



# Baseline Study for the Tuungane Health and Conservation Project

Social Assessment of Lake Tanganyika  
Households



Sustain East Africa

November 2024

# Table of Contents

---

Summary	6
Introduction	7
Poverty Probability Index	10
Quantitative Analysis	11
Livelihoods	12
Living Conditions, Housing, and Energy Use	15
Household Items	21
Access to Credit	23
Beach Management Units (BMU)	27
Fishers	29
Fish Trading	42
Fish Processing	46
Bibliography	51

# List of Tables

---

1 Proportion of household heads born in the ward	9
2 Percentage (%) estimates of the Poverty Probability Index (PPI) for households	10
3 Water treatment in the dry season at village level (%)	15
4 Main water source in the dry season at village level (%)	17
5 Sanitation facilities at village level (%)	18
6 Handwashing at village level (%)	19
7 Asset ownership at village level (%)	21
8 Access rights, security, and decision making around fisheries resources at village level (%)	30
9 Awareness and acceptance of fish reserves at village level (%)	32
10 Group membership of fishers at village level (%)	40
11 BMU awareness and participation at village level (%)	41
12 Group membership of fishers at village level (%)	45
13 Group membership of fish processors at village level (%)	50



# List of Figures

1 Map of lake Tanganyika with sample sizes from each locations	8
2 Population pyramid	8
3 Self-assessment of the ability to meet daily needs at village level	12
4 Type of fishing boats used at village level	13
5 Relative importance of different species at village level	14
6 Main type of water treatment in the dry season	15
7 Main source of water in the dry season	16
8 Household item ownership	21
9 Proportion of households that borrowed money in the last year at village level	23
10 Purpose of the loan	24
11 Source of loans	24
12 Reason for not having borrowed any money in the previous year	25
13 Household membership of a COCOBA, SACCO, or FICO at village level (%)	26
14 Mobile phone usage for financial transactions at village level (%)	26
15 Household participation in BMU activities over the past 12 months at village leve (%)	27
16 Household awareness of BMUs at village leve (%)	28
17 BMU membership at village leve (%)	28
18 BMU membership at village leve (%)	29
19 Self-assessment of fisheries resource management over the past five years	30
20 Satisfaction with involvement in decision-making around fisheries resources?	31
21 An indication of the relationship with fisheries extension officers	32
22 At the moment, do you think the current number of fish in the lake is sufficient to meet the fishing, food, and livelihood needs of the community?	33
23 In the future, do you think there will be sufficient fish for the communities	34
24 Type of fishing gear used at village level (%)	34
25 Seasonal targeting of fish species over the past five years	35
26 Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years	37
27 Lowest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years	37
28 Satisfaction levels of fishers	38
29 Do you think BMUs are helpful to improving your fishing practices?	40
30 Do you think your current activities are likely to support your needs over the long term (next 5 - 10 years) ?	42
31 Forms of fish trading	43
32 Seasonal trading of fish species over the past five years	43
33 Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish traders	44
34 Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish traders	44
35 Satisfaction of fish traders	45
36 Do you think your current trading activities are likely to support your needs over the long term (next 5 - 10 years) ?	46
37 Processing form at village level (%)	47
38 Processing equipment at village level (%)	47



39 Seasonal processing of fish species over the past five years	48
40 Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish processors	48
41 Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish processors	49
42 Satisfaction of fish traders	49
43 Do you think your current processing activities are likely to support your needs over the long term (next 5 - 10 years) ?	51



## **Disclaimer**

Disclaimer

## **Rights**

Rights

## **Suggested citation**

Please cite this report as such :

## **Acknowledgements**

Acknowledgements



# Summary

---

Provide broad overview of key findings

# Introduction

---

Intro text...

# General Household Information

Household sample sizes across villages along the lake Tanganyika shoreline.




Figure 1: Map of lake Tanganyika with sample sizes from each locations

## Population Pyramid




Figure 2: Population pyramid






Table 1: Proportion of household heads born in the ward


Village	Yes	No	Average years spent if not born
ISASA	56.4%	43.6%	18.5
IZINGA	18.2%	81.8%	26.4
KALA	10.5%	89.5%	21.0
KALUNGU	48.3%	51.7%	18.2
KATENGE	53.3%	46.7%	25.4
KICHANGANI	57.8%	42.2%	22.0
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	31.6%	68.4%	18.2
KIPILI	25%	75%	26.9
KIZUMBI	22.6%	77.4%	21.4
LYAPINDA	38.5%	61.5%	22.9
MAJENGO MAPYA	13.8%	86.2%	6.5
MANDA KERENGE	28.7%	71.3%	20.5
MANDA UHURU	10.5%	89.5%	28.5
MKINGA	30.6%	69.4%	22.9
MPASA	19.5%	80.5%	23.1
MTAKUJA	32.7%	67.3%	31.5
MWINZA	12.8%	87.2%	27.6
NG'ANGA	16.7%	83.3%	29.7
NTANGANYIKA	36.1%	63.9%	20.5
TUNDU	25%	75%	19.6
WAMPEMBE	18.6%	81.4%	19.7



