

# Systematic approaches to livelihoods enhancement and diversification

A Review of Global Experiences

Jock Campbell



International Union for Conservation of Nature 2008

The designation 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 IUCN, IMM Ltd., ICRAN, SACEP, UNEP, or the United Nations Foundation concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN, IMM Ltd., ICRAN, SACEP, UNEP, or the United Nations Foundation, nor does citing of trade names or commercial processes constitute endorsement.

This publication has been made possible through funding from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland and the European Union.



Published by: IMM Ltd., IUCN Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group (IUCN ELG) and IUCN Global Marine Programme (IUCN GMP), in collaboration with the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN), South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Foundation (UN Foundation).



Copyright: © 2008 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holders.

Citation: IMM 2008. Systematic approaches to livelihood enhancement and diversification: A review of global experiences. IUCN, International Union for the Conservation of Nature.

Cover photographs: © Jock Campbell (front); © Gayathri Sriskanthan (back)

Printed by: Karunaratne & Sons Ltd, 67 UDA Industrial Estate, Katuwana Road, Homagama, Sri Lanka

Available from:

IUCN Asia Regional Office, 63 Sukhumvit Soi 39 Wattana, Bangkok, 10110 Thailand

IMM Ltd, The Innovation Centre, Rennes Drive, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4RN, UK.  
[www.imm.uk.com](http://www.imm.uk.com)

IUCN Global Marine Programme, Rue Mauverney 28, 1196 Gland, Switzerland; Tel: +41 22 999 0217;  
Fax: +41 22 999 0025; E-mail: [marine@iucn.org](mailto:marine@iucn.org)

This publication is available as a download from the IUCN Global Marine Programme website:  
[http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/marine/marine\\_our\\_work/climate\\_change/publications.cfm](http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/marine/marine_our_work/climate_change/publications.cfm)

A catalogue of IUCN publications is also available.

## Table of Contents

Preface	4
Acknowledgements	5
Acronyms and Abbreviations	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Methods	8
3. Findings and Examples of Livelihood Change Approaches	9
3.1 Rural Community Development Support	9
Example 1: Jambi Kiwa	12
Example 2: Alternative Livelihoods To Poppy Growing In Afghanistan	12
Example 3: Promoting income-generating activities for women	14
Example 4: Supplementary Livelihood Options for Pacific Island Communities	15
3.2 Livelihood Change and Aquatic Resource-Dependent Communities	16
Example 5: Canadian Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring	17
Example 6: Tonle Sap Sustainable Livelihoods Project	18
Example 7: Coastal Livelihoods in Cambodia	19
Example 8: The Arab Regional Centre for Entrepreneurship & Investment Training	22
Example 9: Northern Ireland Regional Enterprise Development	23
Example 10: Clustering support: The Orissa Cyclone, OTOP Thailand	24
3.3 Corporate Staff Development and Enterprise Growth	25
Example 11: Career development methods	25
Example 12: Staff Recruitment In Formal Companies	26
Example 13: Staff Development In Formal Companies	26
Example 14: Managing Change In Companies	27
4. Discussion of Approaches, Lessons Learnt and Principles for Intervention	28
4.1 Discussion	28
4.2 Lessons Learnt	30
Discovery	30
Direction	32
Doing	33
4.3 Summary of Lessons Learnt	37
5. References	38

## Preface

The people who depend upon the world's marine resources for their livelihoods are under increasing pressure from changes in, and declining availability of, ecosystem services, conflicts over access rights, marginalisation from resource access, criminalisation of their livelihoods and exclusion. The poorest of these people are often the least able to respond to those changes and many are becoming marginalised from the activities that have been part of their livelihoods and culture for generations.

Whilst these people are not blameless in the causes of change that are affecting coastal resources, they are only part of the problem. But in many situations they are being asked to take a disproportionate responsibility for the consequences of what are often external factors which have often kept them in poverty, degraded their environment, introduced inappropriate technology, promoted market pressures, excluded them from the policy process, changed access rights and heavily, and often inappropriately, invested in coastal development.

Many coastal people recognise their dependence on the marine resource base and value its sustainable and managed use for the future. Generally, however, they lack the resources, knowledge and power to ensure that resources are effectively managed in the face of rapid external change.

All too often the solution to coastal resource use problems is seen by outside agencies as imposed resource management measures, increasingly with some form of social element. These have had some success when measured from environmental perspectives, but in many cases they have left the poor poorer and the marginalised more on the edge of the development process.

Amongst development agencies working in coastal communities, there is a growing recognition that integrating livelihood change processes and resource management measures is an imperative. It is recognised that such integration needs to be much more than resource management initiatives with social development annex. Involvement in decision making needs to be more than extractive consultation with community elites -it needs to recognise the diversity of stakeholders and to meaningfully include them and planning for the future, should include the potential, the needs and the aspirations of these different groups. It needs to recognise the complexity of people's livelihoods, and their relationships with the marine resources need to be fully understood and incorporated into management strategies. If environmental objectives are to be achieved in equitable and sustainable ways then the consideration of resource-dependent livelihoods needs to lead rather than follow that process.

However, responding to this need for livelihood change is often a time consuming and difficult process requiring multi-disciplinary approaches, multi-agency cooperation, active engagement of communities and a transfer of power. But without this, resource management success is likely to be short-lived.

Developing ways of successfully integrating social and environmental considerations in the sustainable and equitable process of coastal resource management and associated livelihood change has been at the centre of the Coral Reefs and Livelihoods Initiative (CORALI). CORALI aims to develop and test a systematic approach to Sustainable Livelihood Enhancement and Diversification (SLED) that builds on past experience and lessons learnt from around the world.

The **Global Overview** aims to bring some of the global experience together and provide guidance on how SLED might be further developed and used. It does not claim to be exhaustive in its review but rather to scope the subject and bring together key strands of understanding and learning.

## Acknowledgements

Funding for this work was provided by the European Commission and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland as part of two regional projects:

The EU funded project “Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Development for the Long-term Management and Conservation of MCPA’s encompassing Coral Reefs in South Asia”, implemented by UNEP and executed by ICRAN; and the project “Management of Climate Change Impacts on Coral Reefs and Coastal Ecosystems in Tsunami-affected Areas of the Andaman Sea and South Asia”, funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland and implemented by IUCN.

These two projects worked closely together in order to increase effectiveness, to ensure harmonisation of findings and to maximise the uptake of project outputs. The collaboration has worked well and has enabled the projects to go beyond their original briefs.

IMM would like to thank all those people who made this collaboration possible and effective.

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACOA	Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
AI	Appreciative Inquiry
ARCEIT	Arab Regional Centre for Entrepreneurship and Investment Training
BC	British Columbia
CORALI	Coral Reef and Livelihoods Initiative
CORDIO	Coastal Ocean Research and Development in the Indian Ocean
CTA	Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
EU	European Union
FSPI	Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International
HRDC	Human Resources Development Canada
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ICRAN	International Coral Reef Action Network
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MCPA	Marine and Coastal Protected Area
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NI	Northern Ireland
OTOP	One Tambon One Product
PFAR	Pacific Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RALF	Research in Alternative Livelihoods Fund
SACEP	South Asia cooperative Environment Programme
SLA	Sustainable Livelihoods Approach
SLED	Sustainable Livelihood Enhancement and Diversification
TSSLP	Tonle Sap Sustainable Livelihoods Project
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
VAT	Value Added Tax

# 1. Introduction

This document was produced as part of the Coral Reefs and Livelihoods Initiative (CORALI), collaborative process established under two regional coral reef projects:

1. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Project “Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Development for the Long-term Management and Conservation of MCPA’s encompassing Coral Reefs in South Asia” funded by the EU and coordinated by the South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP) together with the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) and IMM Ltd.
2. The IUCN project “Management of Climate Change Impacts on Coral Reefs and Coastal Ecosystems in Tsunami-affected Areas of the Andaman Sea and South Asia” funded by the Foreign Ministry of Finland in support of activities under Coral Reef Degradation in the Indian Ocean (CORDIO) during 2006-2007.

The Coral Reefs and Livelihoods Initiative (CORALI) seeks to build knowledge and understanding of the inherent linkages between people and coral reefs, and encourage the improved integration and support for livelihood development within coral reef management.

Key to the CORALI process has been the further development and piloting of the SLED approach. SLED (Sustainable Livelihood Enhancement and Diversification) is a systematic approach to improving and diversifying the livelihoods of people faced with significant outside change.

SLED was developed as a response to the recognition that coastal livelihoods in many parts of the world were undergoing rapid and significant change due to a number of factors (IMM, 2003a, UNDP, 2006). These factors include changes in coastal population pressure, coastal industrialisation, tourism, urbanisation, pollution, resource over-exploitation, technology changes, market pressures, changes in resource access rights and the effects of climate change. The relationship between these factors is often complex, with change in one often affecting changes in the others.

The effects of these changes are also very variable with different stakeholders being affected in different ways. Research conducted on the effects of change on the fisheries post-harvest sub-sector in India for example (IMM, 2003b) showed how changes in access to fish resources could affect a wide diversity of different stakeholders from vessel owners, crews, fish processors, traders and consumers in many different ways. Most marked was the way in which change affected men and women quite differently, with women often being affected most adversely, and also how vulnerable the poor were to such changes.

In part, the differences in effects can be attributed to the relationship which resource users have with the resource. Whittingham et al. (2003) looked at the complexity of the relationship between resource users and one specific aquatic environment, the coral reef, and identified many different forms of dependency that had not been well recognised before. They note that some people depend almost entirely on marine resources for income, employment and food. Some use marine resources as part of a diversified portfolio of livelihood options which they switch between on a regular basis. Others depend seasonally on marine resources or at certain critical times in the livelihoods. Some use marine resources as an intermittent safety net when other livelihood opportunities are denied to them. Some also migrate in and out of the coast in response to changing opportunities (Luttrell et al., 2004 and IMM et al., 2005). They also interact with marine resources in complex ways, not just for the more obvious purpose of food, and income but also for providing protection from the sea, for land-based building materials, for medicinal purposes, in spiritual relationships, as a means of social bonding and as a sense of identity (Whittingham et al., 2003).

When viewed at the household level, marine resources are often just one source of a diversified livelihood portfolio which balances emerging opportunities, available assets and perceived risks. This tendency for households to naturally diversify was studied in some depth in Cambodia to understand what factors support and inhibit livelihood change (IMM, et al, 2005). This further demonstrated the complexity of change in communities and identified a large number of “push” and “pull” factors that influence different people’s livelihood decisions at different stages in their lives and under different circumstances.

One of the most significant change processes affecting people in coastal communities is the introduction of resource management measures to protect resources and ensure their sustainable use. These can have

positive effects in that they offer the potential to conserve marine resources and provide opportunities for the future. They are also likely to affect access rights of resource users and such change can be less positive. In extreme cases marine resource management measures can criminalise the livelihoods of the poor such as when current resource harvesting methods are made illegal over-night (Campbell et al., 2006). In other cases they may lead to reduced access to natural resources, increased competition and conflict, and a decline in income sometimes resulting in poverty and the inability to service debts.

The management measures which the two regional projects, of which CORALI forms a part, are specifically concerned with are Marine Protected Areas (MPA) and how these might be linked more closely and effectively with people's livelihoods. MPAs represent a very significant change in livelihoods of resource-dependent households and that can have equally significant effects across a much wider group of people who interact with those resource dependent households. The current phase of SLED's development within CORALI is being implemented within the context of MPAs.

There is a growing recognition of the problem of adverse changes in livelihoods as a result of marine management measures but the understanding of the resultant livelihood problems is less well developed than the thinking behind the management process itself. Often the perceived solution to such problems is a call for the development of "alternative livelihoods" and some funds are now being routinely added to the end of marine management projects to initiate such alternatives. Frequently these are seen primarily as a means to achieve conservation rather than reduce poverty (O'Garra, 2007). They are also often sequenced to occur after the resource management measure are put in place thus forcing the affected communities to address two issues simultaneously: 1) the loss of opportunity from existing problems (over-exploitation, habitat degradation etc.) and 2) the loss of opportunity resulting from the imposition of the management measure itself. This often results in severely constrained livelihood opportunities giving rise to conflict and an escalation of efforts to circumvent the management measure and engage in illegal activities.

