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In Search of an Elusive Convergence

As the debate over “convergence” on fisheries subsidies issues continues, it is perhaps time to focus instead on better fisheries-management measures at all levels

Speaking at the University of the West Indies, Jamaica, on 18 January 2016, Roberto Azevêdo, Director-General of the World Trade Organization (WTO), drew attention to “some convergence” on the outstanding Doha issues, such as fisheries subsidies at the 10th Ministerial Conference of WTO in Nairobi. This is a wee bit of an improvement over “too little convergence” on the technical issues of fisheries subsidies and “virtually none” on the core substantive issues, as observed by the Chair, Negotiating Group on Rules in WTO, in a report, nearly five years before Nairobi.

During the 15 years that had elapsed between Doha and Nairobi, what indeed are the areas of convergence that have been achieved at WTO on fisheries subsidies? Precious little, we are afraid. For some Members like Argentina, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Peru, an ambitious agenda for fisheries subsidies reform, especially to prohibit a broad latitude of fisheries subsidies that contribute to overfishing and overcapacity, has now got whittled down to just prohibiting subsidies on activities that affected overfished stocks, and prohibiting subsidies to any fishing vessel engaged in illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. Even this whittled-down proposal is raising more debate than convergence.

The European Union (EU) reiterated the need for transparency and, in this context, highlighted the importance of improved notification to WTO of fisheries subsidies above a certain threshold. It was not agreeable to some other Members due to their poor capacity issues. The EU was game for prohibiting the most harmful subsidies, particularly vessel subsidies in IUU fishing. It has doubts, however, if a consensus could emerge on what the most harmful subsidies indeed are, and about enforceability of this discipline. Peru further made a standalone proposal seeking flexible treatment for sustainable artisanal fisheries for its contribution to food security, poverty reduction and the development of local communities. The African, Caribbean and the Pacific countries reiterated in Nairobi, as in the Doha Work Programme 2005, special and differential treatment for developing countries, including for the least developed countries and small and vulnerable economies.

There are lingering doubts regarding practicalities. How do you, for example, prohibit subsidies for activities affecting overfished fish stocks, while permitting subsidies for activities targeting underexploited stocks, especially in tropical waters where these disparate stocks share common marine space? There are also doubts regarding, for example, stern treatment of fuel subsidies at a time when fuel prices are plummeting southward. Cheaper fuel, in the absence of fisheries management, is bound to act as an incentive to build new fishing vessels.

The protracted debate on fisheries subsidies has exposed the complexity of fisheries-management issues in both the developed and developing world, and has also raised questions about the competence of WTO in dealing with fisheries subsidies issues. The sovereign rights regime for exploration, exploitation, conservation and management of marine fishery resources at the national level is unable to sync with trade regimes, especially in countries with poor capacity for fisheries management.

What has happened to fishing capacity and fish stocks since the Doha Round? Things have not moved from bad to worse in spite of no WTO fisheries subsidies discipline. According to the FAO State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2014, there is a reduction in motorized fishing fleet by number in China, Japan, EU-15, Iceland, Norway and the Republic of Korea, for example. Fishing capacity seems to be better managed than ever before by the fisheries authorities, as well as by the regional fisheries management organizations (a claim that some might disagree with). The state of the world’s fisheries also has somewhat improved since the Doha Round.

The share of fish stocks fished at unsustainable levels has fallen from 33 per cent in 2008 to 29 per cent in 2011. Also, fully fished stocks accounted for 61 per cent in 2011. The yield from these stocks, under effective management measures, can sustain food security, livelihood security and poverty reduction. Let us, in any case, wait for the latest FAO estimates, which will be published in July this year.

If fishing capacity can reduce and fish stocks can recover without WTO fisheries subsidies disciplines, why not then focus all energy on better fisheries-management measures at all levels? Rather than waiting for some elusive convergence, we propose that the outstanding Doha issues be dealt with minus fisheries subsidies. Azevêdo should advice the WTO Members to do so. It is high time to remove the dead fishery subsidies canary from the trade mine shaft; the ploy has not worked.
Titled ‘Deadly Catch: Uganda’s fishermen seeking sex workers prompt HIV surge’, an April 2014 article in The Guardian reports 43 per cent of adults have been infected in Kasensero, a Ugandan fishing community bordering Lake Victoria. According to the article, “Once their catch is sold...most head for Kasensero’s bars and the sex workers who hang out there”. This, and many other similar reports in the media, echo multiple studies in the medical literature linking HIV to stigmatized sexual behaviour.

For example, a recent review of 44 articles about HIV among fishermen considers heterosexual sex to be responsible for most infections. According to the review, as many as 30 per cent of fishermen are HIV-positive, while 42 per cent engage in transactional sex (that is, they hire prostitutes). The review, by Smolak in AIDS Care, 2014, included studies on fishermen—internationally as well as in specific Asian, Africa and European countries. Similarly, a recent publication by the WorldFishCenter, titled ‘HIV/AIDS in the Fisheries Sector in Africa’, generalizes “a number of lifestyle factors suggest that heterosexual sex is the prevalent channel [for HIV infection] in fishing communities”.

For fisherfolk, as well as for all adults, the specific risks that account for most HIV infections as well as the numbers infected, differ between Africa and the rest of the world. Outside Africa, the percentage of adults with HIV is much less than in Africa, and the two risks that drive HIV epidemics are anal intercourse among men and sharing unsterilized syringes and needles to inject recreational drugs. Since only a minority of adults have these risks, the percentage of adults with HIV outside Africa—as well as the percentage of fisherfolk—is almost always low.

However, the situation is different in Africa, where 5 per cent—25 per cent of adults are infected in more than a dozen countries, and where injecting illegal drugs and male—male sex account for only a minority of HIV infections. But how are so many adults—and fisherfolk—getting HIV in Africa? The common view that almost all HIV infections among all adults in Africa come from sex is not based on evidence. No studies among fishermen in Africa have looked at all risks, including blood exposures through unsterilized syringes, needles, razors, and other skin-piercing equipment used for healthcare and cosmetic services.

Conflicting evidence
Similarly, researchers have only rarely traced infections in African adults to sexual partners—instead, researchers have routinely assumed that an HIV infection in an African adult came from sex, without showing that is so. At the same time, researchers routinely ignore abundant conflicting evidence—such as people with HIV who deny sexual risks, and HIV in children with HIV-negative mothers.
The characterization of Africans, in general, and fisherfolk, in particular, as—on average—more willfully and thoughtlessly promiscuous than other adults is denigrating, stigmatizing and disempowering, weakening their voice in civil society. Even worse, the emphasis on sexual risks distracts from what has to be done—and can be done—to help prevent HIV infections in fishing communities.

Avoidance of sexual risks is not enough to protect someone from HIV. In African countries with a lot of HIV infections, fisherfolk, like all other residents, are at risk to get HIV from minor blood contacts. The Joint United Nations’ Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) warns UN employees in much of Africa that “unsafe blood collection and transfusion practices and the use of contaminated syringes account for a notable share of new infections”. To address this risk, UNAIDS assures UN employees: “Because we are UN employees, we and our families are able to receive medical services in safe healthcare settings, where only sterile syringes and medical equipment are used, eliminating any risk to you of HIV transmission as a result of healthcare”. UNAIDS—and other public health organizations and initiatives—do not similarly warn local populations or assure safe care.

In countries with a lot of HIV infections, fisherfolk have many of the same risks as other residents. They go to barbers who may reuse razors and electric shavers without sterilization. They go to doctors who may reuse needles and syringes for injections or needles, tubes or bags of saline for infusions. Because of their profession, fisherfolk have some special blood-borne risks. On board a fishing boat, tools in a first aid kit may be reused without sterilization from one person to another. Reliably killing HIV requires boiling instruments, not just rinsing in chlorine or alcohol; boiling may be difficult on a boat.

While staff of UNAIDS and other public health organizations are aware of the risks of getting HIV from blood exposures in Africa, public health agencies have not alerted the public to these risks. It is understandable that people delivering healthcare do not want to warn people about risks of getting HIV during healthcare. But this is an ethical failure—in not telling people about all risks, public health staff are not respecting their responsibility according to the World Medical Association’s Declaration of Lisbon on the Rights of the Patient, including: “Every person has the right to health education that will assist him/her in making informed choices about personal health and about the available health services”.

With healthcare professionals not wanting to talk about blood exposures, HIV prevention programmes and messages designed by public health professionals are incomplete. This failure to warn leaves all adults—including fisherfolk—unaware of what they need to know to avoid HIV. As long as health professionals are not willing to craft a complete message about risks, it is up to others to do so. For example, civil society organizations that are not controlled by public health professionals, such as churches and unions, could revise their HIV prevention programmes to warn people about blood exposures as well as sex.

Formal organizations representing fisherfolk could revise HIV prevention programmes to warn fisherfolk not
only about sex but also about blood exposures. Fishing communities could spread the message through crews and fish markets. Despite decades of failure on the part of health experts to warn Africans about HIV from blood exposures, one can always hope that experts will wake up to their ethical responsibility to deliver this. But since lives are at stake, multiple strategies may be considered to ensure change.

Good evidence shows that Africans aware of risks to get HIV from blood exposures have less HIV. During 2003–07, national surveys in 16 African countries asked people how to prevent HIV. In these surveys, the percent of adults who mentioned “avoid sharing razors/blades” as a way to prevent HIV ranged from 10 per cent in Swaziland to almost 50 per cent in Niger and Ethiopia. In five countries where less than 15 per cent of adults recognized contaminated razors or blades as risks for HIV (Kenya, Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania and Zimbabwe), the percentages of adults with HIV ranged from 5.6 to 26. On the other hand, in six countries where at least 30 per cent mentioned razors or blades (Democratic Republic of Congo [DRC], Ethiopia, Ghana, Niger, Rwanda and Senegal), only 0.8 per cent to 2.9 per cent of adults were HIV-positive.

On the other hand, good evidence shows that warnings about sexual risks alone have almost no impact on the rate at which people get HIV. Ten trials of HIV prevention in Africa tested what happens when some adults (in the intervention arm of the trial) get special education and warnings to avoid sexual risks while other adults (in the control arm) do not get such education or warnings. What was the result? Educating and warning people about sexual risks had virtually no impact on the rate at which they acquired HIV infections (see http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1940999).

Changing the message—warning about blood as well as sex—not only gives fisherfolk the information they need to avoid HIV and to protect their loved ones, it also reduces the blame and stigma that have been linked to HIV. If a husband or wife has HIV, the other spouse should not assume it came from sex outside marriage. But on a larger scale, recognizing blood-borne risks arms African fisherfolk to fight back against the demeaning and weakening stereotype that they are unusually and thoughtlessly promiscuous.
For the Love of Oceans

A recent conference at Annapolis, US, dealt with the role of the seafood industry in the social development of seafood-producing communities in developing countries.

Annapolis, the capital of the state of Maryland, US, founded in 1649 with a population of 39,000 people near Washington, D.C. is worth a visit for ocean and seafood lovers. It was an excellent place to host an event that brought together 100 people from the five continents representing the fisheries supply chain, certification organizations, fishing and fish-farming communities in developing countries, NGOs, foundations, international cooperation agencies, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the World Bank, besides UN organizations and government representatives. The event—a conference on the seafood industry and social development— took place at the Loews Annapolis Hotel, during 21 and 22 September 2015.

The sponsors of the conference—Oxfam, Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) and the Rockefeller Foundation—opened the event by outlining the objective which was to explore the potential for mobilizing the seafood industry to deliver substantial social and economic benefits for communities dependent largely on fishing and fish farming. Fred Boltz from the Rockefeller Foundation outlined the reasons for the interest of the Foundation in fisheries and the support for global fisheries, human livelihoods, food security and social development through partnership with SFP, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and Care and Rare.

Most of the seafood originates in developing countries, and 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the producers are small-scale, with limited or no alternative livelihoods.

With many of the world’s fish stocks overexploited, wild catch has been roughly flat for the last 30 years, with the deficit made up for by the dramatic growth in aquaculture which now supplies nearly half of all seafood consumed by humans. Most of the seafood originates in developing countries, and 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the producers are small-scale, with limited or no alternative livelihoods. Against this background, environmentally, socially and economically sustainable seafood production is essential for sustainable development and reduction of poverty and inequality.

