

**The United Republic of Tanzania**  
**President's Office – Planning and Privatization**



**The 2002/3 Tanzania Participatory Poverty Assessment**

**Site Report for:**

-----

**Kigoto, Ibanda Ziwani, Igombe and Kibangaja Streets**  
**Mwanza Municipal City, Mwanza Region**

**April, 2002**

**Released by the**  
**Economic and Social Research Foundation**



## **DISCLAIMER**

This Site Report has been issued by the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) in its capacity as Lead Implementing Partner for the TzPPA.

The Report represents the views of local people engaged in the research process and PPA Research Team members. As such, the Report does not represent the official views of ESRF or the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.

All reference should be acknowledged.

For clarification or further information about the TzPPA, please contact ESRF at:

51 Uporoto Street

P.O. Box 31226

Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Phone: 022-2760260

Email: [ppa@esrf.or.tz](mailto:ppa@esrf.or.tz)

or search the TzPPA WebSite at:

<http://www.esrftz.org/ppa>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>1.0 OVERVIEW OF THE TANZANIA PPA PROCESS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 OBJECTIVES AND SUBJECT .....	2
1.3 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS .....	3
1.3.1 <i>Ensuring Diversity</i> .....	4
1.3.2 <i>Positive Inquiry</i> .....	4
<b>2.0 THE RESEARCH PROCESS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 CHALLENGES IN SITE SELECTION PROCESS.....	5
2.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	6
2.3 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES .....	7
2.4 LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES.....	7
2.5 THE MWANZA CITY COUNCIL: A BRIEF PROFILE .....	8
2.6 POPULATION .....	8
2.7 THE RESEARCH SITES: BRIEF PROFILES.....	8
2.7.1 <i>Kigoto</i> .....	8
2.7.2 <i>Ibanda Ziwani</i> .....	9
2.7.3 <i>Igombe Community</i> .....	9
2.7.4 <i>Kibangaja Community</i> .....	9
<b>3.0 KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 THE PERCEPTION AND EXPERIENCE OF DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS ON VULNERABILITY AND POVERTY.....	11
3.2 LIVELIHOODS AND VULNERABILITY .....	12
3.2.1 <i>Fishing</i> .....	12
3.2.2 <i>Fish Trade and Marketing</i> .....	17
3.3 AGRICULTURE AND VULNERABILITY.....	18
3.4 PETTY TRADING AND VULNERABILITY.....	18
3.4.1 <i>Local Brew</i> .....	18
3.5 CHILD LABOR AND VULNERABILITY .....	19
3.6 WOMEN AND VULNERABILITY.....	19
3.7 DISABLED PEOPLE AND VULNERABILITY.....	19

3.8	HAZARDOUS AND ILLEGAL LIVELIHOODS.....	20
3.8.1	<i>Prostitution.....</i>	20
3.8.2	<i>Poaching/illegal fishing .....</i>	20
3.9	GOOD GOVERNANCE AND VULNERABILITY .....	20
3.9.1	<i>Corruption.....</i>	20
3.9.2	<i>Illegal Fishing Gears .....</i>	20
3.9.3	<i>Lack or little education and creation of awareness on the gears and laws to the fishermen.....</i>	20
3.9.4	<i>Lack of a Beach Management Unit (BMU).....</i>	21
3.9.5	<i>Grace period to destroy Beach Seines, and Dagaa net. ....</i>	21
3.9.6	<i>Illegal beer brewing (Gongo).....</i>	21
3.9.7	<i>Poor Environmental Sanitation .....</i>	22
3.9.8	<i>Lack of Security .....</i>	22
3.9.9	<i>Urban Planning and Vulnerability .....</i>	22
3.10	ECONOMIC REFORMS AND VULNERABILITY.....	23
3.10.1	<i>Marketing and Price fluctuations.....</i>	23
3.10.2	<i>The Free Market and Vulnerability .....</i>	23
3.10.3	<i>Prohibition of Beach Seines and Sardines nets .....</i>	23
3.10.4	<i>Ensuring Safety of Fishing equipments.....</i>	24
3.10.5	<i>Education Improvement Programme and Vulnerability .....</i>	25
3.11	SOCIAL POWER AND VULNERABILITY.....	25
3.11.1	<i>Exclusion to Land Ownership and involvement in Civic Matters.....</i>	25
3.11.2	<i>Exclusion to property ownership .....</i>	26
3.11.3	<i>Lack of power in family matters -Family planning.....</i>	26
3.12	HEALTH AND VULNERABILITY.....	26
3.13	HIV/AIDS AND VULNERABILITY .....	27
3.13.1	<i>Education on HIV/AIDS and vulnerability .....</i>	27
3.13.2	<i>Prostitution and vulnerability .....</i>	27
3.13.3	<i>AIDS Orphans and Vulnerability.....</i>	28
<b>4.0</b>	<b>COPING STRATEGIES.....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	ENVIRONMENT .....	29
4.2	LIVELIHOODS.....	29
4.3	SOCIAL SERVICES .....	30
<b>5.0</b>	<b>POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>31</b>
5.1	DAGAA (SARDINE)NETS.....	31
5.2	BEACH SEINES .....	31
5.2.1	<i>Lobbying and Advocacy Initiatives .....</i>	31
5.3	CORRUPTION .....	32
5.4	PARTICIPATORY WORKING WITH THE FISHER COMMUNITIES .....	32

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report stems from a 10 days research and feedback sessions with the communities of Kigoto, Ibanda Ziwani, Igombe and Kibangaja streets in Mwanza City Council and city council officials who were involved in getting secondary information and clarification of various issues that were emerging from the field.

The research team would like to recognize and thank all those who helped to make this research a reality. First we thank Mr. Phineas Kauswa who was the district based research partner for his work of familiarizing the team with the research sites, assisting the team to access secondary information from the city fisheries offices, making possible for the research team meet key important people like the city council HIV/AIDS official Ms. Manoko, participating in facilitating the research process and in organizing the district feedback meeting. We also thank the City council planning officer Mr. David Mulongo, with whom the research team worked together, to identify the research sites and in organizing the district feedback meeting.

We also owe a great deal to all street chairpersons that participated in this research for their tireless efforts to ensure the research process is carried out successfully by organizing various social and livelihood groups for discussion on issues related to their vulnerability. We would like also to thank members of the Igombe Beach Management Unit (BMU), Mr. James Mpangala, Seleman Alenga and Vedastus Madege and the Street Executive Officer of Igombe for organising groups of people and fishermen for discussion.

Last but certainly not least, the most important acknowledgement is due to the members of the communities in the research sites who took time off to speak with the research team and gave of their ideas and insights that helped to put this report together.

### Team Members

Godfrey Tweve

Njoki Tibenda

Emanuel Mwaigomole

Atuswege Mwangomale

Phineas Kauswa – District Based research Partner (Mwanza)

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

ERSF	Economic and Social Research Foundation
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
BMU	Beach Management Unit
TRA	Tanzania Revenue Authority
COBET	Complementary Basic Education and Training
RIPs	Rural Integrated Programme
TCCIA	Tanzania Chamber of Commerce and Industries Association
TANESCO	Tanzania Electricity Supply Company
FGD	Focus Group Discussion

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a result of the participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) study conducted in the streets/communities of Kigoto, Ibanda Ziwani, Igombe and Kibangaja in Mwanza City Council, Mwanza region for ten days. The report reveals the perceptions and experiences of various vulnerable social groups involved in Participatory Policy Research from the above-mentioned streets/communities. The main theme under study was *Vulnerability* that is, understanding the concept and experiences of diverse social groups on vulnerability, the causes of their vulnerability and coping strategies at individual, households and at community level. A consortium of 15 implementing partners including 3 government institutions, academic or research institutions, national and international NGOs, carries out the PPA 2002/3 project. In this respect, the Economic and Social Research Foundation was selected to lead the implementing consortium as a lead partner.

The study used participatory methodologies to get information and its analysis thereof. This methodology used a variety of tools or methods. The methodologies comprised review of existing policies and literature, community mapping, vulnerability matrix, the well-being and ill-being matrix, observations, individual interviews with key informants, focus group discussions, community feedback meetings and district feedback meetings.

The selection of sites for the research was carried out in a participatory way with the city council officials who identified the sites before the team arrived and a later on advised the team to include other sites with more significant industrial fishing. Together with the representatives of the community, various social and livelihood groups were identified to participate in the research. The groups involved orphans and out of school children, youths, widows, unmarried women with families (*wasimbe*), elderly, people living with HIV/AIDS, fishmongers, Agents, owners of fishing gears (*Nsabis*), fishermen and city council officials for secondary data.