## Poverty Probability Index

Table 2: Percentage (%) estimates of the Poverty Probability Index (PPI) for households

Category	Upper National Poverty Line	Lower National Poverty Line	Extreme Poverty Line
Overall	63.6	58.2	25.6
Male	65.7	60.1	26.5
Female	56.3	52.1	22.4
Youth	61.5	55.7	22.8



# Quantitative Analysis

---

# Livelihoods

## Household welfare self-assessment




Figure 3: Self-assessment of the ability to meet daily needs at village level



# Fishing




Figure 4: Type of fishing boats used at village level

Relative importance of different species at village level






Figure 5: Relative importance of different species at village level



# Living Conditions, Housing, and Energy Use

## Water Use




Figure 6: Main type of water treatment in the dry season

Table 3: Water treatment in the dry season at village level (%)

Village	Add Bleach or Chlorine	Boil	Strain Through a Cloth	Use Water Filter	Let it Stand and Settle
ISASA	62.9%	34.3%	2.9%		
IZINGA		55%	45%		
KALA		58.6%	41.4%		
KALUNGU	6.8%	71.6%	21.6%		
KATENGE		33.3%	66.7%		
KICHANGANI	13.6%	40.9%	36.4%	9.1%	
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	12.5%	62.5%	25%		
KIPILI	7.1%	42.9%	50%		



Village	Add Bleach or Chlorine	Boil	Strain Through a Cloth	Use Water Filter	Let it Stand and Settle
KIZUMBI		80%	20%		
LYAPINDA	11.8%	41.2%	47.1%		
MAJENGO MAPYA	5.6%	66.7%	27.8%		
MANDA KERENGE	10.1%	64%	25.9%		
MANDA UHURU	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%		
MKINGA	15.4%	65.4%	19.2%		
MPASA	26.7%	53.3%	20%		
MTAKUJA	29.3%	43.9%	19.5%	7.3%	
MWINZA		73.3%	26.7%		
NG'ANGA		50%	50%		
NTANGANYIKA	24%	40%	36%		
TUNDU		71.4%	28.6%		
WAMPEMBE	4.5%	45.5%	45.5%		4.5%




Figure 7: Main source of water in the dry season





Table 4: Main water source in the dry season at village level (%)



Village	Neighbour's Open Well	Neighbour's Tap	Open Public Well	Piped into Plot	Pond or Lake	Protected Public Well	Protected Well in Plot	Public Tap	River or Stream
ISASA	2.6%	2.6%	17.9%	5.1%	2.6%	15.4%	7.7%	7.7%	33.3%
IZINGA			7.3%		7.3%	38.2%			45.5%
KALA					5.3%				94.7%
KALUNGU			17.2%		10.3%	13.8%	1.1%	12.6%	31%
KATENGE			20%		6.7%	20%			53.3%
KICHANGANI	6.7%		24.4%		2.2%	4.4%	2.2%	11.1%	24.4%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI					10.5%	2.6%		86.8%	
KIPILI	1.8%	1.8%		3.6%	12.5%	8.9%		66.1%	1.8%
KIZUMBI					3.2%				96.8%
LYAPINDA			40%		4.6%	7.7%			38.5%
MAJENGO MAPYA			16.7%		20%	6.7%		53.3%	
MANDA KERENGE					93.5%				2.8%
MANDA UHURU					84.2%			5.3%	5.3%
MKINGA			4.1%		6.1%	26.5%		59.2%	
MPASA					8%	1.1%		87.4%	1.1%
MTAKUJA	2%	2%	2%		12.2%	6.1%	2%	8.2%	32.7%
MWINZA					2.6%				97.4%
NG'ANGA			11.1%		27.8%				55.6%
NTANGANYIKA			8.3%		25%	25%		33.3%	2.8%
TUNDU					3.1%	6.2%		53.1%	37.5%
WAMPEMBE	0.9%		50.4%		2.7%	22.1%		21.2%	0.9%

