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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Lake Victoria is a shared natural heritage for the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) Member States. The fishery contributes to the prosperity of the well-being of the communities and economies of the three states in terms of employment, wealth generation, food security and foreign earnings.

The total lake production for the three countries is estimated to be 350,000 metric tonnes per annum, generating a gross economic product of US $ 3-4 billion which contribute 3% of the GDP for the Riparian States. It also supports an estimated 30 million people with income ranging from US $ 90-270 per capita.

Lake Victoria had abundant fish diversity of over 300 species, but there has been a decline in both numbers and diversity over the last few decades.

In the pre-Nile perch regime most of the fishing boats were owner-operated. The owner worked in the boat, controlled fishing operations and managed the sale of fish. Gear ownership was high amongst fishermen. The fishery was managed along traditional guidelines and local communities benefited accordingly. However, this pattern has changed during the last 10 to 15 years as a result of the expansion and development of the fishery. The development of the fishery provided opportunities for investment by individuals outside the fishing communities, who now control the physical resources. These owners employ skilled managers, from within the fishing communities, to organise the fishing operations and to sell the fish when it is being landed. This has succeeded in changing the traditional fishing structure and culture.

Overall, the structure of the fishing regime and the co-dependence between the different participatory elements applies enormous pressure on the Lake system. This has resulted in disregard for fishing regulations and has been exacerbated by the absence of an effective Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) system in place. An inclusive MCS strategy will contribute to addressing these problems by promoting or enforcing responsible fishing practices throughout the Lake, both by improving confidence in the fisheries management system and through targeted application of MCS resources.

1.2 Overview of MCS and the fishery in the three Partner States.

The Lake Victoria Fisheries Management Plan (FMP) (Bwathondi, Ogutu-Ohwayo, and Ogari; LVFRP/TECH/01/16; November 2001) identified several factors that threaten Lake biodiversity and the sustainability of the fishery. The FMP attributes these threats to the expansion of fishing capacity, limited community participation, deleterious land use practices and demographic growth. The FMP also suggests that the improvement of current MCS strategies will contribute to addressing the problems associated with the fisheries, these being:

- Unrestricted access;
- Illegal mesh sizes, gear use and fishing techniques;
- Landings below permitted sizes;
- Non-compliance with closed breeding areas;
- Illegal trans-border trade;
- Lack of knowledge and awareness on environmental and conservation management;
- Unlicensed fishers.
The fishery is characterised by a large area, utilised by a large number of fishers using several gear types operating from the shoreline to 20km offshore. The persistent use of illegal gear in the fishery causes considerable concern because of the environmental impact, affecting long term sustainability of stocks. Illegal activity, particularly the use of beach seines, is common along the shoreline because these locations provide good access and easy escape from the authorities, as well as minimising the probability of theft of fishing gear.

Access to the fishery is on condition of obtaining a licence but a national system for verifying license and vessel registration details is not available to surveillance units for inspection purposes. Consequently, there are a large number of unlicensed fishers.

Another important concern is smuggling across borders on land and on the Lake. The fish are caught by smaller fishing vessels, transhipped at sea or on islands to transport vessels which move across borders and land directly to land transport. The fish are not recorded and export tax revenue is lost to the respective treasuries of the Riparian States. Other concerns regarding unreported products are those on a more localised level i.e. verifying catches at landing sites and factories.

There appears to be a mismatch between the distribution of MCS resources and the distribution of fishers around the lake – both within and between states. In Tanzania the authorities are limited to using skiff type vessels which are thinly distributed throughout the shoreline and particularly scarce in the south and central regions. The geography of the coastline is very irregular punctuated by a number of islands which provide shelter for illegal fishing activity and fishers. The distribution of inspectors and BMUs is more even, but the ratio of these MCS resources to the number of fishers is generally much lower than in Uganda and Kenya.