The study identified the following key findings as the causes of vulnerability of fisher communities of Mwanza city council at different levels: at individual, households or at community level. The findings include:

- Policy related shocks like prohibition of beach seines and *dagaa* nets, trade liberalization on markets and pricing, survey on the safety of boats and taxes.
- Good governance issues on corruption, poor involvement of fisher communities in urban planning and fisheries development and inadequate social services.
- Poor support for HIV/AIDS orphans and people living with HIV viruses, lack of awareness training to fisher communities.

The study recommends that (i) a review be conducted on the decision of the government to ban *dagaa* nets and beach seines, (ii) import taxes on fishing gear and equipments be reviewed and deducted to enable affordability by the small fishermen, (iii) disciplinary measures be taken against corrupt fisheries and police officers who have taken the advantage of the ban to enrich themselves and (iv) lastly the fisheries department take a more participatory approach in working with fishermen instead of using force and threats.

## 1.0 OVERVIEW OF THE TANZANIA PPA PROCESS

### 1.1 Introduction

Institutions committed to poverty reduction must have ideas about why it occurs, why it persists and how it can be overcome to guide their work. Indeed, they have always operated on the basis of specific theories about poverty that reflect their understanding of cultural, social and economic realities.

Since the second half of the 1980s, public institutions have developed increasingly sophisticated multi-topic surveys as their preferred means to measure, analyse and learn about poverty. In contrast with single-topic surveys (such as Employment, Income and Expenditure Surveys), these multi-topic Household Surveys are designed to generate information on a wide range of issues intimately linked to household welfare. At the same time, private development aid institutions and, to a lesser extent, academic institutions were rapidly pioneering a “participatory approach” to developing information and understanding about poverty.

In their current forms, both methodologies involve poor people in the production of data. The primary difference between participatory and survey-based research is that the former systematically involves poor people in the *analysis* of its findings. It is this analysis, as much as the raw data, which is then synthesized to inform pro-poor policies.

Some of the advantages to Participatory Policy Research are obvious. First, data analysis does not depend on speculation by urban elites about the conditions faced by poor people. Instead, it is the result of poor people – the “everyday experts on poverty” – reflecting on, theorising about, debating and explaining the world in which they live. Second, Participatory Policy Research contributes to social democratisation by engaging poor people in policymaking processes.

On the basis of these characteristics, the Government of Tanzania has decided to make Participatory Policy Research, in the form of Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPAs), a routine part of its Poverty Monitoring System.

The 1<sup>st</sup> PPA Cycle began in January 2002 and will run through December 2003. A Consortium composed of the following fifteen institutions is implementing the PPA:

1. The President’s Office, Planning and Privatisation (PO-PP)
2. The Ministry of Finance (MoF)
3. The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)
4. Christian Social Services Commission (CSSC)
5. The Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF)

6. Concern for Development Initiatives in Africa (forDIA)
7. The Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Dar es Salaam
8. Maarifa ni Ufunguo
9. Women’s Research and Documentation Project (WRDP)
10. Action Aid, Tanzania
11. Pastoralists and Indigenous NGOs Forum (PINGOs)
12. African Medical Research Foundation (AMREF)
13. CARE International, Tanzania
14. Concern Worldwide, Tanzania
15. Save the Children, UK.

ESRF is the Lead Implementing Partner. As such, it is responsible for coordinating and facilitating the Consortium’s activities.

The 2002/3 PPA is being conducted in thirty sites chosen through a rigorous process (involving numerous stakeholders) of “purposeful sampling.” Sites are located in every Regions of mainland Tanzania, including:

- |                        |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Bagamoyo District   | 16. Manyoni District   |
| 2. Chunya District     | 17. Mbulu District     |
| 3. Dodoma Rural        | 18. Meatu District     |
| 4. Handeni District    | 19. Muleba District    |
| 5. Igunga District     | 20. Mwanza District    |
| 6. Ilala District      | 21. Newala District    |
| 7. Iringa Urban        | 22. Njombe District    |
| 8. Kibondo District    | 23. Nkasi District     |
| 9. Kigoma Rural        | 24. Rufiji District    |
| 10. Kilosa District    | 25. Same District      |
| 11. Kinondoni District | 26. Simanjiro District |
| 12. Kyela District     | 27. Singida District   |
| 13. Lindi Rural        | 28. Songea Rural       |
| 14. Muheza District    | 29. Tanga Urban        |
| 15. Makete District    | 30. Tarime District    |

## **1.2 Objectives and Subject**

The first Stakeholders’ Workshop for the PPA Process was held on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2001 in the Courtyard Hotel, Dar es Salaam. Representatives from Government, donor institutions and civil society organizations attended, discussed and debated the shape to be taken by the PPA Process in Tanzania. Their conclusions, in combination with Government’s prior expectations, led to the formation of specific goals. These are:

- Enhancing, through in-depth description and analysis, research participants’ and policymakers’ understanding of key poverty issues.
- Exploring the (a.) different and sometimes competing priority needs of poor people, (b.) likely impact of policies and (c.) tradeoffs and potential compromises between diverse interests in order to develop ‘best bet’ recommendations for poverty alleviation.
- Facilitating the constructive engagement of civil society in pro-poor policymaking processes.

Each PPA Cycle will focus on a particular subject, or “Research Theme,” strategically selected to contribute timely information to key policy debates. The 1<sup>st</sup> PPA Cycle focuses on “vulnerability” due, amongst other reasons, to its immense impact on people’s well-being and capacity to rapidly erode improvements made by the PRSP. The working definition adopted by the PPA (2002/3 cycle) understands vulnerability as – *‘the susceptibility of individuals, households and communities to becoming poor or poorer as a result of events or processes that occur around them’*. More specifically, the study is concentrating on:

- The concept of “vulnerability” and who is vulnerable.
- The forces that make people vulnerable and lead to (further) impoverishment.
- “Coping mechanisms” at individual, household and community levels.

### 1.3 Methodological Considerations

Many aspects of the 2002/3 PPA Methodology – including its core beliefs, principles and methods – are typical of participatory research. For example, the PPA’s methodology is founded upon:

- The belief that ordinary people are knowledgeable about, and are capable of particularly reliable and insightful analysis of their own life-circumstances.
- The principle that *all* people – irrespective of age, gender, level of formal education, etc. – have a fundamental right to participate in informing the decisions that shape their lives.
- The use of proven methods, such as Seasonal Calendars, Venn Diagrams, etc., to facilitate the meaningful involvement of people in the research process

Nonetheless, the 2002/3 PPA’s methodology is less than typical in:

- The number and nature of steps taken to ensure that a wide variety of people are aware of, encouraged and supported to participate in the research process.
- Its focus on people’s “successes” and “strengths” rather than “problems” and “weaknesses”.

These innovative directions are elaborated upon below:

### ***1.3.1 Ensuring Diversity***

Participatory Poverty Assessments and participatory planning processes (exemplified by PRA and PLA) are very different. Though they are practical expressions of the same beliefs and values, their respective roles in poverty alleviation imply distinct methodological necessities and forms. For example, the goal of PRA/PLA is to generate effective, locally owned action plans. As a result, the methodology places a lot of emphasis on Village Assembly-sized meetings in which a critical degree of consensus is fashioned around a specific plan of action. In the process of pursuing this worthwhile goal, marginal perspectives and agendas for change are frequently left behind.

PPAs do not need to develop “community consensus.” In order to fulfill their mandate and contribute to well-informed, effective policies, PPAs must learn about the *range* of conditions people face as well as their concerns, competing priorities, success stories, etc. Instead of determining a single course of action, PPAs can – on the basis of such rich information – recommend hundreds. This is an ideal outcome that would significantly undermine the likelihood of PRA or PLA exercises leading anywhere at all. Therefore, the 2002/3 PPA Methodology reflects many decisions and incorporates many techniques to access the *breadth* of circumstances, experiences and lessons learnt by ordinary people.

### ***1.3.2 Positive Inquiry***

During the PPA Training Programme, researchers discussed the pros and cons of various approaches to participatory research and concluded that they needed to make something new... something that meets Tanzania’s needs, answers Tanzanians’ concerns and belongs to them. This methodology-in-the-making includes:

- Focusing on uncovering people’s “success stories” rather than producing lists of urgent problems to be solved by Government. With regards to the 2002/3 PPA, this implies (a.) learning about effective coping strategies employed (now and in the past) at individual, household and community levels and (b.) exploring how Government can encourage, facilitate, buttress and complement grassroots initiatives to diminish vulnerability.
- Helping research participants see themselves as key actors in poverty alleviation rather than dependent upon the action of others.
- Helping research participants develop a better understanding of the circumstances they and their neighbours face.
- Creating useful information for policymakers operating at village, district, national and international levels
- Avoiding the creation of false expectations by using methods better suited to the participatory production of local action plans.