## Sanitation

Table 5: Sanitation facilities at village level (%)



Village	Shared Sanitation Facility	Flush elsewhere	Flush to pit latrine	No facility	Pit latrine with slab	Open pit	Composting toilet	VIP latrine	Other
ISASA	17.9%	7.7%	69.2%	2.6%	5.1%	15.4%			
IZINGA	11.1%	1.8%	12.7%	1.8%	16.4%	63.6%	1.8%	1.8%	
KALA	24.3%	2.6%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	73.7%		7.9%	
KALUNGU	16.1%	1.1%	24.1%		14.9%	47.1%		12.6%	
KATENGE	6.7%		6.7%		20%	73.3%			
KICHANGANI	22.2%	15.6%	31.1%	2.2%	4.4%	24.4%		22.2%	
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	26.3%		26.3%		2.6%	63.2%		7.9%	
KIPILI	23.2%	3.6%	30.4%	5.4%	21.4%	21.4%		17.9%	
KIZUMBI	12.9%		6.5%		25.8%	58.1%		9.7%	
LYAPINDA	15.4%	1.5%	3.1%	3.1%	9.2%	80%		3.1%	
MAJENGO MAPYA	31%		6.7%	3.3%	20%	63.3%		6.7%	
MANDA KERENGE	15.7%	2.8%	19.4%	0.9%	18.5%	43.5%		13%	1.9%
MANDA UHURU	33.3%		5.3%	15.8%	26.3%	52.6%			
MKINGA	18.4%		18.4%	2%	6.1%	65.3%		8.2%	
MPASA	23%	3.4%	5.7%		11.5%	75.9%		3.4%	
MTAKUJA	20.4%	4.1%	40.8%		20.4%	12.2%		22.4%	
MWINZA	23.1%		2.6%		7.7%	84.6%	2.6%	2.6%	
NG'ANGA	33.3%				16.7%	83.3%			
NTANGANYIKA	41.7%	2.8%	41.7%	2.8%	13.9%	36.1%		2.8%	
TUNDU	40.6%		9.4%	3.1%	12.5%	71.9%		3.1%	
WAMPEMBE	18.6%	0.9%	9.7%		18.6%	60.2%	0.9%	9.7%	

Table 6: Handwashing at village level (%)



Village	Handwashing Place Available	Soap	Tippy Tap	Water
ISASA	48.7%	27.8%	19.4%	52.8%
IZINGA	14.5%	46.7%		53.3%
KALA	5.3%	33.3%		66.7%
KALUNGU	56.3%	44.2%	10.6%	45.2%
KATENGE	20%	40%		60%
KICHANGANI	22.2%	43.8%	6.2%	50%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	23.7%	42.1%	21.1%	36.8%
KIPILI	23.2%	36.4%	4.5%	59.1%
KIZUMBI	19.4%	46.2%	7.7%	46.2%
LYAPINDA	9.2%	37.5%		62.5%
MAJENGO MAPYA	36.7%	30.4%	26.1%	43.5%
MANDA KERENGE	25%	43.6%	12.7%	43.6%
MANDA UHURU	36.8%	41.7%		58.3%
MKINGA	36.7%	48.6%		51.4%
MPASA	28.2%	37.2%	9.3%	53.5%
MTAKUJA	51%	43.2%	2.3%	54.5%
MWINZA	12.8%	33.3%	11.1%	55.6%
NG'ANGA	11.1%			100%
NTANGANYIKA	41.7%	41.7%	12.5%	45.8%
TUNDU	28.1%	25%	8.3%	66.7%
WAMPEMBE	9.7%	45%	5%	50%



# Household Items




Figure 8: Household item ownership

Table 7: Asset ownership at village level (%)