When alternatives are introduced, these are often selected from a standard menu of alternatives with little consideration of capacities, aspirations, needs or historic development of the communities concerned (Campbell et al., 2006). The success rate of such approaches has been very mixed (Perea, 2002). Their implications across the wider development of the communities in which they are used, for sustainable resource-use, and for the balance of access to benefits from women, the poor and other marginalised groups, are rarely considered or understood.

**Photo:** Fishing boat, Thailand (© J Tamelander/IUCN).



The aim during the development of SLED has been to produce a systematic approach to responding to livelihood change that reflects an understanding of the changes that were affecting aquatic resource-dependent people within the complexity of their past and current livelihoods, that promotes and supports their visions for the future, and that helps them to make the best use of the opportunities available and to develop their capacities to take up those opportunities.

A part of the process of developing that systematic approach was to review key examples of livelihood change approaches in other contexts to try to understand if there were common elements of successful approaches that could inform and influence the development of SLED. The review document presents the finding from that study.

The review starts by describing the methods used in the study and then outlines a series of examples from experience from around the world where attempts have been made to diversify some aspect of people's livelihoods. From these examples lessons are drawn which are used to inform a way forward for developing a systematic approach to supporting livelihood change. From these lessons some intervention guidelines are also identified.

## 2. Methods

There are many situations in the wider global society where people's livelihoods need to change. The circumstances surrounding such changes are diverse and often seemingly unconnected. However, in many of these situations the people concerned with managing or facilitating the change have developed ways, procedures and approaches to foster and support that change. Whilst those different approaches have been developed under different circumstances, most of them are broadly trying to achieve the same thing. They are helping to understand livelihood change needs, defining potential change options and facilitating the change process. Some of these approaches provide suggestions and lessons that can be applied to the development of a systematic approach to livelihood change that would be applicable to enhance the livelihoods of people who depend upon coastal resources.

This review of global experience cannot claim to cover all the examples that are available or to address all the approaches that have been used. Rather it aims to scope the subject and to draw on examples from largely different fields. It adopted a purposive sampling approach, using examples that were known to have demonstrated elements of success in quite different fields of operation. In the process of identifying examples of systematic approaches to livelihood change processes, a broad approach was taken that took the research out of the narrow field of community development to assess what other areas of human experience could inform our approaches. A framework of key livelihood change areas was developed and was distilled down to four broad study areas where it was considered that current thinking and case study materials might provide useful guidance for SLED.

The four areas studied are:

- Rural community development support
- Livelihood change and aquatic resource-dependent communities
- Entrepreneurship and enterprise development
- Corporate staff development and enterprise growth

At first some of these may seem too divorced from the lives of people dependent on marine resources in coastal communities to be relevant to the management of marine protected areas. However, all of these broad categories are largely dealing with the same issue: how to understand and respond successfully to the need for livelihood change. The fact that some of these livelihoods may be those of poor people on the beach in South Asia, and others may be of reasonably well-off corporate staff members, does not detract from our ability to learn lessons from both that may be interchanged. The outcomes may be quite different but the ways of reaching those outcomes have a number of similarities.

In the process of researching these four areas it was found that, whilst there are many examples of livelihood change around the world, there are relatively few examples where a systematic approach to bringing about that change has been developed and used. The enterprise development and corporate growth areas were relatively more developed in such approaches but the natural resource management and rural community development areas were less so.

The examples are reviewed in each section and then discussed in more detail in a discussion and lesson learning section. From this a set of key lessons for guiding livelihood change interventions are distilled.

### **3. Findings and Examples of Livelihood Change Approaches**

The analysis below starts with the area where many of the current efforts to support livelihood change are situated: rural community development. Examples are given where approaches to supporting change have evolved or are being developed. The discussion then moves to examples where livelihood change has specifically been used to address conflicts between livelihoods and aquatic resource sustainability. A third theme of the overview is to look towards a specific, and very relevant, area of the development process concerned with the development of entrepreneurship and success in enterprise formation. Lastly we look to the systems which established businesses use to recruit and develop their staff and to assist them to deal with change in the organisation.

#### **3.1 Rural Community Development Support**

The motives for supporting community development are numerous but include the following categories; a) poverty reduction through increased income generating opportunities, b) increased overall economic development of the nation, c) support for specific target groups such as women, d) providing work opportunities for expanding rural populations, e) encouraging regional development in marginalised communities, f) providing opportunities for people dependent on declining industries or industries where labour requirement is decreasing, and g) reducing pressure on over-exploited natural resources. The last of these categories is on the ascendancy as more natural resources, especially fisheries and other aquatic resources, become over-exploited. There is now a growing urgency to “find alternative livelihoods” for people to reduce their dependency on these resources.

Whilst much work has been done of the factors which inhibit or support livelihood change (see IMM et al., 2005 for a review of these), there has been much less emphasis on describing or developing systematic approaches that respond to these factors. In reality, much of the livelihood change at the household level occurs without any support from outside at all. In many communities livelihood diversification is a common strategy (Gordon, 1999 and IMM et al., 2005) and some might even say it is the norm (Barrett and Reardon, 2000). Ellis (2000) discusses the breakdown of income sources in a average household in Sub-Saharan Africa which consists of 25% from crop output, 15% from livestock, 10% from farm wage work, 12% from non-farm work, 15% from non-farm work as a self employed person, 15% from remittances and 8% from gathering.

Whilst communities create their own opportunities there are also groups, organisations and projects that aim to provide support for this process. Haggblade et al., (2002) identify three groups of outside interveners in livelihood change: a) large private companies, b) non-profit promotional agencies and c) governments.

Large firms have provided demand for changes in production systems or services. Many of these have been agribusinesses which need agricultural products. In Cambodia, for example, the arrival of a Malaysian company interested in processing and trading seaweed stimulated widespread uptake of seaweed culture amongst the rural community (IMM et al., 2005). Other industries where large companies have stimulated local diversification include food retail, tourism, and yarn making.

A wide diversity of non-profit organisations have become involved in supporting livelihood change and these have used many different approaches to facilitate that change. Haggblade et al., (2002) note that NGO strategies have evolved from long-term integrated systems of support to more specialist single dimension interventions but with entrepreneurship development components. But even such highly effective service delivery systems such as the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, which seems of the face of it to be mainly focussed on credit provision, are often engaged in community mobilisation, group formation, mutual support, and skills development. In research with coastal communities in Cambodia it was found that those agencies that address the complexity of people's livelihoods are likely to be more effective than single issue interventions (IMM et al., 2005).

Governments have a major influence over the context in which rural livelihood change occurs. Sometimes this is intended, on other occasions it is by default. As discussed above, governments can provide policies and support services which create both an enabling environment and directly stimulate individual livelihoods or enterprises. These can often be more successful than is often envisaged (IMM et al., 2005). But all too often the multi-sectoral nature of livelihood change and multi-disciplinary approaches that are required to respond do not always sit well with government. What requires a linking together of support from government agencies often ends up falling between those agencies and getting support from no one. In effect, the provision of support for livelihood enhancement and diversification becomes the "stepchild" of the different ministries Haggblade et al., (2002). Governments can also create conditions that make existing livelihoods unviable or unsustainable. For example, changes in policy and law regarding the capture of wild shrimp seed in both India and Bangladesh seriously constrained the livelihoods of poor coastal dwellers and forced them either into criminalised livelihoods or to rethink their livelihood strategies where few alternatives were available (Campbell et al., 2006).

In response to this classification of support mechanisms, Haggblade et al., (2002) identify a three pronged approach to support rural livelihood diversification: 1) identifying or re-starting of key engines of regional growth, 2) identifying a handful of key commodity or service-specific sub-sectors, and supply chains within them, that hold potential for growth and participation by the rural poor, and 3) developing flexible institutional

**Photo:** Woman weaving baskets, Orissa, India (© P. Townsley).



coalitions of interested stakeholders with the ability to alter opportunities on behalf of the poor. As a broad strategy this is fine, but it does not, nor did it intend to, provide the detail of how this might be achieved.

The end product of such a strategy should be a dynamic environment in which a vibrant enterprise development and growth sector can thrive. Davis (2006) developed a framework aimed at pro-poor rural economic growth and enterprise development which revolved around ten key areas:

1. An enabling environment that provides for an attractive investment climate and fosters dynamic entrepreneurship;
2. Adequate mechanisms and structures that address local needs;
3. Active private sector institutions and linkages;
4. Functioning and effective infrastructure (hard and soft);
5. Access to integrated and open markets;
6. Access to effective and efficient support services and resources;
7. Adaptive management capacity and entrepreneurial competence within business and enterprises;
8. Local organisations, groups and associations (representing the poor) as building blocks;
9. Active participation in and ownership of development processes by well-linked stakeholders;
10. Ongoing learning from success and failure by all stakeholders.

However, these ten areas are more end-points that describe a functioning environment which would support enterprise growth, but do not tell us how to get to that point.

Ellis (1998) suggests that intervention to achieve livelihood diversification does not necessarily mean an expansion of the role of the state but rather “improving the institutional context of private-decision making by, for example, reducing risk, increasing mobility, minimising barriers to entry and ensuring fairness and transparency in the conduct of public agencies. It is also about helping the poor to identify opportunities, and facilitating them to improve their assets and income generating capabilities.”

One of the most significant developments in terms of understanding the livelihoods of people and how the different factors affect those livelihoods is the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA). A sustainable livelihood can be described as follows (from Carney, 1998 adapted from the work of Robert Chambers and Gordon Conway):

*A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base.*

Ellis (2000) describes the SLA as an approach to understanding and responding to the need for livelihood change at the community level. The SLA in its simplest form can be thought of as a) a framework of linkages and interactions between people, their assets, the institutional environment in which they live, the vulnerability context that affects them, the resultant livelihood strategies that they develop and the livelihood outcomes that they achieve, and b) a set of intervention principles. Unfortunately, in the process of simplifying the SLA in order to allow it to be easily described, there is a danger that the approach is interpreted as a mechanistic tool that requires limited skills, knowledge and understanding to apply. In reality the SLA is much more than its component parts and has evolved to become a very effective method for understanding and responding to the complexity of people’s livelihoods. The SLA has been used by practitioners over the last ten years to develop both a diversity of tools and skills that allow an understanding and effective response to people’s needs (Carney, undated).

The SLA has now been used extensively to understand how livelihoods are changing in response to changes in the outside world and as a framework to classify the factors that support or inhibit livelihood change (IMM et al., 2005). It has been less used as part of a systematic approach to facilitating livelihood change although elements of it are visible in the more successful approaches.

Four examples of livelihood change approaches at the community level are discussed below. The first deals with a process that evolved over time using a very holistic approach. The second deals with a formal research process which looked at ways of supporting and facilitating livelihood change. The third is concerned with the

specific needs of women in the process of enterprise development and livelihood change. The fourth is a review of the success and failures of a range of projects on livelihood change in the Pacific.

### Example 1: Jambi Kiwa

The first example is that of the grassroots formation and development of the Jambi Kiwa cooperative in Ecuador ([www.jambikiwa.org/](http://www.jambikiwa.org/)). This was an association of largely indigenous women set up to grow, process and market medicinal and aromatic plants. The association grew out of shared view of being marginalised but also a shared vision that things could change for the better. A key facet of this was the context in which it occurred: one of change in a nation-wide movement for indigenous rights.

Jambi Kiwa has evolved through a strong understanding of the asset base that the community had and could mobilise and build upon to develop its cooperative approach to enterprise development. The Jambi Kiwa also harnessed and mobilised both internal and external action in support of their objectives. A key part of this was a shared vision of what they wanted to achieve and strong ownership of the process – Jambi Kiwa is an owner-operated cooperative movement. Leadership was also central to progress but in the Jambi Kiwa it was very much a sense of shared leadership. In its relationships with the outside world the cooperative developed relationships on its own terms – breaking with the traditional “patron-client” relationship. The strength of leadership was seen as a driving force behind the development of a wide network of external support agencies instead of dependency on a few. The relationship with these external agencies is also one of them responding to the needs of the cooperative rather than driving where the cooperative is going.

Without consciously doing so, the association addressed all the elements of Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. They understood the assets base and its potential for growth and change, they understood and transformed relationships, they used indigenous knowledge of wildlife seasonality, and applied this to the market place. They built upon their strengths, on a shared vision of the problems they faced and a shared vision of where they wanted to go. They also linked what they were doing individually to wider community and national change processes. They were very participatory and supportive of one another, building strong partnerships. They also addressed all levels of sustainability: economic, social, environmental and institutional.