## **2.0 THE RESEARCH PROCESS**

The research process involved several stages and identified several issues for analysis. Firstly, a courtesy call was paid to the Mwanza City Council Executive Director and later on the team met the City Council Planning Officer with whom they held a brief discussion on the PPA research agenda and its objectives. At this stage a preliminary site selection discussion was held before the activity being handed over to the fisheries department with whom the site selection process was completed.

### **2.1 Challenges in Site Selection Process**

The site selection process was affected by the criteria set by the PPA implementing consortium in Dar-es-Salaam that demanded the research to be conducted in the newly formed district of Nyamagana.

The criteria for site selection directed that the site should be in Nyamagana district and must have the following characteristics:

- Must have good access to markets
- Must be urban
- Should have industrial fishing for market
- Fishing must be of fresh water and
- Must be in a region that have moderate prevalence of HIV/AIDS

When the research team arrived in Mwanza, the situation was different to what had been expected. The Nyamagana district exists on papers only. No any physical development had been made since the government's decision to make it a district on April 2002. Everything was still the same under same District Commissioner, the same City Council Executive Director and it's all personnel. What existed are the two divisions of Nyamagana and Ilemela (the new districts). However, still there are a lot of arguments between the councilors, Members of Parliament and the central government on the borders of the new districts. The councilors complain that the central government –the Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government Authorities–changed the borders suggested by them.

This confusion affected the site selection process because, according to the City Planning and Fisheries Officers, there were no significant fishing activities in the Nyamagana division like it was in the Ilemela division. It was therefore, suggested that if the research is to learn much about industrial fishing in lake Victoria, the team should consider incorporating the Ilemela division where most of the industrial fishing of Nile Perch and the popular Mwanza Sardines is done.

Earlier, the research team decided to strictly base on the criteria provided and concentrated in the Nyamagana division (which is now the Nyamagana District) in two small fishing streets of Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani. However, as days passed and information derived from these two places reviewed, it was proved that there was no significant industrial fishing in these two streets apart from being the hide-outs of illegal fishing activities. The major fishing gears used in these two places is Beach seines and *Dagaa* (sardine) nets of mesh size smaller than the required 10.0 mm.

- *The government notice no. 370 of 7/10/1994 under the auspices of the Fisheries Act, 1970 (no.6 of 1970) set a regulation that prohibited the use of specified vessels or tools in the lake Victoria and the Indian Ocean. The tools and vessels banned include Fishing trawlers, Beach seines, Dagaa (sardines) nets with mesh size of less than 10.0 mm and gillnet with mesh size of less than 127.0 mm.*

With this understanding, the team decided to incorporate the Ilemela division too by conducting discussion with the fishermen of Igombe and Kibangaja.

**Table 1: Selected sites for the research in Mwanza City Council.**

	<b>Division (new district)</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Street</b>	
1.	Nyamagana	Kirumba	Kigoto	Ibanda Ziwani
2.	Ilemela	Bugogwa	Igombe	Kibangaja

## 2.2 Research Questions

The major research issue that the research set to explore was;

- To explore the various forms of vulnerability associated with fishing livelihoods.

Specifically, the research set to examine several questions related to understanding the dynamics of vulnerability related to the communities living in the identified fishing sites. The questions include:

- What are the different factors that place the fishing communities in the identified sites vulnerable to poverty?
- How do these different 'risk factors' affect different social/livelihood groups and vice versa?
- What kind of strategies do people in these communities adopt to cope with, overcome or avoid these factors?
- What opportunities exist for these people?
- What kind of policy related recommendations could be raised to overcome their vulnerability?

A checklist with relevant key issues was adopted for each focus group and individual interviews held to put the study on focus.

## **2.3 Data Collection Techniques**

A range of techniques was used to learn various issues related with vulnerability.

- Focus Group Discussions (FGD) were predominantly used for livelihoods and social group discussions. The social groups that were identified during the street government meeting groups were those of women both married and widows, orphans and out of school children, youths, the elderly. Livelihood groups included fishermen both owners of fishing gears and equipments and employed fishermen. Also the research included those sectors whose activities are connected with the fishing sector like fishmongers and fish processors.
- Local institutions too were involved including the street governments and the beach management units (BMUs)
- Visual techniques were also employed including village maps, Venn diagram and vulnerability matrix.
- Observation techniques of fishing sites and gears were used to triangulate certain kinds of information.

## **2.4 Limitations and Challenges**

The research faced two major limitations and challenges that impeded greatly the effectiveness of this study to learn issues on vulnerability.

### **■ Choice of site**

As pointed out before, the newly formed district of Nyamagana existed on papers only and did not have significant industrial fishing activities that could have generated detailed information about industrial fishing and its contribution to the vulnerability of smallholder fishermen

### **■ The Uhuru torch races (Mbio za Mwenge)**

The day the team arrived in Mwanza (19/06/2002) found that the region was busy with the preparation to receive the Uhuru torch from Kagera region-which meant that all city council officials were part of the different committees responsible for the *Mwenge* races. Moreover, the ward in which the site selected for the research was, hosted the *Mwenge* vigil. This too meant that, all the ward and street leaders were busy and could not meet the research team for discussion and planning of the research. The *Mwenge* celebrations delayed activities for three consecutive days -from the 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2002. This left the research team with only 5 days to do the research.

## 2.5 The Mwanza City Council: A Brief Profile

The city of Mwanza is on the southern part of the Lake Victoria. The city is one of the 7 districts that make the region of Mwanza. Other districts include Misungwi, and Kwimba on the south of the city. Sengerema and Geita are found on the west side while in North there is the Ukerewe district and on the east side there is the Magu district.

The city covers an area of 1,324 sq Kms of which 900 (68%) are covered by water and the remaining land area is 424 (32%). Regional wise, the city takes around 3.77% of the whole area of Mwanza region.

Administratively, the city is divided under the following administrative units.

Streets	326
Urban hamlets	188
Villages	17
Wards	20
Divisions	2

## 2.6 Population

The rate of population increase in the region is 3% annually, which is higher compared to the national population increase rate of 2.8%. In 1948 the population size was 11,399 and increased to 223,013 in 1988 (*the 1988 population census*). Currently, Mwanza is estimated to have a population size of 619,910 people. It is also estimated to have 87,132 households whereby each household is estimated to have an average number of 7 people. This household level surpasses the national average of individuals (i.e of 5 people). The population density shows that there are 1,462 people in every sq km of dry land.

## 2.7 The Research Sites: Brief Profiles

### 2.7.1 Kigoto

Kigoto is situated in one of several mountains overlooking the lake Victoria on the west side of the city. This community is very small and its houses have been built on the steep mountain slopes. The major livelihood activity in Kigoto is fishing and petty trading with small kiosks, fish mongering, *mama ntilies*, frying fish and local beer brewing ('*gongo*' brewing). Also Kigoto is a residential area for the Police force. The residents of Kigoto depend on the waters of the lake for drinking, cooking, washing and cleaning their household utensils. This has made them prone to various water borne diseases like typhoid, bilharzias, amoeba, dysentery and cholera. There is no medical facility in the area or even a primary school. All these services are available in Kirumba, which is about 30 minutes walking

distance from Kigoto. Moreover the civilian residents of Kigoto face the danger of eviction any time now because the habitat has been declared property of the Police force. All houses have been marked with the *popular red 'X' symbol* meaning that they should be ready for demolition and eviction any moment

### **2.7.2 Ibanda Ziwani**

Ibanda Ziwani is a typical fishing community situated on top of the mountain overlooking Lake Victoria. Very small farming is practiced in this area, mainly cultivation of cassava and maize in very small plots. The population of Ibanda Ziwani is 530 people with 143 households. Busisi borders Ibanda Ziwani on the north side and Kigoto is on the south side. On the east side there is Ibanda Juu while Kabuhuro Street is on SouthEast. The lake Victoria borders Ibanda on the west side. The major ethnic groups include the *Sukumas, Kerewes and Jitas*. On the side of social services Ibanda Ziwani lacks piped water and depends on the lake Victoria waters and two spring water sources at Nyamasaji and Bukerebe, which are used for drinking and cooking. The nearest primary school is found in Ibanda Juu (the school has only 4 classrooms). There is no dispensary or even medical stores. In terms of security of people and their properties, each individual is responsible for his/her household security because there is no police post within the community. Also there is no a market except a small place called '*kwa God*' where there is a number of small kiosks. Most of the services are found in Kirumba.

### **2.7.3 Igombe Community**

Igombe is a typical fishing community on the outskirts of Mwanza town, almost 16 kms northwest from the city center. It is one of the 6 major and busiest Mialo (beaches) and boat landing sites in the region. Most of the processing industries buy their Nile- Perch there. The population is over 10,000 people. The major livelihood activity is fishing and all other livelihood activities are connected and depend on this. Such livelihood activities of Igombe include livestock keeping, farming of food crops like tomatoes, rice, cassava and potatoes and cash crops. The only significant cash crop that is cultivated in Igombe is cotton. Also there is petty trading activities, small restaurants, medical stores, small wholesale shops and many others.