Village	Bed or Mattress	Clock	Generator	Iron	Mobile Phone	Radio	Refrigerator	Smartphone	Sofa	Stove
ISASA	17.3%	0.9%	0.9%	7.7%	15.9%	10%	1.4%	6.8%	1.4%	1%
IZINGA	26.3%	1%	0.5%	1.4%	19.6%	12%	0.5%	1.9%	0.5%	2%
KALA	22.8%	0.7%		3.7%	20.6%	11.8%			1.5%	2%
KALUNGU	19%	0.9%	0.5%	3.3%	16.2%	10.8%	0.7%	4.7%	1.6%	1%
KATENGE	32.6%				23.9%	8.7%		2.2%		
KICHANGANI	16.8%	1.6%		6.8%	15.2%	7.6%	1.2%	5.2%	2.4%	
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	21%		1.2%	4.2%	17.4%	13.2%		4.2%		1%
KIPILI	19.8%	0.7%	0.4%	3.2%	15.9%	9.5%	1.1%	4.6%	2.8%	1%
KIZUMBI	23.3%			4.3%	19%	13.8%	0.9%	0.9%		2%
LYAPINDA	24.4%	0.5%		1.9%	18.3%	15%		2.8%	0.9%	2%
MAJENGO MAPYA	26.9%			0.9%	23.1%	10.2%		2.8%		2%
MANDA KERENGE	19.6%			2.8%	15.6%	10.3%	1.2%	7.1%	3%	1%
MANDA UHURU	22.2%			2.5%	17.3%	9.9%		4.9%	2.5%	1%
MKINGA	21%	0.5%		2.5%	18.5%	10%		2.5%	3%	
MPASA	21.4%		0.3%	4.5%	18.5%	12.1%	0.3%	4%	1.8%	1%
MTAKUJA	15.3%	1%	0.3%	7.5%	14.3%	9.4%	1.9%	5.5%	5.2%	
MWINZA	27.8%			3.2%	20.6%	10.3%		2.4%		2%
NG'ANGA	27.9%				21.3%	8.2%		3.3%		
NTANGANYIKA	18.7%	0.5%		4.9%	15.9%	12.1%	0.5%	6.6%	2.7%	1%
TUNDU	26.3%				22.2%	11.1%		2%		2%
WAMPEMBE	20.4%	0.4%	0.4%	3.3%	18.5%	10.7%	1.6%	4.1%	3.7%	1%



## Access to Credit

Proportion of households that borrowed money in the last year at village level




Figure 9: Proportion of households that borrowed money in the last year at village level






Figure 10: Purpose of the loan




Figure 11: Source of loans





### Reason for not having borrowed any money in the previous year




Figure 12: Reason for not having borrowed any money in the previous year






Figure 13: Household membership of a COCOBA, SACCO, or FICO at village level (%)




Figure 14: Mobile phone usage for financial transactions at village level (%)



## Beach Management Units (BMU)




Figure 15: Household participation in BMU activities over the past 12 months at village level (%)






Figure 16: Household awareness of BMUs at village leve (%)




Figure 17: BMU membership at village leve (%)






Figure 18: BMU membership at village leve (%)

## Fishers






Figure 19: Self-assessment of fisheries resource management over the past five years

Table 8: Access rights, security, and decision making around fisheries resources at village level (%)

Village	Rights to access and use fishery resources are being upheld by regulatory and/or communal systems	Happy with the current security of your rights over fisheries resources	Involved in decision-making processes regarding fisheries resources
ISASA	70%	60%	40%
IZINGA	46.2%	53.8%	11.5%
KALA	71.4%	64.3%	7.1%
KALUNGU	51.4%	72.2%	30.6%
KATENGE	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%
KICHANGANI	60%	80%	40%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	69.2%	64.3%	35.7%
KIPILI	64.3%	64.3%	50%
KIZUMBI	50%	66.7%	10%
LYAPINDA	75%	60.7%	7.1%
MAJENGO			



Village	Rights to access and use fishery resources are being upheld by regulatory and/or communal systems	Happy with the current security of your rights over fisheries resources	Involved in decision-making processes regarding fisheries resources
MAPYA	53.8%	69.2%	
MANDA KERENGE	67.8%	66.1%	40.7%
MANDA UHURU	55.6%	44.4%	44.4%
MKINGA	100%	100%	45.5%
MPASA	42.4%	57.6%	15.2%
MTAKUJA	40%	60%	40%
MWINZA	66.7%	60%	20%
NG'ANGA	20%	40%	
NTANGANYIKA	64.3%	50%	42.9%
TUNDU	45.5%	54.5%	
WAMPEMBE	48.9%	55.6%	17.8%




Figure 20: Satisfaction with involvement in decision-making around fisheries resources?






