

PROYEK PESISIR
(Coastal Resources Management Project)

USAID/BAPPENAS NRM II PROGRAM

**Building a Coastal Management Learning
Capacity at IPB : *Progress Report***

Kem Lowry (University of Hawaii) and
Brian Needham (Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island)

WORKING PAPER
Proyek Pesisir, Jakarta

August, 1998

A. Project Context

The Indonesia Coastal Resources Management Project (CRMP---also known as *Proyek Pesisir*) is part of the USAID-BAPPENAS Natural Resources Management II Program being implemented between 1996 and 2003. The strategic objective of NRM II is to "to decentralize and strengthen natural resources management in Indonesia." *Proyek Pesisir*, which began in 1996, is designed to provide lessons about 'best practices' in community-level coastal management by establishing, maintaining and assessing pilot coastal management projects. The first provincial pilot project sites were established in North Sulawesi in 1997. A field office was established in Lampung in April, 1998, and a field office is expected to be established in the Province of East Kalimantan later in 1998.

Learning from experience is an integral component of *Proyek Pesisir*. As the Year Two Workplan (*Proyek Pesisir*, 1998) notes, the project sites "enable the CRMP to evaluate what works/what fails and why, and to take these lessons forward into the national and global policy/practice arenas (the national track)". The local track sub-programs of CRMP are simultaneously reinforced and complemented by additional national track activities which emphasize institutional and policy development and which shall facilitate the ultimate replication of CRMP-derived best practices in other areas of Indonesia and more globally" (Year Two Workplan, 4). The most immediate 'clients' for lessons generated from the initial pilot projects are staff and counterparts of subsequent *Proyek Pesisir* project sites. The coastal management lessons from *Proyek Pesisir* could also be immediately relevant to other projects underway in Indonesia such as: the ADB supported Marine Evaluation and Planning project (MREP) and the multilateral Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project (COREMAP).

Proyek Pesisir has sought to institutionalize learning from the pilot projects by designating a 'learning partner', the *Pusat Kajian Sumberdaya Pesisir dan Lautan* (PKSPL or Centre for Coastal and Marine Resources Studies) at the *Institut Pertanian Bogor* (IPB---Bogor Agricultural University). IPB has, in turn, designated a Learning Team charged with facilitating the learning process. The members of the IPB Learning Team are:

- Darmawan, manager (100%)
- Nevity Zamani (25%)
- Bambang Haryanto (40%)
- Amiruddin (40%)
- Fedi Sondita (25%)
- Burhanuddin (40%)

B. Expectations for the Learning Team

The formal *Proyek Pesisir* expectations for the Learning Team are outlined in the 1998-99 agreement between the University of Rhode Island (as the USAID contractor) and PKSPL, IPB as the contractor. Under the terms of the agreement, the Learning team is to produce:

- Methodology/manual for site documentation and self-assessment
- Operational plan for site assessment
- Six monthly site assessment reports for
 - North Sulawesi field program
 - East Kalimantan field program
 - Lampung field program
- Input to manual for socio-economic baseline surveys.

Beyond these formal expectation are the hopes, articulated in a variety of ways, the IPB can develop capacities to document, assess and synthesize the experiences of the project sites, to broadly disseminate these experiences in reports and articles and to provide outreach assistance to field projects. Project and URI staff also talk about the hope that IPB will become a center for coastal management and will develop the capacity to educate future generations of Indonesians in the technical and social skills necessary for integrated coastal management. Indeed, PKSPL faculty have developed a two year Masters degree in Coastal and Marine Resources Management in conjunction with the Faculty of Fisheries and Resources Management. The first class of 27 was admitted in 1997.

C. Current Status of Learning Team Activities

Since *Proyek Pesisir* began, IPB staff have organized or participated in nine training programs, published the first issue of *Jurnal Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Pesisir Dan Lautan Indonesia* (Indonesian Journal of Coastal and Marine Resources Management), helped organize a national conference and developed a preliminary report on the North Sulawesi project site.

In general, however, initial activities assigned to the Learning Team have taken longer than anticipated. Lack of Learning Team progress is attributable to a number of factors. Certainly, the political unrest and economic turmoil within Indonesia has been disruptive and has required personal and professional adjustments on the part of staff. However, many of the start-up problems confronting the Learning Team are the predictable (if not inevitable) problems associated with new team projects: Uncertainty about the team role in the larger project; uncertainty and unfamiliarity with specific required tasks and intended

products; uncertainty about the team strategy and the roles of individual team members within the strategy and within-team dynamics.