### **2.7.4 Kibangaja Community**

Kibangala is situated around 1 km north of Igombe. Kibangaja has mixed livelihood activities the major ones being fishing and agriculture of farming and livestock keeping. Kibangaja has a major sardine fishing camp, which is inhabited by *Waha* fishermen who have migrated from Kigoma region. The original inhabitants are the *Sukumas* whose major livelihood activities include farming of food crops like rice, maize potatoes and cash crops like cotton. Livestock keeping is also practiced as well as other petty trading activities.

The relationship between the indigenous people of the place and the newcomers – the fishermen - has always been tense because of ownership of the beach area. The sardine fishing camp has only three years since it started and it has led to a lot of misunderstanding between these two groups. The fishermen have built their temporary grass thatched houses along the sand beach, which was once used as pathway for cattle that were going to drink water in the lake. Occupation of this area has reduced to a large extent access of cattle keepers to the lake because along the beach there are always sardines spreads on the ground for drying. At some point fights broke out between individuals when cattle passed over sardines spread on the ground.

The hostility reached its peak when the locals managed to influence some local politicians to report the problems to the City Immigration Department claiming that the fishermen were not Tanzanians but refugees from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Immigration officers questioned these fishermen and it was found that they were Tanzanians. Even though they continue to live along the beach, fishermen complained to be discriminated in all matters of civil activities like involvement in leadership and decision-making regarding day-to-day livelihoods of the place.

In case of social services, Kibangaja like Kigoto, Igombe and Ibanda Ziواني does not have clean and safe piped water. This situation makes the people prone to water borne diseases like typhoid because their only water is the lake water which is so contaminated from bathing and washing clothes, cleaning of household utensils and sharing with livestock who are coming to drink water. Also people who use it as a toilet dirty the beach. There is neither a primary school nor a dispensary. All these services are available in Igombe, which is around one and half km away.

## **3.0 KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS**

### **3.1 The Perception and Experience of Different Social Groups on Vulnerability and Poverty**

Different people who were involved in focus group discussions and in key informants interviews, explained how they understood the concept of vulnerability to poverty and their experiences. Explaining the concept of vulnerability was made easier by the use of the Vulnerability matrix and the diagram that depicted a picture of a household on two roads leading either to well-being or to ill-being.

Most of the men, who are mostly fishermen, related vulnerability and ill being to lack of fishing gears that are recommended by the government and lacking voice to discuss with the government about the prohibited beach seines and *dagaa* nets. In this they consider the government as being unfair. They also related ill being with lack of power in determining the prices of fish, lack of good houses, having large families (dependents) and beliefs in witchcraft.

The case was not much different to women involved in petty trading: i.e selling fried fish, who related their vulnerability and ill being to inability to control fisheries officers who could confiscate their fish just because it was purchased from illegal fishermen and lacking enough capital to run their businesses.

Orphaned children understood ill being as the situation whereby one is lacking essential basic needs like good clothes, adequate food, shoes, opportunity to attend school and parents who could provide such needs to them. They also related their vulnerability to lack of playing grounds and inability to defend themselves from some adults who have the tendency of marginalizing them, like taking by force the money they have earned from casual jobs.

To the youth, their experience of ill being was reflected by lack of money to own good houses, lack of capital to engage in a meaningful income generation activity like opening up a hair salon, purchasing a grain milling machine or a furniture mart or engaging in fishing activities by using their own gears and equipments. Also lack of information about micro-finance institutions that could have helped them was another form of ill being to the youth.

Widows' ill being is reflected in lacking of property and a legal institution that can protect their rights to property ownership. Other widows' experience of vulnerability and ill being has been on being infected with HIV, stigma and rape. They face problems of supporting their families and lack of communities' knowledge about their plight of living with HIV just because their health seems to be good. This puts men who are promiscuous on danger of being infected.

Generally, the ill being and well being diagram revealed a lot about the perception of different social groups and livelihoods on vulnerability. As it can be seen, most people have their own perceptions about vulnerability with regard to their life experience.

### 3.2 Livelihoods and Vulnerability

Livelihoods could be grouped under:

1. Fishing activities
2. Non-fishing activities i.e. farming and livestock; and beer brewing.

#### 3.2.1 Fishing

The fishing sector is an important livelihood activity to the residents of the city of Mwanza. It has employed almost 1% of the total population of the residents. The Lake Victoria has varied types of fish species like Nile perch, Tilapia and Sardines. Earlier when industrial fishing began, most of the processing industries carried out fishing themselves. The result was poor development of local smallholder fishermen because they had nowhere to sell their fish. Their condition remained the same until the government stepped in and prohibited the industries to do fishing. Currently, all industries buy from fishermen through their middlemen called Agents.

**Box 2: Number of Fishermen, Fishing equipments and beaches in the Mwanza city council-2001**

Number of fishermen-Full time	1,500
Number of fishermen-part time	2,000
No. of boats	669
No. of beaches (Mialo)- major	6
No. of beaches (Mialo)-minor	21

According to the Mwanza City Council Development Plan for the year 2002/3, the contribution of the fisheries sector to the incomes of the council was enormous. The chart below provides an overview of the two major beach sites (mialo) and their incomes for the year 2001.

**Box 3: Fish harvests in the city of Mwanza for the year 2001**

Month	Kirumba Beach		Igombe Beach	
	Tonnage	Value (Tshs)	Tonnage	Value (Tshs)
January	1,452	435,600/=	223,142	33,345,700/=
February	2,175	489,375/=	174,331	35,785,900/=
March	2,064	624,500/=	275,519	82,395,400/=
April	2,713	616,560/=	190,964	57,714,500/=
May	3,050	915,000/=	171,632	81,813,300/=
June	2,671	801,300/=	174,124	83,884,800/=
July	1,162	408,600/=	145,372	68,138,100/=
August	2,335	537,050/=	178,929	93,791,400/=
September	3,678	1,029,840/=	168,725	55,680,570/=
October	1,721	516,300/=	159,318	82,122,300/=
November	3,071	798,460/=	127,321	38,196,300/=

The above chart provides a general picture about fishing sector for the year 2001 alone.

More specifically, the fish catch per species since 1998 to 2001, which provide a picture of the type of fish harvested.

**Box 4: Fish production since 1998-2001**

Type of fish	Year and Tonnage			
	1998	1999	2000	2001
Nile – Perch Niloticus	532.0	320.4	719.6	60,580
Tilapia (Oreochromis Niloticus)	13.0	10.0	95.0	2,560
Sardines (Rastrioneobola)	113.0	900.0	1054.0	800
Others	-	-	-	50

\*<sup>1</sup>Source: city council fisheries department report 2002

As it can be noted, Nile Perch leads this group in terms of commercialization followed by sardines and Tilapia. Nile Perch and Sardines have both the local and foreign markets while Tilapia is only local market oriented. From the Mwaloni landing site (Kirumba ward) where there is a big market of fish, sardines and other dried fish products like fillet chips are loaded to destinations in Dar-es-Salaam, Rwanda, Burundi and to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).

Processed Nile Perch fillets from the processing industries of Mwanza find their way out of Tanzania through the Mwanza airport to various destinations in Europe.

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately the data for 2001 does not tally with the data in box 3 above

The City fisheries office statistics for 2001 shows that there are:

- 1,500 fulltime fishermen and
- 2,000 part time fishermen
- 669 boats
- Beaches (Mialo)-6 major ones and 21 minor beaches which include the Ibanda and Kigoto.

There are 6 fish processing industries, which consume the largest part of the Nile –Perch caught. They include:

- Omega Fish Factory
- Mwanza Fishing industries
- Tan Perch Industries Ltd
- Nile Perch Industries Ltd
- VicFish Ltd
- Tanzania Fish Processors Ltd

Out of fishing the city council collected 246,000,000 /= Tshs in 2001.

**Box 5: Levies collected by the Mwanza City Council from the fisheries sector**

No.	Source	Tshs
1.	Fishing licences	5,000,000/=
2.	Boat licences	3,000,000/=
3.	Fish levy	234,000,000/=
	<b>Total</b>	<b>246,000,000/=</b>

While this picture reflects the success of the sector, there are number of shocks and processes that have been occurring to fishermen that put them into a vulnerable situation. Such shocks include:

**(i) Fishermen/fishing**

These are skilled men and youths who do not or have not acquired their own fishing gears/equipments but they are employed by the gears owners (*Nsabi*) of Beach Seine nets, lift nets, Gill nets and Long Lines. Fishing gear owners (*Nsabi*) are responsible for employing fishermen, selling fish, paying the fishermen and maintaining or replacing the fishing gear/equipments.