In Kenya, patrol vessels are concentrated in the centre of the country, and in these districts the ratio of inspectors to fishers and patrol vessels to fishing vessels is high. However, MCS resources are much scarcer in the north and south, especially in relation to the number of fishers and fishing vessels. The absence of resources in border areas when Kenya is reportedly the preferred destination of smuggled products (because of the higher market price compared to neighbouring riparian states) is unlikely to be contributing to the solution of the smuggling problem. On the other hand Uganda has given the threat of smuggling a high priority and has deployed the main body of its patrol vessels to the east of its territorial waters to combat the threat of smuggling on its border.

Levels of illegal fishing, piracy and cross border activity are likely to increase as fishing pressure increases on the remaining resources. The current culture of irresponsible, non-compliant behaviour in the fishery is encouraged by an ineffective MCS system. By contrast, the supporting policy and particularly the legislative framework are firmly established in each Riparian state and provide adequate provision for fisheries management. The challenge is to harness this underlying strength to create a truly effective MCS system.

For this to take place, the capacity and capability to implement MCS activities requires strengthening. For example the disparity between patrol vessels and number of fishing vessels and fishers is apparent throughout the Lake. Lake patrols are mostly reliant upon the smaller wooden and fibreglass vessels of just under 10 metres. As such their operational capacity is limited in terms of personnel that can be deployed and their endurance. Coverage of landing sites is particularly affected as
patrol vessels provide the best means of accessing these remote and often difficult to reach sites.

The communication infrastructure is rudimentary region wide and information is relayed between units using personal mobile phones on the majority of occasions. Some units have SSB radio but the power source at fisheries monitoring centres (FMCs) is unreliable. The rudimentary communication equipment reduces the effectiveness of surveillance activities. Control and enforcement units are thinly distributed throughout the districts so up to date intelligence sources would enable units to prioritise activities and improve efficiency as well reduce costs. Ideally, the communications systems should enable control units to relay information from operational activities on the Lake to units on land.

One of the objectives of MCS is the reduction and/or elimination of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing activity. This can be affected through a range of surveillance activities that combine deterrent and participatory approaches e.g. targeted surveillance/patrols and/or sensitisation exercises respectively. Other avenues that may be explored include work at diplomatic level with non-LVFO member states which are the destination of unregulated fishery products.

From an operational perspective, the procurement and deployment of suitable vessels and equipment would improve overall effectiveness of patrols. From a control perspective, the penalties should be reviewed so that they are commensurate with the benefits gained from illegal fishing activity and provide sufficient deterrent. The judiciary should also be sensitised to fine offenders the maximum levels. Overall this should increase the deterrent effect of MCS.

Although the above discussion has highlighted a number of different activities that need to take place, the most important and pressing requirement is to establish a viable and harmonised fishery MCS system. MCS is often referred to as the “executive arm of fisheries management” and the MCS activities must relate to specific management objectives. This is fundamental, and is at the core of the proposed strategy.

1.3 Scope and process in Strategy preparation

The purpose of the document is to identify strategic objectives and provide a framework for the Riparian States for implementation. The baseline information required to formulate the strategy, and summarised in the above discussion, was provided by the Challenges and Strategic Statements from the Guidelines document, research conducted in the preparation of the national MCS Status Reports and in a workshop process with the RWG-MCS.

Should be remembered here that the scope of MCS in the modern use of the term is wide and often referred to as “the executive arm of fisheries management” implying the inclusion of many concepts and activities. However in the preparation of this Strategy the stakeholders have been cognizant of the need to build upon linkages with other players and RWG in order to address the broad and complex nature of MCS.

2 Strategy
2.1 Requirements

The fundamental requirements of an MCS strategy are as follows.
(i) A sustainable MCS strategy must set realistic and measurable objectives, be responsive to changing priorities for action, must be efficient (providing the most suitable and cost-effective resources for different tasks) and effective (directed optimally to reduce prohibited activities and increase compliance).

(ii) MCS activities must be supported by an adequate administrative and operational infrastructure.

(iii) MCS activities and results must be monitored and analysed in relation to objectives and priorities, so that strategies can be regularly reviewed and improved.