The process seems to have been an iterative spiral of development which started small and built on experience and lesson learning and involved feedback mechanisms which established, reinforced and sustained both the success and the growth of the process. The end result has many of the characteristics of the ideal environment described by Davis (2006). This evolution from trying to see what works on the ground to moving to a closely integrated process of development is often seen in community development activities where the champions of change are from within the community or at least in community-based organisations. This might be viewed by some as a rather inefficient process of trial and error, however the iterative process and internal growth does create opportunities for group learning and a gradual development of a shared vision, whilst taking the time to embed these in the systems and processes that people are comfortable with.

### Example 2: Alternative Livelihoods To Poppy Growing In Afghanistan

Quite a different example is that of the Research in Alternative Livelihoods Fund (RALF) established with DFID funding in Afghanistan. This is designed to facilitate research into livelihoods alternatives to poppy growing in Afghanistan. RALF is implemented by the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) and operated for the period January 2004 to January 2007. The goal of the project was: sustainable livelihoods in place for rural Afghans in poppy growing areas. The many years of war have left Afghanistan with little research capacity and so DFID supported the establishment of a programme to facilitate the involvement of outside research institutions through the following outputs:

- A competitive mechanism for funding innovative research projects tailored to the programme purpose;
- Recommended technologies and support services, tested and available for implementation;
- Improved capacity for applied research and extension in government and NGO partners.

The intended outcomes of RALF were alternatives to opium production that are practicable in the socio-economic environment of Afghanistan, and that are accessible to rural people. RALF operates through a competitive research fund managed by ICARDA. Alternative livelihoods are one of the pillars of the National Drug Control Strategy and the RALF programme focuses specifically on natural resource management aspects. The projects funded under RALF have carried out field research in a participatory way with farmers and other beneficiaries. Each project is designed to identify alternatives, to transfer the results to beneficiaries and for scaling up successful research outputs to a broader group. Two case studies from the RALF work are outlined below.

#### *Village Decision Driven Research Project*

One of the initiatives funded under RALF was the “Village Decision Driven Research Project”. Key to this project was the desire to avoid adopting an “experimental approach to livelihood alternatives” but rather to ensure that the initiatives are informed by an understanding of both the local situation and the ability to turn local produce into marketable products. The project proposal identifies three important aspects to this approach which needed to be fully integrated with each other:

1. To establish an understanding of how poppy cultivation is integrated in local livelihood strategies, both in terms of household economics, access to credit, and local power structures;
2. To analyse and identify the opportunities existing within a specific agro ecological zone in a dialogue with the local farmers, and build up the capacity to carry out these analyses;
3. To examine the opportunities for marketing the products identified.

The planned outputs of this were as follows:

- Survey based on a participatory livelihood analysis in order to learn more about the social, economic and political context of current livelihoods and attitudes towards opium poppy production in order to better assess the feasibility of alternative livelihoods;
- Needs assessment and improved capacity of a local agricultural research station to respond to village organisation requests;
- Analysis of the potential for marketing the products identified during the survey;
- Implemented pilot activities where the data from outputs 1 and 3 are used to initiate marketing of products.

This project adopted an approach which works with the community to understand the social, economic, and political context for current agricultural livelihoods in villages and includes assessment of attitudes towards opium production. In order to establish the broadest possible understanding of the project area, a participatory livelihood analysis was carried out. It also worked with local institutions to build up capacity to understand, facilitate analysis and respond to livelihood change options. In addition a detailed market analysis was implemented.

#### *Enhancing Livelihoods for Resource Poor Households in the Afghan Hindu Kush*

A second project under the RALF programme (McNeil et al., 2006) entitled “Enhancing Livelihoods for Resource Poor Households in the Afghan Hindu Kush Using the Territorial Approach to Agroenterprise Development” started with a territorial characterisation to gain an overview of what was happening on the ground. The advantages of the territorial approach is the ability to classify different area of operation to ensure that interventions can be tailored specifically to the conditions in that area. This was initially done on a wide area and then within 10 villages for a more focussed validation process using participatory rural appraisal (PRA) methods. The second stage was a market opportunity identification study working through local groups to identify and prioritise enterprise options. This involved participatory market chain mapping and characterisation of growing conditions for high yielding crops. This was to be followed by scaling-up, performance evaluation, institutionalisation and looking at advocacy options.

Lesson from the research include:

- The complex nature of livelihood interdependence and the links between different stakeholder groups, and the importance of realising and prioritising benefits to all stakeholders;
- The importance of including all players in the options market chain in the formation of enterprise plans;
- The value of tools that help stakeholders to see their current situation more clearly;
- The value of systematically encouraging collective action.

These two case studies under the RALF project example are quite different from the Jambi Kiwa initiative. They consciously attempt to conform with a predetermined research framework yet they end up covering some similar ground. This includes a strong diagnostic element of the livelihoods of the people they wish to help, considerable direct involvement of the community in the research process, and an assessment of the market for the opportunities that might be exploited. Linkages with local research communities was an element of sustainability which was addressed, but the institutional sustainability of the Jambi Kiwa suggests that the internal engine for change and innovation is stronger in that initiative. Again an element of context is at play here – developing the kind of grassroots institutional development seen in the Jambi Kiwa situation was likely to have been much less possible than in the Afghan case.

### Example 3: Promoting income-generating activities for women

The role of women in the household is often distinctly different from that of men, but all too often development processes ignore this and treat the members of a household as a homogeneous entity. In 1999 the Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA) in the Netherlands, led the organisation of a seminar on “the economic role of women in agricultural and rural development: the promotion of income-generating activities” (CTA, 1999). The seminar addressed a range of issues which included an understanding of the roles of women in rural development, the problems they faced, the factors affecting their well-being, the use of gender-analysis, the legal status of women, and women’s access to the factors of production. The seminar also identified future action in the form of strengthening women’s role in development through the promotion of income-generating activities. To do this requires recognition of the fact that action is needed in all the areas considered.

The assumption that women’s well-being will be improved by focussing on the household has not proved valid and mainstreaming gender in the livelihood development process is considered essential. An enabling environment for women is vital and gender policies are considered as a good starting point. But the implementation of livelihood change policy also needs to incorporate indicators of women’s livelihood change. Key to this enabling environment is seen as a greater involvement of women in decision-making processes and in representation, and hence in civil society. For this to be successful requires changes in the attitudes to women in society; livelihood change can promote this and benefit from it. Transparent and equal land rights are seen as central to this process, as are rights to education and health. Women’s access to appropriate financial services, technology and agricultural extension are also seen as critical.

This differentiation of the role of women in livelihood change is echoed by a number of other case studies on specific examples. One such study on the time supply behaviour of women in an income-generating project in Zambia (Hast, 1997) noted that when developing alternatives for women it is important to consider:

- The livelihood status of the household, including family size and number of children;
- The allocation of time between men and women;
- The differences in control over resources between men and women.

Hast emphasises that a useful indicator in analysing the effects of income generating projects on women is change in their bargaining power – a concept which is closely related to empowerment. A sense of ownership and empowerment in the livelihood change process is a recurring one and one which seems to be important in achieving success.

These examples, and other studies of the role of women in rural development, emphasise a broader lesson, that of recognising, understanding and responding to the diversity of stakeholders in rural communities and the need to understand the differences between stakeholder groups and responding to them. All too often the most marginalised groups (whether they be indigenous groups, ethnic minorities, women, the old, or the disabled) remain marginalised and do not have access to the opportunities that livelihood change can bring. Understanding the differences in the role of women, and other stakeholder groups, in different cultures, different countries and in different religions emphasises the importance of context when considering livelihood change.

#### Example 4: Supplementary Livelihood Options for Pacific Island Communities

In 2007, the Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPI), with support from NZAid, implemented a study of 43 livelihood diversification projects in the South Pacific (O'Garra, 2007).

While the methods and approaches actually adopted within the specific initiatives are not described in any detail, some lessons can be learnt about the implementation process. The study is particularly relevant to CORALI in that most people in the Pacific are directly or indirectly influenced in their livelihood options by what is happening on the coast. Whilst the study did not focus solely on aquatic resource related options, some of the livelihood choices were linked to coastal resources.

The majority of the activities studied were initiated by the communities or individuals themselves. The motives for doing so were mixed but, as described by Maslow's pyramid which is discussed later in this report, the study revealed that money was not the only driving force of most livelihood change decisions and that other issues such as status and power were important as well.

The extent to which participation in decision-making was achieved in the projects studied was assessed and it was found that there were numerous forms of participation. Some forms included only specific groups or excluded other groups and the results highlighted the dangers of using the term "participation" to describe very specific forms of participation such as the limited inclusion or involvement of people in order to extract their knowledge.

A lack of access to credit in most of the projects considerably limited the capacity of the initiatives to expand and remained an obstacle to growth. These activities depended upon a recirculation of funds already in the community, and for poor communities this means that growth opportunities are likely to be stunted.

Social capital was considered to be particularly important as a factor affecting the success of initiatives. Where existing community groups existed, targeting these increased social cohesion in the communities. In other situations rivalries developed between competing initiatives, or between groups (e.g. between men and women). Leadership in the community was considered an important factor in success. Where community leaders supported an initiative it was more likely to strengthen social cohesion. Cultural characteristics are very distinct within and between communities in the Pacific but these were generally not taken into account in the development and management of the initiatives.

**Photo:** Fishing boats at Kanyakumari, India (© J Tamelander/IUCN).



In the majority of cases studied, goods or services were developed for which there was an existing market. Whilst this had the danger of creating market saturation, it also provided immediate and lower risk selling opportunities. The linkages between access to markets and transport linkages are particularly pronounced in the Pacific, but for different reasons, this is often the case of more remote communities generally.

The “success” or “failure” of projects could not be attributed to a clear set of characteristics although the study correlated success in these projects with the following points:

- The need for an initial baseline study;
- The extent to which there was leadership support for the livelihood options;
- The social cohesiveness of the target group.

These points emphasise both the importance of the wider context in which livelihood diversification operates and the need to go beyond the isolated households, families or individuals concerned and see how livelihood change will operate in a wider community.

### **3.2 Livelihood Change and Aquatic Resource-Dependent Communities**

The FAO estimates that 52% of global fish stocks are fully exploited and 25% were over-exploited or recovering (FAO, 2004). However, the global population of 28 million people who directly depend upon capture fisheries is expanding by 2.6% per year, or 730,000 people. The technology which these fishers are using is increasing in efficiency and this is further increasing their productive capacity. In addition, changes in climate and coastal resource-use are degrading important coastal ecosystems (such as mangrove areas and coral reefs) that will further threaten the availability of fish. Such changes are making the lives of the poorer and more marginalised coastal communities worse off in many different ways (Campbell et al., 2006).

Coral reefs are the area with which this study is most concerned. The benefits which coastal communities derive from reef systems are many and diverse, and these play important roles in people’s food security, incomes, employment, security, culture and religion (Whittingham et al., 2005). But the survival of these reefs is becoming increasingly fragile and threatened (Wilkinson, 2002).

There have been a variety of ways of trying to address the decline in the coastal system, such as improved resources management, territorial use-rights in fisheries (Rubec et al., 2001), coastal area development, marine protected areas, conservation of coastal resources, and pro-poor conservation. Few of these efforts and approaches have had wide-spread success although there are examples where improvements are visible, for example community-based mangrove management in St Lucia (UNEP, 2006).

There is now an increasing focus on getting communities to move away from aquatic resource exploitation and one of the often quoted strategies for achieving this is the development of alternative livelihoods (Campbell et al., 2006). In the majority of coastal management initiatives the need for livelihood change is recognised but this is then often put to one side as important but out of the scope of that initiative. In part this is because livelihood change is recognised as a difficult challenge. UNEP (2006) describes the creation of livelihood alternatives as “promising but problematic” and requires “a long-term commitment from all actors, and considerable effort to build capacity, change attitudes, provide a social safety net and financial resources to ensure that users do not return to their former livelihoods”. The World Bank (2006) recognises that the use of “MPAs come at a high cost – in social, financial and political capital. MPAs cannot be sustained in the absence of alternative income-generating activities that can absorb the excess labor from areas newly closed to harvesting.” This is recognised but no solutions are provided.