The main roles of fishermen are to sail boats (by peddles or engines), to catch fish and sometimes sell them and ensure the safety of the fishing gears/equipments. Fishermen may be residents or non-residents of the fishing village/area. At any rate their fishing activities involve them fishing out at night(s) or whole day(s) and search for more fertile grounds

where they camp for days/weeks/months without their spouses hence, a need for income to support themselves, their families and for saving. Fishermen were vulnerable to:

(a) *Insecurity of Employment.*

They are considered and treated as laborers and not workers/employees even in the situation where they have worked for 7yrs with one *Nsabi*. They are always at the mercy of the *Nsabi* who can sack them off-employment at any time without any compensation. They say they are harassed by *Nsabis* or in-charges (*Nsabi* second hand) and therefore they need to be considered under legal/registered employees i.e. employment codes and ethics).

(b) *Poor Income (posho)*

Fishermen do not get salaries. They get shares, which sometimes are determined by the *Nsabis*. E.g. gill net fishermen all together get fish or income of 2 out of 6 days of fishing and a 4 days catch belongs to *Nsabi*. Since they are so many (usually 4), the *Nsabi* gets a lion's share. For the beach seine, a *Nsabi* get ½ of all income after deducting expenditures of food provided to fishermen, paraffin oil and a boat share of 1,000/-Tshs.

(c) *Environmental Problems*

They are exposed to rough weather and water turmoil (cold/hot temperatures, rains, etc). For example for 1-2 weeks of July they are exposed to dangerous Southeast winds called "Marimbe". They do not have proper working gears like life jackets, groves, raincoats, sweaters or sheltered boats. They are therefore exposed to associated health problems, loss of their lives and their gears. Due to the above working conditions they are liable to ill health and loss of lives through drowning they therefore need insurance of their lives, health and for their equipments.

(d) *Poor Security For themselves and their Equipments*

There is increasing theft and armed robbery of fishing equipment (nets, motors and boats). This jeopardizes their employments and in most times this leaves them maimed and at any time they can be killed by armed robbers/thieves. Going out to fish is a risky business.

(e) *Availability of Fish.*

The months of June-October and February are periods of low fish catch. Despite of their more labor input, they remain paid wages (*posho*) or get nothing because they catch little (3-10kgs) or not at all, something tough compared to 1ton they get during good times.

(f) *Prices of Gears and Equipments*

High prices of legal gear such as 6" mesh size gill nets are prohibitive. For example, a 6" mm fishing net requires an investment of about Tshs. 2 million compared to about Tsh. 400,000 – Tsh. 700,000/- Tshs for the illegal 4" mesh size net. Fishermen's incomes can only allow them to own part or all of the illegal 4" gill net, but the 6" gill nets are too expensive

to own. Because of this, the fisheries officers and marine police sometimes beat them, confiscate their gears and demand bribe from them constantly.

*(g) Conflict Over the right L. Victoria Sardines (Dagaa) nets*

Fishermen claim that, the 6-8 mm mesh size nets are suitable for L. Victoria *dagaas* instead of the required 10.0 mm mesh size. According to their experience, the sardines of Lake Victoria are much smaller than those of Lake Tanganyika and Indian Ocean, which are bigger and fit for the 10.0. mm mesh size. The situation is made worse by the fisheries officials, who despite their knowledge about this problem cannot help but rather have taken the advantage to harass, confiscate and demand bribes from fishermen.

*(h) Conflict Over Mesh Size and Favorable Fish Size by Fish Agents and Fish Factories*

While the government insists on using bigger mesh size nets, the fish agents or factories offer better prices for fish less than 5 kg, ie larger fish fetches less money. This conflict provides a loophole to use smaller mesh size nets.

*(i) Poor Knowledge, Information and Skills*

Fishermen complained of lacking adequate knowledge and information about the market prices of their fish and sources of capital i.e financial institutions that provide loans to smallholder fishermen. Moreover the research learned that fishermen have inadequate knowledge about the policies and regulations regarding fishing and safety facilities regarding safe fishing. The people who were supposed to inform them about these things like fisheries officers, the transport and communication officers and the police have taken the advantage of it by claiming bribes to these poor ignorant people.

*(j) Poor Capital*

Lack of capital and loans make them remain poor, unable to purchase their own gears and always vulnerable to *Nsabis*.

*(k) Health Risk*

Fishermen have a high risk of getting STIs and HIV/AIDS by virtue of their profession. Some of the fishermen explained how they move with their lovers to various fishing grounds and hence do not use condoms for trust. Most confess they have many lovers because once they eat fish which has a lot of protein they cannot resist the strong urge to sex and much more, they have money enough to buy sex.

*(l) Loosing their Spouses*

Long absence from home creates marital break downs. Some come home to find their wives pregnant and or with babies from other men.

### **3.2.2 Fish Trade and Marketing**

Fish is sold fresh or processed (fried, dried or salted). Those engaged in fresh fish business are the fishmongers and factory fish agents. They directly or indirectly sell their fish to factories. Fish processors include those who fry fish and sell at their doorsteps or carry from door to door or sell at the market. Their customers include households for relish and passerby for delicacy eating. Those who dry fish are many including those who dry fish-chips from factories and dry them for the Democratic Republic of Congo market. All the above groups are vulnerable to:

#### *(a) Availability of Fish or Fish seasons*

Low fish catches mean increase in fish prices while the selling price (customer ability to buy) remains low. Low fish catches lead to fishing competition and lessens business profitability.

#### *(b) Fish Prices*

The factories set fish prices, which are too low to meet the costs involved in fishing or purchasing fish. Such prices make small fishmongers and the agents fail to markup anything that can help as a benefit. The prices provided by industries differ from one industry to another. One industry may offer 700/=, another 900/= and another 1,050/= on same Nile – perch the same day.

#### *(c) Taxes*

The agents pay 1.2 % of their sales to TRA. This percent for some includes expenses. They are also vulnerable to taxes, which change often. The processors are vulnerable to “*ushuru*” which if they do not pay they get their fish and selling racks confiscated and sold.

#### *(d) Harassments From Fisheries Officers and Police*

Normally, fish processors buy fish that is below ½ kg from the fish agents and fishermen, as the fish factories do not require this. However the fisheries officials and police sometimes confiscate their fish on the assumption that they are colluding with beach seine net fishermen. That is, they are punished on behalf of the beach seine or gill nets below 6” owners.

#### *(e) Low Capital and Lack of Loans*

Those who fry fish could buy more fish, sell fresh fish and venture for bigger markets while factory agents could buy more fish and invest in bigger business.

#### *(f) Poor Markets and Low Customer Demand*

Those who fry fish lose customers during the seasons of high fish catches because households prefer to buy fish direct from the beach fishermen.

(g) *Security*

Agents are highly insecure and sometimes get bodily harm. For example, armed- robbers twice attacked a fish agent in Kigoto. The last time, he was cut by a machete and robbed 400,000/=shillings cash.

(h) *Lack of Knowledge and Skills*

All participants in the assessment said they need business skills to conduct their activities. The agent said he needs also knowledge in order to determine bad fish before taking it to the factory. Lack of knowledge and skills include their inability to co-ordinate amongst themselves. They have not managed to form an association.

### **3.3 Agriculture and Vulnerability**

(a) *Crop Farming*

Small farm activities are practiced in Ibanda Ziwani, Igombe and Kibangaja. They grow maize, cassava, sweet potatoes, bananas and on the small scale. These activities mostly involve women. The farmers are vulnerable to:

- Vermin, which include monkeys and porcupines.
- Loss of their farms (Ibanda Ziwani) following the new city council extension and therefore the city urban planning officials have surveyed new plots in this area i.e. restructuring of the village set up.

(b) *Livestock and Animals*

Cows, goats, sheep, ducks, chicken dogs and cats are kept. The livestock keepers are vulnerable to shortage of pastures.

### **3.4 Petty trading and Vulnerability**

#### **3.4.1 Local Brew**

The major local brew is 'Gongo' brewed from cassava millers, which has been declared as illegal all over Tanzania since time in memorial. According to the Mwanza City authorities despite its illegality, *gongo* was the second major income earner after fishing in 2001 in the city (a research conducted in 2001). Local brewers are vulnerable to:

- i. Fishing activities. The customers of local brew depend on incomes from fish, and therefore beer brewing and selling is regulated by the fishing industry including fish seasons, fish prices, use of illegal gears and their confiscation, etc.
- ii. Local Leaders and Police. The brew is illegal. Therefore the brewers are occasionally ambushed. This makes them loose their business and become corrupt as they keep on giving bribery to their police.

- iii. Conflicts. Sometimes conflicts occur at the drinking places. These are to be resolved and sometimes properties are lost.
- iv. Levy. Local beer is illegal but yet they pay *ushuru!*
- v. Poor community value status. Local brewers are considered as drunkards and less valued socially.

