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Introduction/Background

1976
- Founding of GAM

1989 - 2000
- Military zone
- Humanitarian pause
- CoHA
- Special autonomy

2001-2003
- Martial Law/State of Emergency
- Tsunami

2003-2004
- Trigger for change?

2005
- Martial Law
- Relief/recovery

2006-2009
- Recovery

2013
- Donor intervention
Overall Objective

To assess whether donor agency interventions and the peace agreement generated changes in the aquaculture industry with an emphasis on determining to what extent there was a shift in aquaculture management in Aceh.
Methods

- Case studies
- Document analysis
- In-depth interview
- Farmer surveys
- Direct observation
Perceived Positive changes

- World (donors) focus on Aceh
- Peace agreement
- Local Government Law
- Investment by government
- Safer environment
- Security
- Ex-combatants became farmers, integrated into village activities
- Economic security
Resources from donors

Rehabilitation

Capacity building

Combatant village

Source: Field visit, 2013 and Jesmond Sammut
Perceived positive change

Social/political
Peace agreement
August 15, 2005.
Wali Nanggroe Law/
Qanun Wali Nanggroe
Qanun No. 8/2012

Economy
Government of Aceh Law
Fishery Law
Qanun No. 7/2010
Perceptions of negative changes

1. A decrease in production and income
   “Aquaculture is not more developed compared to before the tsunami” (Respondent)

2. Livelihood shift between farmer to fisherman
   “Aquaculture became a subsistence livelihood... It was not like that in the past, where farming was the main source of livelihood” (Respondent)

3. Unimplemented and unused technology and input
   “When we were back, none of mangrove trees were left. Conflict happened between group members. Assets were sold and divided” (Respondent)
Figure 1. Production, area and number of farmers of brackishwater ponds in Aceh Province
Perceptions of negative changes

- Conflict due to aid
- Aid dependency
- Erosion of the culture of communal work

Is the donor intervention effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.57%</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why were the benefits of interventions not sustained?

- Lack of coordination
- Poor institutional capability
- Limited exit strategy
- Lack of monitoring and evaluation
- Conflict caused by uneven distribution of aid
  - Conflict between farmers and fishermen
  - Conflict between wants and needs
  - Lack of trust in government and community
- Challenges specific to Aceh
  - Traumatic stress due to conflict and tsunami
- Short period of time to spend resources
- Absent of identification and need assessment
- Seeing humanitarian aid as a project
- Lack of transparency (corruption)

Internal vs External
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