

Lake Victoria Resource User Groups Survey

C. T. Kirema-Mukasa, J. P. Owino, K. Odongkara,
J. Ikwaput, C. Lwenya, D. N. Murakwa,
M. Medard and F. Sobo



Fisheries Management Series Vol. 3

August 2005



Funded by
NORAD

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

**IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Programme &
Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO)**

IUCN/LVFO Socio-economics of the Lake Victoria Fisheries Phase II

Lake Victoria Resource User Groups Survey

**C. T. Kirema-Mukasa¹, J. P. Owino², K. Odongkara³,
J. Ikwaput⁴, C. Lwenya⁵, D. N. Murakwa⁶,
M. Medard⁷ and F. Sobo⁸**

August 2005

¹ Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization Secretariat

² IUCN - The World Conservation Union, Nile Perch Project

³ Fisheries Resources Research Institute, Uganda

⁴ Fisheries Resources Department, Uganda

⁵ Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute

⁶ Fisheries Department, Kenya

⁷ Former staff of Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute

⁸ Fisheries Division, Tanzania

Published by:



Copyright:

© 2005 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO)

This publication may be produced in whole or part and in any form for education or non-profit uses, without special permission from the copyright holder, provided acknowledgement of the source is made. IUCN would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication, which uses this publication as a source.

No use of this publication may be made for resale or other commercial purpose without the prior written permission of International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and LVFO.

Citation:

C. T. Kirema-Mukasa, J. P. Owino, K. Odongkara, J. Ikwaput, C. Lwenya, D. N. Murakwa, M. Medard and F. Sobo (2005): *Lake Victoria Resource User Group Survey*, IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office (Nairobi, Kenya) and Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (Jinja, Uganda), viii + 33p.

ISBN:

2-8317-0897-4

Design and layout:

Gordon O. Arara, IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office

Printed by:

Elite Offset Ltd.

Cover photographs:

Dried Nile Perch on sale in Mwanza (Heck, 2002)

Available from:

IUCN- EARO Publications Service Unit,
P. O. Box 68200 - 00200, Nairobi, Kenya;
Telephone ++ 254 20 890605-12; Fax ++ 254 20 890615;
E-mail: earo@iucn.org

The designations of geographical entities in this book, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the participating organizations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The opinions expressed by the authors in this publication do not necessarily represent the view of IUCN, LVFO or their members.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ACRONYMS	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vi

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Objectives of the survey	2
1.2 Methodology	2
2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	4
2.1. Basic information on RUGs operating on Lake Victoria	4
2.2. RUGs objectives and ongoing activities on Lake Victoria	9
2.3. RUGs achievements and challenges	15
2.4. RUGs linkages with other stakeholders	18
2.5. Training needs of RUGs	18
2.6. RUGs Membership, Finances and Management	21
3. CONCLUSIONS	24
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	24
5. REFERENCES	24
6. ANNEXES	25
Annex 1: Questionnaire	25
Annex 2: Contact persons and addresses in Kenya	28
Annex 3: Names and addresses of group contact persons in Tanzania	30
Annex 4: RUGs itinerary, Tanzania	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Types of Resource User Groups (RUGs)	vii
Table 2: Sample size and registration status	2
Table 3: Categories of RUGs	5
Table 4: Year RUGs registered	6
Table 5: RUGs initiators on Lake Victoria	7
Table 6: Reasons for formation of RUGs on Lake Victoria	8
Table 7: Objectives of RUGs on Lake Victoria	9
Table 8: On-going activities by RUGs on Lake Victoria	10
Table 9: RUGs achievements	15
Table 10: Challenges faced by RUGs on Lake Victoria	17
Table 11: RUGs linkages to ther stakeholders	18
Table 12: RUGs training needs	19
Table 13: RUGs Membership	21
Table 14: Enrolment of RUGs	22
Table 15: Sources of finances for the RUGs activities	22
Table 16: Management of RUGs	23

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This survey has been undertaken by *The Socio-economics of the Nile perch Fishery on Lake Victoria Project Phase II*, facilitated by The World Conservation Union (IUCN) Eastern Africa Regional Programme and Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) with support from The Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD). Their support is highly appreciated.

The authors are grateful to the resource user groups consulted in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda for their hospitality and their contributions to this survey. Likewise, the team wishes to thank the technical officers contacted from central and local government, NGOs, private sector and other agencies in the three countries for their guidance, logistical support and for their perspective on resource user groups and fisheries management on Lake Victoria. Finally, the authors wish to acknowledge the technical support and coordination by the Secretariats of LVFO and IUCN Eastern Africa during this activity, as well as for editing this report.

ACRONYMS

BMUs	Beach Management Units
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DFOs	District Fisheries Officers
DFR	Department of Fisheries Resources
ECOVIC	East Africa Community Organizations for the Management of Lake Victoria Resources
EU	European Union
FIRRI	Fisheries Resources Research Institute, Uganda
HIV/AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
IUCN EARO	The World Conservation Union, Eastern Africa Regional Office
LVEMP	Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project
LVFO	Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization
LVFRP	Lake Victoria Fisheries Research Project
MUWANDA	Mwanza Women Development Association
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for International Development
PIT	Project Implementation Team
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RUGS	Resource User Group Survey
SIDO	Small Scale Industries Organization
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
TAHEA	Tanzania Home Economics Association

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Partner States sharing Lake Victoria in East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda) recognize the critical importance of involving the resource user groups (RUGs)¹ in a partnership arrangement with other relevant stakeholders (governments, private sector etc) in the management of Lake Victoria fisheries. This necessitates having a better understanding of these resource user groups, their activities, capacities, and relationships with other stakeholders, opportunities and constraints existing for their participation in fisheries management of Lake Victoria.

The World Conservation Union (IUCN) and Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) are implementing the *Socio-economics of the Nile perch fishery project phase II on Lake Victoria* focusing, among others, on strengthening the capacities of the RUGs for effective participation in the management of the lake's resources. The project is implemented by the Project Implementation Team (PIT) drawn from LVFO member institutions (Fisheries Departments and Fisheries Research Institutes of the Partner States), LVFO Secretariat and IUCN EARO. The PIT carried out a survey for a more detailed and better understanding of the RUGs as a prerequisite for building their capacities. The objectives of the study were to improve the information base for fisheries management on Lake Victoria; assist governments in planning for the participation of resource users in fisheries management; and help the local communities to be represented in future support programmes for capacity building.

The study was done between the last quarter of 2002 and the first quarter of 2003, using a questionnaire developed by PIT (Annex 1). Data was collected from a total of 30 RUGs in Kenya, 24 RUGs in Tanzania and 80 RUGs in Uganda. The information was analyzed and presented in graphics and tables.

The survey identified the following:

- a) Basic information about the existing groups,
- b) Spectrum of RUGs activities, in particular their involvement in fisheries management and industry,
- c) RUGs successes and challenges in pursuing their goals,
- d) RUGs linkages with other stakeholders - central and local governments, civil society organizations (CSOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and private sector,

¹ Organizations of those utilizing the fishery resources of Lake Victoria

- e) RUGs managerial and technical capacity, training needs, financial resources, and support strategies.

Key findings

- a) The survey identified 4 types of RUGs in Tanzania, 3 in Kenya and 4 in Uganda as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Types of Resource User Groups (RUGs)

Country	Types of Resource User Groups (RUGs)
Kenya	Self-help groups
	Beach Management Units (BMUs)
	Cooperative Societies
Uganda	Beach Management Units (BMUs)
	Women groups
	Youth groups
	Company/Associations
Tanzania	Self-help groups
	Beach Management Units (BMUs)
	Communal (traditional) groups
	Associations

Source: Survey data

- b) Most of these groups were originally formed to meet social and/or welfare objectives and had little to do with resource management.
- c) The RUGs are involved in a number of activities including welfare, fisheries management and conservation, monitoring and security of fishing gears and equipment, HIV/AIDS awareness creation, development projects, fishing, fish processing and trading, credit and saving facilities, gear production and maintenance and environmental protection.
- d) RUGs exploit social capital i.e. features of social organizations, which comprises improved social relations of trust, reciprocity and exchanges, common rules, norms and sanctions, and connectedness, which enhances cooperation and cohesiveness among these groups.
- e) In Kenya, RUGs have made various achievements such as improved savings and credit provision, acquisition of group property and resources, improved infrastructure at the landing sites – toilets, water supply, and identification and protection of breeding areas in collaboration with the Fisheries Department.
- f) In Tanzania, RUGs achievements included self-employment and income generation of the rural poor, awareness creation and skill acquisition.