It is difficult to estimate how much of the seafood industry is already closely engaged with promoting improvements in the ecological management of fisheries and fish farms around the world through fisheries-improvement or certification programmes. Fishery and aquaculture improvement projects (FIPs and AIPs), certification schemes and other mechanisms are all used to connect the seafood supply chain to improvement activities and deliver increased sustainability and environmental protection.

Gender equity

The challenge now is to translate this into social development with associated socioeconomic benefits, improve commercial terms for producers, empower communities, improve labour conditions, and promote gender equity, community development and poverty alleviation.

This article is by René Schärer (fishnet@uol.com.br), Member, ICSF from Brazil.
The first session of the Annapolis conference was titled ‘Challenges and Opportunities in Social Development’ and was chaired by Blake Lee-Harwood of SFP. The objective was to get an expert panel to outline the challenges and opportunities in social development.

Christoph Béné of the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture in Colombia, outlined the importance of fish in world trade, which amounts to twice the volume of chicken and thrice that of beef, with between 660 and 820 mn people depending on fisheries and aquaculture for their source of income. Béné pointed out the challenges present, such as, reduction of fishmeal dependency and improvement of the efficiency of aquaculture and, more specifically, the promotion of labour rights, the recognition of women as a key entry point, and the need to change the narrative by moving away from ‘crisis’ narrative to building a new image based on food security and nutrition contribution.

Rachel Davis of SHIFT talked about the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and their implications for the seafood industry. Andrew Hudson of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) talked of ocean threats and solutions for restoring the oceans through an engine for sustainable economic development, job creation and poverty reduction.

Gawain Kripke presented Oxfam’s vision for change, with small-scale producers and labourers having a voice and a fair share in the ownership of the benefits of seafood resources.

Among the other speakers were Carrie Thompson of USAID, Bill DiMento of Highliner and Jim Cannon, the president of SFP.

The second session on ‘Current Activities and Approaches’ brought together presentations from multilateral institutions like the World Bank. Among the speakers were Randall Brummet and Leah Karrer of GEF and Nicole Franz of FAO. The FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Small-scale Fisheries (SSF Guidelines) were accorded top priority and it was evident that the Guidelines are very well-known by now and the instrument continues to attract great interest.

Part 2 of the second session was dedicated to examples from the business sector, with presentations by Mike Kraft of Bumblebee, Rene Benguerel of BlueYou and Helen Packer of the Fishing and Living Programme. These presentations outlined examples of community and small-scale fisher involvement, fair-trade supply chain and fisheries-improvement programmes.

The session ended with a look at civil society involvement in fisheries-improvement projects. Rene Scharer of the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF) traced the importance of the process of civil society and fisher involvement from the 2008 Bangkok Conference, through regional consultations and national workshops all the way to the negotiating sessions at FAO in 2014.

Civil-society partnerships

The SSF Guidelines reflect the positive side of stakeholder involvement. The negative example is the lack of participation of all the members of the supply chain—from small-scale fishers to the government—which led to the failure of the lobster FIP in Brazil. Five years after the programme began, lobsters are closer to collapse than ever before. Three examples of civil-society partnerships with family aquaculture operations in Indonesia and Thailand show that there are solutions for sustainable fish farming and maintenance of human rights conditions even in countries which have made the headlines for negative reasons over
the last few months. Abdul Halim of Seafish for Justice, Helen Packer of MDPI, Pongsagorn (‘Art’) Satjipanon of Oxfam GB Asia Regional Centre, Tom Grasso from the Environmental Defense Fund and Arlene NieresStaprnvanit of the Network of Aquaculture Centers rounded out this session.

The third session, ‘Developing Tools for Change’, was dedicated to presentations of certification and fisheries/aquaculture-improvement programmes, with many interesting experiences from around the world. Jeff Peterson of the Global Aquaculture Alliance (GAA), Valeska Weymann of GlobalGap, Iain Pollard of ASC, Yemi Oloruntuyi of the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), Corey Peet of Postelsia, Ashley Apel of Fair Trade USA and Libby Woodhatch of Seafish talked on certification.

Mark Prein of GIZ, Urs Baumgartner of BlueYou, Anton Immink of SFP, Michael Akester of GEF/UNDP Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem Programme, Huw Thomas of Morrisons, Dessy Anggraenni of SFP and Simon Bush of Wageningen University talked on fisheries and aquaculture improvement projects.

The Work Session that followed was structured around these questions: What are our objectives and the core strategic questions we need to answer to attain our goals? How can we collaborate more effectively? What are the best combinations of tools and actions to deliver the outcomes we all seek? What do we need to do right now to succeed in the future?

The fourth session, ‘The Way Ahead’, provided an opportunity to identify the main themes and opportunities that have emerged from the conference while also allowing all participants to make suggestions about future directions and activities.

The results of the Work Session and Session 4 are available for consultation on the conference website (see ‘For more’ below).

Being a first for members of the supply chain and civil society organisations, it is encouraging to note that social development of fisher and aquaculture communities is a matter of general concern and is being addressed by many UN and cooperation agencies, funding organisations (foundations) and some members of the supply chain who were present at the Annapolis conference. From here to sustainability is a long way to go, but at least the first steps have been taken.

A poll conducted among the participants in the closing session of the conference sought answers to the question “What are your top recommendations for future interventions?”. The results were: (i) implement SSF Guidelines (59 per cent), (ii) bring the voices of fishers to the foreground (76 per cent), (iii) empower the voices of fishworkers (76 per cent), (iv) connect the supply chain with the project (79 per cent) and (v) improve collaboration between stakeholders (70 per cent).

It was encouraging to note that the majority of participants already knew about the SSF Guidelines and the engagement of ICSF in the process leading to its adoption by the FAO. The fishing and aquaculture community now counts on three global initiatives to work for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture: (i) the SSF Guidelines with a human-rights approach, (ii) TBTI (Too Big to Ignore) joining academics, fishers and society, and (iii) the network inaugurated at the Annapolis conference for social development through the supply chain.
Next to Slavery

Workers and crew on board vessels in the Pacific tuna fishery rarely enjoy the right to decent living and working conditions

Just a few years ago, while undertaking a commissioned desk study on the four major Pacific and Indian Oceans’ tuna species, I came across a few reports that mentioned the hiring and situations of fishing vessel crews. One of them was a 2011 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime report by Eve de Coning [de Coning, E, 2011. Transnational organized crime in the Fishing Industry. Focus on: Trafficking in Persons, Smuggling of Migrants, Illicit Drugs Trafficking. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2011. United Nations, Vienna. 144 p] that discussed trafficking in persons in the fishing industry. I was ‘glued’ by the content of that report—perhaps because, as a professional fisheries scientist for more than 40 years in the Asia-Pacific region, I had not before given the scruffy and hardened crews of fishing vessels much of a thought; truly, her report opened my eyes, or started to.

My attempts to find related information on tuna fishing vessel crews generally was unsuccessful except for the several Southeast Asian fleets’ ‘long-haul’ vessel reports that nowadays are becoming widely read. Until, that is, I encountered ‘Letter from Mr Able Seaman, Pacific Islands crew member on board Alienlandic purse-seiner, Sweep the Ocean’ [Sharples, P and Able Seaman, 2010. Letter from Mr Able Seaman, Pacific Islands crew member onboard Alienlandic purse-seiner, Sweep the Ocean. SPC Fisheries Newsletter #133 - September/December 2010. pp 27-28]. Representing sections of Mr Able Seaman’s letter here enables a discussion about the situation of crews on commercial tuna vessels in the Pacific Islands region—notwithstanding that the discussion refers to a minority of fleets and senior crews.

• “While being employed by this foreign fishing vessel and fishing in our Pacific waters, I feel that I am actually fishing in foreign waters, not my own Pacific Island waters. This is because foreigners who have been sweeping up the fish across the Pacific…”

In 2014, 305 purse-seiners and 2,966 longliners were licensed to fish in the Western and Central Pacific Commission Convention Area (WCPFC-CA) [Hurry, G., 2014. The Western and Central Pacific tuna fishery. WCPFC, Pohnpei. http://devpolicy.org/presentations/2014-Pacific-Update/Day-2/Glenn-Hurry.pdf]; in addition to them, are a minority of pole-and-line and troll vessels; the harvest from the Convention Area in 2014 was 2,860,648 mt [WCPFC Scientific Committee, 2015].

• “… are labouring Pacific Islander crews almost to slavery in their own backyard and leaving scars that may not ever heal.”

Manning agencies

State workers at tuna ports in the WCPFC-CA, employees of crew manning agencies and diplomatic missions, and others can testify to
the conditions experienced on vessels by junior crew, which include verbal and physical abuse, beatings, frostbite from non-supply of adequate equipment, very long work periods (18 hours or more each fishing day) and no days off, poor sleeping areas, non-functional toilets and showers, poor drinking water, inadequate food (‘bait fish and boiled rice every day’) [High Court of Tuvalu, 2012. Regina v Kamikamica TVHC 4; Criminal Case 03 of 2011 (21 January 2012). Judgement. http://www.pacilii.org/tv/cases/TVHC/2012/4.html—accessed April 2015], inadequate or absent first-aid equipment, and witnessing deaths of fellow crew because of poor health and accidents with fishing gear.

- “Having worked for about 10 years on board various foreign fishing vessels that employ Pacific Islanders as crew, I feel very embarrassed to say that we slave at great risk and uncertainty for just a little cash in return.”


- “There are many Pacific Islanders who have worked 15 years or more on purse-seiners and longliners, moving from boat to boat, developing skills to become very able seamen but who still labour as deckhands, the lowest rank on board vessels, without promotion or increase in salary simply because the foreigners use rank to dominate Pacific Island crew. It is unique to find a Pacific Islander that ranks over a foreigner.”

There are maritime training institutes in Kiribati, Tuvalu and Fiji, and graduates are engaged by both the merchant marine and fishing industries. Even so, largely their qualifications are not considered when adjudicating salaries; the wages of primarily unskilled workers remain constant. Moreover, junior crew engaged by contract from countries neighbouring the Pacific (including Indonesia and the Philippines) are often placed in debt because the cost of their securing passports—and even travel to take up their contracts—are deducted from their promised wages.

“Another aspect is safety. Recently, news has circulated among Pacific Island crewmen on board foreign fishing vessels about two Pohnpeian crewmen that went missing from aAlienlandiclongliner in Papua New Guinea’s East New Britain Province.”

A few reports reach concerned ears in Fiji [Fiji Times on-line, 26 May 2014. ‘Set adrift in dinghy’; Fiji Times on-line, 10 March 2014. ‘Lost at sea’] but others circulate in the Pacific [There are reports of fisheries observers (who are known, and tracked) having been ‘lost’ overboard. They include Charles Lasisi and
Wesley Talia (Papua New Guinea) and Keith Davis (USA). There are murders, fights and deaths stemming from exhaustion, poor conditions, harsh treatment and long periods at sea. Safety-at-sea practice is low and awareness is not handled correctly; the fishing vessels of some fleets would not pass accepted maritime safety certificates.

• “We work in a situation where one lives under strict orders and should the orders be disobeyed or hindered, the penalties are harsh. Anything can happen to us out here and nobody will be able to tell what really happened.”

Whereas the deployment of fisheries observers and the duration of their voyages are recorded, much less is known about junior crew (names, vessels, voyage length), especially as trans-shipping of crew is not uncommon—due to crewing demands and breakdowns, for example). An often-reported and evidenced example of abuse was that of an Indonesian crewman who was presented to the Immigration Department in the Marshall Islands to show the scars on his body inflicted by the dog of the master of his vessel.

• “My final wish is that our Pacific Island countrymen recognize that being crew on board foreign fishing vessels is a difficult lifestyle. More strongly, they must realize that such employment is next to slavery. All we want is to work and provide for our families the best way we can; however, to risk our lives for meagre wages is not what we had in mind. I kindly ask that our governments’ appropriate authorities closely monitor the activities of the licensed fishing vessels and whatever circumstances may arise in the fishing grounds. We would rather struggle for the benefit of our own people and our nations rather than work as slaves to others who treat us like dirt in our own territory.”

