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A Useful Toolkit

The Work in Fishing Convention, 2007, aims to better working and living conditions for millions in the fishing sector

Thursday, 14 June 2007, will go down in history as a particularly significant day for fishers and fishworkers all over the world. That was the day the 96th Session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) of the International Labour Organization (ILO) adopted the Work in Fishing Convention, 2007, which seeks to guarantee innovative new labour standards to improve the conditions for millions of men and women working in the fishing sector worldwide.

Adopted in the year of the silver jubilee of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Fishing Convention is the first ILO instrument in fishing since the adoption of the 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone regime by coastal States in the 1970s. This time around, unlike at the 93rd Session of the ILC in 2005, more countries, including China, which accounts for the largest share of fishing capacity and the largest number of fishers in the world, voted for the adoption of the Convention (see report on page 42).

The Convention has a three-tier structure. First, all provisions of the Convention, upon its ratification, would apply to fishing vessels above 24 m in length, and fishers working on board such vessels. Second, many of the provisions would apply to the majority of commercial fishing vessels and fishers working on them, regardless of size of the vessel. Third, some of the prescriptive provisions would apply to fishing vessels below 24 m over an unspecified period of time. The latter tier, presumably, applies to industrial fishing operations employing vessels below 24 m.

On the matter of compliance with the requirements of the Convention, the flag States are required to undertake inspections, reporting, monitoring, complaint procedures, appropriate penalties and corrective measures. There are further port-State provisions, albeit weak, to report to the flag State, about non-confirmation to the requirements of the Convention by a fishing vessel that calls at its port, and even to take measures to rectify any conditions on board such a vessel that are hazardous to safety or health. Except for minimum age, the other provisions of the Convention that would apply to the small- and artisanal subsector are non-prescriptive; it has been left to the ILO member countries to adopt laws, regulations or other measures to implement them. It is thus now important to press for campaigns at the national level to identify, through a consultative process, categories of fishers and fishing vessels that should be included within the scope of the Convention, and to ensure its maximum coverage. In particular, countries with large fisher populations and fishing fleets, such as China, India and Vietnam, which voted for its adoption, should ratify and implement its provisions at the earliest.

The Work in Fishing Convention, 2007, is just a toolkit. The ball is now in the court of national governments. They should consult all relevant stakeholders, especially organizations representing fishworkers, and use the Convention to develop effective measures to protect the working and living conditions of fishers, both in large- and small-scale fishing.

New look, new beginnings

With this issue, SAMUDRA Report adorns new garb in the form of a bolder and more contemporary look. This is the first major design overhaul in almost 15 years, and, while the redesign brief was to impart a fresh vitality and energy to the journal, we have tried to maintain continuity with change. The fonts, graphics and other design elements have been chosen to make the reading experience more comfortable and enjoyable. Yet the makeover has not sacrificed sections and features that have been longstanding favourites with readers. Apart from a revamped back-of-the-book section that contains short news items and tidbits, Web flagposts have been used liberally to point readers to additional information resources on the Internet. And, as the new tagline points out, our focus remains on “Fisheries, Communities, Livelihoods”.

The redesign was developed by Design Difference in collaboration with the SAMUDRA Team. We hope you like the new version and we welcome your comments and suggestions. Please email us at icsf@icsf.net.
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A workshop titled “Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia”, was organized by the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF), in collaboration with the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC), in Siem Reap, Cambodia, from 3 to 5 May 2007.

The workshop was followed by a two-day symposium where the participants were joined by representatives of the governments of some South and Southeast Asian countries. The workshop aimed to:

- review the experiences of traditional and modern rights-based approaches to fisheries management, and discuss their relevance and scope in the Asian context;
- contribute to improving the overall effectiveness of fisheries management by promoting responsible small-scale fisheries and the rights of small-scale fishing communities; and
- advocate for policies that recognize the rights of fishing communities to the coastal lands and resources customarily used by them.

Since its inception in 1986, ICSF has been working on issues that concern small-scale and artisanal fishworkers, with a particular focus on seeking recognition for the rights of small-scale fishing communities to fisheries and other coastal resources, as well as their right to participate in decision-making processes that affect their lives and livelihoods. For fishing communities, both marine and inland, safeguarding their rights to access fisheries resources and to the continuous possession or enjoyment of coastal residential habitats and other lands traditionally used by them, is of paramount importance.

These rights are currently being threatened in various ways, due to developments both within and outside the fisheries sector. At the same time, recognition of these rights, within the framework of sustainable utilization of living natural resources, is necessary if fishing communities are to progressively share the responsibility of managing coastal and fisheries resources.

These were the issues that were discussed at the three-day workshop, which attracted 56 participants from 10 countries of Asia, namely, Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam. Apart from representatives of various fishworker organizations (FWOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), researchers, activists and representatives of regional and multilateral organizations also participated in the workshop.

Siem Reap Statement

The recommendations of the workshop—in the form of the Siem Reap Statement—were shared with participants of the two-day Symposium that followed, to which government policymakers and representatives of regional and multilateral organizations were invited.

Prior to the workshop, studies were undertaken in five countries—Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Philippines and Thailand—on rights-based fisheries management and attendant
issues. Among other things, the studies aimed to document and explore the understanding that fishing communities have about their rights to fisheries and coastal resources, as well as the obligations and responsibilities associated with these rights, and to document and discuss their initiatives to assert these rights and fulfill their responsibilities. Information and analysis from the studies formed the basis for discussions at the workshop.

The workshop began with an introduction by John Kurien, Member of ICSF, who traced the origins of the organization as an international network of individuals—currently from 20 countries—with a marked developing-country focus. Kurien said that one reason for conducting the workshop in Cambodia was to ensure that the concerns of inland fisheries were well reflected. It was also the first time that ICSF was conducting a workshop in collaboration with a government, Kurien pointed out. Elaborating on the theme of the workshop, he said that even though many international agencies have now begun to talk about rights in fisheries, their focus is largely on property rights at sea and on land. For ICSF, however, rights take really substantive meaning only if they extend to all realms of life and livelihood.

In his inaugural speech, HE Nao Thouk, Director General, Fisheries and Administration of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, RGC, mentioned that the fisheries sector is crucial for the livelihoods of the Cambodian people and the national economy. Consequently, the RGC has promoted fisheries reforms by designating fisheries as one side of its official ‘rectangular strategy’. In October 2000, the Prime Minister of the RGC initiated historical changes in the fisheries sector by releasing more than 56 per cent of fishing-lot concession areas (536,302 ha) for local people to organize community fisheries. The reform aims to promote broad local participation in fisheries management.

Prior to the workshop, studies were undertaken in five countries—Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Philippines and Thailand—on rights-based fisheries management and attendant issues.

Fifty-six participants from 10 countries of South and Southeast Asia gathered at Siem Reap, Cambodia, for the ICSF Workshop.
Muhammad Adli Abdullah of Panglima Laot, Indonesia (left), and Chandrika Sharma of ICSF at the Siem Reap Symposium

Nomura concluded with some suggestions, namely, that small-scale fishers should be given preferential access to fishery resources; management responsibilities should be decentralized and shared; rights-based management should be encouraged; diversification of livelihoods and improved post-harvesting should be promoted; integration and linkages with other sectors should be improved; and additional financing is required for the transition to responsible fisheries.

Elaborating on the background and rationale of the workshop, Sebastian Mathew, Programme Adviser, ICSF, said that the rights of fishing communities are currently under threat in various ways, and the workshop would provide an opportunity to discuss them and lay out strategies to mitigate the problems that are prevalent.

The first session of the workshop saw presentations and studies from different countries of South and Southeast Asia on the theme, “Fisheries and Coastal Area Management Regimes of Asia: What Rights and Interests of Artisanal and Small-scale Fishing Communities Are Taken into Account?”.

Community perceptions

Allan Vera of the Community-based Coastal Resource Management (CBCRM) Resource Centre, Philippines, discussed community perceptions of their claims and rights to resources, decision-making processes, and the related legal framework. He also highlighted some of the key threats facing communities in recognizing and realizing these rights. Some of the threats arise from the use of destructive fishing gear; conflicts over resource use; the overall context of fisheries liberalization; lack of participation in policy-making and enforcement; and competing claims to fisherfolks’ settlements. Vera also outlined community actions towards management of coastal and fisheries resources in some parts of the Philippines.

In his presentation, Sim Buntheon of the Community-based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute (CBNRM-LI), Cambodia, said that after small-scale fisheries management in developing countries.
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Community perceptions

Allan Vera of the Community-based Coastal Resource Management (CBCRM) Resource Centre, Philippines, discussed community perceptions of their claims and rights to resources, decision-making processes, and the related legal framework. He also highlighted some of the key threats facing communities in recognizing and realizing these rights. Some of the threats arise from the use of destructive fishing gear; conflicts over resource use; the overall context of fisheries liberalization; lack of participation in policy-making and enforcement; and competing claims to fisherfolks’ settlements. Vera also outlined community actions towards management of coastal and fisheries resources in some parts of the Philippines.

In his presentation, Sim Buntheon of the Community-based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute (CBNRM-LI), Cambodia, said that after
the development of the community fisheries programme in Cambodia, fishing communities have become more aware of their rights to fish, and particularly their right to prevent illegal fishing. They have also become more aware of their responsibility towards fishery management and conservation.

Wichoksak Ronnarongpairee of the Federation of Southern Fisherfolk (FSF), Thailand, and Supawan Channasonkram of the Sustainable Development Foundation (SDF), Thailand, stressed that the small-scale fisherfolk of their country believed that the sea and its resources belonged to all, and that everyone had a shared responsibility to protect them. The sea cannot be owned by any individual, they said, reiterating a common belief among Thai fisherfolk that is based on religious principles. Recognizing the rights of communities to collectively use and manage—but not permanently own—their resources was essential. While rights of communities to manage resources were recognized in a legal sense, these rights were being violated in several ways, such as through destructive fishing by push-nets and trawlers, efforts to privatize the sea, and so on. While the community has taken several measures to protect its rights, the efforts have gone largely unrecognized, they concluded.

Valentina D. Endang Savitri from Telapak, Indonesia, pointed to some of the threats facing small-scale fishing communities in Indonesia, including from industrial fisheries, expansion of aquaculture, centralized conservation programmes, and coastal tourism. In practice, most of marine waters are “free for all” and many fisheries are fully exploited or overexploited. The government efforts to promote decentralization offer an opportunity to shift from a State-based paradigm to a community-based one. However, they have also put more pressure on resources, as local governments sell off resources to increase their incomes. Communities have reacted in several ways to protect their rights, such as through the establishment of fisherfolks’ organizations, and sometimes through open, often violent, clashes with the industrial fleets at sea. Realizing their responsibilities, communities are also promoting environment-friendly and sustainable fishing gear and methods, and conserving natural resources through replanting mangroves and rehabilitating coral reefs.

Harekrishna Debnath of the National Fishworkers’ Forum (NFF), India, presented the country study prepared by Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action (DISHA), about the community of fishers and fishworkers functioning around traditional landing centres—the khotis—in the Indian State of West Bengal. The main function of these centuries-old organizations, which represent both boatowners and crew, is to ensure harmonious fishing operations and functioning. These organizations, said Debnath, understood the concept of rights, only when faced with ‘wrongs’, such as displacement by tourism and industry, and overfishing by mechanized boats. They have taken various initiatives for responsible management of resources. Only ‘aquatic reforms’, along the lines of the agrarian land reforms,
which confer non-transferable community rights to the sea to the fishers as custodians, can bring about a positive change in fisheries management, Deb-nath concluded.

Only ‘aquatic reforms’, along the lines of the agrarian land reforms, which confer non-transferable community rights to the sea to the fishers as custodians, can bring about a positive change in fisheries management

Rafiqul Haque Tito of Unnayan Bikalper Nitinirdharoni Gobeshona (UBINIG), Bangladesh, stressed that fishing communities in Bangladesh firmly believe that water bodies rightfully belong to fishers (as expressed in the Bengali slogan, jal jar jala tar). They also perceive a right to security of profession, life, property and human dignity, rights that are being threatened by factors such as unsustainable shrimp culture. Communities are aware of their responsibilities to protect fish resources and water bodies from overfishing and pollution, and have taken several initiatives to fulfill them.

Synthesizing the presentations from Southeast Asia, Elmer Ferrer of the CBCRM Centre, Philippines, pointed to some commonly held perceptions of rights. Fishing communities believed, for example, that fishing for livelihood is a right, that equitable and sustainable resource use is a right, and that participation in management and staying close to fishing grounds is a right. They also believe they have a right to basic social services. All the case studies, said Elmer, have identified perceived threats to the realization of these rights, and have identified remedial measures.

V Vivekanandan of the South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies (SIFFS), speaking on the role of traditional organizations in fishing communities, said, "Finding a balance between traditional and modern organizations is vital for the future of fisheries management in Asia." He also suggested that traditional structures could act as control mechanisms, while modern organizations could provide content to the structure and make up for the weaknesses and limitations of the traditional organizations.

Group discussions
At the end of the first day, workshop participants were divided into four, mainly language-based, groups, namely, (i) Cambodia, (ii) South Asia (Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka), (iii) Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, and (iv) Philippines and Vietnam. The groups were asked to discuss the following questions:

- What kind of rights/perceived claims to fisheries resources and coastal management do fishing communities have?
- What are the main threats to the realization of these rights?
- What have been the actions taken to protect rights/exercise responsibility towards protecting and managing fisheries and coastal resources?
- What institutions—traditional or otherwise—exist to take forward the rights, and define the responsibilities?

Day 2 began with the groups presenting the key points of their discussions. The Cambodia group mentioned that although community fisheries have been introduced in the country, lack of awareness of fishery laws and related
legal instruments is a major hurdle in recognizing rights.

Participants from the South Asian group highlighted various perspectives on rights. While the Sri Lankans asserted their right to fish anywhere, anytime, within national waters, subject to controls on destructive and harmful fishing methods and gear, the Bangladesh participants pointed to the need to recognize the rights of traditional Hindu fishermen to fish in the sea, rivers and inland water bodies, access to which is currently denied. Indian participants stressed the need for fishing communities to have exclusive access to fish in the sea and water bodies, while the participant from Pakistan was concerned about the entry of outsiders into the fishing grounds, and the control of fishing areas by the rich, affecting access of the small-scale. The South Asian group viewed the issue of entry of outsiders (non-traditional fishers) as a threat, considering that it has led to a disregard for traditional norms that protect fish resources (like traditional fishing bans during breeding seasons), the use of destructive gear and fishing methods, promotion of intensive shrimp aquaculture and hatcheries, and the formation of special economic zones.

In the Vietnam-Philippines group, participants from Vietnam said that the fisheries in some of their provinces are being decentralized, with the government trying to devolve authority to different administrative levels. Vietnam’s history of centralized planning has hampered fishers from staking claims to their rights, but, with recent developments, they are growing more aware and taking the effort to assert their rights. In the case of the Philippines, the central government provides the legal framework, and encourages NGOs to support community initiatives. However, there are some gaps between the policy objectives of the government at the national level, and the implementation approach and capacity of specific NGOs. The government’s allocation of marine-culture areas for investors is a threat to the small-scale fishers, who lack the capital to compete with these entrepreneurs.

The Indonesia-Malaysia-Thailand group said that, in general, customary and/or traditional laws had existed in their countries prior to the present rule of States/governments. The group felt that customary laws and rights should be recognized in national legislation. The group highlighted various threats to their rights, from processes at the international, national and community levels. They stressed the need to work
with traditional and community-based institutions.

All group reports stressed the various initiatives taken by fishing communities and their organizations to protect their rights, ranging from policy advocacy and conservation efforts, to mass mobilization. Several issues came up for discussion following the presentation of group reports, particularly the issue of traditional institutions and rights. The participants from Aceh, Indonesia, described their efforts to get recognition for the traditional practices and institutions (like the Panglima Laot), efforts that have borne fruit. They are also seeking recognition of their rights (through bilateral agreements) to fish in waters they were traditionally fishing in.

In his presentation titled “Integrating Fishing Community and Fisheries Concerns into Coastal/Wetland Management Initiatives and Policies in Asia: Present Situation and Possible Ways Forward”, Magnus Torell, Senior Adviser, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre (SEAFDEC), highlighted the growing competition over space in coastal areas from various sectors. In such a context, it is important to consider how the traditional rights of coastal people to live along the coast and access resources can be secured, particularly in coastal/wetland-area management processes.

As possible ways forward, he suggested that there should be fisheries representation in physical and economic planning and in discussions on international conventions and agreements. He also stressed the need to create ‘untraditional’ alliances and co-operation and co-ordination at all levels. In the discussion that followed, it was mentioned that the legal framework in some countries, such as Cambodia, Thailand and Vietnam, had some provisions that could be used to protect people’s rights to coastal/wetland resources and their management.

In their presentation, titled “Rights to Coastal and Fisheries Resources: A Gender Perspective”, Nalini Nayak, a Member of icfr from India, and Dongkamol Sirisook of SDF, Thailand, highlighted the invisibility of women despite their active contribution to the fisheries sector. Nayak said that the present developmental paradigm is basically patriarchal as it largely depends on production for the market and on control of resources by a few in an unsustainable way. If women’s roles are made more visible and given value, and their role in decisionmaking is taken seriously, there would be a greater focus on life and livelihood rather than mere profits from centralized production and market-centred development.

Questions discussed
Following the presentations, the groups, organized as earlier, discussed the following questions:

- What kind of coastal/wetland management policies are needed that factor in the concerns, interests, rights and responsibilities of fishing communities?
- How do we make the development paradigm more life- and livelihood-centred?
- How do we make women’s roles in fisheries development?

Responding to the first question, the Cambodian group said that their Fisheries Law provides a strong base for all Cambodians to participate in community fisheries management. The Indonesia-Malaysia-Thailand group said that the community should be consulted through an open, participatory process at all levels, information should be made available, and environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be implemented in a transparent manner. Participants from the Philippines and Vietnam emphasized the need to recognize preferential user rights for small-scale fishers to the nearshore area and to ensure that planning starts at the community level. The South Asian group stressed, among other things, the need to develop and strengthen...
local institutions to protect coastal resources.

Presentations on the remaining questions centred on the need to balance short-term development goals with the long-term sustainability of natural resources, taking into consideration the culture of the community. Also stressed was the need for gender-disaggregated data and an enabling environment for the equitable participation of women in fisheries and in decision-making processes. Local institutions, and the capacity of women in these institutions, should be developed, apart from enhancing their role in marketing fish, and guaranteeing them equal participation in the fisheries through appropriate legislation.

**Panel discussion**

There were five presentations in the panel discussion on “Markets, Technologies, Traditional Organizations and Human Rights”, chaired by John Kurien. In his presentation, Arjan Heinan, Fisheries Management Facilitator, Netherlands Inland Fishers Organization and Voluntary Adviser, Danao Bay Resource Management Organization, Philippines, posed the question, “How Does Your Perception of the ‘State of the Fishery Resource’ Influence the Manner in Which You Articulate Your Rights?”. Based on the responses of representatives of FWOS to this question, Heinan concluded that the most pressing rights are perceived to be the rights to: fish within existing rules; expand fishing operations; participate in formulating resource management measures; protection from outsiders and newcomers; market fish; participate in monitoring, control and surveillance, and revitalize traditional laws on fisheries management.

In her presentation, titled “How Does the Expansion of Markets and the Related Growth of International Trade Affect the Rights of Fishers and Fishing Communities?”, Ma. Divina Muñoz from the Women of Fisherfolk Movement, Philippines, highlighted ways in which promotion of fish exports, cheap imports of fish and fish products, and the liberalized regime in coastal areas in the Philippines, are affecting small-scale fishing communities in very negative ways. She also pointed out the difficulties small-scale producers from developing countries faced in accessing export markets. She concluded that the current trade regimes undermined food security and curtailed the right of each nation and its producers to develop a sustainable fishing industry.

Drawing on his experience in India, V Vivekanandan of SIFFS gave an overview of technological changes in the fisheries sector in his presentation, titled “How Does the Introduction of New Technologies Impinge On or Expand the Realms of Rights for Small-scale Fisheries?”. Technology has the power to transform livelihoods and social relations, he said, and warned that the stage of fisheries development, including the status of the resources being exploited, matters when technology is introduced. There are clear winners and losers with the introduction of technology, he cautioned.

In his presentation, titled “How Can We Use/Strengthen Traditional Organizations to Establish/Regain Rights in Order to Protect the Identity and Dignity of Riparian Communities?”, Muhammad Adli Abdullah of the Panglima Laot, Indonesia, traced the history of Panglima Laot, a traditional fishermen’s association in the Indonesian...
1. We, 51 participants representing small-scale and artisanal fishing communities, fishworker organizations, non-governmental organizations, researchers and activists from ten South and Southeast Asian countries, having gathered at the workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, from 3 to 5 May 2007 at Siem Reap, Cambodia,

Representing a diversity of geographical, social, linguistic, cultural and economic backgrounds, but yet being bonded by a commonality of interests and concerns,

Being aware of our duty towards present and future generations, and our accountability,

And believing that natural resources of bays, seas, rivers and inland water bodies are the common heritage of all and that they should not be privatized for the benefit of the few,

Further believing that these resources should be equitably and responsibly shared for sustaining life and livelihood and towards the greater benefit of all small-scale and artisanal fishing communities,

And realizing that responsible fisheries can be assured only if human rights of fishing communities, including the right to decent work and labour standards, and human development, are secure,

Stress that just, participatory, self-reliant and sustainable development of coastal and inland fisheries is of vital importance to us.

In view of the above, we draw attention to the following issues:

Fisheries Conservation and Management
2. The protection of the inland, marine and coastal environments and the sustainable management of fisheries resources, are paramount concerns for small-scale and artisanal fishworkers and fishing communities in Asia. Many communities in the region have been implementing measures to restore, rebuild and protect coastal and wetland ecosystems, drawing on traditional ecological knowledge systems and deep cultural and religious values, reiterating the right of traditional and community-based organizations to conserve and co-manage coastal and inland fishery resources, and to benefit from them.