As technical advisors, our role was primarily to help diagnose problems and issues associated with the general learning project at IPB and to assist the team in designing strategies to deal with the problems. Within constraints by the brevity of our visit, lack of full context about the IPB working environment and our less-than-full understanding of the personal and professional agendas of our Learning Team colleagues, we tried to assist them in working out a more detailed learning strategy. A broad range of topics was discussed, including team-building, rudiments of evaluation, the Learning Team's role in the larger project, a Learning Team strategy, an outline for Learning Team reports, topics for 'learning' and a host of related issues. A few of these topics are discussed below.

D. Team-building

The Learning Team is composed of dedicated young professionals, most of whom are trained in fisheries and other technical aspects of ocean and coastal management. None is trained in social science generally or in evaluation in particular. Project inertia can be attributed in part to the lack of familiarity with the learning tasks as envisaged by *Proyek Pesisir* staff, in spite of numerous discussions among PP staff and team members. Team members were concerned that 'learning' meant evaluating project activities (and project colleagues) and that such evaluation would invite criticism of them. They have spent much of their time to date talking among themselves both about their understanding of project philosophy and how that translates into project tasks for the learning team.

Time management seems to be another significant cause of inertia, although not much discussed. All the Learning Team members are involved in a number of academic, service and professional activities, most of which impose familiar tasks and predictable time demands. The learning project, by contrast, involves both unfamiliar tasks and unbounded time requirements. Hence, there is an understandable desire to divide the learning enterprise into a series of small, familiar tasks for which time and resource budgets can be made more predictable.

As technical advisors, we emphasized two key issues regarding these team-building issues. First, we argued that the Learning Team is necessarily a 'partner' with PP and with project site staff and not superior in the project hierarchy. We all agreed that Learning Team staff should work with project staff to identify lessons. Second, we made the case that the critical role of the LT is in

documentation of project experience in key areas and not in evaluation. The documentation process is central to creating a shared understanding of what happened at the project sites. Carefully developed documentation reports, we argued, can be the basis for conversations of the implications of project activities for future projects; for drawing lessons from experience. (In our view, participation on the Learning Team is a tremendous opportunity for professional development. Members of the team are in a position to become national and regional experts on coastal management and the design and implementation of local coastal management projects).

E. The Project 'Logic' of the IPB Partnership

The language of the contract describes specific intended outputs on the part of the IPB generally and, more specifically, the Learning Team that has been formed at IPB. The tasks and outputs described in the contract are linked by a set of implicit premises about how a coastal management 'learning process' could be developed and maintained. The central purpose of the proposed learning process is to systematically assist in the development and dissemination of coastal management project 'lessons' that would inform other projects in Indonesia, in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world.

Since we spent some time discussing how it is useful to identify and analyze underlying causal 'theory' or 'logic' of projects---the assumptions or premises by which project activities will induce changes in coastal conditions or the behavior of coastal resources users---we thought it useful to make explicit the premises upon which the Learning Team project is based.

Roughly, the project premises are that:

1. There exists in IPB (specifically in PPSKL) a core of key staff who are already knowledgeable about social and technical aspects of marine management generally and coastal management in particular or are willing to develop that expertise.
2. The key staff will be assembled into a Learning Team to work collaboratively with each other, with Proyek Pesisir staff and with staff at current and future sites and with other stakeholders;
3. The Learning Team will develop a strategy for facilitating learning in conjunction with Proyek Pesisir staff, project staff and others.
4. A key component of the 'learning strategy' is the in-depth documentation of key coastal management activities at project sites (to be determined in

consultation with Proyek Pesisir staff, project site staff, and others), the assembling this documentation in carefully-developed reports and dissemination of the reports to key stakeholders.

5. The documentation of key project activities will be based on both documents routinely submitted to the Learning Team by project staff (reports, plans, minutes of meetings, memos, etc.) and observations and interviews by members of the Learning Team with project staff, significant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, community residents and others.

6. Reports by the Learning Team will be disseminated to Proyek Pesisir staff, site project staff and others for review and comment.

7. The Learning Team will convene meetings of project staff and others interested in coastal management to discuss Learning Team reports and to generate possible 'lessons' for other project sites. These tentative 'lessons' will be compiled by the Learning Team and disseminated more broadly among coastal management professionals for further review and comment.

Close examination of project 'theory' or logic makes it possible to determine to what extent that 'theory' is regarded as an accurate representation of what is to happen and whether, and to what extent, planned events are being implemented as intended.