Two major challenges to securing safe and correctly-remunerated conditions in the Pacific tuna fishery, are management of recruiting agents (notably, in Asian countries) and accountability of vessel masters. Non-realization of contracted wages and other conditions are frequently laid at the feet of recruiting agents—often, we receive reports of repatriated crew ultimately discovering that they worked for 18–24 months ‘for free’ because of agents’ manipulation of contracts or ‘disappearing’, and masters’ imposition of arbitrary fines aboard ship.

We state that there are three major components in a sustainable and sound tuna fishing industry: the resource, the vessels and the crew. Unfortunately, this third component is too often neglected whereas without crew, neither the resource could be caught nor the vessels operate. At the very least, all seafarers (which include junior crew) [With acknowledgement to VGroup Limited, www.vships.com] deserve

• the right to a safe and secure workplace that complies with safety standards,
• the right to fair terms of employment,
• the right to decent living and working conditions on board,
• the right to health protection, welfare measures and other forms of social protection,
• a workplace free of discrimination of any kind, and
• wage payments and allotments paid in a timely fashion and payments verified.

The governments of the Pacific Islands countries benefit greatly from the Pacific tuna stocks but along with the benefits, come responsibilities and reputation. It is encouraging to record that Pacific governments are beginning to recognize this.

For more


Under-Reporting of Slavery and Abuse in Pacific Fisheries


Crew conditions on fishing vessels in the Pacific Islands region
Despite artisanal fishing being a good option to earn a living, Michael feels that now with the impact of climate change and the widespread use of illegal fishing gear, fishing is becoming harder. The challenge is to be responsible in artisanal fishing, and improve fishing activities in the responsible marine fishing areas, which requires that people stop using illegal gear in favour of artisanal trawling and small nets”, he says.

Michael feels that at present, the youth, who have seen how the fishery resources have diminished, can embrace responsible fishing through the use of legal gear and valid legal fishing licenses. Artisanal fishing allows the youth to pursue an activity that generates income while simultaneously allowing them to study. The principal needs of the youth relate to access to credit to improve their fishing gear. Easy credit will encourage more young people to obtain fishing licences and fish responsibly, respecting rules and regulations.

**Social security**

With 18 years dedicated to fishing, Michael now enjoys social security...
since he is part of a local fishing association. As a young fisher, he participates in meetings on fishing and the need to conserve the sea's resources.

Life at sea permits the youth to get closer to the traditional knowledge enshrined in their fishing communities, which can surprisingly enrich perceptions regarding marine life. "There is knowledge that has been handed down from generation to generation, which has to do with the odours and the sounds of fish of different species. We learn this knowledge with the time spent being in the sea. When fish swim in large shoals, they throw up an oil-like substance which allows us to figure out the species of the fish. We can also listen keenly to the sounds of the fish and identify the species. Some species are also prone to hit against the boat. We have great knowledge about the sea which the majority of people do not possess. It is important to merge this knowledge with other types of knowledge to improve the well-being of our families and communities. All the members of the family are integrated into fishing activities", says Michael.
Towards a Modern Commons

The Community Fisheries organizations in Cambodia possess the basic framework and principles to be considered good examples of a created ‘modern commons’

SAMUDRA Report has featured many articles about the origins and functioning of the Community Fisheries (CFi) organizations of Cambodia (see ‘For more’ below). This article focuses on a recent scoping study, undertaken in August 2015, which sought to ascertain if the CFi in Cambodia have the essential characteristics and attributes necessary to be considered organizations that are utilizing and governing riparian ‘commons’.

What are ‘commons’? To arrive at an answer to this question, we will need to first have an understanding of what constitutes a ‘commons’. The first matter in this regard is to do away with the connotation of ‘commons’ as being some archaic form of tenure which was prevalent in Europe in medieval times, pertaining to agriculture and livestock activities of poor peasants which was usurped by feudal lords through what came to be known as the ‘enclosure movement’ to create forms of private property.

The other, more recent, academic association of ‘commons’ is with the much-quoted article written by Garrett Hardin in 1968 titled The Tragedy of the Commons. In it, Hardin considers the ‘commons’ to be a form of tenure where access to the resources therein is ‘open to all’ and thus inevitably leads to its depletion or destruction.

The historic association of commons being merely a form of tenure of ancient times, and the association of commons as a form of tenure which permits access to all, are both incorrect.

So what then do we mean or understand today when referring to a ‘commons’? Is it about the nature of particular things or resources—such as fish in the sea, forests, public parks, urban residential complexes, the telecommunication spectrum, outer space, Antarctica, and so forth? Is it about the way human governance of these resources/realms should be organized—for example, by a like-minded group, a neighbourhood community or a committee of interested nations?

In our understanding, commons, while they are about certain resources and ways of governance, are more appropriately visualized as the intrinsic combination of (i) a resource, (ii) a community utilizing it and (iii) a set of social rules and norms regarding use, misuse and management.

Principles of the Commons

There have been a whole series of investigations and a large body of analysis regarding the different types of commons, which, even today, function very successfully in various places around the world. The concept of ‘commons’ is also making headway into new realms such as software development, academic publications, music and the like.

One name which stands out when we refer to modern-day commons is that of the late Elinor Ostrom, the only woman Nobel Laureate in Economics. Ostrom spent a lifetime showing that
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when it comes to the managing of natural resources, there are tenure options between State ownership and management on the one hand, and market-oriented, privatized ownership on the other. It was her mission to valorize the examples around the world where groups of people and cogent communities organized themselves to effectively and efficiently manage common resources sustainably.

From the thousands of examples, Ostrom developed several organizing principles which lie at the heart of successful commons (see Box).

**Principles of the Commons and Community Fisheries**

In order to ascertain if Cambodia’s CFi qualify as an example of a ‘modern commons’, we conducted both structured interviews using a questionnaire, and non-structured conversations with representatives from thirteen CFi across the country. We tried to ascertain from them which principles of the commons were present in their organization and which were absent. This sample was not selected on the basis of any planned, purposive, stratified or scientific random manner. Therefore, there is no claim to a priori representativeness of the sample.

On completion of the interviews, we requested two key functionaries of the Fisheries Administration to use their intimate knowledge of the history of each of these CFi to assess and arrange the thirteen according to their overall performance.

The key criteria they used to make this grouping were:
- well-recognized functioning of CFi Committees,
- active member participation in activities such as conservation, use of resources for livelihood alternatives, mobilization of savings and funds,
- the involvement of women, and
- good feedback about the CFi from the concerned Provincial Fishery Officers.

Among the thirteen organizations, only three were considered to be well-functioning and three were considered to be poorly functioning, with the remaining seven lying on the spectrum in between.

Here are our findings:

(a) **Boundaries**

On the issue of clear demarcation of boundaries, we note that all thirteen CFis have attended to this task; eight of them have put up markers and nine have official maps. Variations exist with regard to the extent of awareness among the members about the boundaries. Only two claim that all their members are aware of the boundaries. It is interesting to note that these are the two CFi with the smallest area (115 and 337 ha) in our sample.

(b) **Rule Making**

Nine of the CFi claim that they have devised new rules primarily with regard to the procedures and norms (how to do, how to share the benefits, and so on) for activities which will have a bearing on the social and economic aspects of the members.

---

**BOX:**

**OSTROM’S EIGHT PRINCIPLES FOUND IN WELL-FUNCTIONING COMMONS**

1. Clearly defined group boundaries.
2. Rules governing use of common goods matching with local needs and conditions.
3. Those affected by the rules can participate in modifying the rules.
4. Rule-making rights of community members are respected by outside authorities.
5. A system is available, developed and carried out by community members, for monitoring members’ behaviour.
6. Graduated sanctions are used for rule violators.
7. Accessible, low-cost means for dispute resolution are made available.
8. Responsibility for governing the common resource in nested tiers is built up from the lowest level up to the entire interconnected system.
All of them state that the rules match local needs and conditions. This rule making is often premised on local, customary practices which are socially negotiated and may not be formalized in any written form.

(c) Participation in Rule Making

In the current context, these internal rules are usually made primarily by the CFi Committee, sometimes with the participation of a few active members. For example, rules on dealing with illegal fishing would be made with the participation of members of the patrolling groups. Among the nine CFi which have devised new rules, only two say that all their members were involved in the process. In seven of them it was the Committee and a few members who were actively involved.

Making rules is the easier task; getting members to follow them is more difficult. In four of the nine CFi it is claimed that ‘most’ of the members follow the new rules as well as the existing CFi rules. In three it is said that ‘some’ follow the rules. Only two of the well-functioning CFi make the claim that ‘all’ members follow the new rules made.

(d) Respect for Rule Making

The extent to which outsiders (non-members) respect the rules is a good measure of the respect and the standing which a CFi has in the larger society. Six of the nine which made rules claim that most of the outsiders respect these rules. Presumably, this relates to rules which affect the outsiders too—such as boundaries and issues relating to illegal fishing. Four of them state that only a ‘few’ outsiders respect these rules.

(e) Monitoring Behaviour

In eleven of the CFi, there is a system for monitoring the behaviour of members. Much of this relates to the issue of illegal fishing. It is the Committee, along with members of the patrolling groups, who are involved in the monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) activities. In one—the smallest in terms of membership (108) and area (115 ha)—all the members are involved in MCS activities.

Family-scale fishing in Community Fisheries, Cambodia. For CFi which are largely ‘empty shell commons’ to become ‘lively commons’ requires greater stimulation of the self-organization process among the membership.
(f) Sanctions for Rule Breaking

In all except the three poorly functioning CFi, there are well laid out, graded sanctions for rule breaking. Again, these are rules relating primarily to illegal fishing.

Initially a person who is apprehended for illegal fishing is given advice about the ill effects of what he is doing, and requested not to continue such activities. He is made to sign an undertaking with the CFi to that effect. A second offence attracts a fine and possibly confiscation/destruction of the gear used. The third offence is reported with details to the provincial Fisheries Administration and the local law-enforcing authorities who will take their own course of action. The fourth offence attracts arrest by the police or military, on the advice of the Fisheries Administration, and the offender has to appear before a court. Some fisheries officers have been conferred the power to issue warrants for arrest.

Of the ten CFi that claimed to have graded sanctions, only eight state that implementation is effective. This only implies that action is being taken according to the laid out procedures and norms. In most cases, this does not imply that the problem gets solved—particularly with regard to illegal fishing.

(g) Systems of Conflict Resolution

That conflict is common and perhaps endemic in this dynamic land–water ecosystem is acknowledged by all the thirteen CFi. The fact that illegal activity is so pervasive makes the potential for conflicts a permanent feature of the system. However, conflicts are not restricted to issues of illegal fishing alone.

Since members are dealing with several other resources in their designated area—for example, the flooded rice-growing area, the flooded forests—differential and competing claims over the various common-pool resources are inevitable. There are also conflicts which arise among members on a variety of organizational issues. The presence of conflict in a commons is, therefore, not a matter of surprise.

We also note that seven of the CFi state that conflicts are settled quickly and effectively. Speed is of the essence in conflict resolution, as also negotiations, mediation and efforts to arrive at a consensus without leaving a victor and the vanquished.

Many of the CFi report that when their Committees deal with conflict among members, they call for a meeting in a common area (the office or the pagoda) and hold a dialogue in the presence of local village leaders, and make efforts to counsel the parties concerned, examine the consequences of the conflict, while also going into the causative roots. Illegal fishing by members because of their poverty or sudden household needs is a case in point.

(h) Nested System of Coordination

The management of resources in the CFi is clearly not merely a local issue which can be restricted within their boundary. Where CFi organizations exist in close proximity, the actions/inactions of one clearly affect the other though there may be a time lag before the ill effects (externalities) become evident. Co-operation and co-ordination are evidently required to minimise this.

It is interesting to note that on this issue of the need for co-ordination, there was perfect agreement among all the thirteen CFi in our study.

Currently, the co-ordination is done by the provincial Fisheries Administration. However, this is largely and essentially on a one-to-one basis between a particular CFi and the administration. There is little co-ordination amongst the various CFi organizations although the Sub-Decree of Community Fisheries allows it. All thirteen CFi in the study...
agree that far greater co-ordination is needed amongst them.