3. Fisheries conservation and management measures exist that are appropriate to the multi-gear, multi-species fisheries of the region. There is thus no need for the blind adaptation of fisheries management models from the temperate marine ecosystems, which stress individual rights and do not fit the collective and cultural ethos of Asian countries.

Coastal/Wetland Area Management
4. Coastal/wetland habitats are under threat from pollution, indiscriminate conversion of flooded forests and mangroves, upstream deforestation, damming of rivers, creation of special...
economic zones, construction of ports and harbours, urban sewage, farm effluents and other waste disposal, defence installations, industrial aquaculture, including mariculture operations, mega-development projects, nuclear plants, tourism, mining, and oil and gas exploration, among others.

5. As a result, coastal and inland fishing communities in Asia face deteriorating quality of life and the threat of eviction on an ongoing basis. Coastal/wetland area management policies that recognize the preferential rights of coastal and inland fishing communities to inhabit lands, including lands traditionally used for fisheries-related activities, such as berthing boats, and drying fish, are thus essential.

6. Article 10.1.2 of the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries states: “In view of the multiple uses of the coastal area, States should ensure that representatives of the fisheries sector and fishing communities are consulted in the decision-making processes and involved in other activities related to coastal area management planning and development”; and Article 10.1.3 states: “States should develop, as appropriate, institutional and legal frameworks in order to determine the possible uses of coastal resources and to govern access to them, taking into account the rights of coastal fishing communities and their customary practices to the extent compatible with sustainable development.” These Articles should form the basis for the effective implementation of coastal area management.

Marine Protected Areas
7. Externally conceived, non-participatory marine protected areas (MPAs) exclude access of small-scale fishers—even those using selective gear—to their fishing grounds, and displace them from their habitations. Only the active involvement of local communities at all stages of planning and implementation of conservation and management initiatives will lead to responsible and effective biodiversity conservation and management.

Aquaculture
8. The unregulated expansion of aquaculture, including mariculture, is leading to the privatization of inland water bodies, marine waters and adjacent lands. Clear guidelines, based on principles of social justice, prepared with the full and effective participation of fishing communities, are needed to ensure that aquaculture operations, including mariculture, do not disrupt responsible fishing operations or cause other negative impacts on capture-fisheries-based livelihoods; on the quality of life of coastal communities; and on indigenous species, as through the introduction of alien and genetically modified species.

Sustainable Fishing Gear and Practices
9. The negative impact of bottom trawling, in particular, on fish habitats and fishing communities has been highlighted by fishworkers in several Asian countries. Proscription of all forms of destructive gear and practices, keeping in mind local conditions and the status of fish stocks, should, therefore, be considered.

10. Environmentally friendly small-scale and artisanal fishing gear and practices should be promoted since they involve smaller quantities of gear in greater diversity, often used in tandem with seasonal patterns in fishing, which have potentially less negative impact on fish habitats and fishery resources, and which employ more people per unit of fish output.

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing
11. Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and piracy, in waters under national jurisdiction, affect the rights of small-scale and artisanal fishers to a secure livelihood from fisheries. Effective monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) measures, particularly to control the illegal operations of foreign fleets in waters under national jurisdiction, are essential in this context.

Co-management and Community-based Approach
12. While the State has a central role in developing the broad framework for fish-
eries management, fishing communities have vital roles in co-managing fisheries resources. Increasing the accountability of national and provincial governments to fishing communities, devolution of power to fishing communities, and efforts to enhance the capacity of communities in fisheries management are thus essential.

13. A community-based approach, built upon negotiated rules of access, needs to be recognized as a long-term conservation and management option. Such an approach, employed in conjunction with legitimate input-control measures, such as restrictions on gear, engine size of vessel, fishing area, and fishing time, in combination with effective MCS, and enforcement measures, must be developed in consultation with fishing communities, including fishworkers.

Preferrential Access of Small-scale and Artisanal Fishers

14. Guaranteeing preferential access rights of traditional inland fishing communities to water bodies is an important requirement for protecting their life and livelihood.

15. It is important to create an enabling environment for small-scale and artisanal fishers to access fishery resources within waters under national jurisdiction. Such a policy of preferential access would be consistent with the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement, and the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Fishery resources beyond territorial waters provide an opportunity for expansion and diversification of small-scale and artisanal fisheries. Fishing vessels that are larger in size should be considered for waters under national jurisdiction only after progressively exhausting the possibility of employing smaller fishing units, in conjunction with the use of selective fishing gear and practices.

Trans-border Movement of Small-scale and Artisanal Fishers

16. Unauthorized trans-border movement of small-scale fishing vessels and the subsequent detention of fishers is an issue of concern for several Asian countries. The human rights of fishworkers, and the speedy release and repatriation of arrested fishers on compassionate grounds, should be guaranteed. States, particularly archipelagic States, should recognize the traditional fishing rights of fishers from immediately adjacent neighbouring States in certain areas falling within their national waters and should set up appropriate bilateral arrangements for recognizing these rights.

Women in Fisheries

17. Women play important, though largely invisible, roles in fisheries and in sustaining fishing communities. Coastal and fisheries management policies must protect and ensure women’s rights to fishery resources, to their legitimate spaces in the fisheries sector, to coastal lands inhabited and used by them, and to decision-making processes affecting their lives and livelihoods. It is important that States extend support to women’s work in fisheries, including through provision of credit and appropriate infrastructure for fish processing and marketing. Gathering gender-disaggregated data on employment in fisheries is essential for policy formulation.

Trade in Fish and Fish Products

18. In the absence of effective fisheries conservation and management measures, international trade in fish and fish products has led to the overexploitation of fisheries resources and has had adverse impacts on the livelihoods of small-scale and artisanal fishing communities. In several instances, liberalized imports have depressed prices of local fish in domestic markets. It should be ensured...
that policies and practices related to the promotion of international fish trade, do not adversely affect the livelihood and nutritional rights of small-scale and artisanal fishing communities. Asian governments should exercise caution in negotiating bilateral, multilateral and other trade agreements that have adverse impacts on fishing communities, especially in the context of increasing trade liberalization and economic globalization under the aegis of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and explore the option of taking fisheries out of the WTO negotiations.

**Disaster Preparedness**

22. In the context of coastal communities’ constant exposure to natural disasters, it is important that disaster preparedness programmes be designed and implemented with the representation of fishing communities.

**Establishing a Coherent Management Framework**

23. The challenge in moving towards sustainable fisheries and integrated coastal/wetland area management is to develop, and implement, a coherent management framework for coastal areas/wetlands and the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) in a consultative and participatory manner, taking into account the environmental, ecological, social and economic dimensions of fishing, fish resources and fish habitats, as well as the impacts of global warming. This requires the establishment of effective inter-agency mechanisms and the setting aside of adequate resources, including for capacity building of managers and communities engaged in coastal/wetland conservation and management, fisheries management and habitat protection.

**Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities**

24. While the above assertions pertain to our perceptions of rights, we are fully mindful of the responsibilities, obligations and duties that we collectively have towards nurturing the fishery resources...

For more...
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province of Aceh on the island of Sumatra. One of the oldest organizations in the world, the Panglima Laot traces its origins to 400 years ago, to the time of the Sultanate of Aceh. Stressing its continuing relevance and importance, Adli highlighted the role played by the Panglima Laot in the reconstruction of Aceh following the December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami.

Edward Allison, Senior Lecturer, School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, UK, in his presentation, titled “How Can We Broaden the Concept of Rights Beyond the Realm of ‘Rights to Fishery Resources’ and Into the Larger Social/Cultural Dimensions of Life and Livelihood of the Communities?”, discussed the human-rights perspective on responsible fisheries. Participation in ‘responsible fisheries’ is more effective if communities’ basic human rights are secure, he stressed.

The workshop ended with a Statement—the Siem Reap Statement (see previous page)—formulated by 51 participants of small-scale and artisanal fishing communities, FWOs, NGOs, researchers and activists from the 10 countries represented at the meet. The Statement was based on the belief that the natural resources of bays, seas, rivers and inland water bodies are the common heritage of all, and that they should not be privatized for the benefit of the few, and that they should be equitably and responsibly shared for sustaining life and livelihood and for the greater benefit of all small-scale and artisanal fishing communities. The Statement also stressed that responsible fisheries can be assured only if the human rights of fishing communities, including the right to decent work and labour standards and human development, are secured.

The two-day symposium that followed the workshop had an additional 16 participants, representing the fisheries departments of 10 countries from the South and Southeast Asian region, namely, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Sri Lanka, as well as the WorldFish Centre.

**Inauguration**

The symposium was introduced by John Kurien of ICSF, and inaugurated by Nao Thouk, Director General, Fisheries and Administration of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, RGC. Rolf Willmann, Senior Fisheries Planning Officer, Fisheries Development Planning Service, Fisheries and Aquaculture Development, FAO, delivered the keynote address on behalf of Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director General, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, FAO.

Ly Vuthy, Chief of Community Fisheries Development, Fisheries Administration, RGC, in his presentation, titled “Establishing Rights of Small-scale Fishing Communities to Coastal and Inland Fisheries Resources in Cambodia”, shared the Cambodian experience on community fisheries management. He detailed the legal and institutional framework put in place to support community fisheries, and enhance networking among the communities, leading to greater empowerment and development of livelihood options.

**Government representatives**

The following government representatives of South and Southeast Asian countries made presentations on “The Efforts Being Made to Promote Responsible Small-scale Fisheries and the Rights of Fishing Communities”:

**Southeast Asia**
- Wimol Jantaratnai, Senior Fisheries Foreign Affairs Advisor, Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Thailand
- Suseno Sukoyono, Director, Directorate of Fisheries Resource Management, Directorate General of Capture Fisheries, Ministry of Marine Affairs, Indonesia
- Jessica C Munoz, Supervising Aquaculturist, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Department of Agriculture, Philippines
The representatives of governments and multilateral organizations detailed specific measures and steps, including legal provisions at the national level, taken to support small-scale fisheries. The presentations were followed by a panel discussion, which served as an interface for participants to ask questions and get clarifications.

The Chair of the panel discussion, David Thomson, Team Leader, Tonle Sap Environmental Management Project, Project Support Office (TSEMPPS), Cambodia, emphasized the inherent advantages of small-scale fisheries from an economic, social, environmental and technical perspective. Yasuhisa Kato, Special Adviser, SEAFDEC, in his presentation, titled “Fisheries Co-Management: Using Group User Rights for Small-Scale Fisheries”, stressed the importance of user rights for community institutions, to achieve sustainable and responsible fisheries. He also stressed the need for decentralization and delegation of fisheries management responsibilities to resource users within a co-management framework. Blake Ratner of the WorldFish Centre spoke on “Resilient Small-scale Fisheries: The Role of Rights”. He emphasized the importance of adopting a human rights perspective and of securing rights as a cornerstone to improving fisheries governance.

On the last day, Edward Allison and Arjan Heinan synthesized the discussions from the workshop and the symposium. From the perspective of supporters of small-scale fisheries, Allison said, the rights to fish are paramount, but not at the risk of alienating the rights of others, for example, consumers, future generations and other users of the resource.

Stewardship

A strong message has been sent to governments and international bodies that the transfer of the sea from a common-pool resource into private ownership will be seen by the regions’ small-scale fishers as a violation of their rights. Ultimately, what is being requested is a non-transferable community right—not only to use resources, but to decide on how they are to be used. With this comes the responsibility of stewardship, of equity of access and allocation within communities, Allison concluded.
The Responsibility of Stewardship

The Siem Reap meet demonstrated collective goodwill and an impressive commitment to strengthening rights, shouldering responsibilities and finding spaces in the fast-changing coasts and wetlands of Asia.

The Siem Reap Workshop and Symposium resulted in five days of intensive dialogue and learning on the rights and responsibilities of small-scale fisheries in the context of coastal and wetland management. It was a period of respectful exchange of experiences and views. As outsiders, we have gained the view of much collective goodwill, impressive commitment to strengthening rights and shouldering responsibilities, and finding spaces in the fast-changing coasts and wetlands of Asia.

This commitment was demonstrated by fishworkers themselves, by their supporters and by their governments, who have proved willing to undertake wide-ranging reforms. There is also increasing consensus among the international organizations. It is a good time to be fighting for your rights, because there are more people listening, and in sympathy, than there may have been 20 years ago. So although you may be fighting the same battles, you have more allies and sympathizers now, perhaps. But this is no reason for complacency. While in the past, there may have been more ideological opposition to small-scale artisanal production from the modernizing State, now there may be benign neglect from the neoliberal State and world order.

The fight for rights also constitutes a means of creating new institutions, as exemplified by the efforts of the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC), which seems to have fully appreciated the link between responsible fisheries and wider rights.

The shift in rights to Cambodia’s fisherfolk has been demonstrated in actual practice, with, for example, 509 community fisheries organizations now operating in the Tonle Sap Lake. The RGC’s pioneering and socially responsible actions in the fisheries sector are a fine example of what we are all striving towards.

At the core of the Siem Reap Workshop and Symposium processes has been the series of case studies from fishing communities struggling to claim what they are entitled to by law—in other words, their rights. It is impossible, in this short summary, to do justice to that richness of experience and it is invidious to pick out examples, so I will generalize.

Community action
We have heard from fishworkers and their development partners in 10 Asian countries how communities have mobilized to:

- demonstrate their commitment to responsible fishing and their ability to manage their own resources when given the rights and responsibilities to do so;
- claim their space in the coastal zone, against competing interests from industry, water resources management and tourism, to name a few development processes;
- press for their entitlement to rights on land and sea, and access to basic...
There is now a recognition that economic growth alone is not enough to eradicate poverty, and that rights, freedoms and social justice are needed.
and global networks of activists and supporters, it has been encouraging to see the continuing importance of locally distinct cultural and social practices. Traditional institutions may often be fragile to external influences and may need formal/legal recognition. Strikingly enough, several governments in the region, like those of Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka, have formally recognized traditional rights.

Yet, despite increasing recognition of their cultural and economic contributions, small-scale fisheries are squeezed out by coastal development and wetland reclamation for agriculture, from the landward side, and by industrial fisheries and water resource abstraction, from the seaward side.

Decentralization of government, though cautiously welcomed as a means to local-level empowerment and accountability, is not always beneficial, as we learned from the experience of Indonesia. There, although decentralization has increased the autonomy to manage and control resources, it has increased the pressure on the natural resources that are used by local governments to raise revenues, since they no longer enjoy budget allocations from the central government.

Strikingly enough, several governments in the region, like those of Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka, have formally recognized traditional rights.
to self-determination is the main step to empowerment.

The Symposium highlighted a great contrast between the positions and presentations of the South and Southeast Asian countries, with the latter displaying greater clarity and focus. The presentations of SEAFDEC and the WorldFish Centre were also interesting. While the former highlighted the role of traditional institutions and knowledge in fisheries management, the latter spoke of management being more about relations between people, and highlighted the factors that influence livelihoods.

There was general agreement that in multispecies fisheries, there is no way of assessing stock size to assign community quotas, but, in a context of co-management, fishers themselves can best determine how to regulate the fishery if they are given custodial rights.

There was some focus on traditional community organizations. While I would think they are still the only organizations in some Asian countries that can implement common decisions, they are still male-dominated, and we would have to find creative ways of drawing women into the decision-making process. All along, it was admitted that there is no data on women’s role and space in the fisheries, and the general focus remained on fishing rights. There was little time to analyze local, national and global linkages, and how to strategize. Though there is still an important role for union-type organizations, their existing dynamics are limiting, and they do not exist everywhere. The Philippines is the only country that has a Fisheries Code using which organizations can act. Cambodia also has a progressive fisheries policy, but organizations have to be built up. Aceh in Indonesia has very clear traditional laws and rights, and the fishers there are able to negotiate their rights with the central government.

I feel the main problem in Asia continues to be the lack of good FWOs that have an understanding of coastal rights and responsibilities, and can develop the means to establish them. While meetings like the one at Siem Reap certainly give organization leaders a broader vision, there is need for intensive work in each country to widen the understanding at the base level and evolve strategies of action.

— These views come from Nalini Nayak (nalninayak@asianetindia.com), a Member of ICSF

For more:
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Sources. Claims for rights in small-scale fisheries have often arisen when faced by a wrong committed by someone else. We would not want to perpetuate a wrong on another group.

A strong message has been sent out from Siem Reap to governments and international bodies that the transfer of the sea from a common-pool resource into private ownership will be seen by the regions’ small-scale fisherfolk as a violation of their rights.

Ultimately, what is being requested by participants at the Siem Reap meet is a non-transferable community right—not only to use resources, but also to decide on how they are to be used. With this right comes the responsibility of stewardship, of equity of access and allocation within communities.

---
Iceland is one of the world’s richest countries, and, arguably, the only one so wealthy from wild capture fisheries. Less than a decade ago, over 70 per cent of its currency income came from fisheries and fish products. Today, though this has decreased to 50 per cent, it still leaves the sector the largest currency earner, well ahead of tourism and other industries.

Some of the most productive fishing grounds are to be found within the Icelandic exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The Gulf stream from the south, and the cold currents from the north create a mix in temperatures and nutrients that produce a very favourable environment for groundfish species like cod, haddock, saithe catfish and red fish, pelagic species such as capelin, herring and whiting, and crustaceans like shrimp.

The population of Iceland is 310,000. Annually, 1,600 fishing vessels catch 1.5–2.2 mn tonnes, of which approximately 400,000 tonnes are groundfish, while the rest are pelagic species that go more and more for human consumption. With around 6,000 fishermen, Iceland ranks among the 15 largest fishing nations in the world and reports the highest landings per fisherman (300–400 tonnes). Icelanders are also close to the top of the list for per capita fish consumption.

The history of the Icelandic nation is inseparable from the history of its fisheries. In 1902, after hundreds of years of slavery to oars, the first engine was put on a small rowboat. The installation of that small engine marked the beginning of the nation’s economic revolution of the 20th century. The Icelandic fishing fleet was motorized, boats got bigger, trawlers were built, and modern technology simultaneously adopted. In a few decades, the nation rose from poverty to wealth.

Foreign fleets
During the eventful 20th century, Iceland moved its fishing limits four times between 1952 and 1975. The purpose was to push out foreign trawler fleets, mainly from Britain and Germany and gain sovereign rights over the fishing grounds. This led to the so-called ‘cod wars’, where small Icelandic coastguard vessels had to deal with large British frigates—and won. Support from other nations was almost nil (with the exception of Farœ Islands, which has a population of 45,000), but, purely coincidentally, nations all over the world moved their EEZ limits to 200 nautical miles shortly after the final conflict on the Icelandic fishing grounds in 1975.

Although the Icelandic fishing grounds were—and remain—productive, they have limits. In 1983, the Icelandic Marine Institute (MRI) issued a ‘black report’, stating that the status of the stocks was bad and fishing effort had to be cut. This report led to the enforcement of the individual transferable quota (ITQ) management system in 1984. To begin with, the main purpose of this “temporary action” was

This piece is by Arthur Bogason (arthur@smabatar.is) of the National Association of Small Boat Owners (NASBO), Iceland
purported to “build up and protect the fish stocks” and “secure regional development”. Shortly afterwards, when it became obvious that the system was doing neither—besides the fact that ‘common property’ was being handed out to a selected group—strong debates broke out around the nation about the pros and cons of the ITQ system.

Polls show that around 70 per cent of the Icelandic population disapprove of the ITQ system. However, this discontent has never been reflected in the general elections. On 12 May 2007, Icelanders voted for elections to the parliament, and the only party with the main policy of throwing out the ITQ system, got less than 8 per cent of the votes cast. The new government (Independence Party plus Social Democrats, who command a large majority in the parliament) said in its manifesto that “stability for the fisheries will be secured”. So it appears that the ITQ system will stay.

On 5 December 1985, less than two years after the enforcement of the ITQ system, Icelandic small-boat owners founded their National Association of Small Boat Owners (NASBO). The incentive was the new fishery management system. Icelandic legislation defines boats with gross registered tonnage (GRT) 15 tonne and less and 12–13 m in length, as small boats.

The small-boat owners were fortunate to realize early that an ITQ system can be a direct threat to small-scale fishermen. The founding of the association turned the tables completely for the small-boat owners, and is perhaps the best example of the necessity for small-boat owners, and coastal and artisanal fishers to unite for a say in their future. In 1984, when the ITQ system was enacted, the total quota granted to the small boats was 8,300 tonnes of cod and close to nothing of other species. In recent years, the small boats have fished 80–85,000 tonnes of groundfish, accounting for over 20 per cent of the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) of the main groundfish species.

NASBO is the only organization for small-boat owners in Iceland, made up of 15 regional organizations. Despite numerous attempts by the trawler association, and even some politicians, NASBO has never split. There is no question that this fact plays a big part in its success.

From the beginning, NASBO was the only organization in the Icelandic fisheries to protest against the ITQ system. The small-boat owners demanded that their fisheries should not be treated like other segments of the fishing fleet. They argued that the necessity for cutting down the fishing effort could, by no means, be traced to the small-boat sector. The trawlers, whom most believed to be the main cause for the status of the stocks, should shoulder the burden, they argued. The politicians seemed to have agreed with this reasoning, to a large extent. It also helped that the general public was on the side of the small-boat owners. On the other hand, other organizations in the fisheries turned against NASBO, and remain unfriendly to this day.