2.2 Policy framework

The fisheries management system operating around Lake Victoria has developed taking account of the broad policy environment in the fisheries and related sectors. As the policy influences adjust there are usually consequent changes in the systems of fisheries governance employed on the lake. The following section outlines some of the relevant policy influences particularly as they relate to monitoring, control and surveillance of the fishery, and the development of a specific strategy for the sub-sector.

2.2.1 International level

At the international level, the three Partner States are signatories to the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, a voluntary guide aimed at everyone working in, and involved with, fisheries and aquaculture, which recommends MCS capacity to be proportional to fisheries capacity. According to FAO guidance, the Code advocates that countries should have clear and well-organized fishing policies in order to manage their fisheries. These policies should be developed with the cooperation of all groups that have an interest in fisheries, including the fishing industry, fish workers, environmental groups and other interested organizations.

The Code further elaborates that fisheries should be managed to ensure that fishing and fish processing are conducted in ways that minimize negative impacts on the environment, reduce waste, and preserve the quality of fish caught. Fishers should keep records of their fishing operations. Governments should have enforceable laws with procedures for determining and punishing violators. Punishment for violations could include fines or even the removal of fishing licences if violations are severe. In particular, b protect fish resources, dynamiting, poisoning and other destructive fishing practices should be prohibited in all countries. Countries should also ensure that only fishing vessels permitted to fish in their waters are able to do so. Such fishing should be done in a responsible manner and in accordance with any rules, regulations or laws that may be applied by a country.

2.2.2 Regional level

At the regional level there are a number of important agreements relating to fisheries which must be incorporated into the process of refining and developing this strategy. These agreements include: the LVFO Strategic Vision for Lake Victoria (1999 – 2015); the Vision and Strategic Framework for the Management and Development of the Lake Victoria Basin; the Lake Victoria Fisheries Management Plan. All these documents make reference to harmonising management across Lake Victoria including MCS type activities.
In May 2004 the three riparian countries signed a Regional Plan Of Action (RPOA) to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing on Lake Victoria and its basin. This calls for the development of coordinated MCS measures signalling a move towards harmonised procedures rather than the current diverse systems in place across all three countries.

2.2.3 National level
At the national level the policy environment reflects the national government priorities and the following characteristics and similarities are noted:

a) Fisheries Policy: Uganda has a Fisheries Policy approved in 2004; Tanzania Fisheries Strategy Statement was prepared in 1997 and developed a Master Plan for the sector in 2002. Kenya is in the process of preparing a policy document.

b) Decentralisation of power is an ongoing process which is well advanced in Tanzania and Uganda. Kenya is not yet committed to such a devolution of power.

c) Poverty reduction strategies are taking an increasingly important role in the national level decision-making and budget allocation.

There are other considerations to take into account and these will be incorporated as the Strategy moves through further consultative processes.

2.3 Principles underlying the MCS Strategy

1. MCS is an effort to increase the level of compliance with fishery laws and regulations and as such will include both the “soft” approaches to increase the levels of voluntary compliance and the “hard” approach through effective law enforcement and deterrence. The co-ordination of “soft” and “hard” approaches will be important.

2. MCS will have components at the decentralised levels (including BMUs, community levels and particularly local government structures) and the centralised levels (from the national fishery departments and the regional LVFO levels). The links between these different components will be developed and co-ordinated.

3. MCS can only be effective if the procedures are correct but also the equipment and the human resources are appropriately developed – ALL aspects of the system have to be improved so that the system functions as an improved whole.

4. A staged approach will be adopted to the improvement of MCS and while the system is being improved there will be ongoing “soft” and “hard” components to the MCS efforts.

5. The fisheries industry on the lake includes various players at different stages in the chain and the strategy recognises that for compliance to be increased the rules and regulations have to be applied equally, and certainly seen to be applied equally, to both gear suppliers, fishers, traders, processors, exporters and other stakeholders.

6. Collaboration with other stakeholders is crucial if success in compliance to fishery laws is achieved so the stakeholders in this Strategy are committed to working with other relevant parties in implementation.

7. Potential technologies for the improvement of MCS will always be investigated from the point of view of appropriateness and applicability to the local situation.