Not by Principles Alone
Having completed the assessment, in overall conclusion we may say that in the majority of the CFi (10 out of 13) most of the Ostrom principles are present. If we consider the three CFi that were designated as ‘well-functioning’, they exhibit positive indicators of all the principles, whereas the three ‘poorly functioning’ ones lack many of the indicators of the eight principles.

Prima facie, given the data available, we may conclude that the CFi of Cambodia possess the basic framework and principles of functioning to be considered good examples of a created ‘modern commons’. However, as Peter Linebuaug, one of the important historians and current proponents of commons initiatives points out: “There is no commons without commoning”! ‘Commoning’ may be considered the participative social attribute of activities and enthusiastic work/labour on the part of the commoners (the members) in making the commons really work. This is what differentiates a commons from other sorts of institutions.

In our sample, we find a fair degree of commoning only in the three well-functioning CFi. In the case of the remaining ten, they merely function as officially constituted organizations with their elected Committees, with the members, to varying degrees, being involved in some sort of patrolling activities to protect their designated common areas from illegal fishing.

Consequently, an organization which may have all (or most of) the principles ascribable to a 'commons institution' need not necessarily be functioning as a ‘lively commons’. It can remain as an ‘empty shell commons’. For CFi which are largely ‘empty shell commons’ to become ‘lively commons’ requires greater stimulation of the self-organization process among the membership. In many, the Committee, and the members, in their turn, keep waiting for the Fisheries Administration, an NGO or other development partners to assist them. There is not much initiative on the part of the Committee to enthuse the membership to take forward any meaningful, collective and beneficial actions using the natural resources which are available to them in their designated areas. In most cases, the members are satisfied with the individual freedom which they have obtained to fish freely all year round using legal small-scale fishing gear.

Therefore, providing the legal framework and governmental support which give a community the right to create a commons is not adequate to make it ‘lively’. The commoners involved must also enthusiastically engage in defending those rights and translate them into actionable agenda points for conserving the natural resources and utilizing them for enhancing their livelihood options. Such priorities require astute, energetic and accountable leadership; creating trust among the commoners; forging voluntary collective action to defend the commons; and devising creative strategies to maximize and fairly distribute the material blessings from the commons.

Many of the 500-plus CFi in Cambodia have risen to become sterling examples of well-managed commons. We encountered three in our small sample. However, these are still the exceptions rather than the rule.

Clearly, framework and principles alone are not adequate to give ‘life’ to an organization. A ‘lively commons’ is the result of the community of members taking full cognizance of their rights and responsibilities and participating fully in ‘commoning’.

On this score, the CFi organisations of Cambodia have a long, arduous voyage ahead. For this, they require technical support from the fisheries administration; financial support from development partners and moral support from civil society.

For more
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New, but Long Overdue

Small-scale fishers in Europe have established a low-impact fishing platform to further fishing in a sustainable and socially and economically viable manner

Launched in November 2012 at the First Artisanal Fishers’ Congress in Santiago, Spain, formally registered in the United Kingdom in 2014, and with an office established in Brussels in 2015, the Low Impact Fishers of Europe (LIFE) is a relatively new, but long-overdue platform.

The First European Artisanal Fishers’ Congress that launched LIFE, gathered over 50 fishers’ representatives from nine European countries. They agreed to a common declaration that defined ‘low-impact fishers’ as those fishers who:

- use low-impact gear in terms of selectivity and impact on marine habitats,
- work on their own vessels,
- are committed to ensuring the sustainability of their activities by respecting the rules or, where such rules are absent or insufficient, by applying self-imposed measures to protect the fisheries resources and the environment, and
- maintain a strong social, cultural and economic link with their communities.

Fishers engaging in destructive fishing methods that exert a harmful impact on the environment, are non-selective or catch undersized fish will not be represented by LIFE.

Fishers’ organizations wanting to join LIFE are required to sign up to the common declaration and comply with the above definition. Interestingly, the reformed Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) of the European Union (EU) defines ‘low-impact fishing’ as “utilizing selective fishing techniques which have a low detrimental impact on marine ecosystems or which may result in low fuel emissions, or both”. LIFE was established as a single, strong and inclusive voice to represent the interests of small-scale low-impact fishers, both men and women, across Europe. Historically, such a voice has been noticeably absent at the European level. LIFE’s mission is to achieve conditions in which fishing is performed in a sustainable manner and small-scale low-impact fishers in Europe can maximise optimal conditions for their social and economic viability.

LIFE enables European small-scale low-impact fishers to develop and communicate collective positions and to influence the development and implementation of policies and legislation, including the CFP. LIFE acts as a platform for, and promotes, the creation of regional and national low-impact fishing organizations in EU Member States where representation is lacking. LIFE advocates for the right to fish to be granted those who fish sustainably, fleet overcapacity to be reduced where it exists, while preserving jobs in artisanal, low-impact fisheries, harmful subsidies and unsustainable and destructive practices to be stopped, and the health of our seas in Europe and the rest of the world to be restored.

One of the main campaigns of LIFE is to push for the implementation
of Article 17 of the recently reformed CFP. In particular, Article 17 of the CFP obliges Member States of the EU to use transparent and objective criteria, including those of an environmental, social and economic nature, when allocating the fishing opportunities available to them. The criteria to be used may include the impact of fishing on the environment, the history of compliance, the contribution to the local economy, and historic catch levels. Article 17 also encourages Member States to provide incentives to fishing vessels deploying selective fishing gear or using fishing techniques with reduced environmental impacts, such as reduced energy consumption or habitat damage.

As we will see below, Article 17 was incorporated into the CFP thanks to the concerted demands made by small-scale fishers during the reform of the CFP. One European Commission Official has described its provisions as ‘potentially revolutionary’. LIFE Members currently include fishers’ organisations from Poland, Germany, UK, Ireland, France, Netherlands, Greece and Spain, with applications being processed from organisations in Croatia, Italy, Portugal, Sweden and Denmark. All in all, around seventeen national-level organisations are associated with LIFE, representing around 3,000 fishers.

Until the recent review and reform of the CFP—a process that started in 2009 and ended in 2014 with the launch of the new CFP—it could be argued that the EU had no policy for small-scale fisheries. The CFP gave Member States the option of using the 12-mile zone to provide priority access to small-scale fishers to inshore waters. With few exceptions, small-scale fisheries was treated as a national issue, with little relevance at the EU level. Therefore, any small-scale fisher or group of small-scale fishers seeking redress at the European level had to make their voices heard through structures that had been, in the main, set up to service the interests and needs of larger-scale fishing companies and fishery-sector workers employed by such companies. These include the producer organizations (POs), set up by the EU as a means to distribute quotas and the vessel owners’ associations set up to engage with policymakers on fishery-management issues.

Small-scale fishers have been noticeably absent from the European consultative forums where policy matters are discussed with various interest groups, including vessel owners, retailers, consumers, NGOs and trade unions. Those representing the larger-scale fishery interests in these forums were at pains to point out that they represent all the fisheries-sector interests—whether large or small. However, issues discussed in these forums and decisions taken at the EU level as a result were rarely transmitted to small-scale fishers, who did not have the possibility of airing their views and concerns beforehand.

Small-scale low-impact fishers in Poland use fixed nets and lines. Small-scale fishers have been noticeably absent from the European consultative forums
All that changed, when in 2009, in its consultation document, the Green Paper on the Reform of the CFP, the European Commission posed the question as to whether a differentiated management regime for large-scale and small-scale fisheries would be appropriate. Such a regime would protect the most fragile coastal communities from the cuts in fishing capacity that were required to bring fleets and resources into line. Due to the desired cuts in fleet size, the European Commission had envisaged that employment in the fish-catching sector would decline by 60 per cent over 10 years, with the heaviest losses falling on the artisanal sector, which employs around 50 per cent of the fisheries workforce and constitutes 80 per cent of the fleet in terms of vessel numbers. Whilst it was expected that the large-scale fleet would be economically self-reliant, it was proposed that public funding could be used to help the small-scale segment adapt to changing conditions in the wake of the CFP reform, thereby strengthening its economic viability, and helping in maintaining its contribution to the life of coastal communities. Many Member States felt that it was up to them to decide how small-scale fisheries were managed in their countries’ waters, and what measures should be applied to them.

During the review of the CFP, a group of dissatisfied but highly motivated small-scale fishers from Sweden, Denmark, France, UK, Ireland, Spain, Greece and the Netherlands, representing small-scale fishers from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, formed an informal platform to lobby for small-scale fisheries to be given special consideration under the reformed CFP. They felt that they had been unfairly treated by previous policies, which had overlooked their rights when allocating access to fisheries resources, providing access to markets, and to opportunities to develop their enterprises. In particular, many held legitimate grievances that they had been excluded from the quota system, and, as a result, their access rights to their traditional resources were being denied them. They argued that a significant proportion of the European fleet is small in scale and fishes in a non-intensive manner, using a range of seasonally diverse fishing methods on a range of species, with a relatively low impact on the ecosystem. However, the particular advantages of these characteristics—the qualitative aspects of different fishing gear and practices—had been largely overlooked by the CFP. They, therefore, proposed that this should be rectified by providing priority access to fishery resources to those who fish in the most environmentally and socially sustainable way. This demand became incorporated into the CFP under Article 17, as described above.

In the new CFP, the rights of small-scale fishers—defined as those using vessels under 12 m and non-towed gears—to participate in formal consultation processes in the (Regional) Advisory Councils (ACs) are backed by special provisions. These reserve seats especially for small-scale fishers, and make finance available to compensate for the loss of earnings of genuine fishers who attend these meetings. Today, LIFE is working to establish a presence in four main sea basins—the Baltic Sea, the North Sea, the Bay of Biscay and the Mediterranean. It is LIFE’s objective to assure the participation of its members in the ACs in these regions where fisheries interest groups come together to discuss issues of common concern, and to propose actions. Since August 2015, LIFE has organized three regional workshops in Poland for the Baltic region, in Spain for the Atlantic regions, and in Greece for the Mediterranean region. These meetings have gathered around 110 fishers from thirteen countries, who have reiterated their commitment to LIFE and to seeing its aims and objectives realized. For more
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The Low-Impact Fishers of Europe
We demand that the African Union declares an African Year of Artisanal Fisheries, with the objective of promoting the implementation of international guidelines for sustainable artisanal fisheries at the Pan-African level", declared Gaoussou Gueye, General Secretary of the African Confederation of Professional Artisanal Fisheries Organisations (CAOPA) [see CAOPA website http://www.caopa-africa.org/en/] in front of an appreciative audience that had gathered at the landing site of ImiOuadar, in Agadir, Morocco.

This statement ended the celebrations of World Fisheries Day 2015, an event that has been organized each year since 2010 by the CAOPA and its local member—this year, the National Confederation of Artisanal Fisheries in Morocco (CNPAM)—to celebrate African artisanal fisheries in all its diversity.

For the first time, men and women from CAOPA’s 15 national member organizations, were joined by their colleagues from the newly formed Indian Ocean Federation of Artisanal Fishermen (FPAOI) [the Fédération des Pêcheurs Artisans de l’Océan Indien (FPAOI), established in 2015, groups artisanal fishing organisations from Madagascar, Comoros, The Seychelles, La Réunion, Mauritius] and the Maghreb Platform of Artisanal fisheries [La PlateformeMaghrébine de la Pêcheartisanale, established in 2014, groups artisanal fishing organisations from Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Mauritania]. They all saw this as an opportunity to discuss how their groupings could improve networking and collaborations.
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to think by themselves and make proposals to develop the artisanal fishing sector”, said Micheline Dion, from the Côte d’Ivoire Women Fish Processors organization, and Coordinator of the CAOPA women’s programme. “The World Fisheries Day allows us also to highlight the role of women in fisheries”, added Rose Togbenou, a woman fish processor from the Togo Maritime Fishing Cooperative Union.

