were not included in the questionnaire
- Who are the other resource persons within your institution that should be met
- Who could be the person within your institution who would accept to facilitate collaboration between the Ghana NCU and your institution in the future

## B. Methodology used in Senegal PIP Case Study

### ASPECTS METHODOLOGIQUES RELATIFS A L'ETUDE DE L'IMPACT DES PIP SUR LES MOYENS D'EXISTENCE DES COMMUNAUTES DE PECHE

-

#### Unité de Coordination Nationale du Sénégal

(Sous la coordination de Pierre Failler (consultant PMDP) et Aboubakry Kane (membre de l'UCN du Sénégal)<sup>1</sup>)

#### Méthode de travail pour la cartographie des institutions : Organisation du travail de cartographie des institutions

Etapas	Niveau d'intervention			Organisation humaine
	National	Régional	Local	
<b>1. Identification</b>	Institutions dont les décisions ont des incidences directes ou indirectes sur les communautés de pêche	Représentations régionale et départementale des institutions nationales Et l'ensemble des autres institutions qui n'opèrent qu'au plan régional (ou départemental)	2 cas de figures : les émanations locales des institutions régionales auxquelles s'ajoutent celles qui n'opèrent que localement  les groupes homogènes au sein des communautés de pêche (arbitrairement constitués pour les besoins de l'étude)	Tenue de réunion de travail afin de dresser la liste des institutions nationales  Requêtes auprès des services régionaux, départementaux et locaux afin qu'ils dressent la liste des institutions à considérer
<b>2. Demande de coopération et collaboration</b>	<u>Coopération :</u> Courrier de motivation expliquant la vision du programme, le	Mêmes demandes de coopération et de collaboration auprès des institutions	Les demandes portent uniquement sur la coopération.  Le renforcement des moyens	Mise à la disposition de l'UCN de personnes ressources complémentaires  Réunions de travail

<sup>1</sup> Ont également participé à la rédaction du rapport : Moustapha Dème (Centre de recherches océanographiques de Dakar Thiaroye) ; Amsatou Thiaw Cissé (Union des organisations de pêche artisanale de la Grande Côte) ; Pierre Sagna (Ministère de la planification) ; Mamadou Samb (Ministère de la décentralisation et de l'aménagement du territoire) ; Moussa Wally (Ministère de l'environnement)

Etapas	Niveau d'intervention			Organisation humaine
	National	Régional	Local	
	<p>but de l'étude pilote et les raisons de la demande de coopération</p> <p><u>Collaboration :</u> Institutions-clefs sollicitées afin de mettre à la disposition du projet une personne ressource qui puisse participer au travail d'interview des autres institutions</p>	<p>régionales et départementales</p>	<p>humains et informationnels est assuré par les représentations de la DOPM sur place</p>	<p>afin d'expliquer la démarche à suivre</p> <p>Organisation de plusieurs équipes d'enquêteurs</p>
<b>3. Entretien</b>	<p>Entretien semi-dirigé à partir d'un questionnaire de base élaboré pour les différents niveaux d'intervention</p> <p>L'ensemble des informations est compilé dans une base de données</p>	<p>Entretien à partir du questionnaire de base auquel à été rajouté une référence au pentagone des MED</p> <p>L'ensemble des informations est compilé dans une base de données</p>	<p>Entretien des institutions locales à partir du questionnaire utilisé pour les institutions régionales</p> <p>Entretien des groupes au sein de la communauté à partir d'un guide semi-structuré</p> <p>L'ensemble des informations est compilé dans une base de données</p>	<p><u>Au plan national :</u></p> <p>Déplacements à Dakar (15 jours)</p> <p>5 équipes de 2 personnes</p> <p>Au plan régional, départemental et local :</p> <p>Déplacement à Fatcik (3 jours)</p> <p>Dionewar (4 j.)</p> <p>Niodior (1 j.)</p> <p>Foundiougne (3 j.)</p> <p>10 personnes pour l'interview des institutions</p> <p>4 équipes de 2/3 personnes pour</p>