One of the problems with the uptake of alternative livelihoods in the fisheries sector is the “stickiness” in the fisheries-related labour market, with low job mobility and limited employment alternatives in many coastal regions (Willing, 2007). Where few alternatives exist, restructuring of the fishery may be unsustainable or politically unworkable. In many situations the linkages between the need for change within the fishery and wider society are poorly understood and not well responded to. Even when alternatives are suggested and efforts made to promote them they tend to be from the perspective of conservation rather than from the perspective of the livelihoods of people (e.g. Kühlman, 2002).

Where attempts have been made to address livelihood change they have often focussed on improving the enabling environment for change through policy, institutional and legislative changes. However, the poor, who are so often the ones that depend upon aquatic resources for their livelihoods, are often unable to take up the opportunities created by changes in the enabling environment and thus become further excluded from the development process (Campbell et al., 2006).

There are some examples where positive lessons can be learnt, these are outlined below.

### Example 5: Canadian Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring

In two fisheries in Canada, the Pacific salmon fishery and the Atlantic cod fishery, the government made major investments to restructure the fishery.

#### *Pacific Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring*

In the first case study, the Federal Government in Canada addressed the decline in the Pacific salmon fishery through a comprehensive and multi-pronged initiative.

By the late 1990s, substantial changes in the salmon fishing industry in British Columbia (BC) had resulted in the loss of more than 12,000 jobs in BC's salmon fishery, corresponding to a 51% reduction in jobs in the commercial and recreational fishing sectors of the salmon fishery in that province (Audit and Evaluation Directorate, 2004). The decline was a result of changes in the environment, an increase in the world's salmon supply, increasing competition from the removal of trade barriers, and a decline in angler participation in the sport/recreational sector.

The Government aimed to address the issue from several different directions simultaneously, through the Pacific Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring (PFAR) Program, consisting of an investment of Canadian \$400 million over five years. PFAR consisted of the following components:

- Protecting and rebuilding salmon habitats;
- Restructuring the commercial fishing industry;
- Diversifying fishing income;
- Helping communities to adjust to the changes.

The activities were spread over a number of different government agencies. Some of the key lessons learnt from the process were:

- The multi-agency approach was important in its success;
- Existing government support programmes were important but often insufficient to address a major industry change, especially where the intended beneficiaries had quite unique characteristics such as low levels of formal education and literacy, being older, having close ties to the fishing industry, and living in remote communities.
- Working closely in collaboration with the industry, unions, non-profit organisations and other government agencies to address major adjustment issues was critical;
- When introducing similar programmes, there is a need to address and manage workers and community expectations;
- Preliminary assessment of the extent of the problem and issues prior to programme design and implementation is critical;
- Putting in place sufficient administration and programme data processes for reliably recording and tracking programme participants is important to meeting accountability and evaluation requirements (Audit and Evaluation Directorate, 2004).

#### *Fishery Restructuring and Adjustment Measures of the Atlantic Groundfish Industry*

In the second case study, following the decline in catches in the Atlantic groundfish fishery in the late 1990s, the Federal Government announced a programme to assist individuals and coastal communities to adjust to opportunities outside of the fishery, and to lay the foundation for an economically and environmentally viable,

self-reliant fishery. Again a multi-agency approach was adopted and a budget of Canadian \$730 million was allocated.

The programme, as with the Pacific salmon programme, aimed to enhance existing fisheries and well as identify and promote alternatives. The key components were:

- Retiring of existing licences;
- Paying lump sums for clients under the earlier Atlantic Groundfish Strategy;
- Providing adjustment measures for people to become self-employed, to gain work experience, to develop new skills, or to relocate;
- Supporting regional economic development;
- Financing early retirement programmes (Government of Canada, 1998).

One of the key bodies involved in this programme was the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA). As its strategy to support change in the economy it has a focus on small and medium-sized enterprises, supporting the development of wider economic opportunities, and developing policies and programmes to support growth. The Agency addressed six key priority areas:

- Entrepreneurship and business skills development;
- Innovation;
- Trade, tourism, and investment;
- Community economic development;
- Policy, advocacy and coordination;
- Access to capital and information (ACOA, 2003).

These two case studies bring out some important points. Both recognised the need to both enhance the fishery and to diversify and create opportunities outside of the fishery. They also addressed the problem from multiple entry points – not relying on a single strategy. Very significantly, the context of wider economic and community development was considered important as a foundation for the livelihood changes proposed. They also recognised the need to address the issue through a number of government agencies simultaneously and not leave it to the limited mandate of a single agency. They also worked closely with a wide range of local institutions in government, civil society and the private sector to make it happen. They also developed change strategies based on local needs, capacities and aspirations but at the same time recognised the need to build technical and business skills and innovative capacity. They also recognised that these strategies could not be done on a tight budget and that communities and individuals need to be able to access finance for start-up capital. There was also a need for information flows to potential beneficiaries and advocacy for change to support the work. In hindsight, it was recognised in both programmes that there was a need for a strong baseline of knowledge about the need and potential for change, and good monitoring of progress throughout.

### Example 6: Tonle Sap Sustainable Livelihoods Project

The Tonle Sap Sustainable Livelihoods Project (TSSLP) is based around the Tonle Sap lake in Cambodia. The lake supports one of the largest inland fisheries in the world. In the planning phase of the TSSLP the Asian Development Bank financed a study on the Tonle Sap Lake which looked at entry points for a project designed to reduce fishing and other environmental pressures on the lake (Agrisystems, 2004). The study worked in different areas around the lake to identify approaches that could be used to enhance or change current livelihoods. The methods used for the study included the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach to understand the complexities of people's livelihoods and Appreciative Inquiry (AI) to facilitate a focus on positive developmental visions for the future. The SLA was underpinned by an array of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques. The use of the SLA enabled the complexity of the livelihoods of people to be fully understood but above all it enabled the needs of specific marginalised groups (such as women and Vietnamese) to be identified and catered for. The diagnosis allowed an understanding of how different asset combinations have been used to move out of poverty and thus which asset strengthening was most needed. The SLA also allowed a better understanding of how the wider enabling environment worked for different groups of people and how it linked into the community structures and processes. Understanding these complex institutional arrangements was seen as very important for future livelihood change initiatives.

The use of AI was aimed at helping communities to vision a better future rather than just a change away from aquatic resource exploitation. It was also used as a tool to encourage a greater element of self-help in the development process.

The study identified the need for an array of different approaches to livelihood development reflecting the different contexts which different villages currently operate in. Some communities were highly dependent on capture fisheries and were thus more concerned with making community-based management systems work more effectively. Others were more dependent on agriculture and their needs were more about how to improve agricultural productivity that would enable a move away from fisheries.

This study is of interest because it demonstrated the need to look at the complexity of people's livelihoods and the value of the SLA to achieve this. But it also tried to build on the positive aspects of people's own past experience and to help them to see what the future might be. This visioning process is a powerful way of creating a goal to aim for and for helping people to steer themselves towards it.

### Example 7: Coastal Livelihoods in Cambodia

The research in example 7, into the livelihoods of coastal people in Cambodia, is another example where the SLA was used as a diagnostic tool to understand and describe the complexity of rural people's lives (IMM et al., 2005). The research used the SLA to both review global experience of the factors which supported or inhibited livelihood change generally, and to assess the specific factors operating in rural coastal communities in Cambodia. The SLA provided a way of breaking down the complexity of peoples lives by addressing their access to a range of assets (human, social, financial, physical and natural), the way that access was affected by policies, institutions and processes, and by trends, seasonality and shocks to arrive at livelihood strategies. The effectiveness of these strategies was assessed in terms of their effects on livelihood outcomes of the different stakeholders. The SLA framework was specifically used to understand the factors supporting or inhibiting change within each of those elements of the framework. Strategic considerations emerging from the research were as follows:

- Because livelihood diversification is already an important part of the livelihoods of many aquatic resource users, support for livelihood change could play an important role in reducing dependence on aquatic resources and so creating a more favourable environment for improving aquatic resource management.
- Livelihoods and the factors that affect them in coastal areas are complex. Interventions need to understand that complexity and build on the strengths of existing livelihoods, especially the social resources which exist in communities.
- Being close to foreign markets (particularly Thailand and Vietnam) creates opportunities for livelihood diversification and change. Greater emphasis on better linkages with regional markets could provide new opportunities in the future.
- Better linkages and information flows between coastal communities and national markets would also increase local people's choices regarding their livelihoods. It could also increase their share of benefits. Given, the importance of their role, it will be necessary to involve middlemen and women in this process.
- Improved access to effective, low-cost health care facilities and services would play a major role in helping households to improve their livelihoods, especially for the poor.
- In the short to medium-term, relevant, vocational skills and knowledge seems to be a priority for livelihood improvement, especially for the poor. However, improved access to appropriately costed education is also necessary in the medium to long term.
- Appropriate credit mechanisms that are suited to the needs and capacities of different stakeholder groups are critical for improving the outcomes and the speed of livelihood change.
- Formal title over land is very important for people to diversify their livelihoods and to access credit, especially for larger loans, to take up different livelihood opportunities.
- The livelihoods of different households and different stakeholder groups in coastal communities are often very closely interlinked and interdependent. Interventions for rural livelihood improvement should:
  - work with groups who already have the capacity to change and who can stimulate growth in the local economy;

- and work with poorer groups who need more support to help them take advantage of new opportunities.
- Government policies have complex effects at the local level. There is a need to be much more proactive about understanding the impacts of policy decisions and feeding this understanding back into the policy process.
- To deal with the complexity of the coast, interventions should use:
  - multi-agency approaches which bring together a diversity of skills, knowledge and experience;
  - formal and informal networks to bring these together rather than establishing new formal agencies.

This demonstrates that taking a single focus and supporting one facet of livelihood change is unlikely to work because of the complex inter-relationships which exist between all the factors at play. In many communities there is already a strong foundation of experience across livelihoods that can be built upon. Markets and access to them are crucial, but regional international markets can be as important to rural communities as local ones. Health and land issues can be as important to aquatic resource-dependent communities that wish to diversify as access to much more direct support such as credit and business skills. Much of the past focus has been on supporting the more able members of the community to change their livelihoods in order to get some momentum in the change process. This can be a valuable part of the process but benefits are unlikely to trickle down and targeting the less able is just as important. Creating an enabling environment through policy change is just as important as working with the communities directly – the two approaches must go hand-in-hand. The process of change is not best supported by one type of agency (government, private sector or NGO), it is best done through a partnership between all of these and the community. This partnership needs to be flexible and informal so that it can adapt to address the changing environment that the communities face.

### 3.3 Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development

A third area of study to generate examples from which lessons could be learnt is that of entrepreneurship and enterprise development, both in the developing world and developed world contexts.

**Photo:** Tea shop (© J Campbell).



There is an ill-defined stage where an individual turns his/her self-employed livelihood income activities into an enterprise and these two phases of development are closely related especially in the often informal world of coastal communities. An entrepreneur can be described as someone who perceives an opportunity and creates an organisation to pursue it (Reitan, 1997) This separation is clearest when an enterprise adopts a change of legal status but most enterprises in developing countries operate in the informal sector and may never be legally registered as such.

There has been much study of the nature of enterprise and what makes an entrepreneur. The movement of an individual from an employee to an entrepreneur is linked to the recognition of a personally viable opportunity (Reitan, 1997). When a potential entrepreneur and an opportunity coincide entrepreneurial activity *may* take place. However, it is recognised by the literature that identifying what makes a potential entrepreneur is very difficult. It is also true that viable opportunities are not enough; the potential entrepreneur also needs to be able to take up the opportunity. Many people see opportunities but never take them up, others see themselves as entrepreneurs but never find opportunities. There is a need for all three: entrepreneurial attitude, opportunity and ability, before the individual is able to determine if enterprise formation is feasible, desirable and profitable.

Life experiences have been found to be strong predictors of vocational preference (Smart, 1989). This explains why many people follow in their parents' footsteps when it comes to career choice, e.g. the children of fishers often become fishers. Also many people who have an experience of working in small businesses, especially family businesses, develop a desire to establish their own. By understanding why and how people have got to where they are in their working lives we can gain some understanding of where they might go to next.

In addressing systematic approaches to the development on entrepreneurs, the identification of stimulants for entrepreneurship have been identified and in some cases, fostered. Cooper (1973) identified a range of influences that affect decisions to become an entrepreneur. This includes:

1. Family and religious background;
2. Educational background;
3. Psychological makeup;
4. Age at time of maximum opportunity or organisational push;
5. Earlier career experience;
6. Opportunity to form entrepreneurial groups;
7. Geographic location;
8. Nature of skills and knowledge acquired;
9. Motivation;
10. Experience in "small business" setting;
11. Examples of entrepreneurial action and availability of knowledge about entrepreneurship;
12. Societal attitudes towards entrepreneurship;
13. Ability to save "seed capital";
14. Accessibility and availability of venture capital;
15. Availability of personnel and supporting services; accessibility to customers, accessibility to university;
16. Opportunities for interim consulting;
17. Economic conditions.