Indeed, far from the traditional idea that women’s role is confined to fish processing and marketing, CAOPA has been consistently arguing that women are active at all stages of the artisanal fisheries value chain—pre-financing and preparation of fishing trips, fishing, fish processing and marketing. Women are also the pillars of the family in African small-scale fishing communities, being in charge of the children’s education as well as household management. As Antonia Adama Djalo from Guinea Bissau, vice president of CAOPA, put it: “When women in fisheries do well, the whole society benefits”.

During the two days of exchanges and discussion that followed the celebration of the World Fisheries Day, participants were reminded that, at the global level, 10 per cent of people engaged in fishing and aquaculture were located in Africa, which is, therefore, the second continent, after Asia, in terms of jobs offered by this sector. More than 80 per cent of the 12.3 mn Africans engaged in fisheries were in the artisanal fishing subsector, providing income and livelihoods to millions of families in Africa.

Discussions were focused on how the FAO’s Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (the SSF Guidelines) would be integrated in the ongoing reform of African fisheries and aquaculture policies. Indeed, the reform strategy being developed by the African Union identified, as one of its main objectives, “the development of sustainable small-scale fisheries by improving and enhancing the
contribution of small-scale fisheries to poverty reduction, food security and nutrition, and the improvement of the socioeconomic benefits to fishing communities”.

Aboubacar Sidibé, representing the African Union-Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR), emphasised: “Fishing organizations everywhere say that the SSF Guidelines have to be implemented. If we want to get out of the usual top-down approach for this, fishing organizations themselves have an important role to play to popularise the guidelines, and to make them understandable by men and women from fishing communities, using their own languages, so that their preoccupations can be taken care of in future policies. There are also areas where institutions will need the support of artisanal fishers—for example, as mentioned under article 5.16 of the Guidelines, for the establishment of monitoring, control and surveillance systems”.

“In the years to come, the FAO will support the implementation of the SSF Guidelines. This event is important, as we need to evaluate, together with artisanal fishing professional organizations, their capacities and their priorities in the process of the SSF Guidelines implementation”, said Joseph Catanzano, who represented FAO at the meeting. “Concerning the proposal for an African Year of Artisanal Fisheries, it is an excellent initiative. This will also be an occasion to show that the whole community of international development partners must help to address some aspects of artisanal fisheries, including the status of the professionals in the artisanal fishing sector, their rights, their livelihoods, gender issues and the issue of decent working conditions.”
Towards Food Sovereignty

In the context of the SSF Guidelines, the need now is to progressively work towards achieving food sovereignty for the small-scale fishing communities and fishworkers.

This piece is inspired by the discussions held during the ICSF-BOBLME East Coast Workshop to discuss the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Small-scale Fisheries in the context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (the SSF Guidelines) during 6–7 March 2015. The intent here is to raise several points for consideration during the process of consultations around the implementation of the SSF Guidelines. The premise of this article is: if the objectives of the SSF Guidelines are to be realized in their entirety “through the promotion of a human-rights-based approach, by empowering small-scale fishing communities, including both men and women, ... for the benefit of vulnerable and marginalized groups”, there is a need to go beyond the “progressive realization of the right to adequate food”. The need is to progressively work towards achieving food sovereignty for the small-scale fishing communities and fishworkers. Only through food sovereignty as the long-term goal can fisheries contribute to an “economically, socially and environmentally sustainable future for the planet and its people”.

In 1996, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) defined food security as the condition whereby “all people at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, nutritious food, to meet daily dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”. It refers to availability, access and assimilation of food. Food security could, therefore, be achieved without any connections to local community-controlled systems of food production. Food security met through industrial production systems destroys the livelihoods of food-producing communities.

Food security met through industrial production systems destroys the livelihoods of food-producing communities.

In 2007, the peasant movement, La Via Campesina, defined food sovereignty as a rights-based concept—
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the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agricultural systems. It puts those who produce, distribute and consume the food at the heart of food systems and policies rather than the demands of markets and corporations. The definition articulates, powerfully, some of the guiding principles of food sovereignty as: ‘food sovereignty prioritises local and national economies and markets, and empowers peasants and family farmer-driven agriculture, artisanal fishing, pastoralist-led grazing and food production, distribution and consumption based on environmental, social and economic sustainability. It ensures that the rights to use and manage our lands, territories, water, seeds, livestock and biodiversity are in the hands of those of us who produce food’. An important dimension of this definition is that food sovereignty is claimed as a collective right of communities and peoples rather than as an individual right.

Food sovereignty, in the context of fishers and fishworkers, has been articulated by the People’s Coalition on Food Sovereignty (PCFS). In its statement at the 30th session of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) of the FAO in July 2012, it emphasized that discussions on governance of rights, resources management and stewardship of small-scale fisherfolk need to go beyond the issue of ‘access’ to resources and should cover democratic ownership and control of these as well. This aspect of ‘access’ versus a collective right over resources and democratic ownership and control is at the heart of the difference between security and sovereignty. Fishers and fishworkers must be a part of the decision-making process on how their territories (oceans, lakes, rivers and so on) are used. They must have a right to engage in their customary practices influenced by seasonality and other natural cycles and patterns of fishing. They must have the right to practice their livelihoods and maintain their food cultures and traditions—cultures that have been built through experience of being an intimate part of their respective ecosystems (riverine, coastal, marine). The crucial role and leadership of women in achieving food sovereignty is explicitly recognized by the food sovereignty movement.

The February 2015 workshop on the SSF Guidelines threw up several challenges faced by the fishing communities. Chief among them were resource pollution by industry, power plants (nuclear and thermal), urban centres, tourism, sand mining, and so on, violation of legislation by the State and industry (notably those related to pollution control and pollution prevention and Coastal Regulation Zone) and non-implementation of legislation that protects community rights of governance of their resources (for example, Forest Rights Act, customary rights of fishing communities, participation of kulapanchayat and gram panchayat in decision making). These challenges are exacerbated by the increasing corporate control of oceans and the fishing sector and the destruction of local, decentralized markets. All these challenges are a direct threat to the fishing communities in their pursuit of achieving food sovereignty.
The Guiding Principles on which the SSF Guidelines are based, as well as the SSF Guidelines themselves, have set up a framework that will help rebuild food sovereignty. This is reflected clearly in the priority accorded to (i) governance of tenure and tenure rights, (ii) recognition of customary laws, (iii) protection of the quality and diversity of resources, (iv) gender equality with an emphasis on women’s rights and safety, and their crucial role in post-harvest activities and the need to ‘challenge practices that are discriminatory against women’, and (v) the need for ‘urgent and ambitious action’ to combat climate change, including in the context of sustainable small-scale fisheries.

One point that stands out in the context of the SSF Guidelines is that they are ‘voluntary’. If these Guidelines are to be implemented to rebuild lives and livelihoods of fishing communities through food sovereignty, there is an urgent need to implement them in their entirety. In a situation where even legislation and legal mandates are not being implemented or, in some cases, violated by the State, how can implementation of ‘voluntary’ guidelines, with a potential to rebuild food sovereignty, be ensured?

Given that these SSF Guidelines have been built through grassroots consultation with the fishing communities, it is the social movements of fishworkers who have to spearhead their implementation. In this situation, the response of the Food Sovereignty Alliance (FSA) is to move forward through solidarity and reciprocity between fishing communities and other communities (pastoralists, peasants, adivasis, dalits and others) of the Alliance. The challenges facing the fishing communities and other marginalised communities are the same.

Food sovereignty is built on principles of reciprocity, equity, gender justice and solidarity. It also means not viewing various constituencies in silos—for example, fishers, farmers, pastoralists, adivasis—rather recognising that together they form communities. The State and corporations typically have fragmented views of how natural resources are used. The State, rather than the communities and people, is viewed as the ‘owner’ of these resources. To achieve food sovereignty the ideas of commons, custodianship and community are essential. This requires a transformation in the way nature and natural resources are perceived—not as a commodity but with the spirit of trusteeship/custodianship. It also means that the engagement between society and nature and between various constituencies in society must rest on democratic governance of resources, drawing upon customary approaches that nurture equity and justice, customary laws of engagement and accommodations, agroecological methods of production and decentralized systems of producing, sharing and distributing food, all of which have evolved experientially over centuries.

Small farmers, small-scale fishers, adivasis and others in a given region must find ways to share knowledge, exchange produce and support their nutritional web so that food sovereignty can be asserted by all. In the context of small-scale fishers’ dependence on the market and a centralized, import-dependent PDS for grain, pulses and edible oil, access is provided only to poor-quality food, destroying health and eroding local food systems and cultures. Movements like the FSA, ICSF and other social movements working on the rights of small-scale fishers must help build connections across communities to achieve food sovereignty. The connections must aim at enabling grains, pulses, oilseeds, vegetables, greens, fish, meat, milk and eggs to be made
available through reciprocity and exchange in local markets. It also means that we need to build pressure on the State to operationalize the new Food Security Act, 2013, so that food distributed is locally procured from producers, in a way that sustains agroecological and culturally appropriate production by food producers—peasants, pastoralists, adivasis, dalits, fisherfolk. This way communities can work together to understand each other’s resource dependencies so that ecosystems as a whole are protected. This, in turn, will allow for local food cultures to be sustained. Inland fishers, small farmers, pastoralists and adivasis need to collectively protect lakes, rivers, tanks and reservoirs so that communities can have access to good quality and quantity of water to grow food and raise fish.

Movements must also come together to oppose the undemocratic manner in which decisions are made in the name of development—decisions that erode governance rights of communities over their resources. This solidarity must oppose the justification provided for this kind of development which puts the farmer against the fisher—building large dams purportedly to address farmer’s need for irrigation water which is in conflict with the ecological flow that needs to be maintained in the river for fish, and the right to life of adivasis whose homelands are threatened with submergence with the construction of these dams. Another point of convergence and joint effort between the FSA and the social movements of small-scale fishers is the clear recognition of the leadership of women and the need to place their rights at the centre of any effort to achieve food security and sovereignty.

The FSA recognizes one other significant constituency—the co-producers. This group has great relevance in the context of the fishers’ movement as well. These are consumers who are deeply engaged with the producers in co-creating and co-producing food. Consumers have a strong influence on the production process and their needs are insidiously shaped by the industrial food system. Increasing supermarketisation, demand for cheap, convenient food and increased processing to increase shelf-life are all driving not only what is produced but also the nature of labour. This is one of the many reasons for increased feminisation of agriculture and fisheries which has led to more women becoming wage-labourers.

It is hoped that the various ideas articulated in this article will be the beginning of a dialogue of sharing and reciprocity that will strengthen our collective effort for a more just and equitable society.

Fisherwomen waiting for the catch, Andhra Pradesh, India. The crucial role of women in achieving food sovereignty is explicitly recognized by the food sovereignty movement.
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The marine fishery of the Kerala state in India is globally well-known for its high productivity, species diversity, skilled fishers and also, importantly, for sustaining a vibrant small-scale fishery on its once-sandy beaches. Kerala’s fishery has been a trendsetter. It hosted the world’s first development project in 1952 when Norway, India and the United Nations (UN) came together to create the much written-about Indo–Norwegian Project for Fisheries Development. Kerala became one of the globally leading exporters of shrimp from the early 1960s and claims the distinction of being a pioneer in introducing the small-sized trawlers to harvest the shrimp. It also undertook the first long-term study of the economics of artisanal small-scale non-mechanized fisheries and the mechanized fisheries. The fishery also lays claim to having given rise to one of the earliest independent fishworker trade union movements demanding simultaneously for ecosystem management and socioeconomic development.

These processes have been documented by a large number of Indian and non-Indian researchers in the form of articles and books which have been published globally. The fishery has also been a subject of many films and documentaries.

But all that is history. Today Kerala’s small-scale fishery finds itself in limbo. It is struggling to redefine itself. It seems caught in a race against itself. The old dichotomies of non-mechanized and mechanized, small and big, artisanal and modern are irrelevant. The struggles of the mid-1980s and 1990s to create a well-defined realm in the coastal sea—where only the small, the diverse and that which is harmonious with nature—will operate has been defeated. Today it is open access. There are only possession rights—first come, take all!

This is the background against which the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (the SSF Guidelines), recently endorsed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), is being introduced into Kerala.