From 1984 to 1991, the Icelandic small-boat sector was more or less outside the ITQ system. Certain ‘mild’ restrictions were put in place, but access was open, and the number of boats increased day by day. In 1984, the small-boat sector consisted of fewer than 900 boats, almost entirely old, wooden and slow-going, and the average age of the owners was high. In 1991, the number of boats exceeded 2,000, mostly new, built of fibreglass and fast-going, operated by younger men. The small-boat
sector’s fish landings rose accordingly, enough for the government to give in to the pressure from other organizations and decide to force half of the small boats (1,043 boats, all above 6 tonnes GRT) into the ITQ system, along with the trawlers and larger ships. Resistance from NASBO prevented the entire small-boat fleet from being forced into the ITQ system.

However, there were no restrictions in the legislation regarding transferability of quotas, which brought to the surface one of the looming dangers of the ITQ system: Between 1 January 1991 and 1 September 1994, the big seafood companies bought 700 of the 1,043 small boats, transferred the quotas to their trawlers, destroyed the small boats—they could not even be sold as pleasure boats—so they would not enter the fisheries again, and, as the icing on the cake, used the renewal rights to enlarge their trawlers. Today there are only around 110 of the 1,043 small boats left.

How could this have happened? Were these small boats so uneconomical and inefficient? That does not seem to be the case. Around 1990, and for a few years since, the quotas for cod were cut to historical lows. This affected the small-boat sector since the cod was what the small boats relied on, with most of them having no other fishing rights. Therefore, they were the hardest hit during this time period.

Another ugly side of the ITQ system showed up: Simultaneously with the quota cuts for cod (up to over 70 per cent) quotas for other species were increased. The subsequent impact on the bigger ships and trawlers was, in most cases, much less compared to what the small-boat owners went through. Without a sufficient quota, a small-boat fisherman could not maintain himself, his family and his boat. With prices for quotas going up, it was easier to justify selling out. Some of those who sold out later returned to the fisheries, but others regret having sold their boats, and are bitter and feel left out.

The remainder of the small-boat fleet (around 1,000) that was not forced into the ITQ system started to develop. Though regulations were now much tougher to deal with, the legislator still left several loopholes that enabled the small-boat owners to build new boats that were bigger and much more efficient—and stay outside the ITQ system. The small-boat sector started to thrive again, and a substantial number of them operated for days at sea.

Once landings started to increase, history repeated itself. Constant pressure from other organizations forced the government to include, slowly but surely, these small boats too into an ITQ system—but this time differently than earlier. In 2004, the last 300 boats were included in the ITQ system, and, since then, all small boats in Iceland operate under the ‘small’ ITQ system—except the 110 mentioned earlier which fall under the ‘big’ ITQ system.

Unlike the 1991 instance, the small boats are now allowed to use longlines and handlines, with a firewall to prevent transfer of quotas between them and the rest of the fishing fleet. NASBO also negotiated with the government to allow small-boat owners to buy and lease quotas from the ‘big’ ITQ system. The small-boat owners have used this provision to a large extent.

There are now around 800 small boats active in Iceland, 690 in the ‘small’ ITQ system, and 110 in the ‘big’ system. The reason for the decline in the number of boats in the ‘small’ system is that the newest generation of small boats being built push the size limit (15 tonnes) and merge quotas from several smaller boats in order to attain a full-year fishery.

Expectedly enough, some are asking if the firewall around the transferability of quotas will be removed. This is highly unlikely. There is no political will for that, and, after all, the small-boat owners themselves asked for the firewall. 1991 is still fresh in memory.

NASBO has argued for a consideration of the type of fishing gear used,
pointing out that the use of environmentally friendly ones should be rewarded. After years of struggle by the organization, the government agreed to legislate an idea from NASBO—the ‘longline reward’.

Boats using longlines and landing on a daily basis get a 13 per cent lesser reduction from their quotas. This will add close to 6,000 tonnes to the landings of the small-boat sector for the fishing year 2006-2007 (starting 1 September), from boats that almost entirely operate from small coastal communities.

Around 5,300 tonnes of ‘community quotas’ are kept aside at the beginning of each fishing year. These quotas are distributed to the small fishing communities (with populations under 1,500) and their local authorities decide how to use them. This move has added substantially to the landings of the small boats.

The community quotas were introduced in the early 1990s, when the quotas for cod were cut. The small coastal communities pointed out that the legislation was supposed to secure ‘regional development’.

Many small-boat owners feel that the community quotas should be revoked and added to the ‘longline reward’ to further enhance the use of benign fishing gear.

Since 1985, NASBO has been protesting against the ITQ system, pointing out that it will prove to be a threat to not only fish stocks, but also to the small-boat sector and the small coastal communities. However, the issue of whether the ITQ system ‘protects’ fish stocks or not is extremely complex.

While the MRI states that the status of the cod stock is poor, the fishermen claim that the recovery of the cod stock is complete. They point to record landings and catches per fishing unit, adding that they have never seen anything like this on the fishing grounds in the past.

If the fishermen are right, the methodology of the MRI and its reputation is at risk of denouncement and shame. If the MRI is right, the quotas have to be cut, threatening once more the small-boat sector. To add to the complexity of the situation, other stocks like haddock are in excellent shape—as both fishermen and scientists agree.

The question thus arises: Does it matter at all what kind of a management system is used? When quotas for cod were cut to historical lows in the 1990s, the opponents of the ITQ system were up in arms. Later, that very same decade, when the quotas were increased again, the supporters thanked the system. In this respect, the current situation in the Faroe Islands is pertinent. The Faroe Islands authorities enforced a days-at-sea system 11 years ago. Today the cod stock is down around the islands.

Most fishermen in both Iceland and the Faroe Islands claim that these are natural fluctuations, something management systems can perhaps influence at a micro-level. At the same time, they agree that access to fish resources should be closed, except for the smallest vessels using only handlines. With the rapid development of technology, open access for all is unsustainable. It is worth remembering that in 1979, the outlook for the fishermen in Iceland was so bleak that many of them agreed that the fishing grounds were dead for good. The winter season of 1991, however, turned out to be one of the best ever.
The resistance among small-boat owners to the ITQ system is not as generally widespread as before. Most of them now have sufficient quotas, and, after years of fighting for their fair share in the fisheries, they appreciate restraint and the opportunity to concentrate on working with what they already have.

It is not easy to see what should replace the ITQ system, if it is revoked. Does it matter for Icelanders what kind of a system is in place, once access is closed? Perhaps, perhaps not. Fishing rights would most likely continue to be transferable, waste would occur in all systems—whether as discharge of fish within an ITQ system or loss in value within a days-at-sea system where the temptation is to fish as much as possible within time limits at the cost of quality.

Can these two systems be used together? That experiment was tried in Iceland, and it brought out the worst in both systems. One might imagine that the solution would be to ban transferability of fishing rights. What does that imply? In Iceland, fishing rights are attached to fishing vessels. If a boatowner decides to sell his vessel (an act which can hardly be banned), what should happen to the quotas? If the quotas are to stay in the respective communities, the buyers and sellers can simply put in their assignment that the initial numbers of vessels stay put.

No guarantee
On paper, the fishing rights would remain in the community. Would it help to make it mandatory to land the quotas in the community? Doing that by no means guarantees that the fish is processed right there nor that the crew is from the community. The catch can be bought by any fish processor in the country, and crew members can be drawn from anywhere. Can it then be made mandatory to process the catch in the community by forcing people to run processing plants? That would be impossible.

Icelandic legislation grants the municipalities pre-emption rights to buy vessels within their boundaries, should they go up for sale. This legislative grant has, however, hardly ever been utilized. The fact is that once a system has been put in place where fishing rights are defined by units, boatowners start to
Welcome to Cambodia, welcome to Siem Reap, and welcome to the ICSF Workshop and Symposium on small-scale fishing communities and fisheries management in Asia

All over Asia, millions of people depend on fisheries for a living, and the sector is a major source of food security, employment, income and foreign exchange. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), of the 47.6 mn fishers worldwide engaged in fishing and fish farming as a full-time, or, more frequently, part-time, occupation, as many as 42.3 mn, or 89 per cent, are in Asia. Most are small-scale, artisanal fishers, eking out a living from coastal and inland fishery resources.

Clearly, therefore, it is necessary to protect and secure the rights of small-scale fishworkers and their communities to livelihood and resources—both on land and sea—and to the continuous possession or enjoyment of coastal residential habitats and other lands traditionally used by them. This has been a recurrent theme in all the events organized by ICSF, and is the crux of the present workshop and symposium.

A three-day workshop for fishworker and non-governmental organizations, researchers and activists from the Asian region will be followed by a two-day symposium to which policymakers and representatives of regional and international organizations have been invited.

Specifically, the workshop and symposium will:

- review the experiences of traditional and modern rights-based approaches to fisheries management, and discuss their relevance and scope in the Asian context;
- contribute to improving the overall effectiveness of fisheries management by promoting responsible small-scale fisheries and the rights of small-scale fishing communities; and
- advocate for policies that recognize the rights of fishing communities to the coastal lands and resources customarily used by them.

Hopefully, the workshop and symposium will lead to:

- documentation/greater visibility of traditional and extant community-based systems for regulating/managing fisheries in an Asian context, and an understanding of their present relevance to fisheries management;
- documentation/greater visibility of issues facing fishing communities and their rights to inhabit and use coastal lands;
- greater capacity of fishing communities and their organizations to advocate for policies

(...contd. on Page 3)
**FISHING LOTS IN CAMBODIA’S FISHERIES**

The fishing-lot system is said to have been initially introduced in the late 19th century (1863) as a feudal patronage system during the reign of King Norodom. The revenues collected were used to pay the French, who, in turn, kept the Siamese at bay. However, the system was given up in 1884 due to a series of peasant rebellions protesting against the usurping of their aquatic commons. Bearing this in mind, the system was then modified and greatly formalized by the French Protectorate in 1908. They appointed trained staff, introduced strict management and conservation measures and ensured the inclusion of some social interests to take the concerns of the peasantry into account. It is pertinent to note that these changes included the following five elements: setting up the fishing season, creation of fish sanctuaries, restriction of certain types of fishing gear and equipment, protection of reasonable access rights for local villages (7 per cent of total concession grounds) and the establishment of a fisheries research institute. The revenues from this more formalized management system were used until the early 1950s to develop public infrastructure such as roads and railways for Cambodia. After independence in 1954, a legal framework to the fishery was provided by promulgating the Fishery Law of 1956.

In the early post-independence phase, conflicts over the lot system resurfaced. The elite beneficiaries tried to gloss over the issues. They were initially successful. But King Norodom Sihanouk managed to have some of the fishing lots disbanded. In the 1960s, there were often reports of lot owners and managers being killed in disputes with local officials and villagers. It is likely that forces that eventually coalesced with the Khmer Rouge had a hand in these events. In 1973 Lon Nol banned all fishing lots, and in 1975, most fishing activity too was abandoned after the Khmer Rouge seized power. They relocated people away from fishing villages and even attempted to convert wetlands into rice fields. Unlike the people—particularly those of Vietnamese origin—the fish in the Tonle Sap lake faced no threat from the Khmer Rouge. Stocks were at their peak during their rule.

Fishing was revived again by the Soviet-supported socialist government of the People’s Republic of Kampuchea, established after the overthrow of the Khmer Rouge in 1979. In keeping with their ideological leanings, they attempted to make the fishing lots most socialist in ownership by handing them to solidarity groups of fisher families also called “krom samaki nesat”. The concession (tax) was to be paid in the form of fresh or salted fish to the State. This was the phase after more than a century -- that people were relatively free to fish where they wanted. Moreover, there was an abundance of fish following the low pressure on stocks in the Khmer Rouge period. It was during this phase that many people from Vietnam who were good fishermen entered Cambodia.

Many of them settled in the Tonle Sap, establishing floating villages, as they had no access to land. By the mid-1980s, with the Soviet Union in turmoil, the government had to seek alternative (...contd. on Page 3)

— from Cambodia’s Aquarian Reforms: The Emerging Challenges for Policy and Research by John Kurien, So Nam and Mao Sam Onn

---

**Rightspeak**

The Jargon of Fishing Rights

Wade through this alphabet soup of fishing rights!

- BMU: beach management units
- CDQ: community development quota
- CPR: community property rights
- CRZ: coastal regulation zone
- DAP: dedicated-access privilege
- IFQ: individual fishing quota
- ITQ: individual transferable quota
- IVQ: individual viable quota
- LAPP: limited-access privilege programme
- MBI: market-based instruments (or incentives)
- MPA: marine protected areas
- MSY: maximum sustainable yield
- MVQ: minimum viable quotas
- NTZ: no-take zone (also some times called ‘marine reserve’)
- SPA: sanctuary preservation area
- TAC: total allowable catch
- TURF: territorial use rights in fisheries

Workshop Website Launched!

To coincide with the ongoing workshop at Siem Reap, ICSF has launched a website to exclusively focus on the issues being discussed here. Please visit www.icsf.net/icsf2006/jspFiles/rights/index.jsp
that secure the rights of fishing communities to the coastal lands customarily used by them;
• greater capacity of fishing communities and their organizations to advocate for policies directed at equitable and sustainable coastal and fisheries management regimes appropriate for small- and large-scale fisheries in the Asian context; and
• recognition among policymakers of proposals articulated by fishing communities and their organizations for coastal and fisheries resources management.

(History of... contd. from Page 2)

sources of funds to run the country and keep their party cadres content. The fishing-lots system was seen as an important source to achieve both ends.

In 1987, the Cambodian government promulgated the Fisheries Management and Administration Law No. 33 of 1987. This was largely modeled after the Fishery Law of 1956. The new law applied to both marine and inland fisheries, and derived the concept of domain from the French legal concept of public domain—inalienable State property. It further divided the inland capture fishery into three categories: large-scale fishing (basically the fishing lots that are auctioned; also called industrial fishing); middle-scale fishing (fishing gear such as dip-nets, seine-nets, etc., which are licensed; also called enterprise fishing) and small-scale fishing (passive gear like single longlines, cast-nets and small gill-nets; also called family fishing).

The Sub-Decree on Community Fisheries Management proclaimed in 2005 put to question once again the continuance of the fishing-lot system. However, if history is any guide, the issue is not yet a closed matter.

(Country name: Kingdom of Cambodia
Conventional long form: Cambodia
Conventional short form: Preahreacheanachakr Kampuchea
Local long form: (phonetic pronunciation)
Local short form: Kampuchea
Former: Kingdom of Cambodia, Khmer Republic, Democratic Kampuchea, People’s Republic of Kampuchea, State of Cambodia
Government type: multiparty democracy under a constitutional monarchy
Phnom Penh
Area
Total: 181,040 sq km
land: 176,520 sq km
water: 4,520 sq km
Land boundaries: total: 2,572 km
border countries: Laos 541 km, Thailand 803 km,
Vietnam 1,228 km
Coastline: 443 km
Maritime claims: territorial sea: 12 nm
contiguous zone: 24 nm
exclusive economic zone: 200 nm
continental shelf: 200 nm
Population
Ethnic groups: Khmer 90%, Vietnamese 5%, Chinese 1%, other 4%
Religions: Theravada Buddhist 95%, other 5%
Official Language: Khmer (95%)
Other languages: French, English
Currency: Riel (US$1 = 3,987 Riels)

Most Cambodians consider themselves to be Khmers, descendants of the Angkor Empire that extended over much of Southeast Asia and reached its zenith between the 10th and 13th centuries. Attacks by the Thai and Cham (from present-day Vietnam) weakened the empire ushering in a long period of decline. The king placed the country under French protection in 1863. Cambodia became part of French Indochina in 1887. Following Japanese occupation in World War II, Cambodia gained full independence from France in 1953.

In April 1975, after a five-year struggle, Communist Khmer Rouge forces captured Phnom Penh and evacuated all cities and towns. At least 1.5 million Cambodians died from execution, forced hardships, or starvation during the Khmer Rouge regime under POL POT. A December 1978 Vietnamese invasion drove the Khmer Rouge into the countryside, began a 10-year Vietnamese occupation, and touched off almost 13 years of civil war. The 1991 Paris Peace Accords mandated democratic elections and a ceasefire, which was not fully respected by the Khmer Rouge.

UN-sponsored elections in 1993 helped restore some semblance of normalcy under a coalition government. Factions fighting in 1997 ended the first coalition government, but a second round of national elections in 1998 led to the formation of another coalition government and renewed political stability. The remaining elements of the Khmer Rouge surrendered in early 1999. Some of the remaining Khmer Rouge leaders are awaiting trial by a UN-sponsored tribunal for crimes against humanity. Elections in July 2003 were relatively peaceful, but it took one year of negotiations between contending political parties before a coalition government was formed.

—From The World Factbook, April 2007
Siem Reap: Boomtown Gateway

Translated literally from Khmer, “Siem Reap” means “Siam Defeated”, and the name of this province commemorates a Khmer victory over the neighboring kingdom of Thailand. These days, however, the only rampaging hordes are the tourists heading to Angkor, and this once quaint village has become the largest boomtown and construction site in Cambodia.

Being the gateway town to the famous heritage of the Angkor temples, Siem Reap has transformed itself into a vibrant town with modern hotels and architecture. Despite international influences, Siem Reap and its people have conserved much of the town’s image, culture and traditions.

Siem Reap City, the capital of the province, has colonial and Chinese-style architecture in the Old French Quarter, and around the Old Market.

In town can be found Apsara dance performances, craft shops, silk farms, rice-paddy countryside, fishing villages and a bird sanctuary near the great Tonle Sap Lake.

The town is a cluster of small villages along the Siem Reap River. These villages were originally developed around Buddhist pagodas (Wat), which are almost evenly spaced along the river from Wat Preah En Kau Sei in the north to Wat Phnom Krom in the south, where the Siem Reap River meets the Tonle Sap Lake.

The main town is concentrated around Sivutha Street and the Psar Chas area (Old Market area) where are located old colonial buildings, shopping and commercial districts. The Wat Bo area is now full of guesthouses and restaurants, while the Psar Leu area is crowded with local commerce.

...Where there is water, there are fish. If we care for the water, the fish will take care of us...

— Khmer saying

Know Your Khmer

Welcome

Som Svakum
Chhom Reap Suor/
Suor Sdey

Hello

Chhea Te
Chhea Chhle

Thank you

Or Kun
Min Oy Te

Orn Suor Sdey
Tieya Suor Sdey
Sayon Suor Sdey
Riet Trey Suor Sdey
Chhom Reap Lea

You’re welcome

Min Oy Te

Good morning

Arun Suor Sdey

Good afternoon

Yol Prom

Good evening

Bath (male)/
Chass (female)

Good night

Pit Chhea Ban

Goodbye

Bra Kot Nas

How are you?

Teu Neak Soksabay
Chhea Te?

I’m fine

Khnhom Soksabay
Chhea Te

Just a second/
One moment

Som Cham Muoy
Phlet

...And Tomorrow

Group Reports
Coastal Management Initiatives
Norwegian Experience

SAMUDRA for Siem Reap is a special publication brought out by the SAMUDRA Team for ICSF’s workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, at Siem Reap, Cambodia
Workshop opens, pro-poor criteria, principles stressed

On the first day of the workshop, soon after close to 60 delegates from 10 countries had registered, the proceedings got off to a rousing start to the patriotic strains of Nokoreach, Cambodia’s national anthem. A brief welcome by Chandrika Sharma, Executive Secretary, ICSF, was followed by an introductory overview to the workshop by John Kurien, Co-ordinator, Animation Team, ICSF, who extended greetings to the gathering in over half a dozen languages!

That international flavour seemed particularly appropriate as John Kurien traced the history of ICSF and the principles that helped launch it as an international network with a Third World focus, whose members come from different disciplinary backgrounds, but whose common factor is that they all are working closely with small-scale and artisanal fishing communities in different parts of the world.

Cambodia is the only country in Asia where the State has taken giant leaps to create rights for fishing communities and help them to attempt to mutually define responsibilities for co-management, John Kurien pointed out.

That point was reiterated by H. E. Nao Thuok, Director General of the Fisheries Administration, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Royal Government of Cambodia in his inaugural speech. Noting that the fisheries sector is crucial to the Cambodian people’s livelihoods and the national economy, the Director General said that the purpose of Cambodia’s fisheries reform is to “promote broad local participation in fisheries management and the efficient, sustainable, and equitable use of living aquatic resources”.

That community and people-oriented perspective was also evident in the Keynote Address of Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

He stressed that the improvement of the livelihoods of coastal communities and the sustainability of the fishery resources on which they depend require increased attention, strong commitment and collective efforts. When designing policies and strategies for small-scale fisheries management in developing countries, pro-poor criteria and principles need to be used, he added.

If management of single-species fisheries in Northern and sub-tropical waters is considered difficult, the task is even more daunting for the multi-species and multi-gear fisheries of the tropics, he said.

Pointing to the growing trend towards more (...contd. on Page 3)

In Fact

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), of the 47.6 mn fishers worldwide engaged in fishing and fish farming as a full-time, or, more frequently, part-time, occupation, as many as 42.3 mn, or 89 per cent, are in Asia.

China has the maximum number of fishers and fish farmers, followed by India, Vietnam, Indonesia, Bangladesh and the Philippines. The majority of fishers and fish farmers are small-scale, artisanal fishers, eking out a living from coastal and inland fishery resources.

According to the Asian Development Bank, artisanal, small-scale fisheries in Asia are estimated to contribute to at least 50 per cent of total fisheries production, providing extensive rural employment.
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More Inside
CSF traces its history to the historic conference that we organized in Rome in 1984 as a counter-conference to the FAO World Conference on Fisheries where all the representative of nation states participated. On that occasion, we argued vehemently for the rights of small-scale fishing communities to be an integral part of the FAO event. However, since this was not possible, we had no choice but to have our own event. Consequently 100 representatives of fishworkers and their supporters from 34 countries gathered in Rome in an event which we called the International Conference of Fishworkers and their Supporters.

