

Small-Scale Fishery Development Plan in the Samana Area



Project Sites Samana Area

1. Background of Project

The Government of the Dominican Republic has placed importance on fishing as a source of protein of its citizens. In this regard, the "Plan to develop Coastal Fishery Resources" has been enforced with the aim of increasing marine product production and the steady supply of such products to the people.

On the other hand, most of the fishermen working in Samana Bay, in which 34% of the fisherman population is concentrated, are small scale and live below the poverty line. Based on such a background, the Government of the Dominican Republic requested cooperation from Japan to assist the self-reliance of the fishermen through means such as fishing practices, with the intention of establishing sustainable fishing guidance and training systems at CED-EP, which is the marine development training organization in the area.

2. Project Overview

(1) Period of Cooperation

1 August 1996 – 31 July 1999

(2) Type of Cooperation

Experts Team Dispatch Program

(3) Partner Country's Implementing Organization

Centro de Entrenamiento y Desarrollo Presquero (CEDEP), Ministry of Agriculture

(4) Narrative Summary

1) Overall Goal

Small fishing is promoted in the Samana area.

2) Project Purpose

The independence of those involved in small fishing in the Samana area is promoted by the improvement of the management and the execution system of CEDEP.

3) Outputs

- a) The management and execution system of CED-EP is established.
- b) The technical level of the CEDEP staff members is improved by the training.
- c) The technical level of the fishermen of the Samana area is improved by the training.

d) Training materials are developed.

4) Inputs

Japanese Side

Long-term experts	2
Short-term experts	4
Trainees received	5
Equipment	25 million yen

Dominican Republic Side

Local costs	3 million yen
Land, facilities and equipment	

3. Members of Evaluation Team

JICA Dominican Republic Office
(Commissioned to a Local Consultant: Eco Mar Program)

4. Period of Evaluation

Mid-February 2001 – March 2001

5. Results of Evaluation

(1) Relevance

In the Dominican Republic, the fishing industry have provided the nationwide supply of the protein and played an important role. However, many fishermen were living below the poverty line. This project set as its goal the promotion of the self-reliance of small fishermen. The relevance in this sense was thus high.

Moreover, in Samana, there were many fishermen engaging in fishing out of economic need. Partly due to this, the fishing methods and equipment were problematic from the viewpoint of ocean resources protection, which was also considered by the project. There is a satisfactory level of relevance from this as well.

(2) Effectiveness

In this project, the experts of the Japanese side made 26 kinds of training manuals in seven areas, and training was carried out. As a result the technical level of the CEDEP staff improved. However, the goal of establishing the management and operation system of CEDEP was not successful due to the lack of budget expenditure from the

Ministry of Agriculture and to the weakness of the management and financial administration of CEDEP.

The bottom long line fishing method introduced to the fisherman through the training. In comparison with the conventional fishing method, this method registered a 2.5 fold increase in efficiency and a 50% increase in the amount of fishing products and profit, which had a strong impression on the fishermen. The level of technology was thus improved. However, the number of fishermen participating in the training was confined to a small number – 56 people over three years.

From these facts, it is difficult to say that the objective of "the improvement of the technological level of the fishermen" is widely achieved. Based on this, the degree of achievement of this project as a whole is evaluated to be low.

(3) Efficiency

As for the materials provided to CEDEP, they can be said to be appropriate in terms of type and quantity, and the timing of their provision was as planned.

However, on the other hand, the expenditure of the Ministry of Agriculture was confined to 18% of the budget plans of initially planned, and CEDEP sold the fishing products from the practical training for making up for deficiency with the revenue from the products. A situation occurred in which the staff members took time to sell the fishing product, although they were originally supposed to be engaged in practical training with the fishermen. Because of this, the average number of fishermen who were able to participate in the training was only as few as 17 per year, and the efficiency of the training can be evaluated as being low.

(4) Impact

By the introduction of the new fishing method such as the bottom long line method, the operating depth of water deepened in the Samana area to 90-600m from the usual 90-300m, and it became possible to catch species of fish that were formerly difficult to catch. This developed the fishing possibilities of the Samana area, and it showed the opportunity that lies in the extension of technology related to fishing and new fishing methods. In this sense, this project had the positive impact.

However, in the Samana area, where 55 locations on the 300 km coastline are dotted with about 3,000 fishermen, and considering the fact that the number of the fishermen who participated in the training carried out by CEDEP was extremely small, it is difficult to evaluate whether or not this project had enough direct impact in terms of improving the socioeconomic conditions of the area.

(5) Sustainability

The financial and management assistance by the government for CEDEP has been insufficient. The degree of independent financial development is also low, and the organization execution and management system of CEDEP is not fully established. By the sales of the fishing products, it tried to generate self-income resources. However, this resulted in straying from the original duty, which was to provide the opportunity for training for the fishermen. Therefore, the authority and the reputation of CEDEP



CEDEP

EP in the local fishing sector are low. In this sense, it is difficult to say that the degree of sustainability is high as a whole.

6. Lessons Learned and Recommendations

(1) Lessons Learned

In the case of fishing training for the fishermen, not only fishing method is taught, but it also is necessary to teach protection of fishing resources from a medium-term perspective, including the dangers of over-fishing. In other words, alongside learning methods for increasing the amount of fish caught is learned, it is also necessary to provide a good knowledge of fishing periods, locations and types.

In the fishing project, selling the fishing products and using the profits for the project execution costs should be avoided. By doing so, the organizational financial problems are not being fundamentally solved, and the original purpose of the project is not sufficiently recognized. Also, unnecessary competition may start with local fishermen in the sale of the fishing products. This may cause friction with the local community.

(2) Recommendations

First, financial support must be secured fully. Second, in the occasion of the training, consideration is necessary for fishermen to have equal opportunity to receive the training by the means of making a fishermen registration list in the applicable areas. Finally, for the early solution of problems, a system to periodically carry out evaluation is necessary.