The small-scale fishing (SSF) communities of Kerala form the backbone of its marine fisheries sector. The active fishers today number about 150,000. Over the last 40 years, the SSF sector has undergone a great metamorphosis on all fronts—socioeconomic, technological, ecological and political.

Collective action
Measured by conventional socioeconomic parameters of development, the SSF communities were once seen as a rank ‘outliers’. Today their conditions have greatly improved. This can be attributed to the combined result of collective action and the positive responses of the state arising from it. This has resulted in significant improvements in housing, education and health. There has also been a significant
increase in fish prices and appropriate organizational interventions in fish marketing, which account for increase in household incomes. Family incomes from other sources—such a remittances from the Middle East countries where some members of the family may work—have also become a source of funds for making social and fishery-related investments.

From total dependence on human and renewable energy sources to propel their fishing boats, SSF communities have shifted almost totally to the use of mechanical propulsion. The same can be said about the shifts which have taken place in the size and in the materials used for their fishing gear. From small, easily manageable nets and tackle made from cotton and other natural fibres, they have upgraded to using large gear made from nylon and monofilament nets requiring mechanical power for their paying out and retrieval after fishing.

The realm of management of the fishery resources remains a matter of contention. Significant steps were taken in the 1980s for legal enactments which had important resource and ecosystem conservation implications, with positive results in the fishery as a whole. But the unbridled investment spree in the SSF (mentioned above) has created a context where the SSF fish economy, taken as a whole, is economically unviable and shows some disturbing ecosystem changes such as significant fishing down the food chain. However, given the phenomenon of bumper harvests that bring lottery rewards, individual fishers may still be operating profitably from a strict private costs and earnings perspective.

The physical ecosystem of the state’s 600-km coastline has also been undergoing a major change. Over the last 40 years, it has become interspersed at frequent intervals with physical structures such as piers, groynes and breakwaters, which are intended as safe landing centres for the evolving bigger craft and gear. The resultant unintended and unpredicted erosion and accretion caused by these structures have converted what was once a predominantly sandy coastline into one which is lined with granite seawalls.

The combined effect of the technological changes in fishing and the physical changes in the coastline have had a significant bearing on the occupation and work pattern of the women in the SSF communities who were once an important part of the economic lifeline of the sector. This transformation in their lives affects the well-being of the whole community.

The combination of the factors mentioned above pose a serious question about the future of the SSF communities and the SSF sector in the state. This was the motivation for the team of activist–researchers of Protsahan, an NGO based in Kerala, that has long experience in the SSF sector of Kerala, to re-engage with the sector after long and take stock of the situation.

One of the important strategies of this initiative to re-establish and rekindle their contacts with the ‘transformed SSF sector’, in an effort to comprehend what indeed was happening at the local levels, was to use the SSF Guidelines as an entry point for this action.

The first task was to make a brief summary of the essence of the
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SSF Guidelines in English and then translate it into the local language—Malayalam. This summary was printed and the booklet was widely distributed across the state to the key community leaders of the SSF and to the representatives of their social, economic and political organizations.

The summary was well received and commented upon, both informally and formally. An important community leader, who is also the Chairperson of the state-sponsored small-scale fisheries cooperative, popularly known by the acronym MATSYAFED, referred to the SSF Guidelines as the Magna Carta of the small-scale fishing community.

The team met key individuals from the SSF community personally—men and women fishworkers, community leaders, cooperative leaders, trade union activists, fishery scientists and bureaucrats, NGO representatives—so that they could hear their perspectives about the changes which had taken place over the last four decades. This was also used as the opportunity to invite them personally to attend the seminars in their respective regions to discuss the SSF Guidelines.

These visits also helped the team members to make field-level contacts and collect information and data for five studies which were considered to be appropriate for understanding how to re-configure the SSF in Kerala.

In this article, a summary of the studies undertaken is reported.

A. CHANGING FISHING TECHNIQUES

Over the last fifteen years, there have been very significant changes that took place in the small-scale fishery of Kerala, particularly with regard to the nature and investment in the fishing units. The main factors which spurred these changes are the ‘open-access’ nature of the coastal waters and the hugely increased demand for fish in the local, national and international markets.

The trigger for these changes came as far back as the 1980s when the mechanized trawlers pushed the traditional non-mechanized fishing units to a corner and alienated their production and livelihoods. At that juncture, outboard motorization of traditional crafts came as a great saviour of the small-scale sector. For example, the modification of the traditional encircling net into the ‘ring-seine’, aided by motorized canoes, brought traditional small-scale fishers back into the competition for fish.

This big olympic race for fish between sectors and within the ‘traditional’ sector has resulted in a huge excess capacity in ring-seines and introduced the tendency for destructive methods like mini-trawling and pair trawling. This was an unfortunate trend that was wilfully overlooked by the state, the fishers and civil society.

The overall result has been fewer number of fishing days for all and bulk landings of small pelagics for the lucky ones—the first person to reach the fish/fishing ground gets all the fish. The fish is being diverted to fishmeal manufacturers because only they accept such bulk landings.

The investment levels have reached unbelievable heights and a fishing unit is more like a naval unit—a steel hull boat, two fibre-reinforced plastic (FRP) carrier boats, a 550 horsepower (hp) inboard engine and three outboard motors (OBMs), an echo sounder, global positioning system (GPS), wireless sets, a mechanized hydraulic winch—and a bus to transport the workers to the port. And we still call this ‘traditional small-scale’!

An important consequence of this increased investment is the vastly increased levels of indebtedness of the fishermen to merchants. The result is that they have to make the first sale of their fish at the price and place dictated by the financiers. The autonomy of fishers has been lost. Today we have close to 500 ring-
seine units in Kerala and the annual production is stagnating at 500,000 to 550,000 tonnes. There is growing inequality in the fisheries sector and the overall average income in real terms is falling.

B. COASTAL STRUCTURES AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE COAST AND THE FISHERY

One important effect of increased size of fishing boats and their overall numbers is the demand for safe harbouring facilities. Given the earlier highly decentralized spatial settlement pattern, the SSF communities have been clamouring for structures such as harbours and breakwaters built perpendicular to the coast, in order to create these ‘safe havens’ for landing the new motorized fishing boats at every important fish landing site. With their increased political power as a vote bank, their demands are readily conceded by the politicians.

The shoreline changes on the coast are monitored by the Irrigation Department, which systematically collects and collates data about the physical changes of the entire coast of the state. According to their observations, the natural processes of erosion and accretion over the different seasons of the year along the coast has radically changed over the last four decades due to human intervention. The National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM), the Society of Integrated Coastal Management (SICOM) and Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Government of India, compared five historical shorelines (1972–2010) extracted from satellite imageries and concluded that over 63 per cent of Kerala’s 588-km coastline is eroding.

The erosion of the beaches quickly threatens the houses of the SSF which have been traditionally built close to the sea-face. This then gives rise to demands for construction of seawalls and groynes for protection from the wrath of the sea. More than half of Kerala’s coast (53 per cent) is now lined with granite. However, it should be noted that it is not only these coastal structures that cause beach erosion. Interventions far away from the coast along the 41 west-flowing rivers of Kerala—such as building dams, mining of sand upstream of rivers, dredging of river mouths and the destruction of coastal vegetation—are also important, but often hidden, causes for erosion.

It is now recognized that seawalls, in the long run do not provide protection for the shoreline. The waves of the Arabian Sea are far too strong for them. Seawalls only provide profits for the contractors, and quarrying for granite is contributing to major ecological problems in the interior parts of Kerala, far from the coast. If the SSF of Kerala disappears in the next decade, it will be mainly due to seawalls as they destroy beach-based fish landing. Every kilometre of sea wall costs Rs 70 mn to build and Rs 30-40 mn to maintain every two to three years! This is a vicious circle.

There is a radical solution to this intractable dilemma—remove all structures, move the fishers to behind the 200-m hazard line from the sea, use all the granite to re-build the new houses and let the sea re-establish its old natural relationship with the coast of Kerala.

C. THE CHANGING ROLES OF WOMEN IN THE SMALL-SCALE FISHERY

The increasing size of the SSF vessels, their shift to new landing centres and the stone-walling of the beaches of Kerala have been detrimental to the occupations of women in the SSF communities who have traditionally been involved in pre-harvest and post-harvest activities and marketing of the fish from the beach landing centres.

The changes in fishing technology resulted in the greater role of male
Collective action has been a sustained theme among the labouring sections of Kerala’s population.

D. ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SMALL-SCALE FISHERY

Collective action has been a sustained theme among the labouring sections of Kerala’s population. There has always been a commitment by the state to provide organizational support for rural producers. Whether these initiatives led to genuine participation is quite another matter.

Organizational arrangements in the fishery have a long history in Kerala. The first cooperative was organized in 1917 in the state of Travancore, now part of Kerala. Thereafter, when Kerala state was formed in 1956, the government organized separate credit, producer and marketing cooperatives for the fishers.

These top-down initiatives failed miserably, with a few notable exceptions, such as the fisher cooperative in Marianad, Trivandrum, which integrated all the three functions of credit, production and marketing. In 1984, following the unionised struggles of the small-scale fishers demanding a better deal for their sector, the government initiated the formation of cooperatives on the lines of the Marianad model. This network was called ‘Matsyafed’. It currently has 666 cooperatives under its fold.

Matsyafed was envisaged as an economic organization which was to develop a business plan and strategy to maximise the economic benefit of its members—men and women. It had a Business Development Plan (BDP) that was meant to elevate Matsyafed into a business organization that would not be a burden to the government (like many of the loss-making public sector organizations) and also serve the economic and social welfare needs of the SSF communities.

In the initial phases, Matsyafed took the right approach of building cooperatives through community-based contacts. The activities were also diversified into non-fishing activities for generating self-employment opportunities, particularly targeting women and youth. The formations of self-help groups (SHGs), thrift and credit mobilization, and the promotion of microenterprises were some of the initiatives.

However, Matsyafed has not really updated itself with the evolving hard realities in the SSF sector today, which include—too many people chasing the same fish in the same coastal waters, higher capital and operational costs, falling productivity; huge disturbance to the ecosystem and reduced income to fishers.

Matsyafed needs an updated perspective to cope with the changes and the opportunities. New policies,
strategies and business plans are needed in the changing scenario. The need of the hour is for the Matsyafed core team and the line staff to revive its earlier phase of close community contacts. This will be the only way to rectify the unsustainable fishing practices and accomplish the major challenge of attaining prosperity of the SSF in the state. There needs to be a balance between attaining profitable business endeavours without loss of the perspective of ecological sustainability and social responsibility.

E. FISHING COMMUNITIES AND THEIR PROGRESS IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The issues detailed above have had varying effects on the social and economic well-being of the fishing communities of Kerala.

The state is known the world over for its unique human development experience. The population of Kerala has a high quality of life—high literacy, high life expectancy, favourable sex ratio (more women than men), low infant mortality. All this has been achieved in the 1970s and 1980s despite the relatively low per capita income of the state.

However, studies have shown that this high quality of life of Kerala was not applicable to two communities—the fisherfolk along the coast and the tribals in the hills. They were the ‘outliers’ in the Kerala development experience even as late as 1980.

The major socio-ecological movement of the small-scale fishers in the 1980s led to greater politicisation of the fisherfolk, and the attention of the state turned to them in a limited way. The preference accorded to the mechanized sector of fishing, which started in the 1960s, was stopped. The focus was turned to the small-scale fishery from the 1990s onwards. Through the creation of the Matsyafed, considerable funds were provided for motorization of small fishing vessels. The Fishworkers Welfare Board contributed to greater welfare measures for significant improvements in housing, education and health facilities of the fisherfolk.

However, in the last two decades (1995–2015), the fishery sector production and its contribution to net state domestic product (NS DP) have been declining at the macro level. The fishery resources too have declined in stock and variety, which have mostly hurt the small-scale fishery. This seems to reinforce the fact that the huge increase in investments and the new organizational arrangements have not been adequate to compensate for the initial disadvantages faced by the communities. This outcome can be attributed importantly to the lack of any collective resource management accompanying increased investment.