Developing entrepreneurship starts very much at the school stage and awareness raising about business/employment opportunities, about running businesses and the about the skills and risks associated with this can be important in developing a culture of business (see [www.sse.org.uk/network/](http://www.sse.org.uk/network/) ). This is being recognised more and more by developing communities themselves. For instance, there is a growing recognition by South Indian fishers of the need for their children to gain a wider and more formal education which will equip them to seek employment outside of fisheries. Such changes in attitude and awareness amongst the young can be fostered through more direct means to encourage the young to experiment with enterprise and this has been achieved successfully in several countries.

Intervention in enterprise development by outside agencies is a growing area of development activity. Intervention in this process is justified because expansion or change of direction of entrepreneurial activity is thought to be beneficial and intervention is justified on the basis that entrepreneurial growth is limited by market failures, failures in governance or failures in economic systems (Bridge et al., 2003).

Intervention can be either direct (targeting individuals or enterprises) or indirect (creating a wider enabling environment). Such interventions may be supported by an enterprise development policy, but such policies are often missing (Bridge et al., 2003). In many cases the policy responsibility falls between ministries because of the broad sectoral diversity which require interventions across many overlapping and adjacent administrative jurisdictions. Where there is a diversity of institutions providing inputs to livelihood change processes, they are likely to have different policy objectives and bringing these to a common point of focus can be extremely difficult. As a consequence such initiatives are likely to lack the flexibility needed to address the diversity of issues faced by coastal communities. A key part of any strategy for support for enterprise growth, change or sustainability must include ways of facilitating a diversity of agencies, institutions and initiatives to support the potential user in ways that are meaningful to them. Two approaches are widely used and these are sometimes referred to as the “one-stop-shop” approach and the “first-stop-shop” approach. The “one-stop-shop” approach forms a bridge between these disparate organisations and concentrates the services which they offer. However the “first-stop-shop” approach recognises that this will not always be possible. Instead it provides an initial point of contact which either provides direct support or facilitates linkages with the appropriate agency.

Indirect and direct support for enterprise development are often combined and include such measures as 1) supporting macro-economic policies (such as interest rates, taxation, public spending), 2) deregulation and simplification of systems (such as cutting bureaucratic procedures, legislative exemptions), 3) sectoral and problem-specific policies (such as rural development support, cooperative development, support for women), 4) financial assistance (such as grants, loans, venture capital), 5) indirect assistance (such as information and advice, training, consultancy support, mentoring, network development), and 6) relationships (Storey, 1994).

There are also various stages of enterprise development which attract different forms of support (see Churchill and Lewis, 1983). These stages include: 1) the potential for existence; 2) early existence; 3) survival; 4) success; 5) take-off; 6) maturity; 7) decline and 8) termination. These stages are a reflection of different needs of the entrepreneur during different stages of the development process. Bridge et al.(2003) suggest a hierarchy of enterprise needs, illustrated in Table 1. There are a number of examples that demonstrate approaches to enterprise development.

**Table 1:** A Hierarchy of Enterprise Needs

ENTERPRISE NEED	LEVEL OF NEED
An environment which can sustain a well-run enterprise	HIGHER
Enterprise/personal support, including mentoring and advocacy, which are often obtained through networks	
The skills needed to advance the enterprise, such as financial and marketing skills	
Resources for advancing the enterprise, such as equipment, materials, workspace and time	
An idea for an enterprise	LOWER

**Example 8: The Arab Regional Centre for Entrepreneurship & Investment Training**

The Arab Regional Centre for Entrepreneurship and Investment Training (ARCEIT) has been working with the UNIDO Enterprise Development Program promoting new enterprise creation and enterprise competitiveness through entrepreneurship development and investment and technology promotion. The programme is based on the realisation that finance, facilities and incentives are necessary but not sufficient to ensure appropriate entrepreneurial responses. Entrepreneurial growth requires, in addition, a focus on human resources.

The programme has established a funding mechanism for small business development and growth, ran training courses for business start-up that have resulted in a number of new businesses being formed,

trained trainers in enterprise development to multiply up the number of businesses forming, established an incubator service which provides support and guidance to aspiring entrepreneurs, provided counselling services, developed education programmes in support of entrepreneurship development, ran seminars, workshops and debates, and developed a “Centre of Excellence” at the Arab Open University, Kingdom of Bahrain branch to facilitate the establishment and growth of Micro, Small and Medium enterprises in the region.

Specialised components of the work include supporting women entrepreneurs. This component aims at providing assistance to women entrepreneurs in start-up projects, and providing counselling to mature or existing companies which are seeking expansion. The programme is reported to have had considerable success in the region and the approach, now referred to as the ‘Bahrain Model’, is being transferred to other parts of the world.

The ARCEIT programme demonstrates the need to address livelihood change from multiple directions, providing a range of support services to address the diversity of needs of different people at different stages of their entrepreneurial development.

### Example 9: Northern Ireland Regional Enterprise Development

The European Union (EU) provides funds for supporting business development and diversification. Northern Ireland (NI) in the UK, was an area which seriously lacked an enterprise culture in its economy as evidenced by low enterprise start-up and low economic activity rates. Northern Ireland also had the lowest Value Added Tax (VAT) registration rate in the UK suggesting low turn-over of companies. Under the EU’s Programme for Building Sustainable Prosperity the UK government established a programme designed with the following objectives:

- To increase start-up activity in general with a specific focus on groups previously not well represented in self-employment or business ownership (e.g. women and people in the age groups of 45+) and in sectors able to exploit global markets;
- To stimulate and promote the benefits of an enterprise culture particularly the need to celebrate entrepreneurship and the success of local small businesses;
- To provide a physical and support infrastructure to encourage entrepreneurial activity;
- To ensure that the skills and capabilities needed to start and develop a business are on the education “menu”.
- The proposed activities to achieve these objectives were as follows:
- Developing a strategy for the creation of more sustainable business start-ups particularly those with the potential for high growth;
- Increasing entrepreneurship awareness and start-up activity, particularly among under-represented groups;
- Identifying gaps in the enterprise support network and engaging in partnership initiatives to address these gaps, both in terms of infrastructure and in capacity building;
- Working with other Government departments and relevant organisations to raise awareness of the importance of business and entrepreneurship within the education system;
- Pursuing closer links with Universities, Science Parks, Centres of Excellence and other research based organisations to accelerate the development of knowledge-based businesses;
- Ensuring the provision of a range of financial support options (both public and private) to meet the needs of new business starts.
- Linked to this was a Small Business Support Network with the following activities:
- Working in partnership with all those who have an interest in small business development (e.g. local authorities, community groups and other Government Departments) to develop integrated strategies to address development needs of small businesses and implement plans in a co-ordinated way;
- Establishing a resource dedicated to the sourcing, analysis and interpretation of market intelligence to inform the development of plans to assist with the evaluation of small business support services;
- Establishing a “gateway” service to facilitate single point of access information and ‘problem-solving’ advice for the NI small business base;
- Working with other providers of support to build capacity and capability in the area of small business development support.

This example demonstrates the potential for adopting a multi-pronged approach which focuses on the wide array of barriers to enterprise development.

### Example 10: Clustering support: The Orissa Cyclone, OTOP Thailand

Clusters generally refer to two forms of structure: a group of enterprises owned by one person or business across a diversity of economic areas or, more commonly, as a geographical area where a group of, mainly independent, enterprises are developing or have the potential to develop. It is this second structure that is discussed here.

Clustering works on the basis that enterprises/individuals derive certain advantages in working together. The physical marketplace is an example of how bringing potential competitors together in one place can help both the seller and the purchaser. Working together in groups can also be an advantage to the individual either through scale-economies, shared information, shared risk or bargaining power. Clustering can clearly be a benefit in some situations and it is seen widely throughout the world where, for instance, certain villages in Ecuador are renown for Panama hat production or for furniture making, or where the "One Tambon, One Product" (OTOP) system has been introduced in Thailand. Clustering is also an effective way of providing outside support to fledgling enterprises by concentrating support services into a common area.

#### *Orissa Cyclone*

In Orissa, India, following the 1999 super cyclone which hit the coast support was provided to a diversity of individuals and groups to rebuild their lives (IMM, 2001). The extent of the damage meant that many of the NGO and government services could only be effectively delivered if the support was channelled through groups of people rather than at individuals. Whilst this was initially resisted by the communities it was clear that the support services were just incapable of working at any other level given the scale of the disaster. The results of the emphasis on working together were quite significant. In particular it was noted that as a result of being obliged to collaborate, people who had previously had no experience of working together outside of the household, found that they benefited greatly from collaboration and that a new sense of community began to emerge and joint support became the norm rather than the exception. In particular this sense of community allowed and encouraged the development of social safety nets that were not there before.

In one community, which was inhabited by individual bamboo weavers, the bamboo crop was completely destroyed by the cyclone. By bringing these individual producers together into a cooperative they were able to purchase bamboo in large amounts, share transport costs and negotiate better purchasing prices. In addition they were able to share skills, reduce the marketing costs and bargain for higher selling prices.

#### *One Village One Product*

The One Village One Product movement was originally started in Japan and the idea was transferred to Thailand (OTOP). The Thai government has been promoting the local industry through the manufacturing of specialty products based on the native culture, tradition and local natural supplies.

The aims of the OTOP process are:

1. To construct a comprehensive database system which accommodates necessary information from every Tambon (village or small town) in Thailand;
2. To promote local Thai products for every Tambon, and to facilitate the buy-and-sell procedure;
3. To bring internet technology to villages and this is the starting point of the Tambon Internet Project;
4. To help encourage and promote tourism in Thailand down to Tambon level. Thus more income will be distributed to rural people;
5. To help rural people to exchange information, ideas, and to improve communication across various Tambon.

Each village now produces its own products but the OTOP project supports marketing, skills development and information exchange. Clustering together to improve the chances of success is also enhanced when services in support of clusters is clustered. This is the case in the OTOP example where it is an efficient way of supporting enterprise growth by focussing on specific geographical locations and marketable goods and services.

However, it must be noted that clustered production around similar goods and services can lead to an oversupply of products and saturation of the market. There is a need to continuously link supply to demand.

### **3.3 Corporate Staff Development and Enterprise Growth**

The fourth area where lessons can be learnt is that of corporate staff development and enterprise growth. The way that people interact with large formal businesses can provide some useful lessons on how people cope with change and how the institutions within which they work respond to the need for change.

Individuals, particularly those who go through the senior levels of school, college or university, have many career options open to them and there is a growing awareness that assessing the options must be done in a systematic way if a desirable career path is to be identified.

Businesses can be thought of as institutions that buy the services provided by their staff. In a very real sense the staff are individuals with livelihood needs, capacities and aspirations. The formal business is often acting in the role of a benevolent agency in both providing the enabling environment for their staff and providing direct support for the evolution of their livelihoods. Businesses responses to change are part of a spectrum of ways of dealing with recruitment of staff, the career development of their staff and creating an environment to respond to change. The lessons to be learnt from each of these are outlined below.

#### Example 11: Career development methods

Career development initiatives run by schools and governments to help people into jobs that will suit them are a well developed approach to livelihood change, especially in more developed economies. In the case of school career programmes the person being helped is trying to identify their first step on the employment ladder whilst in government employment programmes people are often being assisted to overcome redundancy or long-term unemployment. More specialised programmes of individual livelihood change include helping people who have been injured to take up new careers, or working with convicts to help them find work on their release from prison.

Many career development guides follow a pattern of: 1) analysing the person – understand what the person is good at what are they not so good at; 2) analysing their existing work – understanding what they do and do not like about it; 3) understanding their key requirements from future employment e.g. money, full-time or part-time, security, risk, control - and which are most important; 4) defining the gap between existing and future needs; 5) identifying what opportunities exist or can be created; 6) defining the extent to which the person will need to change and is willing and able to change (slight changes to existing employment, correcting some fundamental aspect of their existing work, substantially change but within the existing work area, moving into another work activity linked to current, diversifying into other unrelated areas, switching to a new job); 7) defining the obstacles stopping the individual from making the sort of desired/needed change (lack of skills/knowledge, lack of work availability, fear of change, lack of financial resources, lack of support); and 8) providing guidance on overcoming these obstacles.