Etapas	Niveau d'intervention			Organisation humaine
	National	Régional	Local	
				l'interview des groupes
<b>4. Recueil d'information complémentaire</b>	<p>Information relative :</p> <p>aux politiques : textes officiels</p> <p>aux mandats et réalisations des institutions : textes de constitution et documents d'évaluation des actions réalisées</p> <p>aux projets de développement : divers documents de préparation, d'exécution et d'évaluation du projet</p> <p>aux sujets précis : pauvreté, condition de vie des communautés rurales, relation environnement et pauvreté</p>			<p>Equipes d'enquêteurs se charger de récupérer les documents pertinents lors des entretiens</p> <p>Déplacement de certains membres de l'UCN jusqu'aux institutions concernées, notamment celles des bailleurs de fond</p> <p>Recherche de documents pouvant alimenter la réflexion sur le sujet de l'amélioration des moyens d'existence des communautés de pêche</p>

**Méthode de travail pour la cartographie des institutions : méthode selon le niveau des PIP**

Niveau	Méthode
<b><i>National</i></b>	<p>1- Informer les institutions cibles par courrier sur :            PMEDP            AMED            Etude impacts PIP            Informations requises</p> <p>2 – Visite des institutions et interview personne ressource et sur la base d'un guide d'entretien et sur rendez-vous</p> <p>3 – Collecte de documents et étude bibliographique</p>
<b><i>Régional</i></b>	<p>1 – Informer représentant régional DOPM sur l'étude et AMED</p> <p>2 – Requête d'informations sur :            institutions régionales : confirmation liste nationale et compléter choix des sites (pertinence)            capitaux des communautés de base des pêcheurs (liste provisoire)            information institutions locales</p> <p>3 – Informer les communautés de pêche et ceux des catégories professionnelles identifiées</p> <p>4 – Mobilisation de l'équipe de travail à Fatick            interview des institutions régionales            interview des communautés de base de pêcheurs et des différentes catégories professionnelles identifiées            recueil de documents et étude documentaire            confirmation liste capitaux            prendre connaissance de leur perception de leur pauvreté            prendre connaissance de leurs solutions et stratégies envisagées            prendre connaissance de leur degré de connaissance des politiques, institutions et processus en cours</p>
<b><i>Local</i></b>	<p>Préalables            Choix d'un département            Choix de deux sites ou villages de pêche maritime            Choix de deux sites ou villages de pêche continentale</p> <p>1 – requête d'informations</p> <p>2 – informer les institutions locales, les communautés de base de pêcheurs et des différentes catégories professionnelles identifiées</p>

	<p>3 – visiter les villages ou sites de pêche pour  Cartographier les institutions locales :  interview des institutions  collecte documents et étude documentaire  interviewer les différentes catégories identifiées dans les communautés de base de pêcheurs  réunion de groupe restreint de membre des différentes catégories identifiées dans les communautés de base de pêcheurs  confirmation de la liste des capitaux provisoires  prendre connaissance de leur propre perception de leur pauvreté  prendre connaissance de leur solution et stratégies envisagées  prendre connaissance de leur degré de connaissance des institutions, politiques et processus en cours  prendre connaissance de leur appréciation des institutions, politiques et processus en cour  prendre connaissance de la place qu'ils donnent aux politiques processus et institutions dans leurs solutions et stratégies</p>
--	---

## **Guide d'entretien des institutions au niveau national**

### **1. Mandats de l'institution**

- ◆ Quels est le statut de l'institution ? (statut légal)
- ◆ Quels sont les mandats officiels de l'institution ? (mandats écrits et reconnus)
- ◆ Quelles sont activités que votre institutions réalisent sans en avoir reçu le mandat (en raison d'une évolution du contexte) ?
- ◆ Avez-vous des prérogatives de lutte contre la pauvreté ?