At the micro level too, there is evidence of increasing poverty and indebtedness among the fishers across the selected districts. The poor socio-economic situation of the fishers is closely related to their increased population and the initial lack of land ownership. The situation of very congested housing still prevails as a serious challenge among the small-scale fishers. This, together with deprivation in basic amenities, leads to poor human development outcomes. The incidence and prevalence of communicable diseases are much higher among the marine fishers, so also occupation-related ailments and lifestyle diseases.

On the educational front, there has been considerable improvement in literacy and educational status among the marine fishers. However, they lag far behind in higher and technical education achievements. This then inhibits their access to the new opportunities in the changing labour market at the state, national and global levels. Dependence on fishing continues.

Since fishing was not a source of increased income for the vast majority of the working fishers, we
must conclude that whatever higher human development outcomes have resulted can only be explained by income sources from outside the fishery and state welfare support.

Migration to the Middle East and employment in government and other sectors outside the fishery are important income-accruing channels among the fishing communities. But there is lack of credible data to support this observed change and, therefore, further detailed enquiry is warranted.

One important observation is the spatial disparity in the development outcomes. Fishers in the Christian-dominated district of Trivandrum and the Muslim-dominated district of Malapuram are much poorer and have lower human development outcomes compared to the rest of the fishing community in Kerala.

Another observation is that there is a historical disadvantage in the initial conditions of development, which resulted in the fishing communities being ‘left behind’ in the initial human development progress of Kerala. The three historically important factors of land reform, the presence of social reform movements and the role of missionaries in spreading English education were absent in the fishing communities. Having been deprived of these processes, the community continues to lag behind and continues to be unable to overcome this initial disadvantage.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE SSF GUIDELINES AND KERALA’S SSF SECTOR TODAY

The scenario which emerges from the five studies is certainly not an encouraging one. This fact was readily accepted at all the three workshops organized to feed back the consolidated results of the studies.

Situating the above context against the background of the SSF Guidelines, provided an important element of hope and determination to the men and women fisherfolk, community leaders, civil society organization representatives, the leaders of the cooperative entities and trade unions, and fishery scientists and policymakers attending the workshops.

The most significant resolve of this multi-stakeholder group was the need to redefine and reconfigure the constituents of the small-scale fishery. How do we define what is small and what is not? This is a major challenge. It is also an evolving process.

Related to this was the discussion on the unbridled increase in investment in fishing crafts and gear which were harmful to the fish stocks and the aquatic ecosystem. How do we limit this financially and ecologically unsustainable growth?

Partly in response to the above was the call for reviving the discussions on ‘aquarian reforms’ in Kerala—giving the rights to own fishing assets solely to those who are actually working at sea. In other words, there should be no absentee ownership. Such changes are easier said than done. There are many vexing questions. Should this right be given to any worker? Or is it reserved primarily to anyone from ‘traditional fishing communities’? Or should it be only for the workers from among them? In the socio-political context of Kerala today, the answer is not straightforward.

The SSF Guidelines provide a good template and a fair starting point from which the SSF of Kerala, as it finds itself today, can negotiate its way to a brighter and sustainable future. For the moment, this is the only definite statement that can be made.
Artisanal fishing has guaranteed food and nutritional security for millions of fishing communities in Brazil. It is estimated that almost 70 per cent of the fish produced in the country comes from artisanal fishing. Besides economic importance, working men and women in small-scale fishing have, over the years, developed a list of ‘know-hows’ and ‘how-to’s’ which represent cultural elements of indigenous and Afro-Brazilian roots, associated to lessons learned from a deep relationship with nature over the years.

The fact that artisanal fishing is an ancient activity means that fishermen and fisherwomen have established a very special relationship with nature. No doubt, the many strategies used by these communities ensured the preservation of their traditional territories, as well as their physical and cultural reproduction.

Brazil is internationally recognized for being a mega-diverse country, with many river basins and an extensive coastal zone, which together provide the basic fisheries resources for food security across the country.

Considered one of the oldest productive activities of humankind, fishing is an important source of income, generating employment and food. Artisanal fishermen and fisherwomen develop fishing for commercial, cultural or subsistence purposes, autonomously or in a household system. In Brazil, it is estimated that the activity involves approximately 3.5 mn people throughout the production chain and artisanal fishing accounts for approximately 70 per cent of the fish production of the country. According to the former Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture (MPA), as of September 2011, 957,000 of the approximately 970,000 registered fishers are small-scale, 44 per cent are fisherwomen (128,427). Currently, these groups are organised into about 760 associations, 137 trade unions and 47 cooperatives. For fishers’ movements, it is estimated that in Brazil there are over 1.5 mn ‘men and women of the waters’.

The Brazilian neodevelopmentalist model has intensified conflicts and rights violations against artisanal fisherwomen and fishermen due to State policy. The government’s action ignores the way of life of these communities. Aimed at opening spaces for the advancement of large projects, predatory tourism, mining, water privatisation, land speculation, business aquaculture, construction of infrastructure for commodities flow, ranging from roads, railways, ports, mine ducts to ports, among other investments, which, encouraged in a disorganized way, are threatening the livelihoods of these traditional populations.

We can list the following aspects:

The plans of privatizing water bodies for aquaculture projects, be they marine or freshwater, have been ongoing since 2003; however, only in the last few years has it been possible to notice its effects in more obvious ways. In this context, the decree...
No. 4,895 was approved on 25
November 2003, which provides
for authorizing the use of
physical water body spaces of
Union domain for aquaculture.
There were many investments
made by SEAP (Special Secretariat
of Aquaculture and Fisheries) and
MPA in order to make more flexible
environmental laws or deregulate the
laws protecting ecosystems. These
bodies carried out heavy investments
in infrastructure and development
of technologies for aquaculture and
there was a broad consolidation
of alliances with business sectors
interested in this market. According
to the Ministry's own data, 900 ha of
water surface were offered for this
purpose in thirteen states in 2013.
Since 2013, numerous notices
were published for the ceding of
public water bodies so that their use
could be regulated by local individuals
or entities whereas, traditionally,
the communities had been using
them for tens or hundreds of years.
The assessment of environmental
and technical facilities was carried
out through a process called Local
Development Plan of Sea Culture
(PLDM) and did not take into account
the views of the communities.
The process of publishing the bid
documents was done without
consultation or seeking any consent,
as provided under the ILO Convention
169 of which Brazil is a signatory,
nor was there any public hearing.
The intention of the recently
wound-up MPA was to transform
Brazil into one of the largest fish
producers in order to meet the
demands of the foreign market. This
intensified conflicts over the use of
water bodies. In this context, a legal
basis was created to grant permission
for private use of Union waters and
to enable the deployment of marine
farms. The MPA, before its extinction,
was attempting to influence the
Civil House to further facilitate
the privatization process through
reducing the control exercised by
environmental and administrative
bodies such as IBAMA (Brazilian
Institute of the Environment), ANA
(National Waters Agency) and SPU
(Union Heritage Department).

Another concern is shrimp farming,
which has left an unsustainable trail
worldwide and is one of the activities
that most degrades the mangrove
areas, and reduces the habitat of
numerous species. This destruction
of mangroves and other coastal
ecosystems and inland waters is
advancing, and it adds to a systematic
violation of human and environmental
rights of people in the waters of the
sea, mangroves, lagoons, ponds and
rivers. The shrimp farms use sodium
metabisulphite and antibiotics in large
quantities, which contaminates the
water and constitutes a significant
potential impact on human health.
Shrimp farming has experienced a
long period of bankruptcy, and
shrimp crops have been decimated by
viral diseases such as white spot and
infectious myonecrosis due to
the environmental and social
unsustainability of the activity. Many
ponds were abandoned, leaving
environmental and social liabilities,
which included approval of the State
for writing-off of debts with public
banks and non-accountability for
environmental crimes. With the
approval of the new Forest Code, this
sector has, since the end of 2014, been
reinvigorated, and the resumption
of several conflicts with fishing
communities, death threats, ban on
fishermen's access to fishing areas,
cutting extensive areas of mangroves
and so on, is already evident.

Fishing statistics
In order to downplay the importance
of artisanal fisheries, the MPA has
stopped collecting fishing statistics
which, although they did not account for the entire production
of artisanal fisheries, were at least
a minimum reference point for the
country, and a tool for fisheries
management. Scientists point to the losses suffered from lack of information for ten years, regarding the changing behaviour of species, which is politically irresponsible as it affects the production of knowledge and the future of the country's biodiversity. Thus, artisanal fishing, which, according to past statistics, once accounted for almost 70 per cent of fish production, now represents only 45 per cent, according to new data projections. The goal is to force an artificial growth of the aquaculture business in the same areas where thousands of fisherwomen and fishermen work.

The growth of mass tourism, through leisure package tours, represents a major cause of conflict. Big resorts, which took over the communities in order to give space to large hotels, have greatly advanced, especially in the northeast. In river areas, the government has encouraged amateur fishing, attracting a lot of 'fish and pay' enterprises who take away areas from the riparian communities in order to build guesthouses which cut off the community’s riverside access. This generates serious conflicts with sport fishers who, armed, are constantly threatening artisanal fishers.

Another conflict factor that has intensified in recent years and become visible is the creation and/or implementation of an integral type of protected area that does not allow human presence. Numerous communities, after the implementation of these usage plans, have been expelled and their traditional fishing activities and farming subsistence prohibited or they have been prevented from building houses and accessing goods and services such as electricity, housing and so on. The implementation of these units is contradictory as the government licenses widespread destruction of nature, but creates small conservation areas too, just in name.

**Fisherwomen**

The implementation of the projects has affected fisherwomen more violently. They are insecure and vulnerable with the arrival of many men from other territories, lured by
the promise of employment. They can no longer go to their work areas alone, particularly in mangrove areas. The number of cases of harassment and sexual violence has increased, generating a situation of fear among women. Prostitution and harassment of girls and trafficking in fishing communities have also increased. Women have complained of ailments linked to contamination by heavy metals and pollution of the workplace.

Allied to this pressure of territorial suppression by large enterprises, a series of measures that violates the rights of traditional fishing communities or imposes policies and specific regulations through ordinances and normative instructions aimed at reducing the rights of communities is observed. Throughout 2014 and 2015, fishing communities and their allies were in an intense process of retaliation to numerous measures intended to circumvent, reduce and remove labour and social-security rights, even interfering with the identity and self-determination of these communities, a right which is guaranteed in the Brazilian Constitution, and in legislation and international conventions and treaties signed by the Brazilian State.

The Ministry of Fisheries has adopted measures that reduce the access of fishermen and fisherwomen to closed craft insurance, which guarantees a minimum wage in the months in which fishing activities are paralysed due to the reproduction pattern of certain species and spawning in rivers. The measures taken by the MPA have increased bureaucratisation under the pretence of getting rid of the so-called false fishermen; thousands of work permits of real fishermen have been cancelled and they have lost their rights. By end 2014, there were 289,000 cancellations; the MPA stopped issuing 200,000 new registrations in the years 2013 and 2014.

The counter-reaction of artisanal fishermen and fisherwomen in Brazil faced with such a difficult context, traditional fishing communities have creatively built various strategies of confrontation and resistance. The Movement of Artisanal Fishermen and Fisherwomen in Brazil (MPP)—the largest fishermen's movement currently existing in Brazil—is on alert and has focused strongly on the State and managed to reverse some processes.

The National Campaign for the Regularisation of the Traditional Fishing Communities Territory has strengthened the movement's capacity for critical analysis, incorporating concepts of territoriality, customary rights and identity. Constant analysis of the situation has enabled a rapid reaction to events. However, the difficulty of raising sufficient resources to mobilise communities and the difficulty of supporting some areas undergoing serious situations of conflict are of great concern for networking.

**National Campaign for the Regularization of Traditional Fishing Communities Territory**

In 2012, Brasília DF, in the presence of 2,000 fishermen and fisherwomen, the National Campaign for the Regularization of the Traditional Fishing Communities Territory was launched. The background for this campaign can be traced to the parallel conference, organized by many grassroots groups and entities in support of artisanal fisheries in Brazil, expressing discontent with the fake participatory processes of conferences held by the government. The parallel conference aimed at diagnosing the situation of fishing in Brazil and proposing outputs and public policies autonomously to present to the government.