The key follow-up conclusions of the Rome Conference were three:

1. Fishworkers and fishing communities the world over faced similar problems and therefore they have a mutual responsibility to find effective solutions.
2. Fishworkers would have to organize themselves better at the national level and also meet together more often at the regional and global level.
3. There was an important role for a network of supporters to further the cause of fishworkers.

The creation of ICSF in 1986 was the result of the third conclusion.

ICSF is a network of individuals—currently from 20 countries spread across the world. We are an international network but with a Third World focus. Our members come from different disciplinary backgrounds, but the common factor is that we are all working closely with small-scale and artisanal fishing communities in different parts of the world. It is our endeavour to support these fishing communities and their organizations and empower them to participate in fisheries from the multiple perspectives of justice, participation, sustainability and self-reliance. Among our members we have individuals who have nearly 35-40 years of experience working closely with fishing communities. Collectively, we can claim to have well over 800 person years of such experience. Over the last twenty years of our existence we have worked in all the continents of the world. We have done studies, undertaken training programmes, lobbied for important causes affecting fishworkers, published many documents, conducted several exchange programmes and organized events such as this where we have brought together fishing communities, scientists, community activists, researchers and representatives of State to discuss issues of common concern. One of the weaknesses of our work has been that we have not been able to address the concerns of inland fisheries and inland fishing communities. We do not have members in the big inland fishing countries like Cambodia and Bangladesh, for example.

This event is really our first attempt to correct this bias. It is also the first time we are collaborating with a government. We are therefore certainly looking forward to increasing our network and our realm of concern into inland fisheries.

And now to the introduction of the workshop. What better place to hold such a meeting than Cambodia to discuss rights and responsibilities in fisheries from the perspective of communities and the State?

Cambodia is the only country in Asia where the State has taken giant leaps to create rights for fishing communities and help them to attempt to mutually define responsibilities for co-management. This initiative has come from the highest level—the Prime Minister himself. Large tracts of inland water areas have been taken out of the control of influential and rich individuals and given over to the communities to manage. This reform policy has been ably implemented by the Fisheries Administration headed by HE Nao Thuok.

However, the situation of the fishing communities in Cambodia is special. They have gone through a long period of civil strife, mass displacement, forced migration and genocide. The cumulative result of these circumstances of history has been a great deficit of trust; a lack of bonding to the place where they stay and an uncertainty about how to relate to the... 

(excerpt from the Introduction to the Workshop by John Kurien)

...(contd. on Page 3)
I spent the last couple of weeks in Aceh, my country, you need two hands to clap. Defining responsibilities is the key to creating rights and they will manage them and earn a sustained livelihood from them. Building trust between governments and communities is the key to creating rights and defining responsibilities. As they say in my country, you need two hands to clap.

Small-scale fishers should be given preferential access to fishery resources, Nomura added. "As a pro-poor policy, a redistribution of access from the industrial fleets to small-scale fishers should be considered. This should be combined with improved protection of inshore areas, some of which have already been made exclusive to artisanal fisheries, he said.

The goal of responsible and equitable small-scale fisheries calls for a combination of decentralization of management responsibilities; a rights-based approach to fisheries management that meets social objectives; and strong support to social development and poverty alleviation, Nomura concluded.

---

### Nokoreach: Cambodia’s National Anthem

**Words by:** His Highness Patriarch Chuon Nat (1883-1969)

**Music by:** F. Perruchot and J. Jekyll, based on a Cambodian folk tune

**Adopted:** 1941, replaced 1970, restored 1975, replaced 1976, restored 1993

The anthem was originally adopted in 1941 and reconfirmed in 1947, around the time of independence from France. In 1970, the monarchy was abolished, thereby replacing the anthem as well. After the communist victory in 1975, former royalist symbols, including "Nokoreach", were reinstated for a short while until replaced with their own national symbols. After the royalist forces defeated the communists in 1993, putting an end to their long civil war, the royalist anthem was also restored to Cambodia once more. The title of the anthem is derived from the name of an ancient Khmer kingdom.

---

### Some History... contd. from Page 2

Government. Consequently, there has not been any widespread demand from the community for securing rights to resources in the manner which has been witnessed in other countries of Asia such as the Philippines or India. Last year I had the unique opportunity to work in Cambodia with both the government and the community. From my experience here, I think that the greatest contribution of the community fisheries initiative of the Royal Government of Cambodia will be in helping to build the social capital in the fishing villages and recreating trust by helping people to work together.

By organizing community fishery organizations in their villages, the people have a unique chance to work together; to explore their newly obtained resources and to take participatory decisions on how they will manage them and earn a sustainable livelihood from them. Building trust between governments and communities is the key to creating rights and defining responsibilities. As they say in my country, you need two hands to clap.

I spent the last couple of weeks in Aceh Province in Indonesia. As you all know, the fishing communities there have been devastated by the greatest natural calamity in our modern era – the 2004 tsunami. Several fishing communities had over half their population – particularly women and children – devoured by the sea. What humbled me was the phenomenal resilience of those who remain. They are getting on with their lives – looking forward and not deterred by the horrific events of the past. They preferred to consider what happened to them as God’s training for them rather than God’s punishment. However, though individual lives have been shattered, the social capital in the community has been quickly re-accumulated. Harmony and trust and the will to move ahead marked their attitude. The responsibilities towards one another in the community and to nature are clearly expressed. But yet there is no assertion of rights or plea for co-management. As a plan to rehabilitate the communities in Aceh, the government is keen to consider co-management, but they have yet to make the first steps towards this.

I placed before you these two examples from my brief experience only to highlight the different paths through which governments and communities may arrive at asserting the rights and defining the responsibilities which can lead to co-management initiatives. Perhaps the government officials in Aceh can learn much from the government initiatives in Cambodia. Maybe the communities in Cambodia can learn from the people of Aceh.

In the ICSF this has been our commitment. We believe that bringing people together and assisting them to interact and learn from each other is a major need of our time. We have facilitated this in Africa, in Latin America, in Europe and in Asia. In Asia we have taken many initiatives over the last two decades because more than three-quarters of the fishing communities in the world live here.

Many international agencies have now begun to talk about rights in fisheries. But the focus is largely on property rights at sea and on land. We at ICSF have talked about rights from the days of the Rome Conference. But our concern for rights extends far beyond the notions of prop-
Organizational Profiles

Following are brief write-ups on some of the fishworker and non-governmental organizations participating at this workshop:

**UBINIG, Bangladesh**
UBINIG is the acronym for Unnayan Bikalper Nitinirdharoni Gobeshona, which translated from the Bengali, stands for “Policy Research for Development Alternatives”. Essentially a policy advocacy and research organization, UBINIG originated in the form of a series of study circles started in 1981. The study circles were organized around issues concerning development and social change from a class and gender perspective. In 1984 UBINIG was formally constituted as an organization.

**Tambuyog Development Centre, Philippines**
Founded in 1984, Tambuyog called attention to declining fishery resources and unabated poverty in coastal communities through interdisciplinary research, creative information and education campaign, community organizing, policy advocacy and constituency building.

Tambuyog traces its roots in the communities along Lingayen Gulf in Pangasinan, where researchers from the University of the Philippines conducted research and organizing. Hence, the name tambuyog, a Pangasinense word for carabao’s horn which symbolizes the call for unity. Its founding was a response to the situation where efforts in community development were focused mainly on peasants and the agriculture sector, while the issues of the fisherfolk remained at the periphery. An important result of Tambuyog’s work after a decade is the substantial amount of data it has gathered participating at this workshop: in Asia because of the large language diversity in the region. But we also know that in Asia this diversity is also our strength because we learn to communicate with our hearts and minds. The shaking of heads; an outburst of disagreement; the hearty laugh; the actions with our hands – all these help to break down language barriers. We will experience much of this in the coming three days. This workshop can only be a beginning. We at ICSF hope that it will light a spark in the minds of those who participate and commit them to create their own visions and missions for asserting rights and defining responsibilities to a new level. This is our hope.

**There is rice in the fields and fish in the waters.**
— Asian saying

---

**Know Your Khmer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s your name?</th>
<th>Teu Neak Chhmos Oy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My name is</td>
<td>Khnhom Chhmos…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are you from?</td>
<td>Teu Neak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mok Pi Brates Na?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you speak English?</td>
<td>Teu Neak Nihey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pheasa Angle Reu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I understand</td>
<td>Bath (male)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chhass (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t understand</td>
<td>Te Khnhom Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoll Te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Some History... contd. from Page 3)**

(right)

In this workshop, we also wish to speak loudly about responsibilities. This is because rights without responsibilities and obligations are futile and empty. Rights without responsibilities are the license for unsustainable actions. This is true both for State and community actions. This is why we need to discuss them as one package or two sides of the same coin.

We know from experience that hoping to achieve this in three days is wishful thinking in Asia because of the large language diversity in the region. But we also know that in Asia this diversity is also our strength because we learn to communicate with our hearts and minds. The shaking of heads; an outburst of disagreement; the hearty laugh; the actions with our hands – all these help to break down language barriers. We will experience much of this in the coming three days. This workshop can only be a beginning. We at ICSF hope that it will light a spark in the minds of those who participate and commit them to create their own visions and missions for asserting rights and defining responsibilities to a new level. This is our hope.

---

SAMUDRA for Siem Reap is a special publication brought out by the SAMUDRA Team for ICSF’s workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, at Siem Reap, Cambodia.
Homing in on rights

On the second day of the workshop, rapporteurs of the four groups that met yesterday presented the reports of the discussions they had over the following four questions/issues:

- What kind of rights/perceived claims to fisheries resources and coastal management do fishing communities have?

- What are the main threats to the realization of these rights?

- What have been the actions taken to protect rights/exercise responsibility towards protecting and managing fisheries and coastal resources?

- What institutions—traditional or otherwise—exist to take forward the rights and define responsibilities?

Across groups, participants stressed community participation in resource management and law enforcement as among the important rights perceived by their fishing communities.

They also pointed to the need for alternative employment opportunities from allied sectors such as aquaculture, animal husbandry and ecotourism as legitimate claims for coastal communities. The Cambodian participants also rued the lack of capacity, including financial assets, and the absence of adequate knowledge about fisheries legislation.

Participants seemed unanimous in wanting sustained access to resources for fishing communities, especially traditional ones, and preventing entry of “outsiders” into the fishery, which was perceived as contributing to overcapacity and resource depletion.

The issue of transboundary crossings by fishermen in the course of their fishing trips also figured among the significant threats facing fishers in the region, especially those from India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

Awareness of problems seems to be high in the region, probably due to the history of movements by fisher groups mass organizations. Nonetheless, the participants expressed the need for stronger grass-root organizations, especially since the right to livelihood is seen as a value co-existing with various social barriers to entry and localised regulations on operations.

Across groups, there seemed to be a common complaint about conflicts with non-fishery interests. Industrialization and urbanization have damaged the coastal ecology and fishing habitats, while new infrastructure projects on the coast tend to displace fishing settlements and affect the access of fishermen.

(...contd. on Page 2)
Fisheries in Cambodia

In terms of total freshwater capture fish production, Cambodia is next only to China, Bangladesh and India. In terms of per capita production, however, Cambodia reports the highest figure. More than 5 mn people are employed—full- or part-time—in fisheries. The sector is crucial not only for people’s livelihoods, but it also contributes over 11 per cent to the national gross domestic product.

Fish is a vital and generally affordable source of food for our population, second only to rice. It accounts for more than 75 per cent of the animal protein intake. An average of 75.6 kg of fish per person per annum is consumed in fish-dependent communities, particularly around the Tonle Sap (Great Lake), as compared to a national average of 151 kg of rice per year. These consumption figures indicate that the inland fisheries of Cambodia contribute more to the national food balance than any other inland fishery in the world.

Bearing in mind that the fisheries sector is crucial to people’s livelihoods and the national economy, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC), during its second mandate, achieved significant reforms in many areas, especially in the fisheries sector. In the third mandate, the RGC continues to promote fisheries reforms by designating fisheries as one side of the Rectangular Strategy.

The RGC considers national and international organizations as well as the private sector to be development partners. For many years, the Fisheries Administration has received fruitful support and collaboration from donors, national and international NGOs and other development partners in implementing its fisheries policy reform effectively and successfully. We express our sincere thanks to them.

The new fisheries law, which was enacted in 2006 by the King, has the objective of ensuring management of inland and marine fisheries, and conservation of biodiversity, and promoting the livelihoods of local communities. It is notable that the traditional use rights of fishing communities are recognized under this legislation.

Towards ensuring sustainable fisheries, the RGC, through a Sub-Decree on Community Fisheries, encourages the establishment of community fisheries in inland and coastal areas. Attempts are being made to ensure greater participation of local communities in fisheries conservation and management. There are also initiatives to improve co-ordination between different sectors to minimize negative impacts on fisheries.

The RGC is committed to responsible fisheries and to the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the 1995 Mekong Agreement on Co-operation for the Sustainable Development of the Mekong River Basin.

The presentation by Magnus Torell of the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre (SEAFDEC) focused on the growing competition over space in coastal areas and the institutional complexities and overlapping responsibilities involved in coastal management initiatives. Despite a number of coastal zone management projects and initiatives, experience indicates a difficulty to maintain structure and organization beyond the project periods. There also seems to be a general agreement on institutional and legal “confusion” and overlaps. Given all this, it is difficult to incorporate small-scale... (contd. on Page 3)

Preah Khan

The Preah Khan temple is part of the Angkor complex of ancient temples dating back 1,000 years. The word Preah Khan means “sacred sword” and represents the sword of Hanuman, the monkey god of the Ramayana epic. Preah Khan was built on the site of Jayavarman VII’s victory over the invading Chams in 1181.
Community Fisheries Management

Some Important Features of the Sub-decree on Community Fisheries Management (SDCFM) of the Royal Government of Cambodia

What are the objectives of Community Fisheries?
Five objectives have been spelled out in the sub-decree: (a) to manage inland fisheries and related ecosystem where fishing lots have been cancelled (b) manage fisheries resources in a sustainable and equitable manner (c) to increase understanding and recognition of benefits of fisheries resource through participation in protection and management (d) provide legal framework to establish community fisheries (e) improve standard of living and reduce poverty.

What composes a CF?
It is a group of Khmer citizens who live in or near the fishing area and voluntarily establish the initiative to achieve the objectives mentioned above.

Who can become a member of a CF?
Khmer citizen; either sex; must be resident in village of the CF area; be 18 years and can be member only in one community fishery.

What are the duties of a CF?
To participate in managing and conserving resources; respect instructions from DoF, MAFF; participate in establishment of conservation areas within CF area; guarantee equal rights in sustainable use of resource; implement bye-laws and formulate plan; enter into CF area agreement with DoF to manage resource; and keep all documents related to CF.

What are the limits on these rights?
The CF has no right to transact the CF area in any manner; will not erect any structure in CF area without permission of DoF, MAFF; will not partition or establish any private ownership in CF area; will not enter into any agreement in CF area with any person or entity not even for scientific research.

How is a CF Committee formed?
Each CF will be lead by a Community Fishery Committee (CFC) which is elected by secret, free and fair election by the congress by an absolute majority of those who voted. The person with highest vote is Chief of CF; person with second highest Vice-Chief. The fishery competent authority; the commune council shall be invited to observe the election. However, results will be officially recognized even if they are absent. The number on the CFC will be 5, 7 or 11 depending on decision of congress. Women will be encouraged to be candidates. Khmer citizens who are members of the CF irrespective of sex have right to stand as candidates. The elected CFC has a term of 5 years and the right to lead and manage the CF in accordance with relevant article of the sub-decree.

What are the duties of the CFC?
The CFC has the following duties: draft by-laws and management plans and operate in accordance with them; seek technical and financial support; represent CF in mediation and conflict resolution; keep bank account and manage finances in transparent manner; make decisions on CF in accordance with by-laws; participate in consultations; report violations; conserve resources and CF area; perform other functions as instructed by fisheries competent authority; appeal if agreement for CF not renewed. The CFC has authority to apply to DoF to request approval of CF area agreement. The CFC may request technical assistance from fishery officials or individuals to draft CF area agreement.

Money matters
The riel (KHR) – pronounced “real” – is the official local currency (US$1 = 3,992 KHR), but the currency widely used in Siem Reap is the US dollar. Please keep this in mind while changing money.

— Excerpted from Cambodia’s Aquarian Reforms: The Emerging Challenges for Policy and Research
**Q&A | Philippines**

*Cesar Allan Vera* of the CBCRM Resource Centre talked to some of the participants from the Philippines on their organizations and what they perceive to be the problems they face:

**On current focus of organizational work:**

Capacity building of Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Councils at the municipal level—*Charles Capricho* of Bigkis Lakas

Looking into fisheries trade and liberalization issues using the framework of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and providing livelihood assistance to local organizations—*Iza Muñoz* of Kilusang Mangingisda

Enterprise development combined with coastal resource management. The small fisherfolk have sacrificed too much to manage their resources but they are not gaining economically—*Pepe Tanchuling* of Tambuyog

**On issues facing artisanal fishers:**

Globalization. It is leading to the promotion of aquaculture which makes small fisherfolk more vulnerable to a variety of problems, such as global warming —*Charles Capricho* of Bigkis Lakas

The bilateral agreements with China and Japan. These are affecting fisherfolk’s livelihood options, food security and sovereignty, and fisherfolk settlements—*Iza Muñoz* of Kilusang Mangingisda

Fisherfolk settlement. We will be displaced if we do not address this issue soon—*Gemma Gades* of NAMAHIN

**On the ongoing workshop:**

The workshop has helped me become aware of the context of other fisherfolks but the time is too short to really understand it better. The fisherfolk struggle is for empowerment. If they are empowered, they can claim their rights. The workshop is contributing to the empowerment of the small-scale fisherfolk—*Charles Capricho* of Bigkis Lakas

It is good to listen to the stories and experiences of fisherfolk from other countries, but I still have a lot of questions that I want to ask other participants—*Iza Muñoz* of Kilusang Mangingisda

It helps participants understand the links between rights and responsibilities. As we struggle to claim our rights, the responsibilities then become clearer—*Gemma Gades* of NAMAHIN

The participants are diverse—from ‘experts’ to small-scale fisherfolk. It further deepens my understanding of property regimes in fisheries. It is interesting to engage ‘experts’ with the concept of the right to livelihoods—*Pepe Tanchuling* of Tambuyog

**Know Your Khmer**

*What’s your name?*

*Teu Neak Chhmos Oy?*

*My name is .... Khnom Chhmos...*

*Where are you from?*

*Teu Neak Mok Pi Brates Na?*

*Do you speak English?*

*Teu Neak Niyey Pheasa Angle Reu?*

*Yes, I understand*

*Bath (male)/Chhass (female) Khnom Yoll*

*No, I don’t understand*

*Te Khnom Min Yoll Te*

*Where is ....? Now Eta?*

*How do I go (get) to....?*

*Teu Khnom Tov Ti Nos Doy Chhis Oy?*

*How far away is ....?*

*Chhngay Ponman?*

*Right*

*Khang Sdam*

*Left*

*Khang Chhving*

*Straight*

*Trong/Tov Trong*

*Up*

*Leung Leu*

*Down*

*Chhos Krom*

"The wealth of the sea belongs to the dead, the living, and those yet to be born.

— Asian saying"

**...And Tomorrow**

Field Trip to Tonle Sap and Angkor Wat

**SAMUDRA for Siem Reap** is a special publication brought out by the SAMUDRA Team for ICSF’s workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, at Siem Reap, Cambodia
Tonle Sap: Cambodia’s Great Lake

The Tonlé Sap (meaning Large Fresh Water River but more commonly translated as Great Lake) is a combined lake and river system of huge importance to Cambodia. It is the largest freshwater lake in South East Asia and is an ecological hotspot that was designated as a UNESCO biosphere in 1997. For most of the year the lake is fairly small, around 1-m deep and with an area of 2,700 sq km. During the monsoon season, however, the Tonle Sap river, which connects the lake with the Mekong river, reverses its flow. Water is pushed up from the Mekong into the lake, increasing its area to 16,000 sq km and its depth to up to nine meters, flooding nearby fields and forests. The flooding provides a perfect breeding ground for fish. The pulsing system with the large floodplain, rich biodiversity, and high annual sediment and nutrient fluxes from Mekong makes the Tonlé Sap one of the most productive inland fisheries in the world, supporting over 3 million people and providing over 75% of Cambodia’s annual inland fish catch and 60% of the Cambodians’ protein intake. At the end of the rainy season, the flow reverses and the fish are carried downriver.

National and local observers often state that the Tonlé Sap Lake is rapidly filling with sediment. However, recent long-term sedimentation studies show that net sedimentation within the Tonlé Sap Lake proper has been in the range of 0.1-0.16 mm/year since ca. 5500 years before present (BP). Thus, there is no threat of the lake filling up with sediment. On the contrary, sediment is not a threat to the lake but an important part of its ecosystem, providing nutrients that drive the floodplain productivity.

The reversal of the Tonlé Sap river’s flow also acts as a safety valve to prevent flooding further downstream. During the dry season (December to April) the Tonlé Sap Lake provides around 50% of the... (contd. on Page 3)

Stay safe

Generally, the Siem Reap area and the temples of Angkor are relatively safe. However, the usual cautions still apply as with any town or city. While visiting the temples, beware of off-duty police officers, who are in uniform, who start walking beside you and begin showing you around the temples.

At this point, either say that you would like to see the temples yourself, or agree on a price at the start.

Several people have been requested for a fee of over US$10 at the end of the temple tour, and you are not going to argue with a member of the police force!

— from Wikitravel

More Inside

Angkor Wat ............... 2
Joy of Living............... 3
Angkor Wat

Angkor Wat (or Angkor Vat) is a temple at Angkor, Cambodia, built for King Suryavarman II in the early 12th century as his State temple and capital city. The largest and best-preserved temple at the site, it is the only one to have remained a significant religious centre — first Hindu, dedicated to Vishnu, then Buddhist — since its foundation. The temple is the epitome of the high classical style of Khmer architecture. It has become a symbol of Cambodia, appearing on its national flag, and it is the country’s prime attraction for visitors.