8. Innovative approaches to the funding of MCS activities will be investigated.

9. Must link and integrate the strategy, as far as possible, with the relevant groups of the EAC such as the Policy and Security Committee.

10. Co-ordination between land and water based MCS must be improved.
2.4 Challenges facing the MCS Sector

1. The continued and in some cases increasing levels of non-compliance with fishery rules and regulations and the major problem areas are:
   a) continued use of illegal gears, mesh sizes and fishing techniques;
   b) capture and landing of undersized fish;
   c) illegal trans-border trade; and
   d) fishing in restricted areas
2. Lack of awareness of the need for fisheries management amongst fishers and other stakeholders;
3. There are inadequate resources, specifically patrol vessels and allocation of funds for running and maintenance costs, to provide surveillance of areas vulnerable to illegal activity including poaching and smuggling such as borders and islands;
4. There is little strategic planning of MCS activities so that they might be targeted to best effect and applied appropriately among the potentially illegal activities;
5. There is little or inconsistent documentation of current MCS activities and their impacts;
6. There is insufficient monitoring, review and analysis of MCS activities and requirements, which is essential if MCS activities are to be deployed to optimum effectiveness and efficiency;
7. Shortage of suitably qualified and experienced individuals (especially vessel handlers and Inspectors)
8. The infrastructure required for coordinating activities nationally and regionally is often absent or deficient, and information on fishers and fishing vessels is not readily available to field inspectors;
9. There is a lack of attention to training of MCS personnel to operate at local and national level and, also to operate in the future at a regional level or in partnership with colleagues from neighbouring states. Harmonised training needs to be conducted in the three countries.
10. MCS activities in three countries are conducted in a largely un-coordinated way and are not harmonised in terms of procedures, reporting, penalties and severity or seriousness of application etc
11. The processes followed and results obtained during the prosecution of cases are often not in line with the objectives of the Fisheries Departments or other enforcement agencies so these processes must be strengthened
12. Control of introduction of exotic flora and fauna and more general pollution issues.
13. The RPOA-IUU requires that national plans of action are drawn up.
14. Must ensure that adequate data collection, storage and dissemination systems for the development of the fishery are in place.

2.5 Stakeholders in the implementation of this Strategy and Action Plan

Participation of stakeholders in the development of laws and regulations is now widely accepted to be critical if high levels of compliance are to be achieved. Similarly, to be able to anticipate high levels of commitment in the implementation of this Strategy and Action Plan a large and varied group of stakeholders must be involved in the development before they can be expected to play a part in the implementation. This involvement of stakeholders is one of the roles of the RWG and NWG and others – to raise awareness of the strategy and the need for its implementation.
2.6 Arrangements for the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan

As explained elsewhere the modern understanding of MCS is much broader than simply law enforcement (MCS is often referred to as the “executive arm of fishery management”) and as such the MCS Strategy and Action Plan will have considerable overlap with other thematic areas within the LVFO. Where there are specific links to other thematic areas special efforts will have to be made to co-ordinate. Many of the activities outlined in the Action Plan are already part of the plans in this area developed by the national competent authorities for their patrol work so there will need to be close collaboration in the field implementation. Similarly for the funding the national authorities have allocated budgets for these activities.

As the regional body co-ordinating MCS activities on the lake, the LVFO will have an important role to play in the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan. The Regional Working Group for MCS and the National Working Groups have the specific responsibility for the implementation working with their partners.

Local Government – particularly in the situations where many of the enforcement functions have been devolved to local government units, these LGUs will have a principal responsibility at the field level with technical and financial support from the RWG and NWG as appropriate. The three riparian states have already facilitated the establishing of the Inter-District Patrol/MCS Teams involving the local government units and a number of patrol activities have been undertaken.

Beach Management Units (BMUs) and other community organisations will also have a role to play in the implementation of activities and there will be close collaboration with this level in all activities.

Security Forces (particularly Police and the Marine Police) are members of the RWG-MCS and represented on the active NWGs for MCS so the arrangements for their inclusion in implementation are well-advanced.

Significant work has to be done to include the judiciary in the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan as their inputs and support is crucial, particularly in the post-inspection activities.