- g) In Uganda, RUGs accomplishments included recording of boats and gears at the beaches, reduction of illegal fishing, fish catch records, improvements in sanitation and hygiene, and reduction in theft of fishing gears, provision of loans to members, construction of permanent houses, getting good markets for Omena/Dagaa/Mukene and identification of alternative sources of income.
- h) Despite these achievements, the RUGs face various challenges such as declining fish catches, poor management of group's resources, piracy and insecurity in the lake, HIV/AIDS pandemic, and lack of skills and technical know-how, among others.

Conclusions

- a) Lake Victoria's RUGs have demonstrated the ability to mobilize local resources to meet some of their localized needs. Hence they can help improve the link between local action and national objectives.
- b) Most of these groups face various challenges in realizing their set objectives, such as reversing the declining trend in fish catches due to too many fishers and overcapacity in terms of investment in the fishing industry, illegal fishing methods and gears, migration of fishers; poor management of group resources; HIV/AIDS; lack of technical know-how, theft of fishing gears and equipment including insecurity of fishers on the lake.
- c) The existing opportunities for social capital may create a conducive environment for incorporating RUGs in the management of fisheries resources and socio-economic development.
- d) RUGs need to acquire skills and knowledge in areas such as: financial management, fish preservation, processing and marketing, fisheries conservation and management measures, planning and development of group activities.

Recommendations

- a) There is need to encourage the RUGs to exploit the opportunity of social capital to enable them participate in fisheries management and improve their socio-economic well-being.
- b) Governments, NGOs and other organizations should be encouraged to provide technical and financial support to the RUGs, especially BMUs for sustainable fisheries development.
- c) Sustainable sources of funding for RUGs should be identified and BMUs should be encouraged to engage in income generating activities such as bidding for tender for their respective landing sites.



© Heck, 2003

Some participants on a field visit at Wichlum landing site during an international workshop held in Kisumu in October 2003, weighing Nile Perch catch

1. INTRODUCTION

Lake Victoria is Africa's largest freshwater fishery, shared by Kenya (6%), Tanzania (51%) and Uganda (43%) of the water surface. The fishery of Lake Victoria consists of 3 major commercial species namely Nile perch (*Lates niloticus*), Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) and dagaa/omena/mukene (*Rastrineobola argentea*). The fishery supports a population of about 30 million people living in the lake basin. The fishery makes substantial contributions to the national economies of the riparian states through export earnings valued at US\$ 600m annually (LVFO, 1999). Nile perch has become a highly demanded commodity in the international market, giving rise to the establishment of more than 30 fish processing plants on the shores of Lake Victoria. As a result, there is an increased fishing effort reflected in the increasing numbers of fishers, (for example in 1980 there were 30,000 fishers and by 2000 the number had gone up to 120,000, LVFO, 2000). This development in the fishery sector poses new challenges for fisheries management such as declining fish catches (especially Nile perch), increased capital investment in the fishing sector, improved mobility of fishers and increased fish processing capacities. Acknowledging the difficulties of managing a shared resource, Lake Victoria's States in 1994 formed the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) for the joint management of Lake Victoria fisheries (LVFO, 2001).

To address these challenges and safeguard continued benefits from the fisheries, fishers and their communities need to be proactive in fisheries management. The three Partner States have thus embarked on a process of involving fishers, as primary resource users, in the management of Lake Victoria's fisheries resources. In addition, the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) has included community participation as a priority in the Lake Victoria Fisheries Management Plan (LVFRP, 2001).

LVFO and IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Programme are implementing *The Socio-economics of the Nile perch phase II project in Lake Victoria*, focusing on strengthening the capacities of the resource user groups (RUGs) for effective participation in the management of the fisheries resources. The project is implemented by a Project Implementation Team (PIT) drawn from LVFO member institutions (Fisheries Departments and Fisheries Research Institutes of the Partner States), LVFO Secretariat and IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Programme. The PIT carried out this survey to gain a better understanding of the RUGs as a prerequisite for building their capacities.

1.1 Objectives of the survey

The objectives of the survey were to:

- i. improve the information base for fisheries management on Lake Victoria;
- ii. assist governments in planning for the participation of resource users in fisheries management;
- iii. help the local communities to be represented in future support programmes for capacity building; and
- iv. inform the design of capacity building programmes for RUGs.

1.2 Methodology

PIT members in each of the countries carried out the survey on their respective portion of the lake, using a common questionnaire that they had previously developed (Annex 1) and other data collection instruments, methods and procedures. Kenya collected information from 8 districts with a RUG sample size of 30, Tanzania surveyed 12 districts with a RUG sample size of 24 and Uganda surveyed 11 districts with a RUG sample size of 80 (table 2). Effort was made to cover both the mainland and islands.

Table 2: Sample size and registration status

Country	District(s)	Sample size	Registered Groups	Non registered Groups
Kenya	8	30	28 (93%)	2 (7%)
Tanzania	12	24	22 (92%)	2 (8%)
Uganda	11	80	31 (38%)	49 (62%)

Source: Survey data

In Kenya, the 12 beaches were purposefully selected according to administrative boundaries (districts), accessibility to the beaches and the existence of groups at each beach. The existence of the group on the beach was identified through a review of records and verification by the District Fisheries Officers concerned.

In Tanzania, random stratified sampling was used to select two Resource User Groups in each of the 12 districts taking into consideration the following: their involvement in fisheries management and conservation activities, socio-economic activities, and accessibility among others. Data were then collected using structured questionnaires, unstructured in-depth interviews, secondary information and three focus group discussions.



*Community meeting at Malehe Beach in Bukoba , Tanzania in June 2002 during a study on
Cross border fishing and fish trade on Lake Victoria*

In Uganda, Fisheries Department staffs from the districts were selected to work as enumerators in the survey. The selection was done by the DFOs, based on their knowledge of the existing groups. The enumerators went through a one-day training workshop to prepare them for the survey. It was agreed that the enumerators were to target all resource user groups that are likely to play a role in fisheries management and socio-economic development of the fishing communities. The landings to be surveyed were agreed upon during the training. The criteria for the selection of the landings were based on accessibility and the presence of groups. All the existing groups in a selected landing had to be recorded to avoid bias. Group officials, especially chairpersons, were targeted for interviews. In the absence of the chairperson, the secretary or treasurer was consulted.



© Corrison, 2005

BMU Community training in Homa Bay in Kenya, June 2005

2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The survey findings on the following areas are presented and discussed in this report:

- i) Basic information on RUGs
- ii) Spectrum of RUGs' objectives and activities, in particular their involvement in fisheries management and development
- iii) RUGs' successes and challenges in pursuing their goals
- iv) Linkages to other stakeholders - central and local governments, civil society organizations (CSOs), NGOs and private sector; and
- v) RUG Managerial and technical capacity, training needs, financial resources and support strategies.

2.1. BASIC INFORMATION ON RUGS OPERATING ON LAKE VICTORIA

Table 3 indicates the broad categories of RUGs identified in the 3 countries. In Kenya, three categories of RUGs were identified, i.e. Beach Management Units (BMU), Co-operative Societies and the Self-help groups. Self-help groups were those groups that were not formed as an initiative of the government. Whereas the rest drew membership from locational and divisional administrative levels, membership of the Co-operatives was extended to neighbouring beaches within the same location and/or division. Co-

operatives were initiated in the mid 1960s by an Act of Parliament to promote marketing of members' produce, mobilisation of financial resources from members and the extension of credit facilities to them. While most of the self-help groups were started by individuals, the Co-operatives and BMUs were started by government. Most self-help groups were formed from the mid 1990s after members became dissatisfied with the performance of the Fishermens Co-operative Societies. Some were also formed to: provide security for fishing gears, in anticipation of assistance from donors as well as for welfare purposes. BMU were later formed by the Fisheries Department to encourage communities to actively participate in fisheries management.

Table 3: Categories of RUGs

Category	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
BMU	7	23	2	8	30	38
Co-operative Societies	3	10	3	13	2	2
Self help group/fisher group/CBO/ women group/youth group	20	67	17	71	41	51
Associations	-	-	2	8	7	9
Totals	30	100	24	100	80	100

Source: Survey data, 2002

In the Tanzanian riparian districts of Lake Victoria, the RUGs comprised different kinds of organizations including community-based organizations. Self-help groups were engaged in resource management and socio-economic activities such as construction of roads, schools and fish weighing facilities. Self-help groups included traditional groups, which were active in community mobilization and sourcing for funds. In the Sukuma community these traditional groups are known as '*irika*' and '*nzenzo*' and are formed around elderly traditional healers. There are approximately 530 BMUs at the moment in Tanzanian portion of the Lake. BMUs are fisheries management and conservation groups embedded within the local village administration system under the peace and security committee. They are involved in curbing illegal fishing gears and methods, issuing of licenses on behalf of the Fisheries Department, compiling fishermens' inventory (name, resident, fishing vessel number etc), recording fish daily catch, controlling migration of fishers, improving sanitation on the beaches and supervising other fishing activities.