Such a career development approach is aimed at working solely with the individual concerned and assumes that the external environment is largely static and unchangeable. It also assumes that the opportunities for livelihood change exist although it does recognise that there are a number of obstacles confronting the uptake of options that need to be addressed. The diversity of steps in this process provide useful stages for any form of livelihood change.

### Example 12: Staff Recruitment In Formal Companies

As companies become more formal in their organisation and structure, so human resource development and management procedures start to become more important. Such approaches tend to focus on how to get the best out of their employees in terms of achieving their management objectives. This will also include issues related to employee satisfaction, employee aspirations, and legal and union expectations of employment conditions. A key part of this is understanding the external demand for the goods and services provided by the workforce over time, and relating this to internal demands for, and scheduling of, manpower. The selection of staff for specific tasks often involves several steps. These include: 1) defining the tasks, management arrangements and the skills, knowledge, physical/mental attributes and attitudes required; 2) assessing the availability of candidates through calls for applications, 3) initial selection/de-selection on the basis of experience and qualification, 4) interviewing staff to define their expectations and capabilities, 5) evaluating and short-listing candidates, 6) negotiating contract details and final selection, and 7) implementing induction and training, 8) carrying out ongoing appraisal and career development support.

From this it is clear that companies wishing to select the best people for the work they have available do not leave this to chance. They do not try to fit people into a list of jobs that have been thought up on no real basis. They carefully try to match people's past experience, needs, aspirations and capabilities with what is needed within the organisation and what is demanded by the market. They then try to make the recruitment work by investing resources in building capacity and confidence to complete the work. Such processes are no less than should be considered for a livelihood change of any sort.

### Example 13: Staff Development In Formal Companies

Once recruited, the career development of employees in formal companies typically involves: 1) assessing progress, 2) identifying staff potential, 3) linking potential to opportunities, 4) designing a succession plan for the organisation, 5) defining the aspirations and interests of the individual, 6) defining skill/experience/attitude/knowledge changes required, 7) developing and delivering a plan to achieve these.

Specific staff development interventions involve: 1) defining standards to be achieved, 2) assessing development needs to reach those standards, 3) defining development interventions required, 4) choosing the development methods, 5) planning and implementing the development intervention, and 6) monitoring post-intervention performance against desired standards.

Specific career development interventions might include training (specific courses – ongoing training), coaching/mentoring, job rotation, job experience, site visits to other work environments, understudying, involvement in specific projects, reflection processes, on-the-job training, group problem-centred learning, tutorials, feedback, action-learning, and distance learning.

Again the process of developing staff is not left to chance. It is a systematic approach to building on what people have already achieved, their aspirations and capacities, the organisation's demand and the market demand for skills and work.

Much of the development of staff in formal companies is related to satisfying their needs. Management specialists have analysed these different needs and tried to establish hierarchies of need. Abraham Maslow developed what is now referred to as Maslow's Pyramid to show the hierarchy of needs of individuals (Figure 1).

Maslow argued that individuals sought satisfaction in each layer, gradually rising up the pyramid as the previous level is satisfied. People's priorities are initially focussed on getting enough food, water, and shelter and having good health. Once these have been achieved they aspire to achieve reduced risk in their lives followed by a sense of social belonging and being part of a group or community. Having achieved this the next level of focus is on self respect and esteem followed by self actualisation.

This theory has been challenged for its over simplification but it does suggest an important point that needs are complex and often hierarchical. But individuals are motivated by different things, some by job satisfaction, others by money, and some by power or status. These differences in motivation may be culturally determined and may, in different cultures, follow a different hierarchy. The important point is that motivation is complex; it means different things for different people and can change as people progress through their livelihood strategies.



**Figure 1.** Maslow's Pyramid.

#### Example 14: Managing Change In Companies

Companies undergo significant change during their lives and these changes are often very unsettling for the people involved. Change management in companies has many parallels with change management within the livelihood context: both are very risky, unsettling and need to be managed carefully. As such corporate attitudes to change management can be useful to consider in the context of livelihood change. Change processes have been studied widely and now constitute a distinct management skill. Broadly speaking change processes can be divided into four phases: 1) understanding change, 2) planning change, 3) implementing change, and 4) consolidating change (the following outline is broadly taken from Heller, 1998).

*Phase 1. Understanding Change:* consists of understanding why change is necessary (its inevitability and its likely effects), understanding the causes of change (social, economic, environmental, technological, political, legal), recognising sources of change (external, internal, global) and defining the type of change (rapid, gradual, slight, radical, to respond to a crisis, for improvement, to avoid loss).

*Phase 2. Planning Change:* focussing on goals (including assessing objectives of change, defining the principles that will govern the change process, determining gaps between where the organisation is and where it wants to be, and assessing the corporate culture that may affect the change process); identifying the demand for change; selecting essential changes that need to be implemented; understanding the complexity of the change process and who will be affected how; planning ways to involve people in the change process; choosing timescales; making action plans; anticipating effects; anticipating resistance to change; testing and checking plans.

*Phase 3. Implementing Change:* This involves communicating change; assigning responsibilities; developing commitment; changing culture; and limiting resistance to change.

*Phase 4. Consolidating change:* This consists of monitoring progress; reviewing assumptions; maintaining momentum; building on change; and assessing the change process.

The planning, management and implementation of corporate change provides a valuable structure for thinking about livelihood change processes in the development context. The four stages suggest a broad

strategic approach and the components of each suggest areas that need to be considered under any livelihood change process.

All three of these examples within the formal business world suggest ways forward for the livelihood change process. But these are not the only ways in which livelihood change can learn from business. Business planning has many similar processes: 1) Defining the current and desired situations, 2) doing research about the internal and external environments, 3) evaluating options, 4) developing a strategy, 5) constructing a detailed plan, and 6) monitoring and review. Key to these very broad categories is the identification of demand for the goods and services which are to be provided. These are covered in stage 2 where research is carried out. Without this demand enterprises which are formed or transformed are unlikely to survive.

## **4. Discussion of Approaches, Lessons Learnt and Principles for Intervention**

The aim of this overview is to learn lessons from different livelihood change processes that could be combined into a successful systematic approach to facilitating livelihood change associated with coastal resource-use that leads to improved livelihood outcomes, is sustainable and that contributes to reducing adverse pressure on coral reefs.

### **4.1 Discussion**

The examples outlined above are a small number of experiences from which we can learn lessons, but they do cover a broad spectrum of institutional uses of livelihood change methods. This diversity of contexts provides a good basis for gaining examples of good practice that can be combined into a systematic approach. The four broad categories of examples are:

- Rural community development support
- Livelihood change and aquatic resource-dependent communities
- Entrepreneurship and enterprise development
- Corporate staff development and enterprise growth

The examples start with general rural community development support. This is probably the closest area to our research focus where extensive work has been done. Much work has been done in this category on identifying the factors that support or inhibit livelihood change. There have even been proposals for broad strategies to achieve this. However, successful methods, which can be defined as “recognisable and replicable approaches” (rather than just a successful outcome) to responding to those factors are few. Approaches such as those proposed by Haggblade et al. (2002) are very broad whilst that proposed by Davis (2006) is more specific but describes a set of end points rather than a process. There are some research strategies that have been developed for understanding the factors which support and inhibit livelihood change, for example within the RALF programme in Afghanistan, but few of these have gone on to generalise approaches. RALF does, however, indicate the need to work closely with communities and to build up the capacity of service providers to support livelihood change.

The Jambi Kiwa example in Ecuador provides a good example of how successful an intervention can be and illustrates the need for strategies to be in harmony with the local culture and conditions, with the economic and political realities of the time and place, and to be adapted to the capacities of people to change. It also illustrates the value of self-supporting mechanisms and working together through the change process.

The consideration of women in the livelihood change process was valuable in that it indicated clearly that stakeholders are not homogenous groups, that development efforts need to be tailored to their specific needs, aspirations and capacities.

The review of livelihood alternatives in the Pacific indicated how difficult it is to generalise about the factors that create success in projects, especially where monitoring of progress has been limited. It did recognise

the value of a good understanding of the local situation, the need for strong leadership and the value of social cohesion.

In the two Canadian fisheries examples there was a very strategic involvement of government in the change process. They recognised that they had to both improved the way existing resources are managed and help people to diversify, i.e. *enhance and diversify*.

The provision of services in both cases involved multi-agency approaches, which were used within the context of strengthening the wider local economy and the community's ability to interact with that economy. Government recognised the value of working with local private sector and NGO institutions. They also provided support through multiple entry points such as business development skills, technical skills, credit, information flows, advocacy and research.

In the case of the Tonle Sap Sustainable Livelihoods Project the use of the SLA as a method of understanding the complexity of people's livelihoods has proved very useful, and the use of Appreciative Inquiry to take people beyond the constraints of the problems they face, is instructive. The Coastal Livelihoods project in Cambodia emphasised the value of using the SLA as a means of systematically understanding the factors which push and pull people into, or away from, aquatic resource use and provides a useful framework for understanding those factors more globally.

In the area of Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development there was a greater emphasis on the factors which influence decision making processes of people when they are forced to make livelihood change choices. Cooper (1973) identified 17 groups of factors that influence people's decisions to become and entrepreneur. Most of these categories would apply equally to rural communities as much as to urban developed societies but they emphasise that the differences between groups from different backgrounds is likely to strongly influence the decisions that they make. School, family and wider community culture can all influence people's willingness to become entrepreneurs. In the case of the Arab Regional Centre for Entrepreneurship and Investment Training (ARCREIT) there was an implicit recognition of the complexity of factors which support or inhibit livelihood change which affect different stakeholder groups in different ways. The approach of ARCREIT was to be multi-pronged: supporting schools, providing counselling, conducting research, running technical training, providing credit and promoting the debate about entrepreneurship. This tried to address the complexity of livelihood change but coming at it from many directions. A similar approach was used in the example of the Northern Ireland Regional Enterprise Development initiative and this becomes a more generalised strategy under the heading of "clustering", where a multitude of agencies come together to provide support for enterprise development in specific locations. There is an implicit recognition that there is a need for a critical mass of support to help enterprises to survive and thrive.

**Photo:** Fisherman, Gwadar, Pakistan  
(© J Tamelander/IUCN).



Private companies probably have invested more than any other form of organisation in understanding and responding to the need for livelihood change. This they have done in part because of the recognition that the people that work for them are the most important assets they have. It is also because many people working in formal organisations see progress within that organisation as a natural progression and are thus pushing for livelihood (or in this case, career) change. The growing market for books and advisers on career development has fuelled research into how to approach career change which has provided valuable parallels with livelihood change. Perhaps the most striking lesson to learn from career development which applies to livelihood change is that there is little evidence from the literature or from experience that just picking likely livelihood/career alternatives from a list and encouraging people to adopt them will give a reasonable success rate in terms of uptake or a lasting sense of satisfaction. Of course there are some cases where this has worked but such an approach has a high probability of failure. Development workers would not accept such an approach to their own career development and inflicting such an approach on village people is likely to have unpredictable, but mainly limited, success.

Most career selection/development and staff recruitment approaches rely heavily on understanding people's past career development and what their needs and aspirations are for the future. They invariably link available skills and motivation to their demand either within their organisations or in the wider market place. They also recognise that people are likely to need support in the process of moving towards achieving their aspirations and potential. The use of psychology to understand the motives of people to stay within a job or to change has also proved important in understanding incentives for change which can have a significant influence at the livelihood change level. The perspective on the hierarchy of enterprise needs (Table 1) also reflects the way in which livelihood needs are likely to change over time and as people become more established in their new livelihoods.

Whilst none of the examples suggests a definitive way forward for supporting livelihood change of people dependent on reefs, an analysis of the different approaches used in the different contexts provides many lessons which could be applied to the livelihoods of reef-dependent people. These lessons do not appear in any one example as a strategy but rather are scattered across examples. However, when combined they start to indicate a strategy which may be adapted or adopted for the purpose of facilitating livelihood change.

The key findings which have emerged from the examples and discussion are summarised below.

## **4.2 Lessons Learnt**

The lessons learnt from this global review are outlined below and sorted according to the three phases of the SLED process; Discovery, Direction and Doing.