3 Strategic Goal

**GOAL**

to increase compliance with fisheries rules and regulations

Several interim strategic objectives (SO) must be achieved to reach this goal, and to tackle the current shortcomings. These are presented below. Each strategic objective is outlined with a very brief overview of the rationale while the detail of the activities to be undertaken to implement the Strategy are included in the tables of the Action Plan.

4 Strategic Objectives

**Strategic objective 1**
Create an operational structure that implements MCS effectively and efficiently in all riparian States of Lake Victoria, with the objective of creating sustainable fisheries in the Lake.
This strategy emphasises the need for systems and institutions to be established and fine-tuned to provide the correct co-ordinating systems within which many of the lower level strategies below, will operate. Much of the preparatory work in this area has been completed in the Guidelines for MCS document, but there is still a considerable task in operationalising the system.

The district level patrols perform a very important function as the interface between the national land local efforts to increase the levels of compliance with fishery laws. Although the degree of devolvement varies between states, the district level provides a critical function in all states. In the short term, to improve the effectiveness of patrols and encourage the adoption of common procedures between the different districts, a series of inter-district teams will be established in each country. This approach also takes account of the different access to physical resources among the districts and ensures that even without its own resources, a district can be involved in the process of MCS.

**Strategic objective 2**

Improve voluntary compliance and simplify the MCS task.

This strategy stresses the need to promote community participation in management of fisheries resources and increase the incentive to comply with fisheries regulations through education and outreach to all stakeholders. Approaches will particularly emphasise the negative effect of non-compliance on stocks and sustainability of livelihoods.

**Strategic objective 3**

Develop an effective reporting system for information exchange within and between MCS stakeholders.

This effort recognises the importance of reporting and information management systems at all levels in the MCS system. The importance of the reporting systems is increased given the regional goals of harmonisation and standardisation of systems between the three countries.

**Strategic objective 4**

Improve information and intelligence sharing between MCS units both within states and between states to combat illegal practices and smuggling at border boundaries.

Closely linked to strategy number 3, this component emphasises the need to upgrade the technological infrastructure and creation of inter-district, district and central MCS coordination units in each state.

**Strategic objective 5**

Improve and standardise the planning and conduct of inspection procedures to improve the impact of actual surveillance, apprehension and prosecution of offenders.
The standard of the actual inspections of potentially illegal operations requires considerable improvement, particularly with the level of resources required to put the Fisheries Officer in the position to carry out the inspection. As the Procedures are improved there are opportunities for increased levels of standardisation, training activities, and understanding of the processes of the communities themselves. Programmes should be implemented through coordination of training for all MCS officers (central and BMU), the creation of standardised training manuals and inspection procedures within states and between states. Planning should be conducted on the basis of good quality information and in-line with both resources available and likely impact. Ensure in the planning of surveillance activities that all levels in the fish movement chain are investigated.

**Strategic objective 6**
Establish or designate an MCS analysis and monitoring unit within the LVFO and within member States.

This strategy is very closely linked to strategies 1, 3 and 4 and aims to ensure full analysis of performance and impact of MCS activities, and the dissemination of results. The efforts to build national capacity and also the role of the LVFO as a central “clearing house” body is in line with all the higher level strategies. Monitoring and evaluation of performance could be closely linked to this strategy.

**Strategic objective 7**
Identify procurement needs and sources of funding in response to identified MCS requirements.

The review of current surveillance and patrol systems in the Partner States clearly identified a lack of appropriate vessels for water-based patrols, and to a lesser extent the shortage of vehicles for land-based work. Basic equipment was lacking in many cases. Similarly all three countries experienced problems in maintaining the vessels in particularly because of the high costs and were unable to keep the vessels operating regularly on the water. Crucial in this strategy is to ensure that items procured to undertake MCS tasks must be both appropriate to the actual activity needed to combat illegal operations and, they must be appropriate to the level of funding available for the purchase and also the operating costs.

**Strategic objective 8**
Review penalties and judicial procedures in each state and develop appropriate interventions

This strategy aims to address a number of issues raised around the lake concerning the process of prosecution after an offender has been apprehended. The task will be based on the results of a wide-ranging review of the judicial procedures in each of the partner states to be led by the RWG.