Angkor Wat combines two basic plans of Khmer temple architecture: the temple mountain and the later galleryed temples. It is designed to represent Mount Meru, home of the gods in Hindu mythology: within a moat resembling gilded stucco on the towers, gilding on some figures on the bas-reliefs, and wooden ceiling panels and doors. Typical decorative elements are devatas (or apsaras), bas-reliefs, and on pediments extensive garlands and narrative scenes. Statuary is conservative, being more static and less graceful than earlier work.

Architecturally, the elements characteristic of the style include: the ogival, redented towers shaped like lotus buds; half-galleries to broaden passageways; axial galleries connecting enclosures; and the cruciform terraces which appear along the main axis of the temple. Most of the visible areas are of sandstone blocks, while laterite was used for the outer wall and for hidden structural parts. The binding agent used to join the blocks is yet to be identified, although natural resins or slaked lime have been suggested. Other elements of the design have been destroyed by looting and the passage of time, including

Some Puzzling Facts

Several extremely important and, we would have thought, glaringly obvious parts of the puzzle do still remain completely unsolved.

These include:
1. an explanation for the amazing suddenness with which the sacred domain of Angkor was brought to life at the beginning of the 9th century;
2. an explanation for why it was developed so methodically and so industriously, at such vast expense, for approximately 420 years;
3. an explanation for why this staggering and unprecedented burst of temple-building, greater in magnitude and quality than anything in India, took place in a remote backwater of rural Cambodia; and
4. an explanation for why all new temple-building at Angkor suddenly ceased in the 13th century after the death of Jayavarman VII and never resumed — even though the site continued to be occupied until at least the 16th century.

The notion that the rulers of Angkor were working to an imported master plan that they were, for some reason, obliged to fulfill within a specific time-frame provides a complete explanation for all of these mysteries.

— from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Angkor_wat)

— from Heaven’s Mirror by Graham Hancock
Since the 1990s Angkor Wat has seen a resumption of conservation efforts and a massive increase in tourism. The temple is part of the Angkor World Heritage Site, established in 1992, which has provided some funding and has encouraged the Cambodian government to protect the site. The German Apsara Conservation Project (GACP) is working to protect the devatas and other bas-reliefs which decorate the temple from damage. The organisation’s survey found that around 20% of the devatas were in very poor condition, mainly because of natural erosion and deterioration of the stone but in part also due to earlier restoration efforts. Other work involves the repair of collapsed sections of the structure, and prevention of further collapse: the west facade of the upper level, for example, has been buttressed by scaffolding since 2002, while a Japanese team completed restoration of the north library of the outer enclosure in 2005.

Angkor Wat has become a major tourist destination: attendance figures for the temple are not published, but in 2004 the country received just over a million international arrivals, of whom, according to the Ministry of Tourism, 57% planned to visit the temple. The influx of tourists has so far caused relatively little damage, other than some graffiti; ropes and wooden steps have been introduced to protect the bas-reliefs and floors, respectively. Tourism has also provided some additional funds for maintenance—approximately 28% of ticket revenues across the whole Angkor site is spent on the temples—although most work is carried out by foreign government-sponsored teams rather than by the Cambodian authorities.

---

flow to the Mekong Delta in Vietnam. The lake occupies a depression created due to the geological stress induced by the collision of the Indian subcontinent with Asia.

— From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tonle_Sap)

---

The Joy of Living

In the meanwhile, within minutes of the King’s departure from the port, a section of the crowd had rushed up the gangplank of the Amiral-Kersaint to see the dancers at first hand. For weekEs now the Marseille newspapers had been full of tantalizing snippets of information: it was said that the dancers entered the palace as children and spent their lives in seclusion ever afterwards: that their lives revolved entirely around the royal family; that several were the King’s mistresses and had even borne him children; that some of them had never stepped out of the palace grounds until this trip to France. European travellers went to great lengths to procure invitations to see these fabulous recuslences performing in the palace at Phnom Penh: now here they were, in Marseilles, visiting Europe for the very first time.

The dancers were on the ship’s first-class deck; they seemed to be everywhere, running, hopping, skipping, playing excitedly, feet skimming across the polished wood. The whole deck was a blur of legs, girls’legs, women’s legs, ‘fine, elegant legs’, for all the dancers were dressed in colourful sampots which ended shortly below the knee.

The onlookers were taken by surprise. They had expected perhaps a troupe of heavily veiled, voluptuous Salomes; they were not quite prepared for the lithe, athletic women they encountered on the Amiral-Kersaint; nor, indeed, was the rest of Europe. An observer wrote later: ‘With their hard and close-cropped hair, their figures like those of striplings, their thin, muscular legs like those of young boys, their arms and hands like those of little girls they seem to belong to no definite sex. They have something of the child about them, something of the young warrior of antiquity and something of the woman.’

---

Molyka was only thirteen in 1975, when the Khmer Rouge took Phnom Penh. She was evacuated with her whole extended family, fourteen people in all, to a labour camp in the province of Kompong Thom. A few months later she was separated from the others and sent to work in a fishing village on Cambodia’s immense freshwater lake, the Tonlé Sap. For the next three years she worked as a servant and nursemaid for a family of fisherfolk.

She only saw her parents once in that time. One day she was sent to a village near Kompong Thom with a group of girls. While sitting by the roadside she happened to look up from her basket of fish and saw her mother walking towards her. Her first instinct was to turn away; every detail matched those of her most frequently recurring dream: the parched countryside, the ragged palms, her mother coming out of the red dust of the road, walking straight towards her...

She didn’t see her mother again until 1979, when she came back to Phnom Penh after the Vietnamese invasion. She managed to locate her as well as two of her brothers after months of searching. Of the fourteen people who had walked out of her house three and a half years before, ten were dead, including her father, two brothers and a sister. Her mother had become an object, terrified creature after her father was called away into the fields one night, never to return. One of her brothers was too young to work; the other had willed himself into a state of guilt-stricken paralysis after revealing their father’s identity to the Khmer Rouge in a moment of inattention—he now held himself responsible for his father’s death.

Their family was from the social group that was hardest hit by the revolution: the urban middle classes. City people by definition, they were herded into rural work camps; the institutions and forms of knowledge that sustained them were destroyed—the judicial system was dismantled, the practice of formal medicine was discontinued; schools and colleges were shut down; banks and credit were done away with; indeed the very institution of money was abolished. Cambodia’s was not a civil war in the same sense as Somalia’s or the former...
Yugoslavia’s, fought over the fetishism of small differences: it was a war on history itself, an experiment in the reinvention of society. No regime in history had ever before made so systematic and sustained an attack on the middle class. Yet, if the experiment was proof of anything at all, it was ultimately of the indestructibility of the middle class, of its extraordinary tenacity and resilience; its capacity to preserve its forms of knowledge and expression through the most extreme kinds of adversity.

Molyka was only seventeen then but she was the one who had to cope because no one else in the family could. She took a job in the army and put herself and her brothers through school and college; later she acquired a house and a car; she adopted a child and—like so many people in Phnom Penh—she took in and supported about half a dozen complete strangers. In one way or another she was responsible for supporting a dozen lives.

Dancers and musicians from all over the country travelled to Phnom Penh for the festival. Proeung Chhieng, one of the best-known dancers and choreographers in the country, was one of those who made the journey: he came to Phnom Penh from Kompong Thom where he had helped assemble a small troupe of dancers after the fall of Democratic Kampuchea. He himself had trained at the palace since his childhood, specialising in the role of Hanuman, the monkey-god of the Ramayana epic, a part that is one of the glories of Khmer dance. This training proved instrumental in Proeung Chhieng’s survival: his expertise in clowning and mime helped him persuade the interrogators at his labour camp that he was an illiterate lunatic. At the festival he met many fellow-students and teachers for the first time after the Revolution: “We cried and wept through the entire performance. When the first musicians came onstage she heard sobs all around her. Then, when the dancers appeared, in their shabby, hastily made costumes, suddenly, everyone was crying, old people, young people, soldiers, children—“you could have sailed out of there in a boat”.

The performers were dismayed when they began preparing for the performance: large quantities of musical instruments, costumes and masks had been destroyed over the last few years. They had to improvise new costumes to perform in; instead of rich silks and brocades they used thin calico, produced by a government textile factory. The theatre they were to perform in, the Bassac, was in relatively good shape, but there was a crisis of electricity at the time, and the lighting was dim and unreliable.

But people flocked to the theatre the day the festival began. Onesta Carpene, a Catholic relief worker from Italy was one of the handful of foreigners then living in Phnom Penh. She was astonished at the response: the city was in a shambles; there was debris everywhere, spilling out of the houses, on to the pavements, the streets were jammed with pillaged cars, there was no money and very little food - "I could not believe that in a situation like that people would be thinking of music and dance." But still they came pouring in, and the theatre was filled far beyond its capacity. It was very hot inside.

Eva Myśliwiec, who had arrived recently to set up a Quaker relief mission, was one of the few foreigners present at that first performance. When the first musicians came onstage she heard sobs all around her. Then, when the dancers appeared, in their shabby, hastily made costumes, suddenly, everyone was crying, old people, young people, soldiers, children—“you could have sailed out of there in a boat”.

The people who were sitting next to her said: “We thought everything was lost, that we would never hear our music again, never see our dance.” They could not stop crying; people wept through the entire performance.

It was a kind of rebirth: a moment when the grief of survival became indistinguishable from the joy of living.

— excerpts from Dancing in Cambodia by Amitav Ghosh

---

The sea begins in the mountains...

— Asian saying

...And Tomorrow

- Inaugural Session of Symposium
- Country Presentations
- Panel Discussions
- Reception and Dinner

SAMUDRA for Siem Reap is a special publication brought out by the SAMUDRA Team for ICSF’s workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, at Siem Reap, Cambodia
The Siem Reap Statement

The following are excerpts from the Statement made by the participants of the workshop on the last day, Saturday, 5 May 2007. The full text of the Statement will be distributed today.

We, 51 participants representing small-scale and artisanal fishing communities, fishworker organizations, non-governmental organizations, researchers and activists from ten South and Southeast Asian countries, having gathered at the workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, from 3 to 5 May 2007 at Siem Reap, Cambodia,

Representing a diversity of geographical, social, cultural and economic backgrounds, but yet bonded by a commonality of interest and concerns,

And believing that natural resources of bays, seas, rivers and inland water bodies are the common heritage of all and that they should not be privatized for the benefit of the few,

Further believing that these resources should be equitably and responsibly shared for sustaining life and livelihood and towards the greater benefit of all small-scale and artisanal fishing communities,

And realizing that responsible fisheries can be assured only if human rights of fishing communities, including the right to decent work and labour standards, and human development, are secure,

Stress that just, participatory, self-reliant and sustainable development of coastal and inland fisheries is of vital importance to us.

In view of the above, we draw attention to the following issues:

- Fisheries Conservation and Management
- Coastal Area Management
- Marine Protected Areas
- Aquaculture and Mariculture
- Sustainable Fishing Gear and Practices
- Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
- Co-management and Community-based Approach
- Preferential Access of Small-scale and Artisanal Fishers
- Trans-border Movement of Small-scale and Artisanal Fishers
- Women in Fisheries
- Trade in Fish and Fish Products
- Fair Access to Social Services, Social Security and Credit
- ILO Fishing Convention
- Disaster Preparedness
- Establishment of a Coherent Management Framework
- Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities

In Fact

Fish and other aquatic animals are crucial for nutrition and food security because they provide the Cambodian people with over three-quarters of their total animal protein intake. They also contribute to much of their essential vitamins and minerals, particularly calcium and vitamin A, as well as fat intake in their diets.

Cambodians are considered one of the highest per capita consumers of fish in the world. A recent estimate from household surveys placed consumption at 66 kg per person per year. Fisheries contributed to between 8 and 12 per cent of the country’s GDP in the years 2000-2004.
Global Recognition of the Importance of Small-scale Fisheries

The globalization of fisheries can be said to have been actively pursued since 1992 when the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) was organized due to international concerns over the global environment. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) initiated the development of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries as a response to Agenda 21 in the same year. With the increased availability of development assistance funding, FAO also started a drastic policy modification of the organization to accommodate a global mandate for the promotion of food security, including by achieving sustainable fisheries. Before such a major modification of its mandate, FAO’s efforts for its member countries concentrated on assistance to developing countries through the implementation of large numbers of FAO field projects.

With such a change of policy, FAO has drastically shifted its focus from support to developing countries to the promotion of globalization. The way it organizes the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meeting, which is the biggest biennial fisheries conference in the world, has also been changed since the early 1990s. Various developmental issues affecting developing countries, including those related to small-scale fisheries, that used to be discussed at COFI meetings, have disappeared from the agenda. For more than 10 years now, small-scale fisheries issues have never been tabled at this global arena.

During these 10 years, however, the frustrations of developing countries that COFI has focused on global initiatives, and not spared the time to discuss issues that they are more interested in, have accumulated. Even though COFI reopened discussions on small-scale issues in the session held in 2003, the level of discussion has never reached the satisfaction of many developing countries.

In the 2007 COFI session, the overwhelming voices of developing countries dominated the agenda on small-scale fisheries, calling for FAO to develop the programme on small-scale fisheries, particularly highlighting the formulation of appropriate global policy on rights-based fisheries for the small-scale sector. COFI, in principle, supported the idea of a global programme on small-scale fisheries but could not clarify the detailed programme framework due to the unclear financial situation needed to implement such a proposed programme.

Immediately after the COFI session, a Regional Fisheries Bodies Secretariat Network Meeting was held, which discussed a possible programme framework among the Regional Fisheries Bodies that are mainly working for the small-scale sector. The Meeting agreed to provide, and advise on, the terms of reference and scope of work of such a programme, and explore the possibility of an extra-budgetary FAO programme for small-scale fisheries.

It was also agreed that in order to facilitate and clarify various preparatory work, a dedicated website would be developed with sufficient focus on rights-based fisheries/co-management. It is hoped that through such efforts, the needs and voices of local fishing communities can reach a global level through co-ordination among various channels, including those of ICSF.

Women in Fisheries

Women have traditionally played four important roles in riparian communities: finding food for the family (including gathering aquatic flora and fauna in the dry season when men migrate to find work); processing fish; selling fish and supporting the husband in fishing and related activities like mending nets, etc. With the coming of community fisheries (CF), their roles in all these activities are bound to expand. Making this expansion of activity also qualitatively different

— This piece is by Dr. Yasuhisa Kato, Special Adviser, SEAFDEC

Tonle Sap fisheries and local livelihoods

The inland water fisheries of Cambodia rank first in the world in terms of per area productivity. However, the natural productivity of the Tonle Sap lake’s floodplains will be threatened if the flood pulse, seasonally flooded habitats, and fish migration routes are disrupted by man-made structures that modify the hydrology of the Mekong river system.

Numerous hydropower dams and irrigation schemes are currently under construction in the region, mainly in countries upstream of Cambodia. The WorldFish Centre, in collaboration with partners including the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute and the Cambodian National Mekong Committee, has recently completed a study on the influence of infrastructure on the Tonle Sap fisheries and local livelihoods. The study has shown that intensive development, if it goes ahead as proposed, will negatively affect 87 per cent of the known fish species in the Mekong river system, as they are migratory.

For more information, please contact WorldFish Centre—Greater Mekong Region at worldfish cambodia@cgiar.org or y.kura@cgiar.org

— This piece is by Yumiko Kura of the WorldFish Centre

Women in Fisheries

Women have traditionally played four important roles in riparian communities: finding food for the family (including gathering aquatic flora and fauna in the dry season when men migrate to find work); processing fish; selling fish and supporting the husband in fishing and related activities like mending nets, etc. With the coming of community fisheries (CF), their roles in all these activities are bound to expand. Making this expansion of activity also qualitatively different

— This piece is by Dr. Yasuhisa Kato, Special Adviser, SEAFDEC

(....contd. on Page 3)
Small-scale Fisheries and Communities: A European Perspective

Small-scale fisheries and the communities they support are under growing threat in Europe from management systems that favour the rule of the market place and control of access to resources by large companies and corporations. From Portugal to Iceland, and from Denmark to the south of Ireland, there has been a steady erosion of fishery rights and access to local fish stocks, from the region’s small fishers. Thousands of jobs have been lost in the sector and fleet size has diminished considerably.

In the United Kingdom, the areas hardest hit have been Scotland and the south coast of England. Small-scale fleets have been the backbone of the country’s fisheries for centuries, pioneering herring, shellfish and demersal harvesting, developing owner-operated boats, and building up scores of small harbours and markets around the coast.

In the past 30 years, the sector has seen its very right to fish local stocks and operate on local grounds, steadily diminished. The fleet has lost over 1,000 boats and up to 5,000 jobs. The major factor has been rigid enforcement of the European Union (EU) Common Fisheries Policy and its related application of single-species quotas on a multi-species fishery. The current decline in cod stocks has been used by the European Commission to reduce all demersal species quotas. Shellfish quotas have also been cut, and the government recently gave 375 tonnes of Scottish nephrops prawn quota to Germany in return for a sole quota for the east of England. Many small coastal ports are suffering economically from the decline of the small-scale sector. A designated ports measure made it illegal for small-scale fishers to land their catches at any but a few large selected ports, without special advance permission in each case. This has added to the time and cost of marketing the production from the smaller vessels, and has seriously limited the fish supply available to small local processors.

As predicted by many at the time, the introduction of a trade in quota entitlement has seen the right to harvest fish gravitating to the most wealthy and powerful groups. Some investors, now in retirement, lease quota at high prices to skippers who lack adequate catching rights.

The market now rules in the area of fishing rights, to the detriment of thousands of small operators. The EU is currently debating the whole question of fishing rights, but, astonishingly, is promoting the idea that all these rights should be ‘tradeable’. The rule of the market will then reign supreme over social and humanitarian considerations.

Now, a new series of measures threatens to further cripple the small-scale sector and its coastal communities. This latest threat comes under the seemingly innocuous and admirable term of ‘Coastal and Marine National Parks’. They are being promoted in the name of conservation but with no regard to the primary rules of such fundamental innovations. There has been no prior scientific investigation to determine whether they are necessary or whether in fact they will actually preserve the ecosystem. Neither has there been any meaningful consultation with the stakeholders most

— from Cambodia’s Aquarian Reforms: The Emerging Challenges for Policy and Research

(...contd. from Page 2)
In Solidarity

The following Statement of Solidarity, in support of South African fishers, was adopted by the participants of the Siem Reap Rights Workshop:

We, the participants of the workshop on Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia, organized by the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF) at Siem Reap, Cambodia, during 3 – 8 May 2007, express our solidarity with the traditional fishers and their organizations in South Africa, specifically the Masifundise Development Trust and Coastal Links, in their struggle to assert their traditional rights.

We congratulate them on the recent agreement with the Fisheries Minister of South Africa that commits the Government to develop a legislative and policy framework that accommodates traditional fishers more effectively, while also providing basic interim relief for artisanal fishers who did not get any long-term fishing rights.

We regard this as a testament to the many years of struggle and hardship of South Africa’s traditional fishers, and the specific campaign efforts of Masifundise and Coastal Links to address the plight and needs of poor fishing communities.

We consider this as a victory not only for the traditional fishers of South Africa but also a victory for traditional and small-scale fishing communities all over the world.

We realize that the road ahead will be a long and difficult one and, in the spirit of international solidarity and a commonality of interests and concerns, we, on behalf of traditional small-scale and artisanal fishing communities in Asia, pledge our unstinting support to the traditional fishers of South Africa and their organizations as they continue to struggle to retain and reassert their traditional rights, in the face of hardships and constraints.

Since the fishing communities are a small section of the UK population, the government tends to ignore their views. A recent protest organized by a women-led group, the ‘Cod Crusaders’, obtained over 250,000 signatures in support, but was totally ignored by the ruling Labour–Liberal Democrat coalition in the Scottish Parliament.

— Asian saying

Our struggle is for the future: ours and that of the fish

— This piece is by David Thomson of the FAO Regional Office, Cambodia
The vast majority of the world’s fishers and fish farmers—96.6 per cent of the global total, or 40 mn people—live in developing countries. 34 mn are small-scale operators who use small open-decked traditional craft powered by sails and oars and fish close to shore. An additional 100 mn people are estimated to be involved in the small-scale post-harvest sector (processing, transport, marketing). There are millions of other rural people involved in seasonal or occasional fishing activities who are not recorded as ‘fishers’ in official statistics.

Fish provides 19 per cent of all animal protein intake in developing countries, a share that can exceed 25 per cent in the poorest countries and reaches 90 per cent in isolated parts of coastal or inland areas and in small island developing States.

As Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department of the FAO, said in his Keynote Address, the symposium and workshop “represent an excellent opportunity to discuss these issues, exchange experiences and improve our understanding of the core issues with regard to fisheries management in the small-scale sector”.

“There has been a growing trend towards increased decentralization of governance in general as well as in fisheries management. Management responsibilities are increasingly shared among the government, communities and other stakeholders. This type of co-management system is gaining in popularity, in particular in the small-scale fisheries sector,” he added.

“Lessons learnt from co-management experience point at four main elements necessary for making...”

(...contd. on Page 4)
Pakistan Fisherfolk Forum
The Pakistan Fisherfolk Forum (PFF) was launched on 5 May 1998 by a large number of fisherfolk community representatives and NGO activists as a result of full-day deliberations at a seminar organized in Karachi to discuss the threats to livelihoods of fisherfolk communities.

Since its inception, PFF has been active in awareness raising, and mobilization and community organization for the protection as well as sustainable management of fisheries and community livelihoods through advocacy, participatory research, information dissemination and participatory community development processes.