### Discovery

#### *Understanding how people's livelihoods have evolved*

People and their livelihoods do not operate in a static situation that has come from nowhere, they and their livelihoods have evolved over time and that evolution has a major influence on where they go to in the future. The Pacific review example demonstrated the link between good baseline information and intervention success. Likewise the Canadian fisheries examples indicated the need for a good foundation of knowledge upon which to build interventions. The Cambodian coastal livelihoods research indicated the importance of understanding this history as a signpost for future potential.

Many young people follow their parents or their communities traditional values systems and strategies for living. This often predetermines what livelihoods they adopt and may act as an important obstacle constraining change. In other cases people show remarkable occupational mobility – again sometimes reflecting similar approaches in those around them. The past experience of people can influence their attitudes to risk and to change that can influence future decisions.

It is important to understand why people have developed to where they are if we are to understand where they are likely to end up and how we can facilitate change.

### *Recognising and responding to the complexity of people's lives*

In many of the examples understanding the complexity of people's lives was recognised as very important to supporting livelihood change. The Sustainable livelihoods Approach was developed specifically to understand and respond to this complexity. This was used to good effect in the example of research in Afghanistan, the Tonle Sap example and the Cambodia coastal livelihoods research. Understanding the complexity of people's livelihoods can reveal many facets of people's livelihoods that may be important to the process of livelihood change. It can also begin to define the factors which push or pull people into or out of fisheries.

### *Recognising the different needs of different stakeholder groups*

The livelihoods of people are not all the same. There is considerable diversity of livelihoods in communities reflecting the number of stakeholders in each household and each community, and their different needs and wants. These needs and wants can be multiple (as demonstrated by the Pacific review example) or change over time (as indicated by both Maslow's pyramid and the hierarchy of enterprise needs). Recognising that these different needs and wants exist and that people cannot be catered for as a homogeneous group is important, especially for vulnerable or marginalised groups such as ethnic minorities, indigenous groups (as in the case of Jambi Kiwa), the old and the very young. The study of women and livelihoods also demonstrated the considerable difference between men and women.

### *Recognising the importance of context*

In several of the examples the context of change was important. The women in the Jambi Kiwa example felt marginalised, but also felt empowered by a wider social movement towards indigenous rights. In the Tonle Sap example those closer to the lake were more focussed on fishing than those further away. Understanding the wider context in which people's livelihoods are fashioned and are changing is important for predicting what is likely and possible.

Likewise building that wider context is also important. The Canadian fisheries examples recognised the importance of building new livelihood options into a stronger local economy that could support and facilitate change.

### *Recognising the interdependence of livelihood components*

Some elements of people's livelihoods are more obviously linked than others: for example skills and knowledge is often linked to market access. But some linkages are more obscure. The example of coastal livelihoods in Cambodia showed how important health was to an individual's ability to work and to invest in change. Likewise, the access to, and clear title over, land was important to promote and support investment in livelihood change. Furthermore it was clear from this research that the livelihoods of individuals are linked to those of other people in the household and to the wider community.

These linkages emphasise the need to be holistic when planning change and not adopt single issue approaches.

### *Recognising that people can be powerful change agents themselves*

In the process of understanding the past it can indicate the extent to which people have been significant agents in the change process. The Jambi Kiwa initiative recognises the internal power that people had to bring about change themselves. This was compounded by them working in a group towards a common goal. In the Cambodia coastal livelihoods research the diversity of livelihood strategies within households and over time indicated the willingness and ability of people to initiate their own change processes. In the Pacific review, around half of the projects studied were initiated by the village people themselves.

### *Engaging in meaningful participation*

The examples demonstrated that different forms of participation are used in developing livelihood change. Some forms are more concerned with extracting information from village people or coercing them to engage in livelihood change processes that they have had little involvement in developing. Where participation has

been much more collegial and empowering, or even led by the people themselves, the people involved have taken on greater responsibility for the change process and become more self-reliant. This was particularly true in the Jambi Kiwa example.

## Direction

### *Developing a shared understanding of the need for change*

Whilst managers of MPAs or other coastal management areas may have identified the need to reduce pressure on the resources they aim to conserve, this may not be recognised by the resource users. A key part of any change process must be to have developed a shared understanding of the need for change. This will help to drive the change process forwards, an important step recognised by corporate change managers.

### *Understanding what helps people to decide to change*

The motivation to decide to change a livelihood strategy, for example away from one which is damaging the reef to one which is more sustainable, is a complex process. Some people see an opportunity to change their livelihoods and are drawn by it, others are pushed by circumstances. In the case of Jambi Kiwa it was a combination of the push of marginalisation and the pull of market opportunity. In the Canadian fisheries case studies it was a decline in resource and market availability. In some cases criminalisation of existing activities can act as a major stimulus, for example the banning of fishing or coral mining in a given area, collect shrimp seed in the coast of India and Bangladesh, or the banning of poppy growing in Afghanistan. But criminalisation of livelihood activities all too often results merely imposing additional risks and costs on the poor. The research in Cambodia's coastal communities showed there that changing livelihoods was generally very opportunistic whereas in India caste linkages to specific types of work makes it difficult to change.

### *Understanding what is important to people about their livelihoods*

In the examples relating to career change an important facet of change was understanding what was important to people about what they did in their existing work or what they would ideally like to be doing. People invariably like some aspects of their work/businesses/livelihoods and dislike others.

Understanding these likes and dislikes and using that knowledge to design change processes can be very important.

### *Sharing a vision of the future*

As important as recognising the need for change is the need to define where the change process will be heading. Corporate change processes are very much concerned with defining clear change goals. In the Tonle Sap example, Appreciative Inquiry was used to develop visions of where livelihood change might lead. A clear vision was also central to the Jambi Kiwa example. Developing and sharing a vision of where a community wants to evolve to helps provide community cohesion in the change process.

As Smart (1989) states, life experiences are strong predictors of vocational preference, but these experiences can be many and complex. Cooper (1973) identifies a range of broad factors that can influence decisions to become an entrepreneur, and IMM et al. (2005) summarises the factors that can push and pull livelihood change from a wide diversity of studies globally. These are likely to change over time as a result of both endogenous changes in the livelihood strategies of the people and exogenous changes in the environment in which they operate.

The work done by Maslow on the hierarchy of motivation indicates how motivation to change can alter over time and with changing circumstances. It is important to recognise this multiplicity of factors and to respond to the diversity rather than focus on specific issues. Likewise, it is important to understand the motives for decision making and to work with them.

### *Understanding the options for change*

Often people do not change because they see no prospects for change. Even when their livelihoods are criminalised they may find it difficult to find alternatives. Part of the motivation for using menu approaches is to provide lists of options for people and this can be useful as one part of a more systematic approach. Good examples of tools which help people to vision ideas beyond their normal scope of operations include the book “Save Na Mekim” (The Melanesian Council of Churches, 1982) which illustrated different rural livelihood activities, gave instructions on how to take them up, illustrated key stages or outputs, and discussed the benefits.

In the case of the Tonle Sap Livelihoods project, Appreciative Inquiry techniques were used to raise people’s awareness about potential livelihood alternatives based on their hopes and aspirations for the future and their strengths and success from the past.

It is important to create an awareness of both opportunities and also to facilitate the development of the vision to recognise how that potential can be used.

## Doing

### *Understanding local power relationships*

An important component of the SLA is the relationship between livelihoods and the formal and informal institutions with which they react. These relationships are often based on relative power and influence and can have an important effect on livelihood changes. This is particularly so for middlemen and women, and for local leaders.

It is important to recognise this role and to engage with these relationships especially where they have a major influence over markets.

### *Building shared leadership and partnership*

The Jambi Kiwa experiences showed how leadership from within the community was important for group mobilisation as was working in partnership and providing mutual support. In business, “champions for change” are often seen as key people to facilitate and engender support around change in business. Partnership is a key part of any group mobilisation process.

The Pacific review also identified leadership, especially in the context of social cohesion, as an important factor in the success of livelihood change processes.

Building on existing leadership skills and partnerships can enhance trust and make working together and providing mutual support easier.

The example of the Cyclone in India demonstrated the importance of people working together and sharing and understanding of, and supporting each other towards, a common goal. Likewise the “One Tambon, One Product” project in Thailand shows the value of working together to access external support and the economies of scale of information exchange and shared marketing.

### *Understanding and matching needs to the market*

When developing new livelihood options it is important to know that such strategies are viable. All too often people have changed on mass to the same new livelihood and saturated the market with goods and services. A key part of avoiding this will be understanding the market. The RALF programme was particularly aware of the need to map market opportunities in advance of livelihood change. Most of the projects in the Pacific review focussed on existing markets where they knew that demand existed. The Canadian fisheries examples went a stage further and tried to develop the local economies further to enhance demand. Staff development activities within companies links staff development to markets – recognising that there is little point in building skills which are not in demand.

Matching people's livelihood options to the market is essential if people are to develop those livelihood strategies to the point where they feel safe and satisfied within them. Likewise, being aware that too many people following the same employment or income earning activity in one area can quickly change market conditions.

#### *Developing a plan for the future which turns visions into reality*

Whilst some processes are driven by a need to change in order to escape for unacceptable circumstances, others have a clear goal of a better life – a vision for the future. Turning this vision into reality is a complex process with many steps. In corporate change processes this complexity is realised and a clear and agreed plan is drawn up to achieve the vision. This can be equally true for livelihood change. It helps people to see where they are going and how they are going to get there.

#### *Enhancing existing livelihoods where possible*

A change from one livelihood to another is not always the only way forwards. Enhancement of existing livelihoods also has a role to play. Enhancement of livelihoods can take several forms: changes in technology, harvesting practices or rehabilitating habitats (e.g. in the Canadian fisheries case studies), improving the business management skills of individuals or improving their access to markets can facilitate a more profitable livelihood and reduce the need to engage in destructive activities that might damage reefs.

The ACREIT example recognises the need to provide support for livelihood development over a period of time and it is recognised that the kind of support that is needed changes as enterprises or livelihood strategies evolve.

Likewise, improved management and more secure access rights to natural resources can increase people's time horizons and reduce their willingness to accept or participate in destructive harvesting practices.

#### *Building upon existing diversity*

It is clear from a number of the examples that livelihood diversification is a strategy that many people have already adopted as part of the coping strategies. This portfolio approach to livelihoods suggests that having more than one source of livelihood income is considered an important part of a wide strategy. Where present, this can be built upon to help the process of livelihood change.

#### *Building upon people's strengths*

A key part of the Appreciative Inquiry method is to focus on people's strengths rather than the problems that they face. The SLA is also more concerned with building on people's potential rather than focussing always on problems. Appreciative Inquiry has demonstrated the power of tapping in to people's strengths and positive experiences to help future visioning and planning.

These approaches can be very powerful in generating motivation for change and for facilitating early successes.

#### *Building entrepreneurial capacity early*

Cooper (1973) recognised the importance of family and early learning on the willingness to become an entrepreneur. The Cambodia coastal livelihoods research recognised the benefits which households provided new entrants into the labour market in helping to build livelihood skills. ACREIT also recognised the need to build skills at school and university as did the Northern Ireland example. A recent experiment in schools in the UK, which rewarded entrepreneurial skills in the young, found that once young people had experienced the benefits of developing a commercially-oriented livelihood under controlled conditions, they were much more likely to move in that direction for a later career.

Supporting the development of entrepreneurship skills in school can help to lay the foundations for a more vibrant economy in the future which creates more opportunities for people to move away from livelihoods that destroy the reefs.

### *Catering for a diversity of skill levels*

In the Jambi Kiwa situation it was recognised that different people had different needs and aspirations, and different capacities to give to the enterprise. Some took on leadership roles whilst others did not. Likewise in the Cambodia coastal livelihoods research it was recognised that there was a complexity of stakeholders with different skills and needs.

Stakeholder analyses can provide a valuable way of differentiating groups and beginning to understand what they need in order to change.

### *Adopting multi-pronged and multi-agency approaches*

Because the support needs of different people vary, reflecting their aspirations, capacities and stage of development, so the kinds and levels of support are likely to be different. In the Canadian fisheries, the Northern Ireland and the ARCEIT examples the problems of livelihood support were addressed using multiple-approaches including the provision of finance, information, training, economic development and advocacy. They also tended to work through a multitude of agencies working together, recognising the limitation and strengths of each.