In the Ugandan riparian districts of the lake, 51% of RUGs surveyed were socio-economic groups started by individuals or by small groups of about 3 people to benefit from micro-finance schemes in order to uplift the standard of living of their members particularly women through savings and lending. 38% of the RUGs surveyed were BMUs mainly started by the Fisheries Department for proper management of the fisheries resources including improving the sanitation situation at the fish landings.

Table 4: Year RUGs registered

Year of Registration	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1982 and before	7	23	1	4	3	4
1983 - 1987	1	3			2	2
1988 - 1992	0	0	1	4	3	4
1993 - 1997	2	7	5	21	9	11
1998 - 2002	20	67	17	71	63	79
Totals	30	100	24	100	80	100

Source: Survey data, 2002

As indicated in Table 4, most of the RUGs were registered between 1998 and 2002. This happened during the period when the Partner States were promoting community participation in resource management on Lake Victoria. As a result, the Fisheries Departments and other institutions in response to the co-management arrangements initiated the BMUs. BMUs are local institution that would ensure community participation in fisheries management within a co-management arrangement. According to LVFO harmonized guideline, BMU is a community based organizations of fisher folk that include crew (*baharia*), boat owners, managers, chatterers, fish processors, fish mongers, local gear makers or repairers and fishing equipment dealers. Co-management describes a partnership among different stakeholders for the management of the resource, provided that all share same vision. It entails a conscious and official distribution of responsibility, roles as well as rewards with the formal vesting of some authority. With support from various programmes and through Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO), such as the EU funded *Implementation of the Fisheries Management Plan Project (IFMP)*, the NORAD funded *IUCN Socio-economics of the Nile perch fishery project* and the World Bank funded *Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP)*, BMUs have started operating around the lake in the three countries, experiencing both successes and challenges over the past years.

Table 5 shows that most of the RUGs were initiated by local communities/individuals. In Kenya, the registration of self-help groups was done by the Ministry of Culture and Social Services, Co-operative Societies by the Ministry of Co-operative Development and BMUs were registered by Fisheries Department. In Tanzania, the office of District Administrative Secretary did the registration of the RUGs. In Uganda, RUGs were registered by the Department of Fisheries Resources, while at the District Level, Department of Gender and Community Development, District NGO Forum or the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Co-operatives.

Table 5: RUGs initiators on Lake Victoria

Initiators	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Government (central/local)	10	33	8	33	14	17.5
Local communities/individuals	20	67	16	67	66	82.5
Total	30	100	24	100	80	100

Source: Survey data

In Kenya, unlike in the other two countries, there was a deliberate government effort to promote co-operative development stimulating the formation of other community-based groups. For instance, before 1982, 23% of the RUGs were in existence in Kenya, whereas Tanzania and Uganda each had only 4% (Table 4). In Kenya, 13% of the groups were also formed to solve specific problems at a specific time and remained thereafter e.g. credit rotational groups.

In Tanzania, awareness on the environment increased in the 1990s as a result of the activities of various projects such as Lake Victoria Environment Management Programme (LVEMP), Kagera Fisheries, Forest Resource Management Program and a number of NGOs such as Tanzania Home Economics Association (TAHEA) Mwanza Women Development Association (MUWANDA), ECOVIC and CARE.

In Uganda, formation of the BMUs was as a result of sensitization and awareness programmes by the Department of Fisheries Resources (DFR) and the Fisheries Resources Research Institute (FIRRI), with financial support from LVEMP. Some of the BMUs in Uganda started as landing committees and were formed mainly during the fish poison era to stamp out illegalities, which had resulted in fish ban. Whereas individuals or local communities who initiated socio-economic groups were basically inspired to promote development and fight poverty through collective action in Uganda, some of them were just emulating groups they had seen in other areas.

Table 6 shows the reasons given by the RUGs for starting the groups. In most cases the RUGs gave more than one reason for starting their groups, therefore the frequency in the table is not cumulative.

In addition to the reasons outlined in Table 6, some RUGs in Kenya were started as a result of dissatisfaction with the performance of the co-operative societies. Others considered the Co-operative societies to be too large and formed smaller groups to ease the management of their finances and coordination.

In Tanzania, health issues such as HIV/AIDS featured prominently in the reasons given for starting the RUGs. Other reasons given for starting RUGs in Tanzania included support to disadvantaged members of the communities, such as street children, orphans, widows, the aged, among others.

In Uganda, another reason that was given for formation of the RUGs was the need to involve fishers in data collection.

Table 6: Reasons for formation of RUGs on Lake Victoria

Reasons	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Enhance community participation in fishery and environmental management	6	20	20	83	19	24
Eradicate illegal fishing practices including insecurity	1	3	15	63	18	23
Support marketing and processing	9	30	10	42	3	4
Socio-economic welfare purposes (improve standard of living and increase income)	3	10	22	92	18	23
Micro-finance for saving and credit facilities	9	30	-	-	1	1
Poverty eradication	-	-	3	13	15	19
Health, including HIV/AIDS	-	-	18	75	-	-

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some RUGs had more than one reason for formation

2.2. RUGS OBJECTIVES AND ONGOING ACTIVITIES

Table7: Objectives of RUGs on Lake Victoria

Objectives	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fisheries co-management, including running beach activities, data collection, record keeping, patrolling to curb illegal fishing and gear protection	5	11	6	25	47	59
Fishing	7	16	7	29	-	-
Fish processing	2	3	-	-	2	3
Fish marketing	8	18	-	-	13	16
Fish quality assurance	-	-	-	-	4	5
Uplift standard of living of members	14	31	8	33	22	28
Income generating activities	-	-	-	-	17	21
Savings and credit	-	-	-	-	10	13
To access loans (credit)	7	16	-	-	3	4
To provide employment	-	-	-	-	5	6
Environment management and conservation	-	-	14	58	11	14
Water hyacinth control	-	-	2	8	3	4
Hygiene and Sanitation	-	-	1	-	13	16
Community mobilization for development	-	-	-	-	11	14
Mobilize fishing community against increased water accidents	-	-	-	-	1	1
Lobbying and advocacy	-	-	-	-	4	5
STDs/HIV/AIDS/Family Planning	1	2	9	38	1	1
Encourage functional adult literacy	-	-	-	-	2	3
Promote gender equity	-	-	2	8	2	3
Handle minor crimes at landing.	-	-	-	-	1	1
Initiate development project	5	11	1	-	-	-

Source: Survey data

Table 7 shows that the most common objectives of the RUGs on Lake Victoria was to improve the standard of living of the fisher communities. Fisheries co-management was also high in the list of objectives as mentioned. In Kenya, fish marketing was among the priority objectives of the RUGs. With the liberalization of the Cooperative activities in Kenya, many groups have seized the opportunity to market their own fish directly to factory agents and this has been promoted by the desire to get commission from marketing Nile perch. Welfare issues affecting the fishers included taking care of orphans and widows, paying school fees, covering funeral expenses, assisting the sick etc. Failure of government to provide some of the facilities has encouraged fishers to initiate development projects to provide facilities such as cold

storage, fish stores, fish landing bandas, insulated collection boats and sanitary facilities. Some BMUs also conducted beach activities including enforcement of fisheries legislation, data collection, project formulation and implementation and promotion of community participation. Improving living standards of fishers was facilitated through income generation, savings and credit facilities. Some groups were formed in anticipation of attracting donor support.

In Tanzania, the overall objective of the RUGs was to promote a self-help culture through achieving the specific objectives of each RUG. These included improved standards of living, management and conservation of their fisheries, addressing environmental concerns, health, HIV/AIDS and the welfare of disadvantaged groups such as orphans and street children.

In Uganda, in addition to the general objectives of RUGs discussed above, the BMUs had an objective of ensuring quality control to meet the European Union (EU) export standard requirements. Womens' groups had objectives focusing on improving socio-economic welfare of their members, encouraging savings among group members and increasing the amount of fish traded. The youth were more preoccupied with fighting poverty among members and management of HIV/AIDS/STD. The fisher groups including the cooperatives had objectives focusing on improving fishing and marketing, alleviating poverty among members, providing employment to members, establishing credit facilities and linking members to NGOs.

Table 8: On-going activities by RUGs on Lake Victoria

Activities	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fish capture	20	67	10	42	72	90
Fish processing,	2	7	12	50	32	40
Fish trading and marketing	12	40	12	50	61	76
Gear, boat production and maintenance	2	7	13	54	53	66
Monitoring and record keeping	5	17	3	13	41	51
Education and training	8	27	14	58	58	73
Loan, credit and saving	11	37	9	38	25	31
Small-scale business development	7	23	18	75	15	19

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some RUGs had more than one on-going activity

Table 8 shows the on-going activities by RUGs on Lake Victoria, the details of which are described below.