### **2. Niveaux d'intervention dans le secteur de la pêche**

- ◆ A quel niveau se situe votre intervention dans le secteur de la pêche (ex. Production, mareyage, transformation, etc.) ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les mesures qui affectent les Moyens d'existence durable des Communautés de pêche ?

### **3. Liens avec les autres institutions**

- ◆ Quelles sont les institutions avec lesquelles vous avez des liens institutionnels établis (basés sur les textes légaux) ?
- ◆ Quelles sont celles avec lesquelles vous collaborez réellement et pour lesquelles existent de solides liens fonctionnels ?
- ◆ Quel est la nature et la forme des liens qui vous unissent aux différentes institutions mentionnées ci-avant ? (pour chaque institution, nature du lien et forme qu'il revêt)
- ◆ Existe-il des institutions ou Communautés de pêche qui vous demandent d'intervenir ?

### **4. Organisation de la prise de décision et mécanismes d'application**

- ◆ Quelle sont les formes habituelles des décisions prises ? (décret, recommandations, etc.)

- ◆ Quels sont les canaux empruntés pour véhiculer les décisions prises ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les moyens législatifs et réglementaires dont vous disposez pour mener à bien votre travail ?
- ◆ Quels sont les moyens financiers et humains mis en oeuvre ?
- ◆ Quels sont les formes de dialogue avec les partenaires institutionnels mis en oeuvre ?
- ◆ Quels sont les formes de dialogue avec les Communautés de pêche ?

## **5. Information**

- ◆ Quelles sont les informations utilisées ?
- ◆ Comment est organisée la collecte de ces informations ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les informations qui font actuellement défaut et pourquoi ?

## **6. Points forts**

- ◆ Quels sont les points forts de l'institution ?
- ◆ Comment ont-ils été développés ?
- ◆ Sont-ils des acquis fragiles ou solides ?

**7. Contraintes à l'exercice du mandat de l'institution, son action et l'application des mesures prises**

- ◆ Quelles sont les principales contraintes internes à l'institution qui entravent son bon fonctionnement ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les principales contraintes qui limitent la portée des actions entreprises ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les principales contraintes qui limitent la coopération avec les autres institutions ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les contraintes qui pourraient être levées sans trop d'effort et de moyen ?

**8. Effets de la décentralisation**

- ◆ Quelles vont être les principaux effets de la décentralisation sur le mandat, le fonctionnement et les actions de l'institution ?
- ◆ Sont-ils déjà pris en compte ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les mesures concrètes prises actuellement ou qui vont être prises dans un avenir proche au regard de ce phénomène ?

**9. Effectivité du mandat, des actions entreprises**

- ◆ Les résultats obtenus sont-ils conformes aux objectifs assignés ?
- ◆ Disposez-vous d'un outil d'évaluation de l'impacts des mesures prises et notamment en ce qui concerne les Communautés de pêche ?
- ◆ Etes vous satisfait de ces outils ?
- ◆ Comment sont pris en compte les enseignements des réalisations passées et présentes dans l'élaborations des mesures futures ?

**10. Points importants non abordés**

- ◆ Quels sont les points importants que le questionnaire n'a pas abordé ?

**11. Documentation**

- ◆ Documents disponibles et modalités d'acquisition
- ◆ Documents créant l'institution et organisant son fonctionnement
- ◆ Dernier rapport annuel ou périodique
- ◆ exemples de contrat , conventions ou tout autres procédures utilisées par l'institution

**12. Personnes ressources**

- ◆ Quelles sont les autres personnes ressources au sein de votre institution qu'il serait pertinent de rencontrer ?
- ◆ Quelle est la personne ressource qui consentirait à devenir le répondant de l'UCN dans l'institution ?