### *Sequencing support for interventions*

In the case of introducing support for livelihood diversification to address reduced opportunities from management measures, the sequencing of that support can be very important. In most situations, livelihood diversification is introduced to respond to declining livelihood opportunities i.e. the management measures are introduced first. This places additional pressure on the communities concerned when livelihood outcomes are likely to be already depleted from resource over-exploitation or habitat damage. There is also a need to sequence support to livelihood change process to match the stage of development of the livelihoods, enterprises and communities in the change process.

**Photo:** Women collecting bait worm for sale, Phuket, Thailand (© J Tamelander/IUCN).



Introducing livelihood change support before management measures is likely to ease the change process considerably.

#### *Raising awareness in government and NGOs, and facilitating support*

Livelihood change requires both short-term support for the change process but also long-term support for continuing livelihood development. Civil society organisations often play a key role in this process but they cannot work alone. Haggblade et al. (2002) recognised both the importance of the role of government and NGOs in supporting livelihood diversification and the weaknesses in the support. In many cases support for enterprise development falls between ministries and departments and gets missed out of programmes. Specialist agencies, such as those dealing with the coastal or with reefs, rarely have the skills to address livelihood issues. In the Cambodia coastal livelihoods research these weaknesses were recognised and it was suggested that informal linkages between government and NGO agencies were important ways forward. That research included line agencies and NGOs and raised the need for livelihood change up the policy agendas of both organisations. In both the Canadian case studies the importance of engaging with local government, NGO and private sector institutions was recognised.

Raising awareness amongst government and NGO workers about the needs for livelihood change and the roles that they can play is an important facet of success.

#### *Building the capacity of service providers and creating an enabling environment*

Both the RALF example and the ACREIT examples recognised that there are likely to be weaknesses in the local service provision from support agencies. They both provided skills to enhance these service providers so that they would progressively enhance the wider support environment.

Without these, emerging livelihood strategies will find it difficult to survive and thrive. They also recognised the need for a diversity of support structures and processes to cater for different needs and different needs at different times or different stages in development. Likewise the Northern Ireland example recognised the need for a wide diversity of support institutions but provide a focal point of delivery of these services through local "gateway" service points.

Helping to build this enabling environment is essential to both the early survival of new enterprises and livelihood change, and to their long-term growth and profitability.

#### *Working through local institutions*

In the Canadian fisheries examples the need to work through local institutions was recognised early on. This has the benefit of building capacity closer to the change process that can continue after higher levels of support are finished. In the RALF example the need to build local institutions became a significant part of the work.

#### *Clustering support*

The OTOP and Orissa Cyclone examples highlighted the need to achieve critical masses of support and demonstrated the value of working through clusters of people wishing to change their livelihoods rather than spreading too thinly.

#### *Building innovative capacity and continuing livelihood development*

In the Cambodian coastal livelihoods research it was clear that providing people with a new livelihood opportunity overcomes an existing problem but does not necessarily give them the capacity to innovate to face future challenges. Building skills to help individuals and communities to innovate in the face of future changes in their environment is key to long-term survival and growth. A part of the ACOA support, in the Atlantic Groundfish case study, was building innovative capacity. In the RALF programme this was slightly at a distance and operated through building capacity of local institutions.

Building innovation skills and more widely, providing support for continuing livelihood development is important.

### *Targeting service provision*

The work done with women (see example 3) highlighted the need to target these groups in particular. This was echoed by the RALF work in Afghanistan. The work on Cambodian coastal livelihoods recognised the different needs of all major stakeholder groups and the importance of addressing those needs separately and with different approaches.

It is important for support agencies to be aware of this diversity and to target support accordingly.

## **4.3 Summary of Lessons Learnt**

### *Discovery*

1. Understanding how people's livelihoods have evolved;
2. Recognising and responding to the complexity of people's lives;
3. Recognising the different needs of different stakeholder groups;
4. Recognising the importance of context;
5. Recognising the interdependence of livelihood components;
6. Recognising that people can be powerful change agents themselves;
7. Engaging in meaningful participation.

### *Direction*

8. Developing a shared understanding of the need for change;
9. Understanding what helps people to decide to change;
10. Understanding what is important to people about their livelihoods;
11. Sharing a vision of the future;
12. Understanding the options for change.

### *Doing*

13. Understanding local power relationships;
14. Building shared leadership and partnership;
15. Understanding and matching needs to the market;
16. Developing a plan for the future, turning visions into reality;
17. Enhancing existing livelihoods where possible;
18. Building upon existing diversity;
19. Building upon people's strengths;
20. Building innovative capacity and continuing livelihood development;
21. Catering for a diversity of skill levels;
22. Adopting multi-pronged and multi-agency approaches;
23. Sequencing support for interventions;
24. Raising awareness in government and NGOs, and facilitating support;
25. Building the capacity of service providers and creating and enabling environment;
26. Working through local institutions;
27. Clustering support;
28. Building entrepreneurial capacity early;
29. Targeting service provision.

## 5. References

- ACOA (2003). Performance Report for the period ending March 31st, 2003. ACOA, Canada.
- Agrisystems (2004). The Tonle Sap Sustainable Livelihoods (Phase 1) ADB PPTA CAM-4197: Phase 1 Final Report. ABD Draft report.
- Audit and Evaluation Directorate (2004). Summative Evaluation of HRDC's Component of the Pacific Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring Program. Human Resources Development Canada.
- Barrett C. and Readon T. (2000). Asset, Activity and Income Diversification Among African Agriculturists: Some Practical Issues. Unpublished mimeo.
- Bridge S., O'Neil K. and Cromie S. (2003). Understanding Enterprise' Entrepreneurship and Small Business. Palgrave, London.
- Campbell J., Whittingham E. and Townsley P. (2006). Responding to Coastal Poverty: Should we be Doing Things Differently or Doing Different Things? In Hoanh C.T., Tuong T.P. Gowing J.W. and Hardy B. (eds) Environment and Livelihoods in Tropical Coastal Zones. CAB International, London.
- Carney D. (1998). Implementing the Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Approach. In Carney D. (ed): Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What contribution can we make? Papers presented at the DFID's Natural Resources Advisers' Conference, July 1998.
- Carney, d. (undated) Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches: Progress and possibilities for change. DFID, London, UK.
- Churchill N.C. and Lewis V.L. (1983). Growing Concerns: The Five Stages of Small Firm Growth. Harvard Business Review, 1983; May-June: 31,32,34,40
- Cooper A. C. (1973). Technical Entrepreneurship. R&D Management 3: 59-64. In Bridge S., O'Neil K. and Cromie S. (2003). Understanding Enterprise' Entrepreneurship and Small Business. Palgrave, London.
- CTA (1999). The Economic Role of Women in Agricultural and Rural Development: promoting income-generating activities. The summary report of a seminar held in Athens, Greece 18-22 October 1999. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Davis (2006). Pro-Poor Rural Economic and Enterprise Development: A framework for analysis and action (REED). An output from the DFID Poverty Oriented Research Programme R8369. NRI, Chatham, UK.
- Ellis F. (1998). Livelihood Diversification and Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. In Carney D. (ed): Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What contribution can we make? Papers presented at the DFID's Natural Resources Advisers' Conference, July 1998.
- Forest Department of Kenya (2006). Farm Forestry Field Schools Enterprise Catalogue. Forestry Department, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Gordon, A. (1999). Diversity in rural incomes: Issues affecting access at household level. Paper presented at a World Bank Seminar on the Rural Non-farm Economy, 7 June 1999. Washington: World Bank. (unpublished) Chatham Maritime, UK: Natural Resources Institute. (<http://www.nri.org/rnfe/papers.htm>)
- Government of Canada (1998). Fishery Restructuring and Adjustment Measures for the Atlantic Groundfish Industry. News release from the Government of Canada, June 19, 1998. Canada.
- Hast M. (Time Supply Behaviour of Women in Income-Generating Project: A case study of women in the seed multiplication project, Mkushi, Zambia. Minor Field Studies No. 78. Department of Economics at the University of Lund, Lund, Sweden.
- Heller R. (1998). Managing Change. Dorling Kindersley's Essential Managers series. Dorling Kindersley London, UK.
- IMM (2001). Learning Lessons from the Cyclone: A study of DFID's Support for the Post-Cyclone Livelihoods Rehabilitation in Orissa, India.
- IMM (2003a). Sustainable Coastal Livelihoods Project South Asia – Main Report. An output of the Sustainable Coastal Livelihoods Research project, funded by DFID, London, UK.
- IMM (2003b). Major Trends in the Utilisation of Fish in India: Poverty-Policy Considerations. An output from Project R7799 "Changing Fish Utilisation and its Impact on Poverty in India", a project funded under DFID's Post-Harvest Fisheries Research Programme, London, UK.
- IMM, CFDO and CBNRM LI. (2005). Understanding the Factors that Support or Inhibit Livelihood Diversification in Coastal Cambodia. An output from DFID-funded research in Cambodia. IMM Ltd, Exeter, UK.

- Krueger N.F. (1995). Perceptions of opportunity: How communities Can Create Potential Entrepreneurs. Washington DC: Small Business Foundation of America, Working Paper 93-03.
- Kühlmann K.J. (2002). Evaluatof Marine Reserves as Basis to Develop Alternative Livelihoods in Coastal Areas of the Philippines. *Aquaculture International* 10: 527-549. Kluwer, Netherlands.
- Luttrell C., Hoang V.S., Ha L.T., Cao T.V., Ngo L., Vu D.X and Dau T.L.H. (2004) Sustainable Livelihood Opportunities and Resource Management in Coastline Communes Facing Special Difficulties. Ministry of Planning and Investment, Partnership to Assist the Poorest Communes. Vietnam.
- McNeil M.R., Hicks P., Bhattacharyya K, Ostertag C. F. and pain A. (2006). Enhancing Livelihoods for Resource Poor Households in the Afghan Hindu Kush Using the Territorial Approach to Agroenterprise Development. RALF project website: [www.icarda.cgiar.org/RALFweb.RALF.htm](http://www.icarda.cgiar.org/RALFweb.RALF.htm)
- Melanesian Coucil of Churches (1982). Save na Mekim: Buk bilong kain kain wok na kain kain samting bilong helpim sindaun bilong yumi. Wirui Press, Weak, Papua New Guinea.
- O'Garra T. (2007) Supplementary Livelihood Options for Pacific Island Communities: A review of experiences. FSPI.
- Pannkuk C.D. (2003). Village Decision Driven Research Project - Project Document. RALF project website: [www.icarda.cgiar.org/RALFweb.RALF.htm](http://www.icarda.cgiar.org/RALFweb.RALF.htm)
- Reitan B. (1997). Where do we learn that entrepreneurship is feasible, desirable, and/or profitable? Paper presented to the ICSB World Conference.
- Rubec P. J., Pratt V.R. and Cruz F. (2001). Territorial Use Rights In Fisheries to Manage Areas for Farming Coral Reef Fish and Invertebrates for the Aquarium Trade. *Aquarium Sciences and Conservation* 3: 119-134. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands.
- Smart J (1989). Life History Influences on Holland Vocational Type. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Volume 34, pp 69-87.
- Storey D.J. (1994). *Understanding the Small Business Sector*. Routledge, London. In Bridge S., O'Neil K. and Cromie S. (2003). *Understanding Enterprise' Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. Palgrave, London.
- UNEP (2006). *Marine and Coastal Ecosystems and Human Well-being: A synthesis report based on the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment*. UNDP, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Whittingham E., Campbell J. and Townsley P. (2003). *Poverty and Reefs*. DFID-IMM-IOC/UNESCO, UNESCO, Paris, France.
- Willing J. (2007). Expert Meeting on the Human Side of Fisheries Adjustment: Chair's summary. In: *Structural Change in Fisheries Dealing with the Human Dimension*. OECD, Paris.
- World Bank (2006). *Scaling Up Marine Management: The role of marine protected areas*. Report number 36635-GLB. The World Bank, Washington, USA.



**International Union for  
Conservation of Nature**

IUCN Global Marine Programme  
Rue Mauverney 28  
1196 Gland  
Switzerland

[www.iucn.org/marine](http://www.iucn.org/marine)

IUCN Asia  
Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group  
63 Sukhumvit Soi 39 Wattana  
Bangkok 10110  
Thailand



**IMM Ltd**

**IMM Ltd,**

The Innovation Centre,  
Rennes Drive,  
University of Exeter,  
Exeter EX4 4RN  
UK

[www.imm.uk.com](http://www.imm.uk.com)



International Union for Conservation of Nature 2008