2.2.1 Fish capture

The majority of the groups had members involved in fish capture i.e. 67% in Kenya, 42% in Tanzania, 90% in Uganda. In Tanzania, some group members were themselves fishers, while in Kenya and Uganda they were hiring crews. In Uganda fishers have formed groups to fight illegal fishing, which threatens their interests.

2.2.2 Fish processing

Most fish (Nile perch) is not processed by the groups, but rather sold to industrial processors. Fish processing by the groups was for local consumption. In Kenya, fish processing involved deep-frying of Nile perch skeletons and sun drying of dagaa, which was dominated by women as individuals but whose savings went to the group's account. The transportation of the Nile perch skeletons from the factories was done collectively to reduce the cost involved in the processing.

In Tanzania, fish processing and trading were done by some 50% of the groups. However, these activities were not considered sustainable for those groups not involved in fish capture because of fish scarcity, seasonal variations, unpredictability of the supply, high prices and stiff competition by agents and/or middlemen particularly those supplying the fish processing plant.

In Uganda, 40% of the groups were involved in fish processing and the majority of the members were women. Fishers were sensitized on post-harvest handling and fish processing to meet the high fish quality standards required by industrial processors. Fish smoking and salting were done involving tilapia and Nile perch not sold to the industrial processors. Sun drying was done with dagaa and its processing was increasing (by artisanal fish processors) as a result of the limited availability of the Nile perch which was being sold to industrial processors.

2.2.3 Fish marketing

In Kenya 40% of the RUGs had members engaged in fish trading and marketing individually. A marketing group in Uhanya was the only one where the members were pursuing a common interest of fish marketing by trading their fish as a group. Two self-help groups were involved in trading of fishing gears. Many groups seized the opportunity to market their own fish directly to factories or agents when the control by co-operatives was relaxed. This has been promoted by the desire to get commission from marketing Nile perch.

In Tanzania, fish processing and trading were done by the same groups concurrently, as mentioned in para. 2.2.2 above.

In Uganda, the majority of the groups i.e. 76% were involved in fish trading activities which included: fish sales to factory agents and fish mongers, transportation of fish, sensitizing of traders on proper fish handling, licensing and awareness raising on fish

prices. Many members were involved in fish trading because of the little initial capital required to start. The buyers themselves sometimes provided this small investment. In addition, some groups were transporting fish to fish factories, as well as to the larger and distant markets. However, in some cases where factory agents were transporting fish to factories themselves, they out-competed these groups.

2.2.4 Gear and boat production and maintenance

In Kenya, only 7% of the RUGs were involved in the trading of fishing gears. Individual fishers were tending to the maintenance of gears and boats. In Tanzania, 54% of the RUGs were involved in gear and boat production and maintenance. These included all groups involved in actual fishing and a percentage of income received from daily fish sales was set aside for the maintenance of boats and fishing gears. In Uganda, 66% of the RUGs were involved in gear and boat maintenance activities. Some groups were involved in supplying fishing inputs (boats and nets) because the demand was high. Such groups were formed to tap the already existing market.

2.2.5 Monitoring and record keeping

In Kenya, 17% of the RUGs (primarily BMUs) were involved in the monitoring of fishing activities to eradicate the use of prohibited fishing methods and gears. Cooperatives were active in record keeping on fish catches. Most groups kept membership records and activity registers. Fishers formed vigilante groups to patrol the fishing grounds and protect their nets. This was a voluntary exercise whereby members met the patrol costs, which included provision of fuel and some incentives for the vigilantes. In Tanzania, 13% of the RUGs were involved in monitoring and record keeping of fish catches and these mainly consisted of cooperative societies and BMUs. The groups were carrying out this activity as part of co-management arrangements. In Uganda, 51% of the groups were involved in monitoring and record keeping on fish catches, sales and income. Some did it for management purposes to monitor the capture of immature fish. It was noted that 5% of the groups regularly reported bad fishing practices to the BMUs. The BMUs, including the landing management committees and task forces, were engaged in co-management activities which included reporting fisheries activities, curbing illegal fishing activities, quality assurance, infrastructure development at landing sites and catch data collection.

2.2.6 Education and training

In Kenya, 27% of the RUGs were involved in education and training of members. Cooperatives were active in training members on how to save. The self-help groups were involved in educating members on issues such as HIV/AIDS prevention, recommended types of fishing practices and saving. The BMUs were the only groups that were involved in community mobilization in fisheries management.

In Tanzania, 58% of the groups were involved in training, basically on fisheries management, fish catch records, fish handling and sanitation, record keeping of small businesses, banana trees planting, participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques, food preservation and manufacturing, eradication of poverty, awareness about HIV/AIDS, environmental protection and management, child care and education. The training was received from different organizations such as LVEMP, LVFRP, KFP, DRDP, KAEMP, SIDO/MUWADA.

In Uganda, 73% of the RUGs were involved in education and training of their members, which included training in data collection, acceptable fishing methods, financial management and business skills. Where training had been conducted, it was supported by LVEMP and other programmes. In addition, the Department for Fisheries Resources, the Fisheries Resources Research Institute, Local Governments and NGOs were also involved in awareness raising among resource user groups with the aim of improving the management of Lake Victoria fisheries.

2.2.7 Savings and credit services

Fishers had difficulties in obtaining loans from banks or micro-financing institutions because of lack of collateral and the risks associated with the fishing business. The fact that most fishers were not involved in loans and saving services was partly caused by their migratory nature.

In Kenya, 37% of the RUGs indicated that they were involved in savings and having access to loans/credits. Some of the RUGs offered credit facilities to fishers to replace their stolen fishing gears and equipment and/or expand their fishing activities. Fishing being a risky business, these groups worked as a buffer for the fishers. RUGs hold these groups in high esteem as they can easily access their cash or credits without lengthy bureaucratic procedures. Some activities were undertaken by individual members and had their savings going to the groups' accounts while some groups had co-operative activities with the profit going to the groups' accounts. Most groups had opened accounts, but some still kept money in the house for easy access. Some groups were saving with SAGA Sacco Limited a micro-finance institution.

In Tanzania, 38% of the RUGs reported being involved in savings and credit activities. Some groups were involved in traditional loan/credit systems whereby money from the groups was made available for borrowing to other RUG members or community members as well as other local groups. In addition, Local Government and Regional Administration (LGRA) had a special fund through which it gave loans to rural groups for poverty alleviation. However, the groups were complaining about the high interest rates and other stringent conditions imposed on the loans. Four groups (17%) mentioned having received fishing boats, fishing gears and outboard engines from donors (e.g. Swiss Aid, Kagera Fisheries Project -UNDP/FAO and LVFRP).

In Uganda, 25% of the RUGS were involved in savings as a result of a general awareness raising campaign on household savings as a means to eradicate poverty.

2.2.8 Small-scale business development

Fishers were encouraged to participate in alternative income generating activities in order to reduce the excessive fishing effort on Lake Victoria. In Kenya 23% were involved in small-scale business development. Some groups were funding their members to begin small enterprises such as fish trade and selling of other non-fish commodities. In Tanzania, 75% of the groups were involved in small-scale business development such as tree nursery projects (selling seedlings to the communities especially during rainy seasons), handicraft, construction of bandas (fish weighing facility) for hiring, operating food kiosks and groceries, brick and furniture making, consultancies in proposal writing, cargo and passenger transportation. In Uganda, the minimal involvement of groups in small-scale businesses (19%) was due to the failure of fisherfolk to diversify their economic activities either due to lack of business entrepreneurship or capital. The majority of groups depended heavily on fishing because it was considered a relatively easy enterprise to start and operate. However, those involved in small-scale business were mainly operating shops, hotels, bars and public transport.

2.2.9 Other activities

Other activities common to all the BMUs included registration drives for new members, managing daily beach activities, resolving conflicts, officiating at beach meetings, development activities such as construction of sanitary facilities, fish stores and fish bandas as well as their management and maintenance. In addition, some BMUs also engaged in the inspection of fishing equipment, provision of baits for long lines and fish farming. Some of the non-BMU RUGs also engaged in sanitation and hygiene improvement at the landing beaches. Others were engaged in quarrying, brick-making, mat-making and farming.