For more, please visit: http://www.pff.org.pk

Sustainable Development Foundation, Thailand
The Sustainable Development Foundation (SDF) was established in 2000 to support the Danish Co-operation for Environment and Development (DANCED) Partnership Programme Towards Sustainable Management of Natural Resources. The programme focused on the promotion of natural resource management by community organizations. It comprised four regional projects, which were co-ordinated by a Central Support Unit (CSU) in Bangkok.

SDF has maintained this structure, as the combination of regional projects and a CSU is in keeping with the foundation’s complementary objectives of facilitating empowerment and collaboration. Established to promote and expand sustainable development ideas and approaches, SDF’s mission is to support and strengthen NGOs, people’s organizations and local groups by promoting sustainable development, learning through doing, developing holistic visions, improving understanding of development, and strengthening the co-operation between various groups in society.

For more, please visit http://www.sdfthai.org/web_pages_index/index.html

CBNRM Learning Centre, Philippines
The Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Learning Centre, formerly the CBCRM Resource Centre, is an NGO based in the Philippines that works with people’s organizations and other civil society institutions towards enabling communities to sustain their resources and livelihood. The CBCRM Learning Centre was established in 1995 to promote exchange of experiences and generation of knowledge on community-based natural resources management in the Philippines and Asia.

The CBNRM Learning Centre envisions a society that allows women and men to live and realize their full potentials in harmony with the environment, affirms the love for life, and strives to develop a deep respect for all its forms and interactions, upholds equity, justice, participation and empowerment as primary values, and promotes reverence for the environment as it continually seeks to understand and work with nature to sustain ecological integrity.

For more, please visit http://www.cbcrmlearning.org/index.htm

Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Learning Institute, Cambodia
The Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Learning Institute works with partners to analyze and improve the community-based natural resources management approach as an integral component of poverty alleviation, sustainable livelihoods and resource management, conservation, and decentralization policies and strategies of the Royal Government of Cambodia.

The Learning Institute is vital in helping to strengthen linkages to locally based approaches, leading to the empowerment of local communities to participate actively in the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources through Community Forestry (CF), Community Fisheries (CFish), Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP), and Participatory Protected Areas Management (PA).

For more, please visit http://www.cbcrmlearning.org/index.htm

Panglima Laot, Aceh, Indonesia
The Panglima Laot of Indonesia is best described as an ancient Acehnese guild of fishermen, wide-reaching in scope and with special privileges such as the right to try wrongdoers within the guild. The Panglima Laot has branches throughout Aceh. Its relevance in the post-tsunami situation is substantial.

The Panglima Laot, an organization forged in the briny past of Aceh’s maritime traditions, is now at the fore of the province’s future recovery. Panglima Laot, which translates as ‘sea admiral’, is offering immediate work that takes survivors’ minds off the 2004 tsunami disaster, provides them with cash and helps clean up the coastline. In the future, the organization will work as a trusted channel for grants to buy boats and rebuild the fishing infrastructure, ensuring aid money is not swallowed up.

“Around 80 per cent of the fishing fleet in Aceh, some 5,000 big and small boats, is estimated to have been destroyed by the tsunami,” Muhammad Adli Abdullah, the group’s secretary general, told AFP.

He said that coastal communities covered by his organization involved some 425,000—fishermen, fish farmers, boat builders and other tradesmen in marine craft and fish culture.

For more information (in Bahasa Indonesia), please visit http://www.panglimalaot.or.id/ default.php?dir=home

Yadfon Association, Thailand
In 1985, Pisit Charnsnoh and his wife founded the Yadfon Association to work with impoverished coastal villages in Trang.

In Thai, Yadfon means raindrop, a symbol of renewal. It took Pisit, who is a Buddhist, time and patience to gain credibility with the Muslim villagers. In the 17 years he has worked in this region, he has become known for his understated but firm and effective manner.

Yadfon’s work, which began in a few villages, eventually spread to 30 communities. The organization encouraged villages to unite in protecting the coastal fisheries and mangroves. In 1986, under Yadfon’s leadership, communities began restoring a 240-acre mangrove forest.

In 1989, with the area restored, the Thai Forest Service and the provincial government declared it the country’s first community-managed mangrove forest. The restoration results were dramatic. From 1991 to 1994, there was a 40 per cent increase in total catch, resulting in increased income levels in the local villages. Co-management became a government-sanctioned model in other communities. At least nine community-managed forests have been created since, and Pisit continues to work for the growth of this strategy.

For more information, please visit http://www.goldmanprize.org/node/91

Telepak Indonesia
Founded in January 1997, Telepak Indonesia became an association in January 2002. Telepak’s objective is to conduct high
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large-scale</th>
<th>Small-scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of fishermen employed</strong></td>
<td>Around 500,000</td>
<td>Over 12 mn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual catch for human consumption</strong></td>
<td>Around 29 mn tonnes</td>
<td>Around 24 mn tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital cost of each job on fishing vessels</strong></td>
<td>US$ 30,000-300,000</td>
<td>US$ 250-2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual catch of marine fish for animal feed and reduction to meal and oil</strong></td>
<td>Around 22 mn tonnes</td>
<td>Almost none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual fuel oil consumption</strong></td>
<td>14-19 mn tonnes</td>
<td>1-2.5 mn tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish caught per tonne of oil consumed</strong></td>
<td>2-5 tonnes</td>
<td>8-20 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishermen employed for each US$ 1 mn invested</strong></td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>500-4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish destroyed at sea as by-catch</strong></td>
<td>6-16 mn tonnes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: David Thomson, ICLARM. Updated by courtesy of Dr. Armin Lindquist. Re-formatted by Kim Ang, FAO*
ing it successful: an enabling policy and legal framework; the participation and empowerment of resource users; effective linkages and institutions; and resources as an asset worth managing."

Small-scale fishers should be given preferential access to fishery resources, Nomura said. “Small-scale fisheries are more efficient generators of local income, employment and food for direct human consumption than large-scale fisheries. With limited resources, there is increased competition between the two sectors. As a pro-poor policy, a redistribution of access from the industrial fleets to small-scale fishers should be considered. This should be combined with improved protection of inshore areas, some of which have already been made exclusive to artisanal fisheries. I recognize, though, that such a redistribution would not be an easy task, considering the large number of vessels in Asia, the existing access rights, and the potential effects on employment in the industrial sector.”

That the road ahead will not be an easy one was something that the workshop participants recognized. As the Siem Reap Statement noted, the challenge in moving towards sustainable fisheries and integrated coastal/wetland area management is to develop, and implement, a coherent management framework for coastal areas/wetlands and the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) in a consultative and participatory manner, taking into account the environmental, ecological, social and economic dimensions of fishing, fish resources and fish habitats, as well as the impacts of global warming.

In achieving that goal, no one can forget or ignore the countless responsibilities that accompany such aspirations. Again, as the participants noted in the Siem Reap Statement, “While the above assertions pertain to our perceptions of rights, we are fully mindful of the responsibilities, obligations and duties that we collectively have towards nurturing the fishery resources and related habitats. These responsibilities, obligations and duties are necessarily oriented toward our collaborative relationship with our communities, the nation State and the international community.”

(Organizational...contd. from Page 2)

quality research on key natural resources management issues, translate the results into persuasive policy advocacy at national and local levels, and work closely with local NGOs and communities to build their own capacities as resource managers and advocates.

Telapak’s governing philosophy is that “all of Indonesia’s territory is a conservation area” in the sense that biodiversity conservation, natural resource-based production, and the empowerment and livelihood security of resource-dependent communities must be integrated in an approach to sustainability and equity that encompasses all aspects of the land- and seascape—from the most remote forests and reefs to farmers’ fields and fishing grounds. (So too, research, local empowerment and capacity-building, and policy advocacy must be carefully integrated to be mutually supportive and synergistic.)

Centre for Marinelife Conservation and Community Development (MCD), Vietnam
The Centre for Marinelife Conservation and Community Development (MCD) is devoted to work to conserve coastal and marine resources, and ensure sustainable development and livelihoods in Vietnam.

Comprising researchers and practitioners in the fields of sustainable community development, coastal and marine ecosystem conservation, environmental literacy and gender issues, MCD’s projects include a locally managed marine reserve in Van Hung commune, a community-based coral reef conservation project in Ninh Thuan, a sustainable fisheries programme in a national park, a women’s participatory programme in coastal resource management, and, environmental literacy programmes in locally managed marine areas.

For more details, please visit www.mcdvietnam.org or email mcd@mcdvietnam.org
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see those rights as ‘theirs’, whether or not the legislation claims that the fishing rights are ‘common property’, as in the Icelandic case. It is also well worth keeping in mind that for every hindrance the legislator builds, at least two ways will be found around it.

The case for the “protection of regional development” has now entered the debate, as shown by the example of Flateyri, a small coastal community on the west coast, with a population of 300. On 17 May 2007—just five days after the elections—the biggest processing plant in Flateyri, which is also the biggest quota holder, announced that it would close down and sell the quotas. The majority of the workforce in Flateyri—120 persons—will lose their jobs. The government says it will “keep a close eye” on what will happen. The fact is that there is little for the authorities to do in cases like this—except to turn the ITQ legislation upside down. It will be interesting to “keep a close eye” on what the government will do. The community quota scheme appears to have helped Flateyri not a bit.

Iceland’s wealth might make it possible for even the smallest fishing operators to deal with an ITQ system. The small-boat owners are working with what they have, keeping in mind that the system will not be revoked. Icelandic small boats have never appeared stronger, never fished as much and never delivered as great quality. Safety-at-sea measures have also gone through a revolution, as have the working conditions on board fishing vessels.

The status of the fish stocks in Iceland seems to have little to do with the management system. Stocks fluctuate, up and down, most likely in spite of whatever management system is in place—not because of it. The negative impacts on the small coastal communities, however, remain. Yet, changing to another system is not the magic solution that many opponents of the ITQ system believe to be the answer.

At the same time, Icelandic small-boat owners realize that enforcing such a system in a foreign environment burdened with poverty, low education levels, and a weak political and legislative regime, where, among other things, human rights are violated, could well mean the end of the small-scale, coastal and artisanal fisheries.

The best advice Icelandic small-boat and coastal fishermen can give to their brothers and sisters around the world is to lay down their differences and unite around the issues they have in common. By doing that, they have a strong possibility to shape their own future.

The status of the fish stocks in Iceland seems to have little to do with the management system. Stocks fluctuate, up and down, most likely in spite of whatever management system is in place—not because of it.
Chile has a coastline of approximately 4,625 km.
Mucho Moolah, Sweatshop Standards

Despite being a jewel in the crown of Chile’s export economy, the salmon aquaculture industry is plagued by poor workplace and labour standards

The salmon industry is one of the jewels in the crown of Chile’s export economy, which has grown at an average annual rate of 15 per cent over the last 15 years. Although production has stagnated in the last couple of years, the value of exports has not. In 2006, salmon exports reached US$2.2 bn, up 28 per cent over 2005, despite a fall in production. Projections for 2007 predict earnings in excess of US$2.5 bn, assuming that demand increases will be sustained in the international markets, which take 98 per cent of Chile’s farmed salmon production.

The Los Lagos (Xth) Region is Chile’s salmon centre, concentrated around Puerto Montt and the island of Chiloé, producing over 90 per cent of Chile’s salmon and employing around 50,000 people, some 60 per cent being women.

But gradually salmon-growing and export-processing facilities are being established further south in Chile’s most southerly, least populated, most isolated regions, where pristine environmental conditions provide ideal growing conditions.

But working in Chile’s salmon aquaculture sector entails dangers to health and safety, and has led to some fatalities. Using data from the Chilean Navy, the Labour Directorate, and the governments of the Los Lagos and Aisén Regions, the non-governmental organization, Centro Ecocceanos, has recorded that between February 2005 and April 2007, 42 workers in the aquaculture—mainly salmon—industry have been killed at work, or have gone missing, presumed dead.

They were engaged as divers (to inspect, maintain and repair cages), salmon feeders, workers who maintained and serviced the salmon cages and related infrastructure, security guards, and feed-plant and fish-plant processing workers.

Most of the workers are in the export-processing plants, where, according to Directorate of Work data, 91 per cent of the tasks are carried out by women, many being single parents. They work shifts, both day and night. Fewer workers are engaged in the rearing centres.

Safety standards
Centro Ecocceanos alleges that in most cases, the high death toll could have been avoided if health-and-safety standards had not been compromised, and if proper training and equipment had been provided. While the salmon industry in Chile might be a giant in the export sector, reporting First-World earnings, it seems that Third-World standards are applied to working conditions and environmental regulation, says Juan Carlos Cardenas, Director, Centro Ecocceanos.
Cardenas points out that multinationals own 36 per cent of Chilean salmon-producing companies, but apply double standards in Chile that contravene the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. These are designed to promote corporate social and environmental responsibility, and deal with employment and industrial relations, human rights, environment, information disclosure, bribery, consumer interests, science and technology, competition and taxation.

Noteworthy among the multinational companies is Marine Harvest, the biggest corporation operating in Chile, bought by Norwegian billionaire John Fredriksen on 6 March 2006 for Euro1.175 bn. Unfortunately, the record of Marine Harvest shows a big gap between the standards applied in Norway and Chile. Marine Harvest has incurred a long list of penalties for not complying with the labour laws. The report of the National Labour Directorate, given to the Chamber of Deputies’ Fisheries Committee for its ‘salmon review’, details some 80 fines applied by the Inspectors of Work in the Xth Region, with amounts totalling more than 63 mn pesos.

In a letter dated 1 June 2007 to Sven Aaser, the Group Chief Executive of Marine Harvest, representatives of Chile’s salmon workers pointed out that many workers in Chile’s salmon industry receive wages of around US$285 or Euro210 per month, that more than half have no life insurance coverage, and that more than three-quarters have no disability insurance.

On 14 December 2005, Javier Velásquez Millán, aged 24, died following an accident at work at Marine Harvest’s Chamiza plant. According to the accident report, Velásquez was carrying out his duties normally. A forklift truck passing close to where he was working tipped over because the floor was not level. The load it was carrying fell on him, killing him immediately. According to his workmates, Velazquez was not provided with any protection. The accident report further states that the surface on which the truck was working was not safe for operation without risk.

In August 2006, two senior executives at the Marine Harvest Chamiza plant were charged with involuntary homicide for their part in the accident. Simultaneously, the family of the victim mounted a claim for compensation. Despite the progress made in the case, according to Jaime Gatica, the lawyer acting for the deceased worker’s family, “Marine Harvest has tried to evade and minimize its responsibility in the accident. It has not behaved in a direct or transparent way. This transnational has shown zero corporate social responsibility.” To date, Marine Harvest has refused to pay any compensation to the family of the deceased worker, and has not admitted any liability in this and other accidents at work.

Based on this and similar incidents, Cardenas calls for a wide-ranging discussion on the real environmental, economic and social costs of salmon farming in Chile, and a review of alternative models of aquaculture that could serve to establish more democratic and so-
Official statistics reveal a high rate of accidents at work in the Los Lagos Region, where 90 per cent of Chile’s salmon is produced. In 2005, accident rates were 11.2 per cent in the rearing units and 13.9 per cent in the processing plants, far above the national average of 7.96 per cent for industrial workers. According to industry sources, 73 per cent of accidents occur in the processing plants, 19 per cent on marine sites, and 5 per cent in the feed plants. Centro Ecoceanos says that the maritime authorities acknowledge that only 5 per cent of the accidents and illnesses suffered by divers operating in the salmon industry are reported.

Over the last few years, according to the National Directorate for Labour, two-thirds of the salmon companies in the Xth Region have violated the labour laws. During 2003-2005, a total of 572 programmed inspections were carried out, 404 of which resulted in fines, equivalent to a violation rate of 70 per cent.

The main violations relate to:
- employment of casual labour (lack of contracts);
- violation of health-and-safety rules at the workplace;
- unsafe underwater working conditions;
- violation of maternity rules; and
- anti-trade-union practices, including violation of the right to association, and harassment of union members and leaders.

Divers employed in the salmon industry are particularly vulnerable to occupational ailments and accidents. There are around 4,000 divers in the industry, of whom 100 are commercial divers certified to international standards. The rest are workers from the artisanal fishing sector who have learned diving from friends and relations. They undertake about 4 mn dives a year. For the 20 years that they have been diving for the salmon aquaculture industry, there has been no professional regulation of their work. Only in 2005 did the Chilean Navy modify the Diving Regulation for Professional Divers Act, to focus on regulating the work in the salmon industry.

A small proportion (less than 10 per cent in 2006) of the so-called ‘shellfish divers’, who are allowed to dive to 20 m, had obtained ‘intermediate shellfish divers’ licences that permit them to dive to 36 m. The intermediate shellfish diver qualification requires the use of newer, safer equipment. However, training is a major problem. In the first qualifying examination carried out by the Chilean Navy in April 2006, only 18 of the 236 workers who took the test passed.

The shellfish divers are more prone to accidents (reporting a rate of 80 per cent) than commercial divers (20 per cent). The latter are much better qualified and trained, but the salmon industry does not hire them for reasons of cost. A commercial diver’s charges are four times more than a shellfish diver’s.

Mariscope, a commercial oceanographic research company, has documented cases of shellfish divers in rearing centres diving to 42 m, and some have admitted going down to 65 m. According to Mariscope, of the 157 shellfish divers surveyed, 87 per cent have been affected by diving-related illnesses during their working lives.

On 5 July 2006, the Special Session of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies, analyzed allegations of low environmental and labour standards in the salmon industry. Labour Minister Osvaldo Andrade stated, “The work-
place conditions and equipment used lack certification, the workers are not competent or trained, and, given that cages are more than 20 m deep, and that ‘yo-yo’ diving practices are used, frequent accidents are common, often not reported, with a regrettable fatality rate.”

Illustrative of the disregard for the health and safety of workers is the reaction of the salmon industry to the earthquake that hit Chile’s southern Aysén Region on Saturday, 21 April 2007. The 6.2-magnitude earthquake caused landslides and waves up to 6 m high, killing around 10 people (three confirmed, and seven missing, presumed dead), including four salmon farm workers.

In January 2007, earth tremors in Aysén prompted the government to open discussions with the industry on suspending activities in the Aysén fjord as a precautionary measure, based on specialist recommendations. Few companies followed the advice, and César Barros, President of SalmonChile, the salmon industry association, denied that any such advice had been given. This drew harsh criticism from Chile’s President, Michelle Bachelet, who said, “It is unacceptable in the context of the tragedy that occurred in Aysén, that there are people denying that the government, on several occasions, through the Emergency Committee, officially notified the salmon companies to make sure of their workers’ physical safety”.

Visiting the area soon after the tragedy, Bachelet told representatives of the salmon industry that all farm installations in the Aysén fjord should be relocated to ensure the safety of workers. Six weeks later, in early June, the industry, represented by SalmonChile, opened negotiations with workers and the Interior Ministry to formulate an agreement that would see workers assuming responsibility for their own safety when undertaking work on farm installations in the earthquake zone.

The legality of such an agreement was questioned by Osvaldo Andrade, Chile’s Minister of Work. René Haro Delgado, Director of Work for the Aysén Region, stated that while such an agreement may have been signed with the mutual agreement of all parties, “it does not absolve the companies from their labour and civil responsibilities and the penalties that may eventually follow an accident at work.”

Salmon companies divest their responsibilities as employers by subcontracting the supply of labour. A 2004 survey showed that subcontracting is increasing. In 1999, 42.9 per cent of Chilean companies used subcontractors to supply workers. In 2003 this had risen to 50.5 per cent. Centro Ecoceanos estimates that over half the workforce in the salmon industry is provided by subcontracting companies. It points out that the regional Directorate of Work has the capacity to make checks on only 12 per cent of the salmon industry installations. In the case of Aysén, the Regional Directorate of Work has no boats to carry out inspections of the farm installations around Aysén fjord, to verify whether or not facilities comply with health-and-safety rules, and whether measures are being implemented to en-
sure the safety of the salmon workers in this high-risk zone.

In 2002 the Research Department of the Labour Directorate published a study by Elías Apud entitled “Ergonomic Study in Salmon Plants of the Xth Region”, based on work carried out in three factories. The report recommends that Chile “moves towards what the International Labour Organization (ILO) calls ‘decent work’, which is no other than work that is dignified, safe, productive and well-paid, where the workers are treated as human beings, and are assured of their individual and collective rights”.

The ILO has recently adopted a new Work in Fishing Convention that guarantees decent work for workers in the fishing sector. Given the growing importance of aquaculture as both an economic and food-producing sector, it is important that aquaculture workers too are guaranteed decent working conditions. Corporate profits should not be gained at the expense of the workers in the sector, as currently seems to be the case in Chile.

For more
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Letter to Marine Harvest from Chile’s salmon unions
An Integrated Approach

The French experience shows that if fishermen are convinced of the potential benefits of marine protected areas, they will take an active part in their implementation.

On 31 March 2007, the Collectif Pêche et Développement, a French non-governmental organization (NGO) working on issues related to fishers and fisheries, held a workshop in Brest, France, on marine protected areas (MPAs) from the fishermen’s perspective. The location was symbolic as the new agency in charge of managing MPAs countrywide will be based in Brest. The workshop was primarily aimed to highlight the importance of the Parc naturel d’Iroise, in which fishermen are significant stakeholders. Participants were invited to analyze the linkages between fishermen and MPAs, and to outline how these could become management tools for fisheries. They drew from two overseas case studies—Arguin National Park in Mauritania (PNBA), and another in Portugal—and two in France (Iroise Marine Park in Brittany, and Cantonement du Cap Roux in the Mediterranean).