## Guide d'entretien des institutions au niveau régional et local

### 1. Mandats de l'institution

- ◆ Quels est le statut de l'institution ? (statut légal)
- ◆ Quels sont les mandats officiels de l'institution ? (mandats écrits et reconnus)
- ◆ Quelles sont activités que votre institutions réalisent sans en avoir reçu le mandat (en raison d'une évolution du contexte) ?
- ◆ Avez-vous des prérogatives de lutte contre la pauvreté ?

### 2. Niveaux d'intervention dans le secteur de la pêche

- ◆ A quel niveau se situe votre intervention dans le secteur de la pêche (ex. Production, mareyage, transformation, etc.) ?
- ◆ A quels types de capitaux s'adressent vos interventions (Humain, Physique, Social, Financier, Naturel) ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les mesures qui affectent les Moyens d'existence durable des Communautés de pêche ?

### 3. Liens avec les autres institutions

- ◆ Quelles sont les institutions ou organisations avec lesquelles vous avez des liens institutionnels établis (basés sur les textes légaux) ?
- ◆ Quelle est votre perception/appréciation des institutions et processus du niveau national ?
- ◆ Quelles sont celles avec lesquelles vous collaborez réellement et pour lesquelles existent de solides liens fonctionnels ?
- ◆ Quel est la nature (collaboration, hiérarchie, etc.) et la forme (textes, accord verbal, contrat, etc.) des liens qui vous unissent aux différentes institutions ou organisations mentionnées ci-avant ? (pour chaque institution, nature du lien et forme qu'il revêt)
- ◆ Existe-il des institutions ou Communautés de pêche qui vous demandent d'intervenir ?

### 4. Organisation de la prise de décision et mécanismes d'application

- ◆ Quelle sont les formes habituelles des décisions prises ? (décret, recommandations, etc.)
- ◆ Quels sont les canaux empruntés pour véhiculer les décisions prises ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les moyens législatifs et réglementaires dont vous disposez pour mener à bien votre travail ?
- ◆ Quels sont les moyens financiers et humains que vous mettez en œuvre pour réaliser vos mandats ?
- ◆ Quels sont les formes de dialogue avec les partenaires institutionnels mises en œuvre pour réaliser vos mandats ?

### 5. Action, moyens disponibles, qualité de la collaboration, etc.)

- ◆ Comment ont-ils été développés ?
- ◆ Sont-ils des acquis fragiles ou solides ?

**6. Contraintes à l'exercice du mandat de l'institution, son action et l'application des mesures prises**

- ◆ Quelles sont les principales contraintes internes (humain (effectif, profil), logistique, organisationnel) à l'institution qui entravent son bon fonctionnement ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les principales contraintes qui limitent la portée des actions entreprises ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les principales contraintes qui limitent la coopération avec les autres institutions ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les contraintes qui pourraient être levées sans trop d'effort et de moyen ?

### **7. Effets de la décentralisation**

- ◆ Quelles vont être les principaux effets de la décentralisation sur le mandat, le fonctionnement et les actions de votre institution ?
- ◆ Sont-ils déjà pris en compte ?
- ◆ Quelles sont les mesures concrètes prises actuellement ou qui vont être prises par votre institution dans un avenir proche au regard de ce phénomène ?

### **8. Effectivité du mandat, des actions entreprises**

- ◆ Les résultats obtenus par votre institution sont-ils conformes aux objectifs assignés ?
- ◆ Disposez-vous d'un outil d'évaluation de l'impacts des mesures prises et notamment en ce qui concerne les Communautés de pêche ?

- ◆ Etes vous satisfait de ces outils ?
- ◆ Comment sont pris en compte les enseignements des réalisations passées et présentes dans l'élaborations des mesures futures ?

### **9. Points importants non abordés**

- ◆ Quels sont les points importants que le questionnaire n'a pas abordé ?

