

Practitioner Input Form

Submitted: 15/02/2005

Input Record Number	016
Name	Tom Franks
Contact Information	t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk
Organisation(s) Involved	HTSPE and a range of Tanzanian organizations
Geographic Area	The SMUWC Project (Sustainable management of the Usangu Wetland and its Catchment)
Dates	
Communities Involved	Communities living in the Kimani sub-catchment of the Usangu basin (nine villages in two districts)
Duties and Responsibilities/ Purpose of Project	The Sub-Catchment Resource Management programme (SRMP) was a sub-project of the overall SMUWC project. SRMP was designed to introduce and test mechanisms for local people to manage water and other resources in the Kimani amongst the range of uses and users (drinking, irrigation, pastoralism, downstream users etc.)
Context of Intervention	Kimani is a remote rural catchment in South West Tanzania. There is some migration in the catchment, but the majority of the population are settled. Systems of local government are in place. Whilst they may not be very effective in delivering service to local people, these systems are well established and accepted. (However, there was at the time described, considerable efforts at the national level to improve mechanisms for managing natural resources by districts and villages).

Practitioner Reflective Case Study

Input Record Number	016 RCS Tom Franks
<p>8.1 Mechanisms</p> <p>SRMP was essentially a pilot scheme to test institutional mechanisms for bringing together the stakeholders on the sub-catchment for the management of land and water resources. The stakeholders included: local resource users, local user associations (irrigation, domestic and pastoralists), local government, institutional resource managers (the Water Office and others) and regional and national government.</p> <p>SRMP developed through a process of resource mapping at village level, participation to discuss and develop mechanisms for shared water governance, support of existing organisations and development of new institutions for managing resources (specifically, the formation of an ‘apex body’).</p> <p>8.2 Experiences</p> <p>Experiences with implementation were mixed. The resource mapping exercise were welcomed by local people because it gave them an opportunity to express their interest and concerns.</p> <p>Work with local resource user associations also had some successes. Members of local associations reported important benefits “It is easier to do things like cleaning canals and maintaining the intake together. It gives the community a voice; members can take part in discussions about subjects that touch them”. Nevertheless there were also signs that not all legitimate users were being represented through these associations. For example, the irrigation associations were only open to landowners, thus excluding the poorer group of those who rent land.</p> <p>On the other hand, although local resource users could see the value of the apex body, many felt that it had been developed too quickly, before the local resource user associations were properly established. There was also considerable fear of another institution, reinforced by misappropriation of funds by officials just as the apex body was being formed. Fears were also expressed that the apex body would be dominated by irrigators, and other resource users would not have an equal voice.</p> <p>It was not possible to assess outcomes by the time my involvement in the project finished.</p> <p>8.3 Criteria</p> <p>No criteria were put in place at the time to measure success and failure. However, an independent evaluation was subsequently carried out.</p> <p>There are a number of ways by which one can measure the functioning and outputs of institutions such as the apex body.</p>	

Measuring outcomes in a situation like Kimani would be significant long-term undertaking. It could potentially involve:

- Local livelihoods of resource users, particularly the poor.
- Assessment of conflicts and disputes, and their impact on the poor.
- Assessment of water availability and access, particularly the downstream users.

8.4 Critical Factors

The critical factor in the case of SRMP was the speed at which it was necessary to implement the actions. Support from the overall SMUWC project was limited by the project's time span, and it was therefore necessary for project staff to 'drive' the process, rather than let it develop at its own pace.

Support for such initiatives is always likely to be required. This support will be both institutional and financial. Given the need for financial support, it is inevitable that difficult issues of sustainability will become apparent (what happens when the initial source of funding ceases?).

Practitioner Input – Part II

Input Record Number	016II Tom Franks
9)	SRPM was initiated through the SMUWC project, which came to an end in 2002. The organization as such did not exist beyond that time. Some of the ideas were taken up further in the RIPARWIN project (Bruce Lankford).
10)	Not really. This is an important area of work.
11)	<p>There is a need for institutional mechanisms which allocate water amongst a range of uses at the local level. It is important to investigate and understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What institutional mechanisms work best and why?• What are the costs of such mechanisms for the poor (both in establishment and in operation)?• What benefits do the poor get out of such institutional mechanisms (these benefits may be both in terms of access to water, and in other forms)?
12)	See answer to question 11.
13)	<p>A range of other work was done in Usangu which could be of interest. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The establishment and use of the Ukwaheri well (Dr Frances Cleaver)• Investigation into water uses downstream of Mbarali (Urassa).
	<p>It would also be useful to consult the JWL project team on the Hadejia-Nguru basin in Nigeria. They are involved in addressing similar issues.</p>
	<p>The Dutch teams working on multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs) may have done work on these issues.</p>