With the spread of MPAs, the tenets of fisheries management are undergoing great changes, and the need for the ecosystem approach to conserve biodiversity assumes new importance. It is necessary to examine how MPAs relate to ongoing fishing activities, and how they could serve fisheries management objectives. Some environmental NGOs view them as a panacea. Greenpeace, for instance, is campaigning for a Global System of Marine and Coastal Protected Area Networks, where fishing would be banned, and that could cover up to 40 per cent of the world’s oceans, while claiming that it is all meant to preserve aquatic resources and thus the interests of artisanal fishermen.

In France, during the campaign for the recent Presidential elections, the coalition of environmental NGOs reaffirmed the objective of turning 40 per cent of the French exclusive economic zone (EEZ) into no-fishing marine reserves. French fishermen have long been familiar with cantonnements (marine areas where certain fishing operations are banned), but with this 40 per cent target for strictly restricted zones, it is clear that the focus is essentially on conserving biodiversity as such, and not on the sustainable use of fishery resources. The challenge for fishermen now is to show that they are capable of carrying on with their activities while fully respecting the ecosystem on which they depend.

Case studies
From the Mauritanian and Portuguese case studies presented at the Brest workshop, it appears that conflicts may arise between the fishermen and the marine reserve managers. The Banc of Arguin National Park (PNBA) case was presented by Yan Giron, a young...
A scene from Doelan Harbour, Brittany, France. Organized small-scale fishers in France are now demanding effective resource management plans.

The PNBA, which is one of the oldest and largest MPAs worldwide, was established in 1976 to protect its rich bird populations. It is inhabited by a population of Imragen, an ethnic group with strong cultural traditions, whose livelihoods depend on fishing and pastoralism. Their peculiar method of catching mullets with the help of dolphins is well known.

The primary objective of those who established the PNBA was to protect its rich bird populations. The vast tidal mudflats are a unique resting and feeding place for many migratory species of birds. Later, foreign observers realized how plentiful fish resources were in the same area, which fishermen had been exploiting for a long time. In the 1990s, some danger signals began to appear, with the guitarfish stocks, for example, dwindling to near extinction. By the end of the decade, several measures were initiated to protect the park from outside operators coming in with industrial boats or motorized canoes, and also to regulate the fishing effort of the Imragen dwellers. A limit of 100 was placed on the number of traditional sailing craft, and, in 2004, a ban was imposed on shark fishing.

Control measures apply essentially to fishermen living outside the park, and they resent the situation as the proscribed area extends to as much as a third of the entire Mauritanian coastline. Only subsistence fishing is officially permitted inside the park, but, given the availability of the resource and the potential for profits, commercial fishing exists. The park’s promoters and fisheries policy managers, acting in league with local leaders, had not provided for such a development. The respective roles of the various stakeholders (government representatives in charge of the park, fishermen and conservation managers) have not been properly defined. Though the PNBA is one of the best-managed MPAs in west Africa, there is room for improvement, which could lead to more equity in the sharing of advantages, better integration of conservation objectives and sustainable fishing operations.

The case study of Portugal was presented at the workshop by Marc Savary, a geographer. Portugal’s first marine reserve, situated in the south of the country, near Setúbal, is the continuation of a mainland natural park, which was established to conserve biodiversity. Close to 2,700 persons are involved in subsistence and artisanal fishing activities in the 57-sq km area. Many of them are unemployed or retired persons with meagre pensions. Due to the economic crisis in the Setúbal area, their number has increased. Some are illiterate, and their average age is 56. Illegal fishing, including by diving, is a frequent occurrence. In the course of time, with the aging of the population, such activities are bound to recede. The park’s authorities have not really taken into account that social problem, nor are they addressing the issue of illegal activities by recreational fishers.

The organized small-scale fishermen are demanding that current rules and regulations be effectively implemented before any restructuring of the park is done. Considering that the management plan disregards their claims and interests, they have now withdrawn from discussions for the marine reserve. They also say that major sources of industrial pollution are still unchecked. They feel they are the only ones to suffer from the creation of the park. The conflict seems to arise from a lack of consultation between the au-
There are a number of small marine parks on the French part of the Mediterranean coast. In some of them, fishermen are closely associated with their management. In recent years, fishermen have, on their own initiative, established new reserved areas with help from dedicated biologists, for instance, the cantonnement of Cap Roux on the Côte d’Azur promoted in 2004 by the local prud’homies (traditional fishermen’s organizations) in collaboration with scientists from the University of Nice.

Preliminary observations show an improvement of the biomass inside the reserve, but it is too early to expect any improvement outside the protected area. That may happen later, as indicated by the positive results obtained elsewhere, for instance, in Corsica. The strategy adopted by fishermen is to create a network of small reserves along the coast that would hopefully increase the recruitment in the fish population. While some scientists question the validity of such an approach to improve fish availability, local fishermen appear satisfied. They are also able to keep recreational fishers at bay, to some extent.

The most conclusive experience comes from the marine park of the Côte Bleue, near Marseille, established in 1983 and covering 10,000 ha. Fishermen have been closely associated with its management. The park includes two integral reserves (no-take areas), and 3,000 cu m of artificial reefs were put in place to provide shelter for the fish and block access by trawlers. Fishermen are very happy with the functioning and impact of the park, and they have given the green light for its extension. Thanks to the park, they have been able to negotiate with the port authorities of Fos, a neighbouring industrial region, on the administrative process is also bedeviled by local political feuds. Just before the recent presidential elections, some politicians pressured the government to hold on to legal sanction for the park, despite 15 years of discussion.

To clear the legal way for the project, the Natural Parks Act had to be amended, because while natural parks aim essentially at conserving nature, marine parks (which are established on State property) must cater to the

In recent years, fishermen have, on their own initiative, established new reserved areas with help from dedicated biologists.
twin objectives of habitat and species preservation and economic development. The Iroise Marine Park does not include integral reserves. It will have a management plan and a management committee in which fishermen will play an active role, and will make proposals to be implemented through the existing fisheries management bodies. Fisher leaders view the project as a real opportunity to promote coastal fishing by bringing in innovative initiatives, and developing collaborations with the recreational sector and environmentalists.

There is a lot at stake in this challenge. It has to be demonstrated that, in order to protect ecosystems, one can do without vast integral reserves. Indeed, one can protect and conserve the environment while continuing with sustainable fishing operations.

Thanks to integrated management measures, these two objectives may not be mutually opposed. The best way to invalidate the rationale of some environmental organizations for the creation of global marine reserves networks to cover up to 40 per cent of ocean space is to work towards the success of the Iroise Marine Park project.

In conclusion, French artisanal fishermen seem to be adequately involved in the MPA processes. This is not quite the case in other European countries. The approach on the Mediterranean coast differs widely from that on the Atlantic coast, because of particular aspects in the respective historical backgrounds and ecosystems.

The cooperation phase is necessarily lengthy. It takes a long time to agree on common objectives and strategies—15 years—in the case of the Iroise Marine Park. This has much to do with the complexity of the territory and the diversity of its activities. Fishermen are not the main opponents of marine parks. The recreational fishing sector is often more powerful and reluctant to accept MPAs.

It is imperative to address the issues of nature conservation and fisheries management with an integrated approach. Establishing a reserve without applying simultaneously a management plan in the adjoining areas will produce limited results. Once fishermen are convinced of the potential benefits of the project, they will take an active part in the implementation of the conservation and management measures.
Focus on the Small-scale Sector

Social issues in small-scale fisheries were discussed at the recent session of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) of the FAO.

For the third time in succession, small-scale fisheries was on the agenda of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), during its 27th Session, which took place during 5-9 March in Rome, Italy.

The background paper for Agenda Item 8 on “Social Issues in Small-scale Fisheries” stressed that more attention needs to be given to the subject, particularly since poverty, vulnerability and low levels of social development compromise the ability of small-scale fishers to adopt responsible fishing practices and participate in co-management and community-based fisheries management regimes. It stressed that social development issues can be addressed through various sectoral policies relating to education, health, social insurance and others, and that a human-rights perspective, widely adopted in the United Nations system, provides an overarching approach to addressing social development.

COFI was invited to guide Member Nations, FAO and other agencies on the kind of policies and measures, including the use of a rights-based approach to fisheries management, that could be taken to contribute to the social and economic development of small-scale fishing communities. COFI was also invited to comment on the Strategy for Action outlined, and recommend specific social development measures relating, inter alia, to:

- a legal framework that ensures access to justice for all individuals and groups within fishing communities;
- policies allowing for non-discriminatory, secure access to, and utilization of, resources important to small-scale fishing communities;
- assurance of access to natural resources and social sector support services by women and vulnerable, marginalized and traditionally disadvantaged groups, including migrant workers, indigenous peoples, and displaced persons in fishing communities;
- legal provisions for representation in local decision-making processes by women and other vulnerable groups in fishing communities to allow them to participate fully and equitably in the economy; and
- social protection measures such as direct cash transfers to the poorest and other safety-net measures such as post-disaster food aid.

Fishers’ organization

The discussion on Agenda Item 8 opened with a Statement (see Box 1) from the two organizations of small-scale fisher people present at COFI, namely, the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP) and the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers (WFF). The Statement, welcoming the...
Mr Chairman, Distinguished Delegates,

One billion people around the world depend on fish as their primary protein source. Artisanal and small-scale fisher organizations and their supporters have, for more than two decades, argued for the recognition of the importance of social issues in the fisheries debate. We see the document presented here today as a very important step forward for us and for our communities.

Not only does the document thoroughly describe the social situation in many coastal fishery communities, it also convincingly argues that there is a strong link between the social situation and human rights and the management of natural resources.

We, the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers (WFF) and the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP), gather artisanal and small-scale fisherfolk from more than 70 countries. The vast majority of the world’s fishers belong to our subsector.

In several countries, fishers are among the poorest and most marginalized. This is because their rights to land and fish resources and to basic services such as education and health, among other things, are not recognized. It is also these factors that prevent small-scale fisher people from fulfilling their potential role in contributing more significantly to local and national economies, to responsible fisheries and to food security.

Recognition of the situation from the FAO is valuable and welcome— but it does not change the situation. It is essential that policies on fisheries management, fisheries trade and coastal management are made consistent with the human-rights approach.

In our opinion, fisheries trade that compromises food security and local livelihoods, as well as ecolabelling schemes that lack a socioeconomic component, need to be revoked. Fisheries-management measures that lead to privatization of fisheries resources, denying access to small-scale fishers, including women fishers, and that lead to displacement of our communities from the coastal lands traditionally inhabited by them, also need to be revoked.

Our rights have to be recognised and respected by governments and by intergovernmental organizations like the World Trade Organization, within a framework of human rights and food sovereignty.

More than 10 years ago, the FAO adopted the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. In these years, the Code has become an important framework for the improvement of fisheries management. The Code fully recognizes the crucial role that small-scale fishers and their communities play in this process.

However, the reality is that marginalized communities have little possibility to participate in management processes, and this participation will not come without broad social development. Legally defined rights are imperative for this development to be achieved.

We, therefore, urge the governments to take these recommendations to heart. Rejecting these recommendations is rejecting fisher people their right to a decent life, quality food and community heritage. It is also denying the social and economic contribution made by them and the opportunity to enhance it.

On our side, we, the fisher people of your countries, will continue our work to make these recommendations a reality.
The Committee:

* Agreed that policies and development programmes needed to be tailored to the specific needs in particular locations, countries and regions and types of small-scale fisheries that could range from occasional subsistence activities to year-round commercial operations targeting fish for export markets (para. 55).

* Recognized that progress in the implementation of international human rights instruments including the conventions on the rights of seafarers and working conditions in fisheries were critical to both small-scale and large-scale fisheries and stressed that the recognition and adoption of human-rights principles can help achieve poverty eradication and facilitate the adoption of responsible fisheries practices (para. 58).

* Expressed its support for the strategy of action as noted in paragraph 23 of COFI/2007/6 that brought together responsible fisheries and social development and stressed the need to adopt a rights-based approach to managing small-scale fisheries that respects the interests of present and future generations and ensures resource sustainability, reduces vulnerability and optimizes the flow of benefits to fishing communities and the wider economy (para. 59).

* Highlighted the importance of disaster prevention and mitigation measures and safety-at-sea for reducing vulnerability of fishers and coastal communities (para. 60).

Germany, speaking on behalf of the European Union, noted that the emphasis in the background paper on human rights detracted substantially from the more fundamental issue— that of fostering more effective fisheries management of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (DFID) and the 25 participating, developing countries of western Africa.)

Delegates stressed the need to foster fisher and fishing-community associations, and for co-management and capacity-building initiatives. Panama, speaking on behalf of States from Central America, highlighted the need to enhance budgets to support small-scale fisheries.

Thailand, welcoming the focus on small-scale fisheries, proposed an exclusive programme of work or a global initiative to support small-scale fisheries, as through Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) working on small-scale fisheries. Several States proposed the creation of a COFI subcommittee on small-scale fisheries, such as the ones for aquaculture and trade. Several States, particularly developing States, supported these proposals, including Algeria, Cameroon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda and Vietnam.

Norway, supporting the NGO State-ment and the focus on rights issues in small-scale fisheries, stressed that securing rights must be done with a view to securing rights of the poor, including through redistribution and facilitating better organization of fishers and processors. Norway proposed a broad-based conference with a large number of participants that would focus specifically on small-scale fisheries, along the lines of the FishRights Conference, 1999, and Sharing the Fish Conference 2006, to discuss fisheries management models appropriate for small-scale fisheries. Several States supported the Norwegian proposal for an international conference. Both Norway and Brazil emphasized the need to link the human-rights perspective with FAO’s Right to Food Guidelines.
ny, speaking on behalf of the European Union, noted that the emphasis in the background paper on human rights detracted substantially from the more fundamental issue—that of fostering more effective fisheries management. The main focus should be on developing an effective management systems based around rights, with the complementary goal being to promote respect for human rights. The document, said Germany, understated the potential of property rights and supporting institutions in delivering sustainable management for small-scale fisheries. Canada, commenting on the background paper, said that the focus should be on the application of rights-based approaches to small-scale fisheries and on developing appropriate governance systems.

Iceland, noting open access as a key problem, called for the adoption of rights-based approaches to fisheries management.

The International Transport Workers Federation (ITF), supporting the NGO Statement, called on States to adopt ILO’s proposed Work in Fishing Convention (which has since been adopted).

The Advance Copy of the Report of the 27th Session of COFI carries the recommendations/decisions on this agenda item (see Box 2). Notably, COFI agreed with Norway's proposal of convening a broad-based international conference focusing specifically on small-scale fisheries.

For more
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Work in Fishing Convention

The recently adopted ILO Work in Fishing Convention addresses issues related to minimum requirements for work on board fishing vessels, and living and working conditions, as well as the social security, of fishers.

On Thursday, 14 June 2007, at Geneva, the Work in Fishing Convention 2007, C. 188, (WFC) was formally adopted during the 96th Session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) 2007 of the International Labour Organization (ILO). There were 437 votes in favour, two against and 22 abstentions. Since the quorum of the meeting was 296 and since two-thirds majority was 293, the Convention was formally adopted by the ILC under Article 19 of the ILO Constitution. In the voting that followed later, the Recommendation on the Work in Fishing Convention, 2007, was also adopted with 443 votes in favour, none against and 19 abstentions.

Unlike at the record vote during the 93rd Session of the ILC in 2005, this time the government of China—which accounts for the largest number of fishers and fishing capacity in the world—along with the governments of Bangladesh, India, Iran, Japan, Korea, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the United States and Vietnam voted for the adoption of the Convention.

Although none of the governments voted against it, important fishing nations such as the Philippines, Indonesia and Peru abstained, along with Malaysia, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Uruguay. Governments who voted against the Convention in the 2005 record vote, such as Egypt, Estonia, Niger, Myanmar and Seychelles, voted for its adoption.

Similarly, 20 governments that abstained from the record vote in 2005 also voted for the Convention in 2007. The only two votes that went against the Convention were cast by employers’ representatives from Korea and Fiji.

By the time the 96th Session of the ILC was held in Geneva in May-June 2007, there were already signs of rapprochement between the social partners. There was, for example, reference to “a package of elements agreed between the Workers’ and Employers’ groups” as a result of the positive outcome of the Interregional Round Table on Labour Standards in the Fishing Sector in December 2006. In his introductory remarks, Captain Nigel Campbell of South Africa, Chairperson of the Committee on the Fishing Sector, referred to the proposed text of the Convention as “mature”.

The Asia-Pacific group (ASPIG)—which includes Asian and Pacific countries such as China, Vietnam, Australia and New Zealand—spoke in the Committee on the Fishing Sector about the need “to take into account differences in the development of fishing fleets, including differences in technology used and variations in the means of determining fishing vessel capacity.”

Amendments
Most of the provisions were retained as they were in the 2005 text. Over 80 amendments and subamendments were submitted to the Committee on the Fishing Sector in 2007— which held 11 sittings, as against 16 sittings during
the 2005 ILC. The largest number of amendments was proposed on Annex III, which dealt with accommodation on board fishing vessels. There was little support for substantial modifications.

For the sake of adopting an inclusive Convention that could be endorsed by the social partners and governments alike, and to address some of the unresolved concerns, several provisions contained in the 2005 draft Convention were amended.

Firstly, the length/tonnage equivalence, as well as the prescriptive requirements in Annex III dealing mainly with accommodation on board fishing vessels above 24 m in length, were amended.

Thus, the gross tonnage equivalence of fishing vessels of 15 m, 24 m and 45 m length, respectively, were relaxed as desired by Japan and in accordance with a joint amendment on behalf of social partners and several governments, predominantly Asian, to better reflect the characteristics of Asian vessels.

Secondly, the notion of “private employment agency” was introduced, distinct from a traditional recruitment and placement agency, to regulate such agencies, while recognizing that the vessel owner remained ultimately responsible for all the obligations established in the Convention.

Thirdly, and most significantly, the concept of “progressive implementation approach” was adopted. Following the December 2006 Round Table, the concept of progressive implementation was proposed and adopted in order to achieve wide ratification of the Convention.

Although the concept was not specifically defined, it was understood as a provision that would permit some countries to implement limited provisions of the Convention slowly, while others could implement all the provisions rapidly.
The aim was to assist developing countries, in particular, those “who might have difficulty in implementing all the measures provided for in the Convention owing to special problems of a substantial nature in the light of insufficiently developed infrastructure or institutions.”

Thus, for vessels less than 24 m in length; or which normally remained at sea fewer than seven days; or which normally navigated at a distance less than 200 nautical miles from the coastline of the flag State or which navigated within the outer edge of its continental shelf; or which were not subject to port-State control—and to fishers working on such vessels—an unspecified time frame was granted for the following requirements: (i) to hold a valid medical certificate; (ii) to carry crew list; (iii) to ensure written fishers’ work agreement; (iv) to undertake risk evaluation; and (v) to adopt measures to provide fishers with protection for work-related sickness, injury or death.

And fourthly, some flexibility was introduced to suspend the schedule of

Arguably, though, the Convention would benefit 17 mn full-time fishers in marine-capture fisheries. It would, however, benefit most, if not all, of the 340,000 fishers working on board fishing vessels above 24 m in length of the world’s fish production originates mainly from marine capture fisheries that employ over 30 mn fishers on board four mn fishing vessels. It is high time that a socially disadvantaged section—which includes both men and women, often forced to carry on earning a livelihood under adverse working and living conditions—finally benefits from an ILO instrument that guarantees decent work.

1. Two-thirds of the world’s fish production originates mainly from marine capture fisheries that employ over 30 mn fishers on board four mn fishing vessels. It is high time that a socially disadvantaged section—which includes both men and women, often forced to carry on earning a livelihood under adverse working and living conditions—finally benefits from an ILO instrument that guarantees decent work.

2. The size of vessels and crew, the duration of fishing trips, and the area of fishing operations, vary across the world. Considering this diversity, it is commendable that the Committee on the Fishing Sector could propose for adoption, a Convention and a Recommendation on work in the fishing sector that cover fishers on board both small- and large-scale fishing vessels with rigour and flexibility. The proposed Convention provides a common framework to address issues related to minimum requirements for work on board fishing vessels, and living and working conditions, as well as the social security of fishers.

3. The marine fishing industry—in particular, the subsectors characterized by larger fishing vessels undertaking longer fishing trips—would benefit from the provisions of the proposed Convention after the adoption, ratification and development of national legislation toward its implementation. Developing countries can greatly benefit from the provisions of the Convention, not only in terms of their national fishing industries, but also as fishing-labour exporting nations. Implemented well, the Convention can put an end to the inhuman treatment of fishworkers, particularly of migrant fishers on board distant-water fishing vessels.

4. ICSF strongly urges the Conference to adopt the Convention. This time, the additional flexibility offered by the proposed Convention should ensure wider support, and enable its ratification on adoption even in countries with insufficiently developed infrastructure or institutions. ICSF hopes, however, that provisions for a “progressive implementation approach” do not lead to an undue delay in extending the benefits of
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1. Two-thirds of the world’s fish production originates mainly from marine capture fisheries that employ over 30 mn fishers on board four mn fishing vessels. It is high time that a socially disadvantaged section—which includes both men and women, often forced to carry on earning a livelihood under adverse working and living conditions—finally benefits from an ILO instrument that guarantees decent work.

2. The size of vessels and crew, the duration of fishing trips, and the area of fishing operations, vary across the world. Considering this diversity, it is commendable that the Committee on the Fishing Sector could propose for adoption, a Convention and a Recommendation on work in the fishing sector that cover fishers on board both small- and large-scale fishing vessels with rigour and flexibility. The proposed Convention provides a common framework to address issues related to minimum requirements for work on board fishing vessels, and living and working conditions, as well as the social security of fishers.

3. The marine fishing industry—in particular, the subsectors characterized by larger fishing vessels undertaking longer fishing trips—would benefit from the provisions of the proposed Convention after the adoption, ratification and development of national legislation toward its implementation. Developing countries can greatly benefit from the provisions of the Convention, not only in terms of their national fishing industries, but also as fishing-labour exporting nations. Implemented well, the Convention can put an end to the inhuman treatment of fishworkers, particularly of migrant fishers on board distant-water fishing vessels.