### **10. Documentation**

- ◆ Documents disponibles et modalités d'acquisition
- ◆ Documents créant l'institution et organisant son fonctionnement
- ◆ Dernier rapport annuel ou périodique
- ◆ exemples de contrat , conventions ou tout autres procédures utilisées par l'institution

### **11. Personnes ressources**

- ◆ Quelles sont les autres personnes ressources au sein de votre institution qu'il serait pertinent de rencontrer ?
- ◆ Quelle est la personne ressource qui consentirait à devenir le répondant de l'UCN dans l'institution ?

**ANNEX 4 : LIST OF PARTICIPANTS PLANNING WORKSHOP, COTONOU, 8-9 OCTOBRE 2001**

Name/Nom	Post/Poste (Institution)	Postal Box/Boîte Postale/Tel.	Contact E-mail / Adresse Electronique
Talhatou Barry	Point Focal I/C Guinée	BP 6129 Conakry, Guinée Tél: (224) 43-02-50/29-74-80	<a href="mailto:Ucn-pmdp@mirinet.com">Ucn-pmdp@mirinet.com</a>
Mme Barry Mama Yawa Sandouno	UCN/ Guinée, Chargée de Programme, Membre ONG ADEPEG	B.P. 4965 Conakry, Guinée Tél. (224) 40-29-53 D (224) 22-60-36	<a href="mailto:Kerewel@yahoo.fr">Kerewel@yahoo.fr</a>
Mamadou Moussa Diallo	CNSHB, Conakry	B.P.3738/39 Conakry, Guinée Tél. : (224) 46-44-91	<a href="mailto:m.diallo@caramail.com">m.diallo@caramail.com</a> <a href="mailto:mdiallo@cnsnb.org.gn">mdiallo@cnsnb.org.gn</a>
Mamoudou Aliou Dia	Chercheur, CNROP	BP 22, Nouadhibou R.I.M. Tél.(222) 5749035/5745124 Fax : (222) 5745081	<a href="mailto:devis@toptechnology.mr">devis@toptechnology.mr</a>
Sidi El Moctar Ould Mohamed Abdellahi	DEARH/MPem Nouakchott	BP 137 Tél. (222) 5290864 Fax: (222) 5253146	<a href="mailto:dearh.mpem@mauritania.mr">dearh.mpem@mauritania.mr</a>
DIA Amadou Bocar	ONG Mauritanie 2000	BP 4242 Nouakchott, Mauritanie Tél.: + 222 5256128/ 6441796 Fax : 5254631	<a href="mailto:abodia@yahoo.com">abodia@yahoo.com</a>
Bernard M.B. Ladu	Director, NIFFR (Nigeria) National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research	PMB 6006 New Bussa, Niger State	<a href="mailto:Gtz-KLFPP@t-online.de">Gtz-KLFPP@t-online.de</a>
M.A. Obakin	Director of Fisheries Nigeria/Chairman NCU Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development Area Eleven Garki Nymi Abuja		<a href="mailto:ropobakin@yahoo.com">ropobakin@yahoo.com</a> ;
Ajayi T.O.	Director NIOMR Nigeria	PMB 12729 Victoria Island Lagos, Nigeria Tel/Fax: (234) 01-261253/ 2619517/615175	<a href="mailto:niomr@hyperia.com">niomr@hyperia.com</a> <a href="mailto:niomr@linkserve.com.ng">niomr@linkserve.com.ng</a>