Figure 21: An indication of the relationship with fisheries extension officers

Table 9: Awareness and acceptance of fish reserves at village level (%)

Village	Aware of fish reserves	Aware of fish reserve purpose	Think fish reserves are a good idea
ISASA	100%	100%	80%
IZINGA	73.1%	57.7%	86.4%
KALA	100%	100%	92.9%
KALUNGU	83.3%	91.2%	90.6%
KATENGE	57.1%	42.9%	50%
KICHANGANI	100%	90%	100%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	85.7%	92.9%	100%
KIPIILI	92.9%	100%	92.9%
KIZUMBI	60%	80%	80%
LYAPINDA	78.6%	77.8%	92.9%
MAJENGO MAPYA	92.3%	100%	100%





Village	Aware of fish reserves	Aware of fish reserve purpose	Think fish reserves are a good idea
MANDA UHURU	100%	88.9%	100%
MKINGA	100%	100%	100%
MPASA	93.9%	93.9%	87.9%
MTAKUJA	93.3%	100%	93.3%
MWINZA	73.3%	60%	78.6%
NG'ANGA	20%	40%	66.7%
NTANGANYIKA	92.3%	100%	92.9%
TUNDU	40%	70%	77.8%
WAMPEMBE	77.8%	77.8%	83.7%




Figure 22: At the moment, do you think the current number of fish in the lake is sufficient to meet the fishing, food, and livelihood needs of the community?






Figure 23: In the future, do you think there will be sufficient fish for the communities





Figure 24: Type of fishing gear used at village level (%)






Figure 25: Seasonal targeting of fish species over the past five years

village	Less than 2 hrs	Less than 6 hrs	Less than 10 hrs	More than 10 hrs	Mean time (hrs)
ISASA	20%	60%	20%	0%	03:28:00
IZINGA	38.5%	61.5%	0%	0%	02:05:00
KALA	21.4%	71.4%	0%	7.1%	03:57:00
KALUNGU	8.3%	91.7%	0%	0%	02:56:00
KATENGE	28.6%	71.4%	0%	0%	02:30:00
KICHANGANI	20%	70%	0%	10%	03:42:00
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI	28.6%	71.4%	0%	0%	02:16:00
KIPIILI	42.9%	50%	0%	7.1%	02:26:00
KIZUMBI	50%	50%	0%	0%	02:08:00
LYAPINDA	17.9%	78.6%	3.6%	0%	02:53:00
MAJENGO MAPYA	23.1%	76.9%	0%	0%	02:46:00
MANDA KERENGE	33.9%	57.6%	1.7%	6.8%	02:52:00



village	Less than 2 hrs	Less than 6 hrs	Less than 10 hrs	More than 10 hrs	Mean time (hrs)
MANDA UHURU	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%	01:55:00
MKINGA	45.5%	45.5%	0%	9.1%	03:30:00
MPASA	21.2%	78.8%	0%	0%	02:31:00
MTAKUJA	20%	80%	0%	0%	02:50:00
MWINZA	26.7%	73.3%	0%	0%	02:25:00
NG'ANGA	40%	60%	0%	0%	02:24:00
NTANGANYIKA	21.4%	71.4%	0%	7.1%	03:36:00
TUNDU	36.4%	63.6%	0%	0%	02:30:00
WAMPEMBE	33.3%	66.7%	0%	0%	02:13:00

Response	Change in time needed to get to grounds compared to 5 years ago (%)	Change in average catch per trip compared to 5 years ago (%)
Decreased	29.6%	66.7%
Increased	29%	15%
Not Sure	1.8%	1.4%
No Change	39.6%	17%






Figure 26: Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years




Figure 27: Lowest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years







Figure 28: Satisfaction levels of fishers








Figure 29: Do you think BMUs are helpful to improving your fishing practices?

Table 10: Group membership of fishers at village level (%)

Village	Cooperative/FICO	COCOBA or savigns group	Other group	Group is TNC supported	Group is helpful
ISASA	10%			100%	100%
IZINGA					
KALA					
KALUNGU	5.6%			100%	100%
KATENGE	14.3%			100%	100%
KICHANGANI	20%	10%	22.2%	100%	33.3%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI					
KIPILI					
KIZUMBI					
LYAPINDA					
MAJENGO MAPYA					





Village	Cooperative/FICO	COCOBA or savigns group	Other group	Group is TNC supported	Group is helpful
MANDA KERENGE		15.3%	2.1%	80%	44.4%
MANDA UHURU	33.3%			100%	66.7%
MKINGA		9.1%		100%	100%
MPASA					
MTAKUJA	6.7%			100%	100%
MWINZA					
NG'ANGA					
NTANGANYIKA		7.1%		100%	100%
TUNDU					
WAMPEMBE		2.2%			100%

Table 11: BMU awareness and participation at village level (%)