### **3.5 Child Labor and Vulnerability**

Children especially orphans, complained of heavy work burden beyond their age. They are involved in drawing water especially in Kigoto where the land terrain is rocky. They (especially girls) are also household clothes cleaners, utensils cleaners and house cleaners. They carry bricks; sand and water for builders and boys of 10-11 years are used to carry fish from boats to the trays and from trays to the weighing tables. All these jobs are too tough to the children involved. The said children are therefore vulnerable to:

- Harassments from *Nsabis/* in-charges. Kanema, one of the laborer children said they are insulted, beaten, declared thieves and dismissed unfairly.
- Low Pays. Kanema and Adolf said they were fish carriers who were paid Tshs 500/- - 1000/- for a all boat. They therefore have to work on several boats and spend a lot of time to earn a reasonable amount.
- Poor Working Conditions and Tools. The fish (Nile perch) have sharp teeth and prickly fins. Working on them using bear hands, and standing n water for so long expose them to cuts and wounds.
- Lives in fishing and agriculture labor engagement expose boys to join fishing and interrupt formal education, and also they move from home to camps immaturely. Youths especially those whose parents are not Nsabi usually go through processes of fish carrying, fish mongering, actual fishing before eventually becoming Nsabi. They say that the route in the fishery industry is a poor and long road.

### **3.6 Women and Vulnerability**

Women need capital to engage in fish processing and higher capital to be a *Nsabi*. They do not engage in fish mongering because they have poor/small capitals. Those who are *Nsabi* are vulnerable to fishermen cheat and bad behavior (sell their fish on their absence).

### **3.7 Disabled People and Vulnerability**

Disabled people may not enter fishery perhaps as *Nsabis* or agents. However fishermen require closer monitoring and sometimes follow up in the fishing grounds. Disability especially physical disability may pose a problem.

## **3.8 Hazardous And Illegal Livelihoods**

### **3.8.1 Prostitution**

Prostitution was mentioned in terms of women who came at the beach to buy fish. They are then picked by fishermen as lovers. Women engage in prostitution because fishermen have ready and regular source of incomes. Many do not come to fishing stations with their wives. Both men and women become vulnerable to STIs and HIV/AIDS. Those married ones are prone to separation/divorces of their spouses.

### **3.8.2 Poaching/illegal fishing**

Poaching may be literally applied to illegal fishing gears (beach seines and the lift-nets) because they are banned since 5 years ago; but they are still in use today. Since they are illegal gears, their owners and their users are all doing illegal fishing and can be considered poachers because they fish the wrong age, size and prohibited species.

## **3.9 Good Governance And Vulnerability**

### **3.9.1 Corruption**

There are three faces of corruption identified.

1. That which is associated with use of illegal or banned fishing gears and equipments:
2. That which is associated with illegal livelihood such as local brew.
3. That which is associated with environmental issues such as hygiene

### **3.9.2 Illegal Fishing Gears**

Beach seines, *Dagaa* nets of less than 10.0 mm mesh size and gill nets of 4 mesh size were banned more than 5 years ago but they are still widely used. The chase between fishermen *Nsabis*, women fish processors and the general community with fisheries officers and police continues.

### **3.9.3 Lack or little education and creation of awareness on the gears and laws to the fishermen**

According to the fishing community in Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani, they were not involved by way of training on issues concerning fisheries, fishery laws and the gears in question. To that effect, they believe that the government is unfairly treating them especially with the use of the 10.0. m m net for sardines which they believe is only suitable for L. Tanganyika. They also believe that since generations ago, their forefathers used the same nets and they had no negative effects. They do not understand or believe the effect of the gears on environmental

or biodiversity. They claim that for example “*mafunzo ya sheria za uvuvi, waendesha mialo na maghati*” of June 2000, never went to them.

### **3.9.4 Lack of a Beach Management Unit (BMU)**

The fishermen claimed that there is no operating Beach Management Unit (BMU) in their streets because the government does not care about them. However, the city fisheries officer said that there is no BMU in Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani because the people there keep on using beach seines and the *Mialo*, which can make a BMU manage effectively are too little with a few boats (not more than 20). Communication vacuum has created a gap in participatory management of the resources and the joint solution of gears stoppage.

The Igombe and Kibangaja BMUs, even though they are so active in their daily activities, they face the danger of fading away soon due to the fact that they are voluntary and no funds allocated to them despite of the fact that millions of money are generated on their beach and sometimes they are given the task to collect sales levies.

This kind of tendency goes against the National Fisheries Sector Policy and Strategy Statement (December, 1997) Policy statement no. 12 on Community Participation, which provides that the government intends to improve the involvement of the fisher communities in the planning, development and management of the fishery resources. It seems some of the fisher communities are segregated and even where there is involvement is so little to the advantage of the officers and not of the communities.

### **3.9.5 Grace period to destroy Beach Seines, and Daga net.**

Provision of 2 years grace period was mentioned, but not applied to fishermen. Also the laws were enforced without concise strategies in place with respect to replacement of the banned gears or alternative activities instead. The high prices of the 5” gill nets and their unavailability have all led to inability of the fishermen to acquire alternative gears and continually go on using illegal gears. This promotes corruption and bribe exchange between the community in one side and the fisheries officers and police on the other side.

### **3.9.6 Illegal beer brewing (Gongo)**

Illegal beer brewing cannot stop because brewers have no capital, knowledge and skills to venture in alternative activities. The fishing community also has a high demand of liquor but continuing to brew exposes them to arrests, fines, imprisonment or both. These lead or expose them to bribe giving to government officials.

### **3.9.7 Poor Environmental Sanitation**

Environmental Issues such as construction of latrines, urinals, utensil racks, boiling of drinking water, etc are poorly implemented. For example, the environmental committee was formed but the Health officer made no follow up. The committee is now doing nothing. On the other side, the committee of men and women in Kigoto trained by the Africa Inland Church (AIC) is doing a better job. Inadequate monitoring and follow up of environmental issues has led eruption of malaria, water-borne diseases and dirty smelly environment.

### **3.9.8 Lack of Security**

Despite the contribution of the fishing sector in the incomes and economy of the city through levies charged to fishermen, no returns are being made to the people who made it possible. Igombe do not have a police post to protect thousands of people living there and those who go there everyday. For every kilogram of Nile –perch sold, the city council gets 7/= shillings. This has made the lives of fishermen vulnerable to poverty because of the dangers involved with armed robbery as one of them said in a group discussion that;

*“ ukipata laki 2 tu kimbia kalale mjini !”*

Lit: if you have earned 200,000/= shillings don't stay in Igombe, run and stay in town. Such statements depicted the dangers involved with lack of security in the area. Many claimed that most of the fishermen whose conditions have improved because of industrial fishing have left Igombe and went to build houses in other places in the city.

### **3.9.9 Urban Planning and Vulnerability**

The people Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani are currently living in fear and confusion of what is going to happen in their lives because of threats to demolition their houses and surveying of land that have taken place in their areas. All civilian houses in Kigoto have been marked with 'x' on claims that they have been built on an area reserved for the police force. The residents are wondering on the truth of such claims because they have lived in the place for many years without being informed or seeing any marks or even banners to alert them that they are developing the plots in an area that is not for civilians. The City's Urban Planning department has been collecting property tax from the same people for all this time and even TANESCO supplied electricity to houses in Kigoto. If it was true that the area belonged to the police force why collect tax and allow TANESCO bring electricity to such people?

The land of Ibanda Ziwani was surveyed earlier in 2002. Until the time of conducting this research, the aftermath of the survey was not yet disclosed to the community. This has left the people to live in fear and uncertainty not knowing if they will be left to occupy their current plots or evicted. These events have stopped many plans people had to do development on the land there.

### **3.10 Economic Reforms and Vulnerability**

#### ***3.10.1 Marketing and Price fluctuations***

The trade liberalization policies affected the pricing of fish. It has been said that during the 1980s the government used to set prices of fish but since the reforms in the management and systems of macro economy whereby among many other things, the government left price controlling in order to allow the market decide the prices of commodities. Igombe fishermen explained that the agents (buyers of fish for the processing industries) have been marginalizing them by setting the prices themselves without any chance to bargaining. The prices have been changing everyday differing from one agent to another depending which industry the agent is selling his fish one industry can provide 700/=, another 900/= and another 1,050/= shillings for the same fish species- Nile Perch. This again increases fishermen vulnerability to poverty because it does not take into account the costs of fuel, allowances and more than 15 hours spent at nights in the lake Victoria waters.