4. ICSF strongly urges the Conference to adopt the Convention. This time, the additional flexibility offered by the proposed Convention should ensure wider support, and enable its ratification on adoption even in countries with insufficiently developed infrastructure or institutions. ICSF hopes, however, that provisions for a “progressive implementation approach” do not lead to an undue delay in extending the benefits of
the Convention to all fishers who fall within its scope. ICSF requests governments to consider speedier ratification of this Convention on adoption, and also to consider extending its relevant provisions, where applicable, to shore-based fishers, especially women, in consultation with social partners. This would be consistent with the ECOSOC Ministerial Declaration in July 2006 on ‘Creating an environment at the national and international levels conducive to... decent work for all... ’

5. ICSF believes that the proposed Work in Fishing Convention 2007, can complement the legal instruments for sustainable and responsible fisheries, namely, the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement and the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, by addressing the social dimension of sustainable development of fishers and fishing communities.

6. ICSF has been disseminating the content of, and mustering support for, the proposed fishing Convention since 2003, and it has, in this regard, organized several meetings in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe mainly for small-scale fishers, who, as a result, have evinced a greater interest in the proposed Convention. Once the Work in Fishing Convention 2007, is adopted, ICSF looks forward to collaborating with the International Labour Office, governments, trade unions and NGOs, for its dissemination, ratification and implementation.

7. Last but not least, ICSF would also like to take this opportunity to urge ILO to look into the conditions of work in the burgeoning aquaculture industry that employs an estimated 10 mn people, and to develop, if deemed necessary, an instrument to guarantee them decent work. Aquaculture today accounts for one-third of world fish production. Over the past quinquennium, while marine capture fishery production has been stagnating, aquaculture fish production has been registering impressive growth. It would be only appropriate that such growth is not achieved at the cost of decent work.

— This Statement from ICSF was made at the 96th Session of the ILC at Geneva on 12 June 2007

In the course of discussion at the Committee on the Fishing Sector, as well as during its adoption at the ILC, there were several references made to the WFC benefiting 30 mn fishers on board 4 mn fishing vessels. Arguably, though, the Convention would benefit 17 mn full-time fishers in marine-capture fisheries. It would, however, benefit most, if not all, of the 340,000 fishers working on board fishing vessels above 24 m in length.
By, For the Villagers

A review of a study of the traditional Indonesian community-based resource management institution called *sasi laut*

This interesting study of the traditional community-based resource management institution of Indonesia called the *sasi laut* is part of a global project jointly funded by the Danish International Development Assistance (DANIDA), International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada, and ICLARM—The World Fish Centre, Malaysia, on fisheries co-management. The study has been undertaken at a time when, in the context of declining resources, fisheries management is in focus in many countries, especially in the Asian coastal States. Specific attention is also being paid to community management institutions, many of which are being revitalized and integrated into formal governance systems for better resource management.

Indonesia has a large number of community-based resource management systems (CBRM) for natural resources. The *sasi* system is one of the few long-enduring CBRM systems in Asia. Unlike other CBRM initiatives, *sasi* has a long history and has undergone transformations over time.

The study makes a detailed comparative analysis of *sasi* in various villages and contexts in Indonesia's central Maluku, which consists of 1,027 islands occupied by 1.8 mn people. It strives to understand why *sasi* could be sustained in some areas, how it has adapted to change, and why, in other areas, it lost its significance.

The study is divided into 18 chapters under five sections. The first section is an introduction to the study and its methodology. Section B sets the context of the regional and village variables, and describes the various factors that could influence the community institution, namely, the socio-political circumstances, and the trends of fisheries management and markets in Maluku. Section C compares parameters like equity, efficiency and sustainability of fisheries in *sasi* and non-*sasi* villages. Section D contains the six case studies conducted in the central Maluku islands, ending with a comparative analysis. The final Section E reflects on the resilience of the *sasi* system, which many believed would surely disappear into oblivion by the 1960s. The last chapter summarizes the results of the study and concludes with policy recommendations for the revitalization of *sasi* and the development of co-management systems in central Maluku.

*Sasi laut*, the study says, can provide the basis for building local-level management institutions. *Sasi* includes rules and regulations (called *adat*, the customary law, which may or may not be written down) to control resource utilization. The *sasi* has a village police force, the *kewang*, which monitors the proper implementation of harvesting rights or the *sasi lelang*. There are three kinds of *sasi*—the land *sasi* (*sasi darat*), the most prevalent form; the riverine/marine *sasi* (*sasi laut*) and the village *sasi* (*sasi negeri*). The marine *sasi* is sometimes influenced by the land *sasi*. The village *sasi* is more of a social institution that deals with local issues, while the other two are concerned with the regulation of access to, and extraction of, natural resources on land and in water.

**Various forms**

*Sasi* varies from locality to locality, even as it maintains the objective of managing resources. The marine *sasi*—*sasi laut*—usually deals with sedentary resources and other resources closer to the land like coral reefs. There are

---

Also sasi laws that regulate the resource utilization of estuarine waters. Sasi is more prevalent in villages that have a population of over 2,000 fishers. There are villages that do not practise sasi but have a communal fish-harvesting system called sousoki.

It is believed that sasi was set up initially to manage social interactions, chiefly to mediate tenure disputes and maximize economic returns to the villagers. Resource conservation and management was a spin-off of this larger control, and dates to 1920, when sasi proscribed fishing using poison in parts of central Maluku.

Contrary to the popular belief that sasi was established to regulate access to sedentary resources, the system was initially applied to pelagic fish stocks, to conserve migratory fish and maximize their harvest for local consumption. It was only in the 1930s, when a market for top shells (Trochus niloticus) and sea cucumbers appeared, that sasi began to address additional types of marine access prohibitions and related ceremonies in parts of southern Maluku.

Historically, the central Maluku islands have been subject to a series of invasions, first by the Portuguese, followed by the Dutch, the English, the Arabs and the Japanese. The spread of Christianity discouraged traditional customs, which were often branded as pagan superstitions. Even though the Dutch tried to abolish the adat, and thereby the sasi, they later found it convenient to integrate them into their governance structures so as to exercise control over the resources. The Dutch were the first to formalize sasi with the decree "Het recht van Sasi in De Molukken" (the rights of sasi in Maluku). The Japanese, who invaded later, abolished the village systems and brought in centralization. After Indonesian independence, under Suharto's rule, the centralization process got legalized under Law No. 5 of 1974 and Law No. 5 of 1979, which failed to recognize the village-level sasi, kewang and adat. Despite predictions about its imminent death, and even though largely weakened by the abovementioned processes, the sasi rules that were developed long ago are still practised by the communities to maximize their harvests as well as to regulate aspects of village social behaviour.

Sasi, which applies mostly to inshore resources, does not limit total catches but places restrictions on season, species and gear. In some villages, there are no restrictions on the local villagers, but outsiders are bound by the adat should they choose to harvest from the sasi area. In most villages, sasi is applied only to a few species, mainly top shells, sea cucumbers and pelagic fishes. Over half of the sasi villages studied sell or auction harvesting rights for one or more species.

Sasi incorporates concepts, attributes and structures that are important in any marine resource management and conservation regime. Among them are the concepts of:

1. open and closed areas and seasons
2. community tenure rights over a marine area
3. limiting access to resources
4. controlled harvest and distribution of benefits
5. locally developed and specifically agreed upon regulations
6. local wardens or enforcers (kewang) who have defined rules of process as well as prescribed sanctions they can impose
7. shared responsibility of all residents to report violations of sasi rules
8. methodology to advise all residents, at regular intervals, of the substance of sasi rules
9. improving or maintaining community welfare, which, being rooted in adat (a belief in the concept of the unity of humans with nature), is consistent with modern concepts of sustainable use of resources
10. a hierarchical institutional structure that divides various tasks among clearly defined bodies (for
Though most decisions are taken by the traditional adat leaders in what can be deemed to be an undemocratic system, the villagers accept them due to the overall community value attached to the rulings.

Involvement of people in management decisions was seen to be higher in sasi villages than in non-sasi ones.

Compliance with sasi rulings was better than in the case of national or provincial laws and regulations. Compliance was found to be even stronger in those sasi villages where the kewang members were locals. The degree of compliance depended heavily on the quality of leadership, the status of economic needs and education levels, and awareness and fear of the threat of sanctions. Cases that are deemed necessary to be reported to the police go outside the village for settlement.

Sasi applies only to nearshore waters but a large number of people—especially younger, commercially oriented fishers—earn their livelihood by fishing for pelagic species in deeper waters a little off the coast, where sasi does not apply. The traditional fishers find it difficult to access these resources due to increasing competition from newer and more efficient technologies. Fishers in villages closer to the cities show an increasing predilection for jobs outside the fishing sector. This could imply a decreasing level of allegiance to the village laws and sasi.

The greatest obstacle for the maintenance and development of sasi is the complete lack of recognition of such systems by the State.
systems by the government. In the absence of a legal basis for adat and sasi, the village institution is seen as a mere implementing agency rather than an active policy-making body. Sasi is not inherently equitable in the sense of being inclusive and democratic. As a strongly patriarchal system, it does not encourage the participation of women in its working.

Apart from being limited mostly to inshore resources, sasi is applied to relatively small areas or a few species, and does not really comprise a comprehensive area or species management plan. The study found sasi’s impact on the health of the resource and habitat to be minimal or, at best, moot.

As an institution, though, sasi has never been static but has changed with the times, remaining resilient. It has been used for different economic and social reasons, not simply for resource management. Sasi and the underlying adat culture have waxed and waned over time, absorbing and reflecting the impacts of colonialism, war, economic development and social change.

Apart from suggesting that more species be placed under sasi, the study also recommends an increase in the area under sasi, after consultation with the villagers, as well as differentiated access for the traditional and modernized fishing sectors.

Since sasi has been able to spread certain important resource management concepts through the villages and make them valued as part of the local culture of central Maluku, it can function as a basis for the development of a modern resource management institution. It would also reduce the potential costs of public education and enforcement of such a management regime.

One major limitation of the study is that by concentrating mainly on Christian villages, it failed to take into account the contextual variables described earlier, which could be different in predominantly Muslim villages.

Excerpt

An effective alternative

In the place of a science-based rationale for management, we find an ethic of working together for the benefit of the community, attachment to a cultural tradition and the tendency to comply with sanctions based on religious beliefs. These have combined to form the basis of a resilient and, within its narrow scope of application, demonstrably effective institution. Sasi also provides an alternative to the Western idea that local management must be highly democratic. The paternalistic model is potentially very efficient and cost-effective, putting little demand on the time of busy fishers, farmers and women, and is also culturally acceptable.
Coastal zone wars

The fishing community in the south Indian State of Kerala is gearing up for an agitation against a proposed law to be introduced by the Union Government on coastal management. The National Fishworkers’ Forum (nff) has announced a nationwide agitation, alleging that the law will threaten the marine environment and affect the livelihood security of thousands of fishermen.

The Kerala Swathantra Matsya Thozhilali Federation is spearheading the protest movement in the State. Federation leaders say that the proposed law favours development over conservation. State president of the federation T. Peter says the absence of public consultation on the law is undemocratic and raises serious questions about the intention of the Government on a matter with serious long-term implications for the fishing communities.

He says it will also deprive the communities of their legitimate rights to livelihood. The federation has already launched a campaign to send online petitions to national leaders highlighting the flaws in the proposed law.

It will organize a State-level convention in July and a campaign to send letters to the Prime Minister, the United Progressive Alliance Chairperson and the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests. Fishermen throughout the State will participate in a protest march to district headquarters on Quit India Day. According to nff leaders, the draft Coastal Management Zone law, due to be announced soon, will further marginalize the fishing communities and place them at the mercy of big business. Campaign committee convenor Harekrishna Debnath says it will add to the impact created by sand mining, tourism, fish farming and other types of aquaculture, land reclamation, hydrocarbon exploration and port development on India’s coast.

Fishworkers’ organizations say that the Ministry is planning amendments to the Coastal Regulation Zone (crz) notification of 1991 allowing commercial activities within 500 m of the coastline. They claim that the new notification is designed to permit special economic zones and industrial and tourism activities in urban areas close to the coast.

“The Swaminathan committee recommends the expansion of the coastal zone to include territorial waters—the area from the shore to 12 nautical miles. This expansion into territorial waters has major implications for livelihoods of fishing communities. There is no explicit mention that this area should be managed with full participation of fishing communities, and that their rights to fish in this area should be protected and promoted. It needs to be explicitly stated that no part of this area shall be diverted for any other purpose,” Peter says. For more, see http://www.hindu.com/2007/06/20/stories/200706207180400.htm

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

Masifundise

The only independent NGO in South Africa working with small-scale and traditional fishing and coastal communities in the west and south coasts of the Western Cape, the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal.

Work includes extensive fieldwork, action research, advocacy and lobbying initiatives, information gathering and dissemination, training and capacity building as well as networking with regional and international organizations working with small-scale fishing communities.

Supports community-based and people-driven organizations and networks of coastal communities, with the organizational capacity to undertake advocacy interventions in order to secure traditional fishing communities and dwellers’ rights to marine resources and sustainable livelihood alternatives.

POEM

M.S.Y (1930s-1970s)

Here lies the concept, MSY
It advocated yields too high,
And didn’t spell out how to slice the pie.

We bury it with the best of wishes
Especially on behalf of fishes.

We don’t know yet what will take its place,
But hope it’s as good for the human race.

—P.A. Larkin, Institute of Animal Resource
Ecology, University of British Columbia,
Canada, 2007

VERBATIM

“In spite of the high level of vulnerability, the small-scale fisheries sector also shows notable dynamism and coping capacity.”

ICHIRO NOMURA, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL
FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE DEPARTMENT, FAO
**TUNA STOCKS**

**Sushi sashay**

Sushi made with deer meat, anyone? How about a slice of raw horse on hat rice?

These are some of the most extreme alternatives being considered by Japanese chefs as shortages of tuna threaten to remove it from Japan’s sushi menu — something as unthinkable in Japan as baseball without hot dogs or Texas without barbecue.

In this seafood-crazed country, tuna is king. From maguro to otoro, the Japanese seem to have almost as many words for tuna and its edible parts as the French have names for cheese. So when global fishing bodies recently began lowering the limits on catches in the world’s rapidly depleting tuna fisheries, Japan fell into a national panic.

Nightly news programmes ran in-depth reports of how higher prices were driving top-grade tuna off supermarket shelves and the revolving conveyer belts at sushi chain stores.

At nicer restaurants, sushi chefs began experimenting with substitutes, from cheaper varieties of fish to terrestrial alternatives and even, heaven forbid, American sushi variations like avocado rolls.

“It’s like America running out of steak,” said Tadashi Yamagata, vice chairman of Japan’s national union of sushi chefs. “Sushi without tuna just would not be sushi.”

The problem is the growing appetite for sushi and sashimi outside Japan, not only in the United States but also in countries with new wealth, like Russia, South Korea and China. And the problem will not go away. Fishing experts say that shortages and rising prices will only become more severe as the population of bluefin tuna—the big, slow-maturing type most favoured in sushi—falls to keep up with worldwide demand.

Last year, dozens of nations responded by agreeing to reduce annual tuna catches in the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean oceans by 20 per cent in an effort to stabilize populations. But the decision only seemed to crystallize growing fears of tuna shortages.

“It’s like America running out of steak,” said Tadashi Yamagata, vice chairman of Japan’s national union of sushi chefs. “Sushi without tuna just would not be sushi.”

In Japan about tuna shortages, helping to push up prices of the three species of bluefin—northern, Pacific and southern—that are considered the best tuna to eat raw. Since the start of last year, the average price of imported frozen northern and Pacific bluefin has risen more than a third, to US$13 a pound, according to Japan’s Fisheries Agency. Wholesalers say that competition from foreign fishing fleets and buyers has made the top-quality tuna increasingly hard to come by here.


**Fishers and fish**

Millions of people in the Asian region depend on fisheries for a living, and the sector is a major source of food security, employment, income and foreign exchange. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), of the 47.6 mn fishers worldwide engaged in fishing and fish farming as a full-time, or, more frequently, part-time, occupation, as many as 42.3 mn, or 89 per cent, are in Asia. China has the maximum number of fishers and fish farmers, followed by India, Vietnam, Indonesia, Bangladesh and the Philippines. The majority of fishers and fish farmers are small-scale, artisanal fishers, eking out a living from coastal and inland fishery resources.

These figures are likely to be underestimates. An FAO study in Southeast Asia, for example, suggested that the figure reported to the organization for the number of inland capture fishers worldwide (4.5 mn, full-time, part-time or occasional) is easily exceeded by those fishing in inland waters in just eight countries covered by the study, namely, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. Further, these figures do not include those involved in other fisheries-related activities, such as marketing, processing, net-making, supplying ice, boatbuilding, and so on. Importantly, women play an important role in several of these activities. Assuming a ratio of about 1:3—that is, for every person who fishes, there are three others on shore engaged in fisheries-related activities—a conservative estimate would place the total number of people involved in fisheries-related activities in Asia at about 130 mn. The total number of people dependent on the sector in Asia is, no doubt, much higher.

Significantly, 90 per cent of the catch from small-scale fisheries worldwide caters to human consumption. According to the Asian Development Bank, artisanal, small-scale fisheries in Asia are estimated to contribute to at least 50 per cent of total fisheries production, providing extensive rural employment.

Fish is an important source of food security in the region. For more than 16 bn of the 3.5 bn people in the region, fish provides more than 20 per cent of the animal protein consumed. This figure rises to more than 50 per cent in countries such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.
Co-management

Co-management, intended as a collaborative and participatory arrangement between governments and resource users to share the responsibility for resource management, is increasingly being put forward as a framework for the management of fisheries resources, partly also due to the perceived failure, or inability, of centralized fisheries management regimes.

To the extent that co-management recognizes the importance of the participation of resource users at all stages of resource management, it is important. However, experience from various parts of the world indicates that often the government commitment to participation of actual users remains on paper.

Co-management regimes can be considered in a context of property rights, and they can also be considered in fisheries with no property rights. While the co-management framework may be easier where property rights exist, it may be more daunting in the absence of such rights. Co-management arrangements that operate in situations where community property rights are established and recognized, are likely to be more effective, as they enable communities to control access, to sanction, and to exclude others. However, this may be possible in only a handful of fisheries worldwide. Governance structures in fisheries are still poor in most parts of the world. The advantage of co-management is that it enables governments and fishery gear groups to adopt and develop meaningful fisheries management measures that can minimize costs and that can also expect realization of management goals in a reasonable time frame. At least, it is one way to develop appropriate fisheries management measures that can engender ownership among all user groups even in the absence of property rights.

— Excerpts from the Comment in SAMUDRA Report No.42, November 2005

Co-management

...this is still the only detailed analysis of production, marketing and distribution in a Malay fishing community, related to community structure and values. — from the prefaces to the first and second editions


Chronicles the history of the North Atlantic Fishing Fleet since World War II, narrates the day-to-day occupations of shipboard life, and examines the fleet’s current operations and future prospects.


This book is a study of some Far Eastern peasant problems, based mainly on field research. The bulk of the book has been left as a description of how a Malay fishing economy ordinarily functions. It will give some idea of the adaptive nature of these peasant economic systems, of the value of their traditional forms of co-operation, and of the claims of such types of society to survival in the face of pressure from forces which threaten to disrupt them while offering no alternative forms of communal existence.

Inshore Ireland, a bimonthly incorporating Aquaculture Ireland, features news from the coast and inland waterways of Ireland. Published from Dublin by the Agricultural Trust, publishers of the Irish Farmers’ journal and the Irish Field, it is compiled by journalists Gillian Mills (mills@inshore-ireland.com), the Editor, and Gery Flynn (flynn@inshore-ireland.com), who looks after features. Inshore Ireland, which has a circulation of 36,000 copies and a readership of 345,000, reports on aquaculture, island tourism, inshore fisheries, water management, policy and regulation, engineering and technology, seafood marketing and retail, and research and development.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**CONFERENCE**

**IASILIC**: Changes on the Horizon

The 33rd Annual International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centres (IASILIC) Conference will be a joint meeting with the Southeastern Association of IASILIC Libraries and will be hosted by Mote Marine Laboratory during 7-11 October 2007. The Conference includes panel discussions, presentations, hands-on workshops and a field trip. For more, visit http://www.iasilic.org/index.php?section=150.

**PUBLICATIONS**


Rights-based management in fisheries, as this dossier shows, can take several forms, including licensing, and individual and community fishing quotas. How property-rights regimes address the issue of allocation of ownership will determine their effectiveness in equitably spreading welfare throughout the fishing/coastal community. Only by recognizing fishing rights that are socially sensitive and address the issues of labour, gender and human rights can fisheries communities, especially small-scale, traditional ones, be assured of social justice in the face of moves towards ecological and resource sustainability.

This collection of articles from SAMUDRA Report is available for free download from http://www.icsf.net.

**WEBSITE**

The Fisheries Information Centre

A unit of the South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies (SIFFS), this centre publishes market intelligence, fish species prices, and weather scan reports for the south Indian States of Kerala and Tamil Nadu. The aim is to equip fishermen’s organizations to take business decisions on marketing fish.

http://fishinfo.siffs.in
What wonder, then, that these Nantucketers, born on a beach, should take to the sea for a livelihood! They first caught crabs and quahogs in the sand; grown bolder, they waded out with nets for mackerel; more experienced, they pushed off in boats and captured cod; and at last, launching a navy of great ships on the sea, explored this watery world; put an incessant belt of circumnavigations round it; peeped in at Behring's Straits; and in all seasons and all oceans declared everlasting war with the mightiest animated mass that has survived the flood; most monstrous and most mountainous!

— from *Moby Dick* by Herman Melville