F. Project Issues to be Examined

Although the URI-IPB agreement calls for site documentation, after discussions with the Learning Team it seemed evident that the documentation should focus on specific planning and management activities that are common to all sites. Such activities might include site profiling, baseline analysis and similar activities likely to be important endeavors at each site.

We brainstormed a list of possible issues to be examined (see Appendix 1). These proposed issues are to be sent to project staff and PP staff for review and comment. We agreed that the Learning Team should pick three or four important issues in consultation with the other stakeholders and that initial documentation activities should concentrate on these issues. After some discussion, we agreed that these documentation reports should be completed by February 28, 1999.

G. Documentation Strategy

Because there was some uncertainty about how the documentation process should proceed, the team collaborated on a series of steps the Learning Team might follow to prepare the documentation reports. These steps are outlined in Appendix 2.

H. Outline of Issue Paper :Proposals and the Issue Papers

In order to have a common format for the issue papers proposals and the issues, we worked on a tentative format for each (see Appendix 3). The core element of the proposals is the questions to be answered in the research(1). Our notion is that these questions would be widely reviewed and amendments would be suggested as necessary. Also important is the preliminary identification of those who are to be interviewed. We assume that the first round of interviewees will also identify some of those to be interviewed in the second round. The issue paper proposals would also identify proposed research dates, documents to be reviewed, etc. Project staff will review the proposals and make suggestions.

I. Learning Workshop

We discussed having the team organize a learning workshop lasting perhaps one full day in March, 1999. This workshop would be facilitated by the Learning Team. Invitees would include BANGDA staff, representatives of donor agencies, NBO representatives, CRC and project staff and others.

The papers prepared by the Learning Team would provide the basis for discussion. Each paper is to conclude with a section titled: Questions for further discussion and learning. These questions could provide the framework for discussion. It is our expectation that the papers would be prepared and circulated prior to the meeting. CRC staff and Learning Team members would serve as rapporteurs for the session to insure that the findings of the meeting are written up and widely disseminated.

(1) The coastal management self-assessment manual, *Coastal Management Capacity Assessment: A Self Assessment Manual*, published by the URI Coastal Resources Center in July 1998 is a useful source for identifying relevant questions to ask.

APPENDIX 1

POSSIBLE COASTAL MANAGEMENT 'ISSUES' TO BE ANALYZED BY THE LEARNING TEAM*

1. provincial working groups
2. 'early actions' at sites to build community enthusiasm and commitment
3. use of extension officers
4. baseline studies
5. coastal management site selection processes and criteria
6. site profiles
7. selection of counterparts
8. management issue identification
9. performance indicators
10. management plans
11. economic activities
12. monitoring.

* Identified at a meeting of the Learning Team on 14/8/98

APPENDIX 2

STEPS IN THE DOCUMENTATION PROCESS

1. Contact project staff about possible management issues to be examined
2. Determine in collaboration with project staff and other stakeholders about which issues will be examined.
3. Determine which Learning Team members will examine which issues (Having Fedi, Darmawan and Neviaty as team leaders was discussed).
4. Develop a brief research proposal for each issue:
 - literature review related to issue
 - research questions
 - identify first round of interviewees
 - establish research dates/protocols
 - budgets
5. Organize review of proposal by major stakeholders
6. Conduct research at sites
7. Draft documentation papers
8. Organize internal (among Learning Team, project staff) and external review (CRC/URI and others) of papers. Revise papers.
9. Design learning workshop to include major national stakeholders and CRC participants. (Circulate papers, etc.)
10. Facilitate learning workshop
11. Working with CRC staff, write up results and circulate broadly
12. Select issues for second round of documentation, etc.

APPENDIX 3

SUGGESTED COASTAL MANAGEMENT ISSUE PROPOSAL OUTLINE

A. ISSUE/THEME

(e.g. coastal management issue/opportunity assessment at project sites)

B. PURPOSE

(e.g. To document the processes of identifying, ranking, analyzing and choosing which problems and opportunities are the focus of project management)

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What were the primary coastal issues/opportunities at each site?
2. Who identified these issues/opportunities? Who decided what the process of issue selection would be? What criteria were used?
3. How severe was the coastal issue/problem? What are the indicators of severity? How great is the coastal opportunity?
4. What is the geographic scope of the issue/opportunity?
5. What are the 'causes' of the problem or issues?
6. What technical analysis of the 'causes' or issues was done? How adequate is the analysis?
8. Which agency is responsible for management of the problem causes? How effective is management?)

D. DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

E. INTERVIEWS (initial round)

F. PROPOSED RESEARCH DATES

G. BUDGET

H. NEEDED PROJECT ASSISTANCE