**Strategic objective 9**
Develop skills, knowledge and capacity at all levels for MCS
Closely linked to all earlier strategies, and separated here to reflect the importance and the resources which should be allocated to the task, capacity building for all partners involved in MCS is crucial. Following a Training Needs Assessment, and using the agreed Inspection Procedures and Manuals as source materials – a multi-level training programme will be implemented.

5 Action Plans

The following tables show the range of activities proposed to achieve the strategic objectives identified above, ultimately attaining the Strategic Goal.
### Strategic objective No. 1

Create an operational structure that implements MCS effectively and efficiently in all riparian States of Lake Victoria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Establishment or implementation of fully functional operational structure; | -Existence of structure and documents supporting structure formation  
  -Terms of reference for each component of the structure | Local and national fisheries authorities coordinated by MCS RWG | X | X | X | X | X |
| 1.2 Creation or designation of report & data depositories within Fisheries Department or district offices or other relevant locations and mechanisms for exchange of information with national analytical units  
Clarify the report flows in the structures. | -Reference system | | | X | |
| 1.3 Creation or designation of analytical unit within each national organisational structure | | | | | X |
| 1.4 Fulfillment/implementation of coordination and strategic function for national working group | -NWG minutes  
-Action plans  
-Completed report forms | | | | X |
| 1.5 Strengthening of links between national working groups and regional working group | -NWG minutes  
-RWG minutes | | | | X |
| 1.6 Reporting and review of MCS effectiveness, and analysis of the most effective ways to increase compliance in the different sectors (lake, shore and factory)  
Methodology for measuring the effectiveness of the MCS efforts – contract external group to develop the methodology? | -Collation of national, regional and local reports on activities undertaken  
-National operational analysis report (report on analysis of effectiveness, efficiency)  
-Set monitoring targets and benchmarks | Monitoring and analysis unit within the national organisational structure; | X | X | X | X | X |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.7      | Short-term objective and priority setting based on the results of MCS review, including the ability to redirect MCS resources to areas of greatest need and where their deployment will be most efficient and effective | - Prioritisation of surveillance activities  
- Improved matching of requirements (areas of illegal activity or non-compliance) with MCS activity | NWG-MCS; National MCS Committee | X | X |
| 1.8      | Clarify roles in devolved implementation between central government systems and decentralised authorities | - No duplication of monitoring and/or surveillance activities;  
- Greater surveillance coverage achieved e.g. number of landing sites | MCS NWG; National MCS Committee | X | X |
### Strategic objective No. 2

**Improve voluntary compliance and simplify the MCS task.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Work with other stakeholders and RWGs in particular to create appropriate processes for all stakeholders to participate in fisheries management and development decisions.</td>
<td>-Level of participation in stakeholder meetings; -Establishment of partnership agreements between stakeholders and management authorities; -Increased efficiency of patrols and inspections e.g. voluntary compliance improved;</td>
<td>National MCS Committee; MCS NWG and RWG, &amp; other RWGs as necessary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Dissemination of results and use of results in sensitisation programs.</td>
<td>-Improved level of understanding by fishers of management priorities; -Compliance e.g. observation of controlled areas</td>
<td>Research Institutes with MCS NWG and National AND District MCS Committee BMUs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Improve feedback on MCS activity and effectiveness from central MCS units to BMUs/LA groups and stakeholders</td>
<td>-Level of participation of all groups in further policy and planning efforts; -Greater national regional cooperation e.g. data and information exchanges</td>
<td>MCS RWG MCS NWG; National MCS Committee BMUs District MCS Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Include MCS practitioners in lake-wide resource management meetings</td>
<td>-Composition of delegations at local, national and regional levels i.e. is it proportional and representative</td>
<td>MCS-RWG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</td>
<td>Implementation By</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Include gear manufacturers, judiciary and police in outreach activities</td>
<td>-Reduced number of illegal gears encountered during patrols and inspections</td>
<td>MCS NWG National MCS Committee; District MCS Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Encourage the development of management actions that are effective, easily implemented and monitored (such as gear and closed areas)</td>
<td>-Feedback from communities on sense of ownership and stewardship of the resources e.g. activities and facilities at landing sites; -Monitor community reaction to surveillance activities</td>
<td>MCS-RWG; MCS NWG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Consolidate landing sites to simplify the MCS task; link licensing of vessels and fishers to designated sites; provide infrastructure development to designated sites.</td>
<td>-Closure of landing sites; -Fewer fishers/vessels registered or licensed; -Greater volume of landings at designated sites.</td>
<td>National MCS Committee; BMUs; District MCS Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Strategic objective No. 3