Village	Aware of BMUs	Has participated in BMU activity	Member of BMU	BMU is TNC supported	Women in BMU leadership	Youth in BMU
ISASA	86.5%	41%	40.6%	4.5%	86.2%	96.4%
IZINGA	3.6%	1.8%		50%	100%	100%
KALA						
KALUNGU	82.8%	23%	20.8%		96.6%	91.5%
KATENGE						
KICHANGANI	82.2%	35.6%	37.8%		96.8%	96.7%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI		2.6%				
KIPILI	79.6%	33.9%	39.5%	5.1%	100%	100%
KIZUMBI						
LYAPINDA						
MAJENGO MAPYA	82.1%	16.7%	21.7%	22.2%	94.7%	94.7%
MANDA KERENGE	89.8%	33.3%	47.4%		94.6%	94.7%



Village	Aware of BMUs	Has participated in BMU activity	Member of BMU	BMU is TNC supported	Women in BMU leadership	Youth in BMU
MKINGA	85.7%	33.3%	28.6%	2.8%	100%	100%
MPASA						
MTAKUJA	81.6%	46.9%	52.5%		86.1%	89.2%
MWINZA	2.6%		100%			100%
NG'ANGA	5.6%			100%	100%	100%
NTANGANYIKA	94.3%	47.2%	39.4%		93.3%	96.8%
TUNDU						
WAMPEMBE						




Figure 30: Do you think your current activities are likely to support your needs over the long term (next 5 - 10 years)?

## Fish Trading






Figure 31: Forms of fish trading




Figure 32: Seasonal trading of fish species over the past five years






Figure 33: Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish traders




Figure 34: Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish traders






Figure 35: Satisfaction of fish traders

Table 12: Group membership of fishers at village level (%)

Village	Cooperative/FICO	COCOBA or savigns group	Other group	Group is TNC supported	Group is helpful
ISASA		22.2%	11.1%	33.3%	100%
IZINGA					
KALA					
KALUNGU	27.3%	9.1%	9.1%	100%	100%
KATENGE					
KICHANGANI		14.3%		100%	100%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI					
KIPILI	9.1%		9.1%	50%	100%
KIZUMBI					
LYAPINDA					
MAJENGO MAPYA	100%			100%	100%



Village	Cooperative/FICO	COCOBA or savigns group	Other group	Group is TNC supported	Group is helpful
MANDA KERENGE		5.3%		100%	
MANDA UHURU	50%			100%	50%
MPASA					
MTAKUJA	33.3%	16.7%	8.3%	80%	60%
MWINZA					
NG'ANGA					
NTANGANYIKA					
WAMPEMBE			20%		100%




Figure 36: Do you think your current trading activities are likely to support your needs over the long term (next 5 - 10 years)?

## Fish Processing






Figure 37: Processing form at village level (%)




Figure 38: Processing equipment at village level (%)






Figure 39: Seasonal processing of fish species over the past five years




Figure 40: Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish processors








Figure 41: Highest sale prices (TSh) of fish species over the past five years for fish processors




Figure 42: Satisfaction of fish traders



Table 13: Group membership of fish processors at village level (%)

Village	Cooperative/FICO	COCOBA or savigns group	Other group	Group is TNC supported	Group is helpful
ISASA					
IZINGA					
KALA					
KALUNGU	22.2%	11.1%		100%	66.7%
KILAMBO CHA MKOLECHI					
KIPILI					
KIZUMBI					
LYAPINDA					
MAJENGO MAPYA					
MANDA KERENGE		25%	6.2%	40%	20%
MANDA UHURU					
MKINGA					
MPASA					
MTAKUJA			33.3%		100%
NG'ANGA					
NTANGANYIKA	14.3%	14.3%		50%	100%
TUNDU					
WAMPEMBE			16.7%		100%






Figure 43: Do you think your current processing activities are likely to support your needs over the long term (next 5 - 10 years)?

## Bibliography

R Core Team. 2019. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org>.

Wickham, Hadley. 2022. *Stringr: Simple, Consistent Wrappers for Common String Operations*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>.

Xie, Yihui. 2014. “Knitr: A Comprehensive Tool for Reproducible Research in R.” In *Implementing Reproducible Computational Research*, edited by Victoria Stodden, Friedrich Leisch, and Roger D. Peng. Chapman; Hall/CRC.

———. 2015. *Dynamic Documents with R and Knitr*. 2nd ed. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman; Hall/CRC. <https://yihui.org/knitr/>.

———. 2023. *Knitr: A General-Purpose Package for Dynamic Report Generation in r*. <https://yihui.org/knitr/>.