2.3. RUGs ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES

Table 9: RUGs Achievements

Achievements	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mobilization of financial and social resources (property, fishing inputs)	12	27	24	100	16	20
Increased income	1	2	19	79	1	1
Sensitization on co-mgt, environment and community aspects such as group formation	-	-	17	71	4	5
Reduction of illegal fishing activities	1	2	9	38	28	35
Record keeping of fishing activities for management	-	-	3	13	2	3
Tree planting (incl. wise use of forest resources)	-	-	6	25	3	4
Awareness creation on HIV/AIDs	-	-	10	42	-	-
Improved beach sanitation and hygiene	-	-	8	33	11	14
Improved wells (water supply)	-	-	2	8		
Participation in seminars and training	-	-	11	46	-	-
Improved infrastructure e.g. fish bandas	6	13	1	4	5	6
Establishing credits and savings schemes	19	42	9	38	4	5
Protection of wetlands & fish breeding grounds	1	2	2	8	-	-
Secure markets for other products (not fish)	-	-	5	21	-	-
Environmental management promoted	-	-	11	46	-	-
Institution of group and community by-laws	-	-	6	25	-	-
Controlled migration of fishers	-	-	10	42	-	-
Reduction in fishing gear theft	-	-	3	13	-	-
Publicity of the group (to outsiders/institutions/donors)	-	-	8	33	-	-
Being awarded District tenders for revenue collection	-	-	2	8	1	1
Collective marketing of fish to agents/factories	2	4	3	13		
Enhanced entrepreneur skills, small enterprises and diversification	1	2	4	17	3	4
Strengthened links with Fisheries Dept & Research	-	-	8	33	-	-
Assistance to disadvantaged groups (orphans, widows)	1	2	-	-	-	-
Reduction of post harvest losses & improved fish quality	-	-	-	-	5	6
No achievements	3	7	-	-	9	11

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some RUGS reported more than one achievement

Table 9 shows the most common achievements of RUGs on Lake Victoria included mobilization of finances and social resources, increased income, improved infrastructure at the landings, establishment of savings and credit schemes and enhanced entrepreneurship.

In Kenya, the study showed that RUGs had made some considerable achievements in meeting their set objectives. The greatest achievement was improved savings and credit for fishers (42%), which was enhanced by the establishment of accounts and availability of financial institutions (saving and credit). Some RUGs (27%) placed priority on acquiring group property and resources such as land, poultry, livestock, engine boats, rental houses, and fishing gears. The RUGs established infrastructure such as toilets, electricity and water supply, fish bandas and schools. Marketing of fish for members was improved through direct price negotiations with industrial fish processors. The RUGs promoted income-generating enterprises by providing funds to their members to invest in fish-trading and diversification into non-fish commodities. The groups also assisted disadvantaged members such as orphans or widows. As a result of group activities such as patrols, there was reduction and in some areas elimination of destructive fishing gears and methods, notably drift-netting.

In Tanzania, RUGs formation has been one of the primary strategies and opportunities for financial and social mobilization. This has enhanced co-operation, networking and community institutions. With liberalization of the Tanzania markets, the roles of the marketing boards are being taken up by the private sector. Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have utilized this opportunity to strengthen the base of RUGs to improve the marketing of their produce. The following were identified as factors that enabled RUGs in Tanzania to achieve their planned activities:

- i) Availability of local natural, material and human resources
- ii) A well elaborated institutional and power structure
- iii) Availability of external assistance and support, namely financial, technical and material
- iv) Homogeneity of the group members
- v) High level of education among group members
- vi) Spirit of entrepreneurship
- vii) Peer support and a culture of development
- viii) Political will, which was a significant factor in the success or failure of group activities
- ix) Good leadership with the ability to keep the groups united

In Uganda, the most frequently reported achievements of the RUGs were reduction of illegal fishing activities (35%) followed by the acquisition of fishing inputs (20%), as shown in Table 9. The construction of fish-handling facilities and increased awareness on fish quality (by the RUGs) has led to the reduction of post-harvest losses. In addition, construction of toilets and other related facilities resulted in the improvement of sanitation and hygiene at the landing beaches as mentioned by 14%

of the RUGs. Other achievements include diversification into other income generating activities, record keeping of fishing activities, environmental management, implementation of micro-projects and improved housing for members. Some groups instituted safety measures on the lake such as use of life jackets, seaworthy boats and avoiding over loading.

Table 10: Challenges faced by RUGs on Lake Victoria

Challenges	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Insufficient resources to run group activities	12	25	20	83	19	24
High death rates of members (HIV/AIDS)	3	6	9	38	1	1
Poor infrastructure and transport	1	2	8	33	1	1
Insecurity and piracy	5	10	6	25	4	5
Lack of commitment among members (resistance from previous office bearers)	3	6	-	-	3	4
Low fish catches	7	14	-	-	8	10
Poor loan recovery, poor financial contribution from members	2	4	-	-	1	1
Lack of incentives (dormant members)	1	2	4	17		
Price fluctuation (due to competition from other products on the international market)	3	6	6	25	3	4
Use of illegal gears	2	4	-	-	5	6
Migration of fishermen	3	6	-	-	1	1
Mistrust from members and negative attitudes	4	8	-	-	5	6
Lack of education, knowledge and skills	-	-	17	71	4	5
Theft of fishing gears	-	-	10	42	6	8
Lack of surveillance equipment	-	-	11	46	7	9
Lack of recognition of the group among other stakeholders (lack of legal empowerment)	-	-	7	29	4	5
Lack of cooperation from police and courts of law	-	-	5	21	-	-
Poor relationships with village governments	-	-	2	8	-	-

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some of the RUGs faced more than one challenge

Insufficient funds to run group activities was most often cited by the RUGs as their greatest challenge (Table 10). All the groups were dependent on members' contributions, which were considered inadequate to meet their needs and also contribute to the group funds. Insecurity was a problem all over the lake, where gear theft and piracy had become rampant causing losses and suffering to the affected fishers. This lowered the incomes of the groups, as the affected fishers were not able to contribute financially to the groups' activities since they had to replace their stolen gears and equipment. High

death rates, resulting from HIV/AIDS hampered the productivity of the fishers and drained family resources. RUGs and individuals are affected as they spend much of their finances assisting ailing members with medical bills and funeral expenses. Lack of confidence and trust in the office bearers due to misappropriation of funds has led to some members withdrawing their membership. Some fishers have been victims of mismanagement of group finances by those entrusted.

2.4. RUGS LINKAGES WITH OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

During the survey many RUGs indicated that they had linkages with central and local governments; community based organizations; non-governmental organizations; and the private sector, among others.

Table 11: RUGs linkages to other stakeholders

Linkages	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Central Government (Fisheries Department)	26	87	20	83	71	89
Local Government	16	53	19	79	68	85
Community based organization e.g. BMUs, fishers' associations	13	43	19	79	6	8
Non-governmental organization	16	53	16	67	14	18
Private sector (industrial fish processors/agents)	16	53	9	31	39	49
Others	-	-	10	42	-	-

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some RUGs had more than one linkage with other stakeholders

In Kenya 87% of the RUGs interviewed had linkages with the Central Government. In Tanzania and Uganda, they were 83% and 89% respectively. The RUGs most commonly interacted with Central Government, through the Fisheries Department, in licensing, provision of technical advice and institutional strengthening of BMUs for co-management of the resource. Other areas of linkages between the RUGs and central government included registration of co-operatives, awareness raising, training and monitoring of fisheries activities through regular visits. 53% of the RUGs in Kenya, 79% of the RUGs in Tanzania and 85% of the RUGs in Uganda had linkages with local authorities. RUGs also mentioned having linkages with fisheries research institutes, particularly in the provision of information on various studies carried out by researchers. The major link the RUGs had with the local governments, especially in Tanzania and Uganda, was in the co-management of the resource. Others included settling of disputes, provision of extension services, awareness raising and mobilization and improvement of fish landing beaches and specifically for Tanzania revenue collection through tenders.

RUGs' linkages with CBOs in Tanzania was through fisheries management functions, such as curbing the use of illegal gears, improving sanitation, awareness creation on environment, catch data records, monitoring fishers' migration and patrolling. In Uganda, the linkages to the CBOs were through awareness raising on poverty eradication, training on fisheries management and provision of savings and credit facilities. NGOs have been active in awareness raising among RUGs on environmental matters, fishing activities, proper food preservation and storage, financial support and community development programmes. RUGs linkages with the private sector were mainly with industrial fish processors and their agents. This contact was mainly through selling fish, accessing loans in the form of nets, boats, engines, cash, provision of ice, advice on fish quality and recording of fish sold to the factories. The groups noted that in case of such credit facilities being availed to them, they were compelled to sell all their fish to the agent to the extent that most times they did not retain any fish for home consumption. RUGs in Uganda also indicated that industrial fish processors assisted them in maintaining hygiene, proper sanitation and cleanliness of the fish collecting centers.

Most RUGs had linkages with other groups within their neighbouring communities and came together when faced with common problems such as loss of property or life, establishment of public facilities (such as toilets) or celebrations and other socio-cultural activities.

2.5. TRAINING NEEDS OF RUGS

Some groups reported having received some training on fisheries management, record keeping, fish handling, sanitation, hygiene and environment and health issues from regional programmes and NGOs. However, many groups recognized the need for training in various areas for fisheries management and socio-economic development as shown in Table 12. The identified training needs were numerous and varied and the most prominent ones have been grouped into 4 major categories as shown in table 12.