#### ***3.10.2 The Free Market and Vulnerability***

Igombe fishermen agreed with the fact that the market should be let to decide the prices and other relationship between them and the buyers but the government should not abstain wholly from helping the fishermen especially in accessing fishing gears and equipments. The processing industries are doing that kind of support only to their few chosen people- mostly the agents and not to smaller fishermen. The government should create a way that it can help them to access fishing gear and fishing equipments. The ministry could even support fishermen by providing them with information about daily market prices of Nile-Perch like it is with agricultural produces, whose prices are announced on radio and other media every day.

These fishermen wondered whether the government really knows that it is only a few bigger fishermen agents who really enjoy the development of industrial fishing in lake Victoria and not them. Most of the tonnages of Nile perch caught shown in the annual reports of the fisheries department, are coming from few big fishermen who have managed to get the trust of the processing industries and got loans of fishing equipments and gears, which were used by the industries before the ban.

#### ***3.10.3 Prohibition of Beach Seines and Sardines nets***

The Tanzanian government in 1994 prohibited the use of these tools and certain vessels like fish trawlers in lake Victoria and in the Indian Ocean with the intention to preserve fish breeding grounds and small growing fish that were in danger of being destroyed by these tools. This decision affected the lives of fishermen who depended on them for generations.

Several issues rose during the discussion with groups of fishermen who still use the same prohibited gears. Such issues include:

- The prohibition was taken without presenting an alternative way to help fishermen. They suggested that the government could have helped fishermen access the recommended gears at the prices that are affordable to them.
- The *dagaa* nets were wrongly prohibited. The regulation generalized the situation in all waters while the sizes of sardines differ. Fishermen complained on the fact that the sardines of lake Victoria are smaller compared to those of lake Tanganyika or Indian Ocean hence the 10.0 mesh size nets are bigger and can let the sardines pass through easily. They recommended the regulation be reviewed and set a specific net with mesh size for lake Victoria.

#### **3.10 4 Ensuring Safety of Fishing equipments**

Soon after the catastrophe that befell the MV Bukoba in 1996 and took the lives of more than 500 people in lake Victoria, the government through its Ministry of Transport and Communication set out to check and ensure the safety of all fishing vessels. The officers of the ministry, and later on a private agent who was given the tender to do that work (Mbondo Survey Project), went to major beaches like Igombe (*with police escort!*) to check things that are important for boat's safety.

Even though fishermen agreed to this exercise they complained about the charge attached to this 'service'. Boat owners have to pay 18,000/= Tshs for the required 7 meters, which a boat is supposed to have *as a service charge*. For any additional metre found, there is a fine of 2,000/=. Moreover, every boat must have 4 life jackets- fishermen agrees to this but their prices are unaffordable in the few shops that stock them in the city. One life jacket costs between 20,000 – 40,000/= shillings depending on the type. They argued that it is difficult for smaller fishermen like them to afford such facilities, hence the use of force to ensure that they have made them more vulnerable to poverty.

These new charges were said to increase the already tax burden they have since every motorized boat is registered for 25,000/-and its annual tax is 15,000/- while non-motorized (paddle) boats 20,000/- and the annual fee is 10,000/-Tshs. Every kilogram of fish sold at Igombe is charged 7/- Tshs. Fishermen asks what kind of services does the Ministry of Transport and Communication provide to them? Why this work be done by another ministry and not by the council fisheries department who could have done it as part of their daily responsibilities? On the other hand, the Mwanza fisheries department explained that, taking cautious measures is important for all fishing vessels but they were also disappointed by this exercise that it was much of a business oriented than a service to the people. Also the appointment of the company that conducts checking of safety in boats, was done in Dar-es-

Salaam without involving the region. The company that won the tender was given all three regions of Mwanza, Kagera and Mara. Therefore, the fisheries department is powerless regarding this issue.

### **3.10.5 Education Improvement Programme and Vulnerability**

Three out-of-school children of Ibanda Ziواني explained the fact that they are out of school because of being of the age more than 7 years old and the Ministry of Education is yet to start the Comprehensive Basic Education Programme (COBET) in Mwanza, like it is in many places in Tanzania. Therefore they continue to remain illiterate until such a programme starts.

#### **Case study 1: Lucas Magoha experience with the Education Improvement Programme**

*Lucas-a resident and fisherman (Nsabi) with a beach seine of Ibanda Ziواني, explained that he had been doing some business in several regions of Tanzania until recently he decided to come back home and settled in Ibanda Ziواني. He enrolled one his children at Kirumba primary school. The child went for a few days and then was returned home deregistered. He made follow-up to the school and was told that his child was above the age required. He took his child back to Ibanda and decided to enroll him again at the primary school in Ibanda Juu and was accepted. Unfortunately for his child, the head teacher of Kirumba Primary school one day visited the Ibanda primary school and saw the kid there. He suggested the kid be deregistered at once. The child was very keen to continue with schooling. Despite the fact that he was ousted, he would not agree to stay at home. He will go to school with his fellow kids and stay with them until evening. Realizing this keen interest, Lucas decided to conspire with the teacher so as to allow the child stay in school without registration until next year when the said programme would start. The head teacher agreed and the child started schooling again. However, the child was disappointed to find that his name was always not called in everyday rooster. The child decided to quit schooling and burned his uniforms in anger.*

### **3.11 Social Power and Vulnerability**

#### **3.11.1 Exclusion to Land Ownership and involvement in Civic Matters**

The *Dagaa* fishermen of Kibangaja the majority of whom are *Waha* from Kigoma region, have been in long conflict with the indigeneous people of the area- the Sukumas- who claims that these migrants are not Tanzanians (*people from Burundi*) and have occupied their farming land area. The conflict escalated in 2001 when the Immigration department of Mwanza interrogated these fishermen in order to know their citizenship. The 'land' in question is the beach area, which belongs to the Natural Resources Ministry. Due to this conflict, which has some local political support, the fishermen have been excluded from participating in any matter that relates to the place they live in at Kibangaja. (*The ward councilor and some local politicians leaders are accused of supporting their fellow Sukumas*)

### **3.11.2 Exclusion to property ownership**

Lack of property ownership and control rights is common to women especially widows of Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani who because of the culture of their ethnic groups have no rights to family inheritance and participation in decision making of family matters

### **3.11.3 Lack of power in family matters -Family planning**

Women have seen this as a major problem to them as their husbands do not give them a room to decide or plan together the number of children they would be able to bear and care. When unhealthy, women cannot involve in income generating activities properly. They also remain with big families to take care when their spouses shift to other areas for fishing or when they die.

## **3.12 Health and Vulnerability**

Most of the people in all sites were said to be suffering from typhoid, malaria, amoeba and bilharzias. This is because of using unclean and unsafe water from lake Victoria for drinking, cooking and washing. They use a reasonable amount of their money and time for medical treatment. They also complained that even the doctors do not conduct thorough medical check up on them because of stereo typing that people coming from places like Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani are always affected by water borne diseases. Hence as soon as they learn that one is coming from such places, they quickly prescribe treatment for typhoid or bilharzias while the case may not be as they think!

Diseases as a shock have had a major impact on the lives of many fishermen. They negatively affect fishing work that demands enormous energy and courage. The case of one fisherman of Kibangaja depicts how vulnerable he had become due to diseases

### **Case Study 2. Poor health and Vulnerability to Poverty**

*Juma Abdallah Mpini (48) is a fisherman of sardines living in Kibangaja and a member of the Beach Management Unit (BMU). He owned 6 boats (vipe) with its fishing gear before his health failed to leg illness. At that time, he was assured of earning between 50,000-150,000/- Tshs daily. He was able to support his family of 23 people- children and other relatives who directly depended on him. Four years ago, he started having the current problem- swollen legs with terrible pains hence could not walk properly any more. This also costed his work. He no longer managed to go on fishing or monitor his boats. Whatever earned out fishing went to cutter his medical treatment. Most of his fishing gear and equipments have worn out due to the fact that there is no money to repair or replace them.*

*His income fell to 20,000/- Tshs per month. His 2 children have stopped attending secondary school because he cannot support their school fees anymore. He also cannot provide monetary or material support to his relatives. His plans to build a modern house have also been shattered. The planned building has ended at the foundation stage since then. According to him everything is clamping down and feels great pains when he sees all his lifetime efforts is being eroded slowly before his own eyes.*

### **3.13 HIV/AIDS and Vulnerability**

#### ***3.13.1 Education on HIV/AIDS and vulnerability***

Education on HIV/AIDS has not been provided in Kigoto and Ibanda despite the fact that the street leaders have received some seminars on this issue. The leaders claimed that they couldn't talk about AIDS openly before their own children, mothers and the like, because their customs do not allow them to do so. This means that their families will continue to be vulnerable to HIV/AIDS until someone comes from outside to explain the effects of these diseases in detail to them than just relying on the media like most of them said they do.