Develop an **effective reporting system** for information exchange within and between MCS stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1      | Develop harmonised and uniform reporting forms and instruct all inspectors (BMU or central/national) to complete them after every inspection, including minimum data requirements. | - Workshops on uniform reporting formats  
- Manual including reporting formats and instructions | MCS – RWG and NWG and Inter-district teams | X    | X    | X    |     |
| 3.2      | Develop district and a central inspection report depositary in each state | - Establishment of MCS report and data depositary | MCS-RWG and NWG and inter-district teams |       | X    | X    | X   |
| 3.3      | Develop a database of inspection reports, harmonised between States within the region | - Establishment of MCS report database | MCS-RWG and NWG and inter-district teams | X    |     |     |     |
| 3.4      | Organise standard summary feedback formats from the database for dissemination to MCS officers at BMU, district, national and regional level | - Improved flow of information to/from inspection officers and central data depository | MCS-RWG and NWG and inter-district teams | X    |     |     |     |
| 3.5      | Prepare regional synthesis report | Regional Patrol report produced | MCS-RWG and NWGs | X    |     |     | X   |
**Strategic objective No. 4**

Improve **information and intelligence sharing** between MCS units both within states and between states to **combat illegal practices and smuggling at border boundaries**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Establish standard information sharing protocols</td>
<td>-Operations manual</td>
<td>MCS RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCS NWG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Ensure that the electronic technologies required to service these protocols are available at the operational level</td>
<td>-Purchase and commissioning of technologies -Increase in information exchange between operations personnel</td>
<td>MCS RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National MCS Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Develop IT systems for sharing information on MCS operations and information on the national vessel and licence databases</td>
<td>-Volume of data exchanged and availability of licensing data to operations personnel</td>
<td>MCS RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National MCS Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Create a central MCS coordination task for the MCS strategy group in each state</td>
<td>-More cohesive MCS deployment by NWG MCS group</td>
<td>MCS-RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCS NWG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Encourage direct contact between coordination units in the region, and between local MCS professionals, especially at the borders and in areas vulnerable to smuggling and illegal activity;</td>
<td>-Schedule regular meetings between MCS professionals from different states in adjacent districts</td>
<td>MCS RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National MCS Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District MCS Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BMUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Develop operational procedures for cross border areas e.g. engaging in hot pursuit.</td>
<td>-Creation of specialised units to tackle specific smuggling problems in border areas -Creation of operations manual for joint activities</td>
<td>MCS-RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic objective No. 5

**Improve and standardise** the planning and conduct of inspection procedures to improve the impact of actual surveillance, apprehension and prosecution of offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.1**  | Develop a standard training manual and training courses for each state building on existing courses and experience available in partner states (e.g. SADC-MCS project in Tanzania funded by EU) | -Regional and national training programs  
-Training departments within national structures | MCS-RWG | X | X |
| **5.2**  | Encourage exchanges of inspectors between states at training courses | -Increasing number of exchanges between training courses | National MCS Committee; MCS-RWG | X | X |
| **5.3**  | Encourage exchanges of inspectors as observers on active deployment | -Increasing number of coordinated exchanges | National MCS Committee; MCS-RWG | X | X | X | X | X |
| **5.4**  | Organise and conduct exposure visit to SADC-MCS Project in Tanzania funded by the EU to examine joint patrols, training systems used, VMS, Information centre, MCS database, Fishery Information Systems and other relevant components | -Visit conducted and lessons used in MCS activities on the lake | MCS-RWG PIU  
SADC-MCS project  
FD - Tanzania | X |
| **5.5**  | Increase monitoring in most efficient places, for instance monitoring at factories as one component of linking water-based patrols for fishers and land-based QA type law enforcement | -Number of inspections conducted | National MCS Committee; MCS-NWG | X | X | X | X |
### Strategic objective No. 6