Table 12: RUGs training needs

Training needs	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Technical aspects of fisheries management	30	100	16	67	77	96
Management of group resources	29	97	20	83	79	99
Planning	20	67	11	46	76	95
Networking and linkages	14	47	16	67	-	-

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some RUGs identified more than one training need

The RUGs identified training in the management of group resources as a priority i.e. 83% for Tanzania and 99% for Uganda and yet for Kenya technical aspects of fisheries management was a priority with a 100% response. However, the RUGs in Kenya also considered management of group resources as important as indicated by 97% response. Management of group resources included financial management (book-keeping), business skills for small-scale enterprises, project management, leadership, organizational and communication skills, savings and credit management (including co-operatives), administration and report writing, and management of shares.

Training in technical aspects of fisheries management was also considered important by Tanzanian (67%) and Ugandan (96%) RUGs; especially fisheries regulations (policy, legal, institutions and institutional processes), resource utilization, conservation and management, fishing and gear technologies, fish handling and post harvest technologies (fish preservation and processing), fish marketing, co-management, monitoring, data collection and reporting, boat building/making, breeding of *Clarias* for bait (fish-farming), security and safety at sea. Other areas related to fisheries conservation identified included environmental management such as tree planting, hygiene and sanitation.

Planning was also identified as a training need (Kenya 67%, Tanzania 46% and Uganda 95%) of RUGs surveyed. Planning in this context was limited to resource user group activities and areas where training needs were identified included preparation of work plans, project proposal writing, budgeting, priority setting, market surveys, diversification of income generating activities, roles of executives and various group members, resource identification, record-keeping and sustainable resource utilization.

Most groups expressed the need for networking among themselves and linkages with government programmes, NGOs, CBOs, development partners and others. They noted that they lacked skills in advocacy and lobbying to enable them access donor and government support.

2.6 RUGS MEMBERSHIP, FINANCES AND MANAGEMENT

2.6.1 RUGs membership

Table 13: RUGs Membership

Membership categories	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Men	931	60.2	327	55.0	709	39.0
Women	604	39.3	158	27.0	566	31.0
Youths	9	0.5	110	18.0	532	30.0
Total	1544	100.0	595	100.0	1807	100.0

Source: Survey data

Table 13 shows membership distribution of the RUGs surveyed in the categories of men, women and youths (i.e. male and/or female about 18 years of age). The table shows that men were the majority members in RUGs and this was because for a long time fishing was considered a male activity, men were more aggressive risk takers, willing to explore new opportunities. Womens' membership was more evident in self-help groups in the 3 countries. Inability for women and youth to acquire resources such as fishing gears, boats, and engines was a major limiting factor for them to join and/or form groups, especially those groups, which required mobilizing resources together. For instance, most of the youths were crew, having little resources and time for RUGs. These could be some of the reasons for the lower membership among women and youths in RUGs. BMUs had more men than women because of the nature of their activities, which included patrolling and surveillance, confiscation of gears and long hours involved in fishing activities.

In Tanzania, men formed and/or joined RUGs in anticipation of development programmes or donor support in the form of cash loans, fishing nets and outboard engines. The gender imbalance in membership was attributed to inferiority complexes and poverty. Some women felt inferior to join groups because of their financial difficulties as well as general household poverty and felt that they could not be accommodated in any group category economically and socially. Some groups indicated 'maturity' as one of the criteria for joining the groups and the youth, therefore, were regarded as immature and had little chances of joining such groups. In Kenya, women's membership in co-operative societies was minimal due to the unfavourable requirements to join the co-operatives, which included owning a boat, among others. However, male youths were the majority members in the co-operatives. In Uganda, the membership of women was increasing as a result of the success of some of the women's RUGs such as Katosi Women Group.

Table 14: Enrolment of RUGs

Enrolment trends	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Growing	9	30	6	25	23	29
Stable	3	10	13	54	40	50
Declining	17	57	5	21	14	17
Fluctuating	1	3	-	-	-	-
Non response	-	-	-	-	3	4
Total	30	100	24	100	80	100

Source: Survey data

Table 14 shows a general trend of slow growth of RUG membership. Growth of membership in some groups was attributed to expectations of projects and funds from external sources. Decline in membership of some groups was attributed to the migration of members, poor management and leadership of the group, lack of incentives, death and/or sickness of members. In addition, high valuation of the previous efforts, protectiveness by the existing members, and increases in entrance fees (for new members) prevented enrolment of new members. Positively, restricting new entry may be considered a determinant factor for group stability.

2.6.2 Financing RUGs activities

Table 15: Sources of finances for the RUGs activities

Sources of funds for RUGs activities	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Registration/membership fees	15	50	15	63	35	44
Fundraising/contribution	11	37	22	92	2	2
Income generating	1	3	8	33	5	6
Levies	2	6	-	-	4	5
Fines	5	17	-	-	1	1
Donor and government funding	-	-	8	33	7	8
Savings and investments	-	-	-	-	7	8
Others (loans from CBOs, banks and fish factories, tendering)	-	-	2	8	5	6
None	-	-	-	-	20	25

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some of the RUGs had more than one source of funds

Table 15 shows that in all the 3 countries the RUGs main source of funding was registration and membership fees as indicated. In Tanzania, fundraising and contributions were a major source of funding for the RUGs as well as income

generating and donor and government funding. In Kenya, fundraising and contributions were noted as one of the main sources of funding for RUGs. In addition to registration and membership, co-operatives collected levies from fish sold by members. BMUs were financed through individual contributions, levies from new entrants and fines from offenders. In Uganda, donors and government support was also a major source of funding for RUGs. Direct manual labour provided by members, fuel for patrols, direct participation in search and rescue operation for boats, gears and fishers were also considered as part of the financing strategy for the groups. However, 25% of the groups could not identify their sources of finance because they were either still at a formative stage, had failed to take off and/or had not associated themselves with any external source of funding.

2.6.3 Management of RUGs

Table 16: Management of RUGs

Group overseers	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Executive committee	7	25	18	75	63	79
Chairperson	9	32	4	17	12	15
Chairperson and secretary	2	7	2	8	-	-
Technical committees	0	-	-	-	1	1
Task force committee	0	-	-	-	1	1
Treasurer	2	7	-	-	-	-
Ministry for social services	3	11	-	-	-	-
Fisheries Department/Co-operative Department	4	14.2	-	-	-	-
Chief	1	4	-	-	-	-
None	0	-	-	-	2	3

Source: Survey data

N.B. Some groups were overseen by more than one organ.

Table 16 shows that leadership in RUGs was mostly provided by the executive committees, which comprised of chairpersons, vice chairpersons, secretaries and treasurers. The executive committee was widely regarded as an essential management organ of the group, elected by (and reports to) the general assembly, which comprised all the group members. In some cases, group leadership was provided by the chairperson who was either elected or was the initiator of the group.

3. CONCLUSIONS

- i) RUGs have demonstrated the ability to mobilize local resources to meet their localized needs and hence can help improve the link between local action and national objectives.
- ii) Most of the groups faced various challenges in realizing their set objectives, such as: declining fish catches due to too many fishers, overcapacity in terms of investment in the fishing industry, illegal fishing methods and gears, migration of fishers; poor management of group resources; HIV/AIDS; lack of technical know-how, theft of fishing gears and equipment including insecurity of fishers on the lake.
- iii) The existing opportunity of social capital creates a conducive environment for incorporating RUGs to participate in the management of fisheries resources and socio-economic development.
- iv) The main challenge facing RUGs was that the groups lacked skills and knowledge in areas such as: financial management, fish preservation, processing and marketing, fisheries conservation and management measures, planning and development of group activities.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i) There is a need to encourage RUGs to exploit the opportunity of social capital to enable them participate in fisheries management and improve their socio-economic well-being.
- ii) Governments, NGOs and other organizations should be encouraged to provide technical and financial support to RUGs, especially BMUs, for sustainable fisheries development.
- iii) Sustainable sources of funding for RUGs should be identified and BMUs should be encouraged to engage in income generating activities such as bidding for tenders for their respective landing sites.

5. REFERENCES

- Heck S., J. Ikwaput, C.T. Kirema-Mukasa, C. Lwenya, D. N. Murakwa, K. Odongkara, P. Onyango, J.P. Owino and F.Sobo (2004): *Cross-border Fishing and Fish Trade on Lake Victoria*, IUCN and LVFO.
- Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) (1999): *Strategic Vision for Lake Victoria, 1999 – 2015*. Jinja, Uganda: LVFO Secretariat.
- (2000): *A New Beginning, The Jinja Recommendations on The Way Forward*. Jinja, Uganda: LVFO Secretariat.
- (2001): *The Convention for the Establishment of the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization*. Jinja, Uganda: LVFO Secretariat.
- Lake Victoria Fisheries Research Project (LVFRP) (2001): *Lake Victoria Fisheries Management Plan*. Technical Document No. 16. Jinja, Uganda: LVFRP.

6. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire Number	Date
Recorded by	Name of Informant

1 Group Identification

1.1	Name of Group
1.2	Location of Group
1.3	<p>Contact Persons & Group Leaders</p> <p>Name Position in Group Address Telephone</p> <p>Name Position in Group Address Telephone</p> <p>Name Position in Group Address Telephone</p>
1.4	<p>Is the Group registered?</p> <p>If yes, registration number, year and office registered with</p>

2 Group Objectives and Activities

2.1	Purpose and objectives of the group
2.2	Geographical area of operation
2.3	Year group started
2.4	Who started the group and why?
2.5	Currently on-going activities
2.6	Expected results from these activities
2.7	What are so far the main achievements of the group
2.8	What are the main challenges, and how does the group intend to overcome
2.9	In what ways is the group involved in the following fields:

2.9.1 Fish capture:
2.9.2 Fish processing:
2.9.3 Fish trading:
2.9.4 Gear/boat production or maintenance:
2.9.5 Monitoring/record keeping on fish catches:
2.9.6 Other activities related to fisheries:
2.9.7 Education or training of group members (what topics?):
2.9.8 Community mobilization:
2.9.9 Loans or saving facilities:
2.9.10 Group/Co-operative development:
2.9.11 Small business development

3 Group Membership and Management

3.1 Number of members and 'categories (women/men/youth etc)
3.2 Is membership growing, declining or stable?
3.3 How does the group finance its activities? (include recent examples)
3.4 What contributions do members make to the finances and operations of the group?
3.5 When was the last members meeting held? How often does the group meet?
3.6 Who is overseeing the management of the group?

4 Group External Links

4.1 What interactions are taking place between the Group and the following institutions:
4.1.1 Central government:
4.1.2 Fisheries department:
4.1.3 Local authority:
4.1.4 BMUs/BMCs:
4.1.5 NGOs:
4.1.6 Industrial fish processors or their agents:
4.1.7 Other local groups (name):

5 Group Training Needs

What are the group's most important needs for staff training and organizational development in the following areas:
5.1 Technical aspects of fisheries management (including fisheries regulations, monitoring of gear/boats, post-harvest fish quality):
5.2. Management of group's resources:
5.3 Planning:
5.4 Linkages to government programmes and other support networks:

ANNEX 2: CONTACT PERSONS AND ADDRESSES IN KENYA

Group Leaders Names	Contact Address	District
1. Rose Atieno Ogwang 2. Jane Akinyi	Takawiri Women Group, P.O. Box 46 Mbita	Suba
3. Jacton Ouma 4. Paul Onyango 5. Naphtali O. O'rao	Takawiri Self Help Group, P.O. Box 46, Mbita	Suba
6. Jack Owuoche 7. Jack Oding 8. Philip Ogutu	Takawiri Traders Self Help Group	Suba
9. Onesmus Musa 10. Salim Juma 11. Daniel Okinyi	Nyangwina Fish Supply, P.O. Box, 16 Muhuru	Migori
12. Dalmas Temu 13. George Ogallo 14. Enoch Wagega	Samo Fishing Group, P.O. Box, 32 Muhuru Bay	Migori
15. Charles Odonde 16. Tobias Agwanda 17. Hosman Ochieng	SALBA Group, P.O. Box, 120 Karungu	Migori
18. Bernad Odingo 19. Ancient Kioko 20. Silvia Odhiambo	Lela B Self Help Group, C/o forest dept. P.O. Box 46 Homa Bay	Homa Bay
21. James Winja 22. Reuben Okore 23. Joel O. Wera	Aketch Fisheries Enterprise Welfare Group, P.O. Box 6 Usenge	Bondo
24. James Oracho 25. Mrs. Obula 26. Hesbon Nyaluo	Uhanya Self Help Group, P.O. Box 65 Usenge	Bondo
27. Christopher Odiwuor 28. Pius Owino 29. Desta Atieno	Dola Youth Self Help Group, P.O. Box 70 Usenge	Bondo
30. John Magere	Onagi Self Help Group, P.O. Box 37, Port Victoria	Busia
31. John Namwamba 32. Geophrey Obago 33. Bonane Obago	Kachanga Group, P.O. Box 33, Port Victoria.	Busia
34. Margaret Oule 35. Beatrice Mbata 36. Dolphine Atieno	Tich Matek Women Group, P.O. Box 65 Usenge	Bondo
37. Consolata Maduri 38. Jarred Olango 39. Fridah Agola Wanga	Osieko Mashida Sindikisa Women Group P. O. Box 70 Osieko.	Bondo
40. Fanuel Okumu 41. Victor Shikuku Ochieng 42. Marsella Adoyo Tembe	Osieko Fisherfolk Self Help Group, P.O. Box 70 Usenge	Bondo

43. William Ogutu 44. Mary Ogola 45. Joseph Oduori	BMU Luanda Disi, P.O. Box 80 Nyamonye	Bondo
46. Otieno Ongata	BMU Takawiri Beach, P.O. Box 46 Mbita	Suba
47. Paul Osata Oduwa 48. Stephen Ochieng 49. Kibaga Ndege	Nyagina BMU P.O. Box 309 Mbita	Suba
50. Lawrence Sunga 51. Peter Ochola Oluoch 52. Patroba Odiwa	Sori-BMU, P.O. Box 63 Sori Karungu	Migori
53. Bernad Were (Manager)	Bunyala F.C.S., P.O. Box 33 Port- Victoria	Busia
54. Joyce Atieno 55. Jared Ochanda 56. Charles Odhiambo Ogera	Yimbo Fishermen Co-op. Society P.O. Box 5 Usenge	Bondo
57. Samuel Omollo 58. Samuel Obondo 59. Erick Otunge	Sori Fishermen Co-op. Society P.O. Box 63 Sori-Karungu	Migori
60. Philip O. Achola 61. Mark Otieno Anjago 62. Mourice O. Omwaga	Obaria BMU and Obaria Self Help Group P.O. Box 67 Kendu-Bay	Rachuonyo
63. Gilbert O. Onyango 64. George Oleso 65. James O. Ayiego	Sango Rota fishermen Group, Private Bag Pap-Onditi	Rachuonyo
66. Jenifer Okelo 67. Mary Ongenyi 68. Pamela Odera	Asat women Group, Box 1, Kombewa	Kisumu
69. Samson Akoko 70. John Nyangwara 71. Richard Omwa	Obaria traders self help group, Box 64, Kendubay	Rachuonyo
72. Thadeus Orwa 73. Jorim Obiro	Asat fisherfolk group, Box 1, Kobewa	Kisumu
74. Lucy Obondi 75. Jacinta Nyadera 76. Christabel Ochieng	Rota fishmongers, Obange primary Nyakwere	Nyando
77. Peter Okello 78. Caleb Ochung 79. George Omondi	Asat fishermen chong buth group, Box 1, Kombewa	Kisumu
80. Jack Otunge 81. James Awino 82. Otieno Obiero	Asat BMU, Box 1, Kombewa	Kisumu

ANNEX 3: NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF GROUP CONTACT PERSONS IN TANZANIA

District	Name of the group	Group Contact Person		
Bukoba Rural	Bilolo Fisheries Cooperative Society (BFCS)	Seif Batebya, Chairperson, Box 164, Kemondo Bay Bukoba	Hamza Mzinga, Secretary, Box 164, Kemondo Bay - Bukoba	Fransis Bajwala, vice chairperson, Box 164, Kemondo Bay-Bukoba
	Kabuara Fisheries Cooperative Society	Felix mgaimukamu, Box Ntoma-Bokoba		
Muleba	Tweyambe Fishing Enterprise	Jovita Justine, Kasheno village, Muleba	Alfredina Mtoizi, Secretary	Esta Elias, Treasurer
	Kikundi cha Maendeleo ya Wanawake Katunguru (KIMAWAKA)	Odilia Kamhabwa, Box 65, Muleba	Asiat Musa, Secretary	Regina Evarister, Treasurer
Biharamulo	Nyamirembe BMU	Sebastian Kalo, Chairperson Box 34, Chato, Biharamulo	Leopard Mutajwaha, Secretary, Box 34, Chato, Biharamulo	
	Bwegera BMU	John Elias, Box 37 Chato, Biharamulo	Nathan Ngereja, Box 37 Chato, Biharamulo	
Ukerewe	Ukerewe Fishing Association (UFA)	Renatus Makene, Chairperson, Box 360, Nansio-Ukerewe	Joseph Cleophas, Vice Chairperson, Box 360, Nansio	Agripina Musita, Treasurer Box 360, Nansio, Ukerewe
	Jadi and Environmental Conservation Group (JAECO)	Joseph Kajange, Box 360, Nansio Ukerewe		
Magu	Amua on Aids Group (AAG)	Bahati Duba, Chairperson, Box 5, Magu-Mwanza	Harrison Odira, Secretary, Box 5, Magu	Lusato Mangwesi, Treasurer, Box 5, Magu-Mwanza
	Magu Tumaini Group (MUTUGRO)	Novath Malugi, Chairperson, Box 44, Magu-Mwanza	Theonestina Nyalufunja, Secretary, Box 44, Magu	Godwin Salapioni, Treasurer Box 44, Magu-Mwanza