Amos O. Olaniyi	President, Fisheries Society of Nigeria	7 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Development House 21 Wharf Road, Apapa, P.O. Box 54089 Ikoyi, Lagos Tél. (234) 1-5876192 Fax : (234) 1-2621146	<a href="mailto:amos492001@yahoo.com">amos492001@yahoo.com</a>
Dr. Meke Soung Pierre Nolasque	SPL/MINEPIA/DPEPIAL	BP 721 Douala, Cameroun Tél. (237) 430642 Fax : (237) 421113/932553	<a href="mailto:PierreMeke@yahoo.com">PierreMeke@yahoo.com</a>
Djama Theodore	Chef Station IRAD	PMB 77 Limbe, Cameroun Tél. Portable: 731297	<a href="mailto:theodoredjama@yahoo.co.uk">theodoredjama@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Nzeugang Célestin	ONG SAILD Cameroun (Service d'Appui aux Initiatives Locales de Développement)	BP 11955 Yaoundé, Cameroun Tél. (237) 22-62-44/61-40-86 Fax : (237) 225162	<a href="mailto:saild@cmnet.cm">saild@cmnet.cm</a> ou <a href="mailto:cnzeugang@yahoo.fr">cnzeugang@yahoo.fr</a> ;
Soumaïla Diarra	Directeur National Adjoint DNAER/Mali Coordinateur National UCN/Mali	BP 275, Bamako, Mali Tél. (223) 221134/222559 Fax: (223) 221134	<a href="mailto:dnaer@malinet.ml">dnaer@malinet.ml</a> <a href="mailto:dnaer:pmdep@datatech toolnet.org">dnaer:pmdep@datatech toolnet.org</a>
Christophe Breuil	Chargé de la planification USR Cotonou		<a href="mailto:Christophe.Breuil@sflp-pmedp.firsnet.bj">Christophe.Breuil@sflp-pmedp.firsnet.bj</a>
Dansoko F. Daniel	Professeur IPR Katibougou, Personne ressource UCN/Mali	BP 275 Bamako, Mali Idem Soumaïla Diarra	
Sanogo Youssouf	Biologiste – ONG Agefore Personne ressource UCN-Mali	BP E. 2927 Bamako, Mali Tél. (223) 232680 Fax : (223) 2322260	<a href="mailto:iadd@malinet.nl">iadd@malinet.nl</a>
Moustapha Deme	Chercheur Economiste CRODT/Sénégal	BP 2241 Dakar, Sénégal Tél. (221) 6325027 Fax : (221) 8342792	<a href="mailto:mdeme@crodt.isra.sn">mdeme@crodt.isra.sn</a>

Diebel Sarr	Ecologue, Chargé de Programme ADPES (ONG)/ UCN/Sénégal	Tél. (221) 8252540/6597925/ 6353536	<a href="mailto:adpes@sentoo.sn">adpes@sentoo.sn</a>
Ibrahima Seck	Ingénieur halieute, Direction des Pêches Maritimes/Sénégal	BP 285 Dakar, Sénégal Tél. (221) 6.545844/8.350830/ 9.576103 Fax : 80214758	
Moustapha Kebe	Responsable Unité Suivi USR/PMEDP Cotonou		<a href="mailto:Moustapha.Kebe@sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj">Moustapha.Kebe@sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj</a>
Jean S. Zoundi	Chercheur/Consultant Institut de l'environnement et de Recherches Agricoles (INERA°	Tél. : (226) 340270/347112 Fax : (226) 340271	INERA 04BP 8645 Ouagadougou <a href="mailto:zoundi@hotmail.com">zoundi@hotmail.com</a>
Emily Corcoran	Expert associé, Gestion des Ressources Aquatiques, USR/PMEDP Cotonou		<a href="mailto:Emily.Corcoran@sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj">Emily.Corcoran@sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj</a>
Karim Hussein	Research Fellow, Rural Policy & Environment Group, Overseas Development Institute, London, UK	Tél. (+ 44)(0) 20 79220300 Fax: (+44)(0) 20 79220399	<a href="mailto:k.hussein@odi.org.uk">k.hussein@odi.org.uk</a>
Jean-Calvin Njock	Responsable Gestion des Ressources Aquatiques, USR/PMEDP Cotonou		Jean-Calvin.Njock @sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj
Mamanding Kuyateh	Responsable Organisations Communautaires, USR/PMEDP Cotonou		<a href="mailto:Mamanding.Kuyateh@sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj">Mamanding.Kuyateh@sflp-pmedp.firstnet.bj</a>