Establish or designate an MCS **analysis and monitoring** unit within the LVFO and member States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.1 Establish national MCS monitoring and analysis units</strong></td>
<td>-Existence and terms of reference for monitoring and analysis units</td>
<td>MCS-RWG and MCS NWG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2 Require an annual MCS activity and effectiveness report</strong></td>
<td>-MCS activity and effectiveness report</td>
<td>National MCS Committee; MCS-NWG. Consultancy to prepare synthesis report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.3 Establish a mechanism for review of reports at national and regional level which includes feedback from local MCS practitioners and a mechanism of revising annual MCS objectives and priorities taking account of the results of these reviews</strong></td>
<td>-Establishment of functioning operational structure (Strategy 1); Updated SOPs, Strategy and Action Plans</td>
<td>MCS-RWG MCS-NWG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic objective No. 7

Identify **procurement needs and sources of funding** in response to identified MCS requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Following analysis of optimal deployment requirements, identify specific needs – e.g. specific areas which require more patrol vessels or fewer inspections</td>
<td>-Equipment selected based on appropriateness for the task and short and long term affordability (delivery and training costs, maintenance and running costs, life-span)</td>
<td>MCS-RWG; National MCS Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Investigate a variety of funding models, paying particular attention to maintenance requirements rather than capital expenditure</td>
<td>-Establish a regional or national trust fund -Explore licence fee options for revenue raising</td>
<td>MCS-RWG National MCS Committees</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Following development of annual MCS strategies and priorities, establish outstanding resource requirements and fund or re-distribute resources as required</td>
<td>-Distribution of resources matches requirements better over time</td>
<td>MCS-NWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic objective No. 8

Review **penalties and judicial procedures** in each state and develop appropriate interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Conduct thorough review of judicial systems in the three countries – identify areas for concern.</td>
<td>- Judicial Review report</td>
<td>RWG, Consultants</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Conduct workshops to raise awareness of the judiciary and police of their role in MCS operations</td>
<td>- Workshops conducted</td>
<td>RWG members</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Harmonise, as much as possible, penalties between states</td>
<td>- Suggestions for harmonisation</td>
<td>National MCS Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Ensure that penalties actually reflect the cost of damage done by illegal fishing or illegal use of gear</td>
<td>- Sensitisation exercises with judiciary and court officials established as regular training for circuit judges</td>
<td>MCS-NWG National MCS Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Target gear manufacturers through sensitisation workshops</td>
<td>- Reduced number of illegal gears encountered during patrols and inspections</td>
<td>MCS-NWG National MCS Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic objective No. 9

Develop **skills, knowledge and capacity** at all levels for MCS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Indicators (and sub-tasks)</th>
<th>Implementation By</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Prepare outline of training needs (integrated with national assessments) among the inter-district patrol teams</td>
<td>National TN reports</td>
<td>RWG, NWG and Inter-district patrol teams</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Prepare outline of training needs (integrated with national assessments) in other levels and stakeholders in the MCS program</td>
<td>National TN reports</td>
<td>RWG, NWG and Inter-district patrol teams</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Conduct assessment of training providers in MCS-related fields in each of the three countries and synthesise regionally</td>
<td>Training providers report</td>
<td>RWG and NWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Prepare training plan for MCS stakeholders with priorities and costed implementation schedule</td>
<td>Training plan</td>
<td>RWG, NWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Prepare training materials for the identified training activities</td>
<td>Training materials</td>
<td>RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Conduct training (Phase 1) and evaluation</td>
<td>Training reports</td>
<td>Various, RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Continue with training and evaluation etc</td>
<td>Training reports</td>
<td>Various, RWG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>