While the street government leaders, who have received some kind of training on HIV/AIDS sensitization fail to talk openly about the details of HIV/AIDS transmissions before their fellow community members, their people, like the Ibanda fishermen, think otherwise. Ibanda fishermen feel that they have been neglected to get such sensitization meetings and seminars because of their illegal fishing activities, which have turned away many city officials and NGOs working on prevention and control of the spread of HIV/AIDS, to the extent that they have forgotten if there are people living there!

#### ***3.13.2 Prostitution and vulnerability***

In Igombe prostitution is another significant business. There are many women from various places in the lake zone who have hired rooms in the place for the sake of doing this higher risk job. The major attraction is fishermen. Some of them might have been living for months in camps at different islands scattered in lake Victoria, hence are in dire need for sex. Fishermen too admitted to this fact that when they land at Igombe beach from their camps, one of the first thing that comes into their minds is to have a woman. Because the urge is so strong they cannot even think of practicing safer sex "...condoms delay things..." They claimed.

In Igombe, there are many unregistered guesthouses (*gesti bubu*) that are said to increase the rate of HIV infections. The rooms are so cheap at the rate of 300/- shillings per hour. A person with only 500/- finds it easy to hire a room and remains with 200/- to pay for sex. Some residents urged the closure of such *gesti bubu*s.

Moreover, people seems not to believe the existence of HIV/AIDS because they have not seen a person within their environments who is sick, suffering and losing life. The nature of the population of Igombe is such that people move between fishing camps and change a lot. It was said that most of the people who found themselves infected of HIV/AIDS tend to leave quickly to their home places and villages to die there. This has continued to put people of fishing places like Igombe vulnerable to such a pandemic because they always believe there is no HIV/AIDS.

### ***3.13.3 AIDS Orphans and Vulnerability***

Support to schooling AIDS Orphans is also not clearly defined. Apart from the little support that is provided by few Non-governmental Organizations in the city, the Government support caters for all children, even those whose parents are still living are very poor to support their childrens' education. The city council in 2001 allocated 14 million shillings in its annual budget for this purpose, which is available for all poor children including orphans. This led to great competition among the poor of the city. The procedures involved to get the funds are also too long. The City Council Executive Director explained that there are many requests to this fund while it is so small. More than 70,000/- Tshs are required for one secondary school student per year. He urged people to develop self –help strategies than depending solely on this fund.

Lack of desegregation between AIDS orphans and other children with regard to this support increase their vulnerability to poverty.

## **4.0 COPING STRATEGIES**

Despite all issues/triggers of vulnerability to poverty explained before, the people in the sites selected for this research live and carry on their daily activities as if nothing is happening against their lives and livelihoods. The reason why they survive is that they have their own coping mechanisms that help to reduce the intensity and severity of shocks and processes that occurs in their lives. Among the coping mechanisms they have include:

### **4.1 Environment**

Since the Lake Victoria is their immediate supplier of water for all uses domestically but it is highly polluted, it hosts a lot of bacteria and it is the main source of diseases (malaria, bilharzias, typhoid, cholera and amoeba). People do boil water for drinking. They make use of mosquito nets and work hard to identify areas less hosting disease causing bacteria/snails. They nonetheless use those areas as their source of water for domestic uses and washing their bodies. Moreover, they keep on urging the government (City Council) to check the situation at the professional and administrative level.

### **4.2 Livelihoods**

Fishery gears are the main means of making livelihood by the people. When they are prohibited without any compensation or not being given alternative means of living, fishermen have found themselves being forced to keep on fishing using the same kind of gears. They are the only affordable ones and are simple to use at the level of their technology. Therefore people:

- keep on advocating to the government about efficiency and relevance of the same gears,
- migrate from areas frequently patrolled by the government officials to other areas considered to be safer to their fishing gears especially in islands,
- abandon fishing and totally shift to other means of livelihood like opening up shops,
- they engage in bribery by corrupting government officials including fisheries officers and the police so that their gears are not confiscated, and
- they keep on fishing at safer times when there are no patrols. Others have managed to establish friendship with fisheries and police officers. Hence they are notified about the patrols beforehand so that they would not go fishing on a wrong day.

For the case of robbery of their assets including in-water robbery of fishing gears, people do migrate from unsafe sites to safer ones. They report the situation to the police officials and at times they shift from fishery to other livelihoods.

To solve the issue of inadequate capital to run fishing activities, fishermen try to save their little allowances they get out of fishing whenever possible or from payments by fish mongers. Rarely do they access credits from financial institutions that provided small loans to groups of people in the city and elsewhere in Tanzania like Pride. Others have resorted at borrowing from their friends/colleagues and relatives while most women create informal revolving funds (upatu).

### **4.3 Social Services**

Both communities of Kigoto and Ibanda Ziwani did not have piped water supply, no hospital/dispensary/clinic/pharmacy. Igombe, which is the busiest spot in the city with a lot of money changing hands, did not have a police post or public toilets. People of the area continually keep on advocating to the government to supply of all these social needs. At the same time they:

- use lake water for domestic and non-domestic uses; they take precautions on preventing themselves from catching diseases (boil drinking water, use mosquito nets, cover and eat hot foods) and when they feel sick the first to try is traditional herbs,
- they make use of the lake by boats instead of roads and cars,
- for school and police assistance they have no choice but follow where they can get any of them.

## **5.0 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

Major issues that have arisen from this research illustrate that people are facing various shocks and events and they are constrained implementation of existing or identified policies and strategies in the development of small-scale fisheries. The team's recommendations are as follows:

### **5.1 Dagua (Sardine)Nets**

The first thing is to adhere to the policy of involvement of fishermen themselves in policy design. The fisher community itself should be consulted to determine whether certain types of gears like the *Dagua* nets are really dangerous to the sardines of lake Victoria. The policy should be reviewed to allow the rights mesh size for lake Victoria *dagaas*.

### **5.2 Beach Seines**

In places like Mtwara, Lindi (regions in the southern Tanzania bordering the Indian Ocean) whereby illegal fishing by using dynamites was common, the government had succeeded in providing support to fishermen in the form of group loans to buy appropriate fishing gear and equipments. This was done through the Rural Integrated Programme (RIPs). The Mwanza city council or the Ministry can also pursue this initiative by allocating part of the income generated annually from fishing to support those who are still using beach seines. Indeed, fishermen do not prefer the harassments, beatings, running away or bribing the fisheries and police officers everyday. It is high costs of the required fishing gear that forces them to continue using unwanted gear.

The fisheries officer forwarded the idea of establishing a *Fishing Trust Fund* that could cater for the needs of such fishermen and all others in need of expanding their fishing activities by increasing capital. The Mwanza City council can accommodate such an idea in its annual development plans.

#### **5.2.1 Lobbying and Advocacy Initiatives**

The Mwanza City Council, Civil Society Organizations and all other activists involved in marine environment conservation can advocate to the Central government to reduce the taxes attached to fishing gears that are required for the lake Victoria fishing. This will enable small fishers to access such gears, hence reduce to a great extent illegal fishing, preserve the marine environment and ensure sustainable fishing. The Mwanza fisheries department in collaboration with the Co-operative Department should facilitate fisher communities to form cooperative societies and unions that would be instrumental in lobbying and advocating on this issue. Such advocacy initiatives have proved successful in other sectors within Tanzania

(TCCIA in 2002 advocated and managed to influence the government to reduce the price of electricity per unit for industries).

### **5.3 Corruption**

All Fisheries and police officers, who are involved in demanding bribes from beach seine and *dagaa* nets owners, are known by face and names by the fishermen themselves. Fishing by using these gears might have been reduced to a great extent if these people did not turn it as their income generation source for quite long to the point that some of them also own beach seines. The police living in Kigoto are accused of confiscating the seines from fishermen and using themselves instead. The City council can intervene in this situation by taking measures against these officers who increase vulnerability and poverty of the poor fishermen.

### **5.4 Participatory Working with the Fisher Communities**

Formation of Beach Management Units (BMUs) should not be taken as an end in itself but as a means towards more involvement of fisher communities in planning and implementation of various programmes that will enhance the development of the sector and sustainable fishing. The fisheries department should be facilitated with funds and improve their skills on participatory approaches. Thus they can also facilitate fishermen to gain knowledge on the effects of using bad gears like beach seines on the marine environment and depletion of fish. The beach seine owners do not know the effects of this gear and are still wondering why the government claims that they endanger fish species while generations and generations have been using them without fish depletion. This has made them accuse the government of conspiring with big fishermen, who are supported by processing industries, to oust them from fishing!

Moreover, fisheries officers, working together with trained BMUs members, should provide awareness to as many fishermen as possible on marine environment conservation, safety of boats and various regulations governing fisheries in Lake Victoria. Provision of these will reduce the use of force to achieve them like it is practiced now. Such workshops shall also provide an opportunity for fisher communities to come forward with suggestions on how they can operate and improve their sector, hence a starting point towards Participatory policy formulation from the grassroots.