Ilemela	Samba Development Association of Tanzania, (SDAT)	Peter Baya Chairperson, Box 1414, Mwanza	Jackson Sabano, Secretary, Box 1414, Mwanza	Said Mandai, Treasurer, Box 1414, Mwanza
	Kibandani Fisheries and Environmental Conservation Group (KIFECO)	Saulo Msumari, Chairpeson, Box 10650, Mwanza	Andrew Nyaruvu, Secretary, Box 10650, Mwanza	
Sengerema	Kikundi cha Upendo (Zabaga)	Tulubuza Laurian, Chairperson, Box 25, Kahunda - Sengerema	Magembe Majura, Secretary, Box 25, Kahunda, Sengerema	Paskari Manyama, Treasurer, Box 25, Kahunda - Sengerema
	Endeleza Mazingira Kome (EMAKO)	Rhoda Onyango, Chairperson, Box 35, Sengerema	Modesta Revocatus, Secretary, Box 35, Sengerema	Adella Matagiri, Tresurer Box 35, Sengerema
Misungwi	Usagara Green Foundation (UGF)	Anton Shol, Chairperson, Box 118333, Misungwi	Chrisopher Shilungushela, Secretary, Box 11833, Misungwi	Mariam Mashagi, Box 11833, Tresurer, Misungwi
	NEMO-Mwalogwabagole	Petro Timotheo, Chairperson, Box 20, Misungwi	Sospeter Kanuti, Secretary, Box 20, Misugwi	Dorothea Michael, Treasurer, Box 20, Misugwii
Geita	Wakulima wa Matunda na Mboga (Igate cooperative Society Ltd)	Hamisi Juma, Chairperson, Box 464, Geita	George Partic, Secretary, Box 464, Geita	Simon Bahati Lusule, Treasurer, Box 464, Misugwi
	Kalangalala Health and Environmental Care (KHEC)	Amon Nzera, Chairperson, Box 435, Geita	John Igogote, Secretary, Box 435, Geita	

Tarime	Kikundi cha Wakulima wa Bustani na uvuvi - Milingo	Yona Nyagori Chairperson, Box 200, Tarime	Anna Oreko, Secretary, Box 200, Tarime	Peter Opiyo, Treasurer, Box 200, Tarime
	Aids and Fisheries Investigation Group (AFIG)	Joseph Lazaro, Chairperson, Box 33, Shirati-Tarime	Charles Paul, Secretary, Box 33, Shirati-Tarime	Pili David, Treasurer, Box 33, Shirati, Tarime
Musoma Rural	Mwanyangeta Kikundi cha uvuvi na Uhamasishaji Ukimwi (Mwakiu)	Deonatus Maro, Chairperson, Box 140, Musoma	Dickson Mafuru, Secretary and Treasurer, Box 140, Musoma	
	Kikundi cha Kuhifadhi Mazingira (KKM)	Hassan Mugeta, Chairperson, Box 1, Mugango-Musoma	Bitu Masamaki, Secretary and Treasurer, Box 1, Musoma	
Bunda	Jinasue	Teresa Epafila, Chairperson, Box Bunda	Dorah Misana, Secretary, Box Bunda	
	Kikundi cha uzalishaji mali cha Bunda Youth group	Protas Materego, Chairperson, Box 98, Bunda	Staffa Nashon, Secretary, Box 98, Bunda	Joseph Fredrick, Treasurer, Box 98, Bunda

Source: Tanzania RUGS field study, Jan-Feb, 2003

ANNEX 4: RUGS ITINERARY, TANZANIA

Date	Survey logistics and transit	Place
23.1.2003	Travel FD focal person from D'Salaam to Mwanza	Mwanza
25.1.2003	Make transport arrangements and funds allocations	Mwanza
26.1.2003	Travel to Bukoba	Bukoba
27.1.2003	Arrival Bukoba	
28.1.2003	Interview DFO/ CDO /other members	
29.1.2003	Interview Bilolo and Kabuara cooperatives	
30.1.2003	Travel to Muleba	
31.1.2003	Interview KIMAWAKA/TWEYAMBE Interview CDO/DFO	
1.2.2003	Travel to Biharamulo, interview DFO	Bukoba
2.2.2003	Interview BMU Nyamirembe Interview BMU Bwegeera	Bukoba
3.2.2003	Travel to Mwanza	Mwanza
4.2.2003	Kagera report summary	Kagera
5.2.2003	Compilation Kagera report summary	
6.2.2003	Travel to Ukerewe, Interview DFO/CDO	Mwanza
7.2.2003	Compile the report to Ukerewe	
8.2.2003	Travel to Mwanza	
9.2.2003	Travel Magu, Interview DFO,CDO, Acting DAS	
10.2.2003	Interview Amua on Aids Group	
11.2.2003	Interview Magu Tumaini Group	
12.2.2003	Compile report for Magu	
13.2.2003	Travel to Ilemela Interview, Samba Devel. Association Interview Kibandani Fisheries Environmental Group	
14.2.2003	Travel to Geita, DFO,CDO,DAS Interview UWAMATI and Kalangala Health and Environmental care Travel to Sengerema	
15.2.2003	Interview Zabaga and Emako groups Travel to Misungwi Interview Usagara Green foundation NEMO, Mwalogwabagole Compile report Mwanza	Mwanza
16.2.2003	Travel to Tarime Interview DFO,CDO Travel to Miningo	Mara
17.2.2003	Interview Miningo group Interview Aids in fisheries investigation group Travel to Musoma,CDO	Mara
18.2.2003	Interview Mwakiu Musoma rural Interview Kwibara Musoma rural	Mara
19.2.2003	Travel to Bunda Interview Jinasue Interview Kikundi cha uzalishaji mali Bunda Compile report Mara PIIT member from Dar travel back	Mara
20-24 .2.03	Report writing	
10.3.2003	Submission of report	

Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO)

Established in 1994 by a Convention signed by the three Partner States of the East African Community (Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda), The Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) is mandated to foster cooperation among the three East African Community Partner States; harmonize national measures for the sustainable utilization of living resources of the lake; and develop and adopt conservation and management measures to assure the Lake's ecosystem health and sustainability of the living resources. The Organization has activities within 5 broad programme areas: fisheries policy, legislation, institutions and institutional processes; resource, environmental and socio-economic research monitoring; aquaculture; database, information, communication and outreach; and capacity building. The LVFO is governed by a Council of Ministers responsible for Fisheries matters in the Partner States. The LVFO is a specialised institution of the East African Community.

IUCN - The World Conservation Union

Founded in 1948, The World Conservation Union brings together States, government agencies and a diverse range of non-governmental organisations in a unique world partnership: over 980 members in all, spread across some 140 countries. As a Union, IUCN seeks to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable. The World Conservation Union builds on the strengths of its members, networks and partners to enhance their capacity and to support global alliances to safeguard natural resources at local, regional and global levels.

Socio-economics of the Nile Perch Fishery on Lake Victoria Project Phase II

One of the many projects within the Eastern Africa Programme of IUCN is the Socio-economics of the Nile Perch Fishery on Lake Victoria, Phase II. It is being implemented through (and with) Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) an inter-governmental agency that brings together the 3 governments sharing Lake Victoria (Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda) to manage the fisheries of the lake sustainably. The objectives for this phase, includes: improving information dissemination on social and economic trends; improving capacity of resource user groups to participate in fisheries management; and improving policy processes to respond to social and economic trends. Within these general sets of objectives, the project carried out a survey on the Resource User Groups (RUGs) on Lake Victoria with a view to improving the information base for fisheries management on Lake Victoria; assisting governments in planning for the participation of resource users in fisheries management; and helping the local communities to be represented in future support programmes that will aim at strengthening their management capacity.

IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office
P. O. Box 68200 -00200
Nairobi, KENYA
Tel: ++ 254 20 890605/12
Fax: ++ 254 20 890615
E-mail: earo@iucn.org

Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization
P. O. Box 1625
Jinja, Uganda
Tel: ++256 43 120205/6
Fax: ++256 43 123123
Email: lvfo-sec@lvfo.org