**Participatory discussion**

This conference allowed fishermen and fisherwomen from 20 states to participate in a discussion process that began with communities and
states, through a base document, and culminated in a national debate covering numerous themes about artisanal fisheries. At the parallel conference, which brought together about 1,000 artisanal fishermen and fisherwomen in all thematic groups, the loss of, and threats to, territory appeared as the central issue. This led to the emergence of a new fishermen movement which, tired of cutting-edge methods, began to organize a grassroots movement. The most important battle call was for the defence of territory. A National Campaign for the Defence of Fishing Territories was proposed.

The movement invited consulting entities, universities and specialized professionals to build a participatory process for the campaign. In the context of the conservative Brazilian National Congress, it was felt that the best strategy would be to build a popular initiative for two reasons: (i) the difficulty to get any bill approved by a Congress dominated by agribusiness and other economically powerful sectors; and (ii) the possibility of making use of an instrument that would allow broader participation and mobilisation of fishermen and fisherwomen in a process that generates empowerment regarding existing territorial rights, strengthens the resilience of communities to defend their territories, makes visible the environmental conflicts that fishermen are subjected to, and seeks the solidarity and support of larger society in defence of the territory.

So, caravans were built under the guidance of different leaders of various states and partners who walked through several Brazilian states presenting to the fishing communities the National Campaign in Defence of the Fishing Territories proposal. Many communities embraced this campaign with much enthusiasm.

Importantly, the popular initiative was built around the broad and autonomous participation of fishermen leaders who debated with experts such as anthropologists and lawyers, defending the way of life and worldview of artisanal fishermen and fisherwomen and their communities. Once built, the proposal was circulated through the states where fishermen collectives validated it. On the eve of the campaign launch, a group of fishermen from several states welcomed the suggestions and questions, and closed the proposal after seeking legal advice for an appropriate formulation of the legislation.

Launch of the campaign and the beginning of the journey

The launch of the campaign, which took place in Brasilia, was attended by 2,000 fishermen and fisherwomen, and was marked by many symbols, including songs and lots of fish, in order to present to Brazilian society, the wealth and diversity of artisanal fishing. Each state brought along their own symbols. The opening act featured fishers—men and women from various regions—authorities, representatives of Via Campesina, CNBB, and other important groups who spread the message of the campaign. There was also a public hearing where all states filed innumerable complaints to present to the public prosecutor, Deborah Duprat, together with representatives from the National Congress for the Committee of Human Rights and the Ministry of Environment. The launch of the campaign was highlighted by a parade that took over the roads of the federal capital.

Meetings called for deepening the knowledge of the proposed bill through workshops aimed at empowering fishermen and fisherwomen regarding the theses of the bill. Diverse groups visited five to six states during the year in order to expand the campaign.

The movement’s plans to collect signatures in the states was marked by creativity, the hallmark of the process, with numerous events,
meetings, seminars and symposiums at universities and participation in popular, religious and cultural festivals as well as home visits at the end of each activity. One fisherman and his little son went through all of Ceará’s beaches on a bike to collect signatures for the campaign, which was featured on TV and in radio programmes. Each day the campaign attracted more support and solidarity.

This process has led to many positive results for communities and artisanal fishers. Among them, we highlight the following:

- empowerment of fishermen and fisherwomen regarding the debate on territory and traditional communities,
- increased resilience in communities threatened by destructive projects,
- broadening the knowledge of fishermen and fisherwomen on public lands and the process of regularisation,
- increasing the number of complaints regarding land grabbing and territorial insecurity,
- highlighting how the campaign bill influences the construction of rules for land regulation, specifically for fishermen in the SPU (Union Heritage Department),
- increasing resistance to eviction from territories,
- making MPP’s impact felt on the 6th Chamber and SPU through the campaign, by generating referrals to secure the land rights of communities,
- generating impact and visibility of the international campaign for fishing territories, making MPP’s impact felt on the 6th Chamber and SPU through
- the campaign, by generating referrals to secure the land rights of communities,
- generating impact and visibility of the international campaign for land and water privatisation in the context of the struggle for territory in Brazil,
- encouraging communities to initiate a regularisation process in other countries,
- advances through local strategies for signature-gathering and discussion on the campaign, which has allowed MPP to strengthen and grow, and
- gaining grounds in social and other media, reflecting the communities’ concerns and helping increase membership.

Finally, the campaign for fishing territories placed fishermen and fisherwomen at the centre of the national debate and has won the support of many groups, including universities. As a result, the number of academic studies on fishermen and fishing territories has expanded.

The good life and the guarantee of fishing territories.

A whole new debate on the defence of the common good, which is opposed to the mercantilist perspective of life and nature that deregulates the hard-won rights, is being articulated in Brazil. This ‘common good’ notion offers space for reflection and appreciation of the relationships established by the traditional communities—among them, fishing communities—as social practices and historically constructed knowledge which have guaranteed the maintenance of a set of tangible and intangible resources that are central to humanity (such as biodiversity, knowledge of natural systems such as water, atmosphere, genetic structures and so on). As a result, traditional populations and their extractive and peasant economies have been accorded a special role in discussions on the conservation of natural resources for the present and future generations.

Strengthening identities and participating in networking around key issues are among the major challenges for the coming years. The key challenge is how to advance the defence and guarantee of territory.
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No Turning Back

Despite official legislation, Indonesia is yet to institute processes to curb illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing

“We have far too long turned our back on the seas, the oceans, the straits and the bays. It’s time to restore everything so that Jalesveva Jaya-mah-e, a slogan used by our ancestors, will echo again.”

—Ir. Jokowi, the President of Indonesia, at his presidential inauguration

The public in Indonesia was surprised by the investigation of the Associated Press into the enslavement of hundreds of foreign nationals in Indonesia. In remote Benjina, in the Maluku Islands, PT Benjina Resources enslaved people who work up to 22 hours per day with no days off, locked up and forced to drink dirty water. The produce from PT Benjina Resources is sent to Thailand, from where it spreads out into international trade via seafood retailers in the US, Asia and Europe. These illegal fish catches are sold to either restaurants or as pet food.

In May 2015, the Indonesian government repatriated 659 workers of PT Pusaka Benjina Resources, comprising 419 Thais, 202 Burmese and 38 Cambodians. Five years before the Benjina case became public, the Supreme Audit Agency on 19 March 2009 published a report on licensing, non-tax revenues, processing and control of fishing for the period 2007–2009. The report reveals violations in industrial relations, including the fact that there are 98 vessels that employ foreign nationals.

In 2014 MV Hai Fa, a freighter vessel of 4,306 GT (gross tonnes) linked up with PT Avona Mina Lestari to transport fish to China. MV Hai Fa transported as much as 800,658 kg of frozen shrimp, valued at 70 bn Indonesian rupiahs (INR). MV Hai Fa also carried 15,000 kg of oceanic whitetail sharks (Carcharinus longimanus) and hammerhead sharks.

Nonetheless, the captain of MV Hai Fa was prosecuted merely for violation of rules related to trade in prohibited fish species and charged with a fine of 200 mn INR and a six-month imprisonment. MV Hai Fa was a Panamanian-flagged vessel captained by foreign nationals, whose operation in the waters of Indonesia is a violation of law. MV Hai Fa also violated many other rules and regulations (see table below).

There are three modes of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in Indonesia. The first is the illegal use of foreign nationals as crew. The second is manipulation of permits for vessels, including those related to tonnage. The third is violation of provisions for landing and processing of fishery products.

Table 1: Violations by MV Hai Fa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Provision</th>
<th>Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 16 para (1), Fisheries Act</td>
<td>Ban on selling harmful fish, and endangering fish resources and the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 29 para (1), Fisheries Act</td>
<td>Only citizens of the Republic of Indonesia or other legal Indonesian entities can operate in the fisheries of Indonesia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 35A para (1), Fisheries Act</td>
<td>It is compulsory for the captain and crew of the vessel to be of Indonesian nationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 41 para (3), Fisheries Act</td>
<td>It is compulsory to land the fish catch in assigned or designated ports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 41 para (4), Fisheries Act</td>
<td>The fish catches should be loaded and unloaded in the assigned or designated ports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 21 Para (2), Conservation of Natural Resources and Ecosystems Act</td>
<td>Fishing of oceanic whitetail sharks and hammerhead sharks is prohibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This article is by Martin Hadiwinatha (hadiwinata.ahmad@gmail.com) Head of Law Development and Fisherfolk Advocacy, Indonesia Tradisional Fisherfolk Union (Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia)
Indonesia comprises 13,466 islands with the total area for fisheries, including the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and the continental shelf, amounting to 6.32 mn sq. km. The land area is 1.91 mn sq. km. Fisheries resources are regulated under Article 33, Para (3) of the constitution, which states: “The earth, water and natural resources contained therein are controlled by the state and used for the greatest prosperity of the people”.

It is estimated that there are 5,400 foreign fishing vessels operating illegally in the sea of Indonesia. Each year one to two mn tonnes of fish are stolen, landed and traded illegally. The foreign vessels that fish illegally come from the following six ASEAN countries, namely, Thailand, Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, Cambodia and Myanmar), and from the following non-ASEAN countries, namely, China, Korea, Taiwan and Panama. Most of the illegal fishing occurs in eighteen locations to the west and thirteen to the east.

In 2011 the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries identified Indonesia’s annual potential fish catch at 6.5 mn tonnes. However, considering the level of overfishing, this seems to be an underestimate. At present, there are 615,130 vessels with permits to fish in the waters below 12 nautical miles and 3,190 with permits to fish in the EEZ.

In the past, Indonesia suffered from a large imbalance in overall socioeconomic development, including in fisheries. Of the total of 1,375 fishing ports, 68 per cent were in western Indonesia, while 25 per cent were in the central region and only seven per cent in eastern Indonesia.

However, under the new Indonesia fisheries act, fishing industry operations can be conducted in the Republic of Indonesia only by its citizens. Exceptions are allowed for foreign entities engaged in fishing in the EEZ, subject to provisions of Article 62.2 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), 1982. Indonesia-flagged vessels are allowed to go fishing in the sea waters of Indonesia, including in the EEZ, but foreign-flagged vessels can fish in the EEZ provided they have licenses.

Figure 1. Distribution of fishing vessels: 2008-2013

Source: KNTI (2014)
Indonesian regulations on foreign investment adopt the negative list system with licences or permission required for foreigners. Under the Presidential Regulation No. 39 of 2014, foreign investment in fisheries in the EEZ is permitted only for those who use fishing vessels of 100 GT or more. There are three principal permits needed to operate in Indonesia’s fisheries—the fishery business licence for fisheries and aquaculture, the fishing licence and the fishery transport business licence.

Foreign-flagged vessels caught for illegal fishing may be subject to severe penalties, including the sinking of the vessel. Indonesian-flagged vessels are required to engage captains and crew of Indonesian nationality. Foreign-flagged vessels that fish in the EEZ should have a minimum of 70 per cent Indonesian citizens as crew.

There are several other policies related to IUU fishing in Indonesia, ranging from the prohibition of transhipment at sea, a moratorium on the termination of licensing of vessels built abroad and a ban on trawling in the waters of Indonesia. Violations can attract administrative sanctions such as warnings, suspension and/or revocation of licences.

According to a new regulation of the Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, those who land above 2,000 tonnes are required to process the catch by building a fish processing unit.

Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) activities are covered under the Fisheries Act of 2014, by which the Maritime Security Agency has been replaced by the Maritime Security Coordinating Board, which is a multitasking agency that coordinates with thirteen other government agencies for supervision against IUU fishing.

The fishing vessel registration system in Indonesia is divided sectorally between the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries. Vessel measurements are regulated by the Ministry of Transportation,
while licensing of fishing vessels comes under the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries. However, there are complaints that this division leads to manipulation of weight measurement of vessels to evade tax and levies.

Manipulation of the gross weight of fishing vessels is becoming a major source of corruption in the fisheries sector, which is worsened by the division of authority between the central and local governments in issuing permits. Under Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government, regulation of vessels between 5 and 30 GT falls under the authority of the provincial government. According to the findings of the Corruption Eradication Agency, which audited the tax liabilities of vessel owners, of the 1,836 fishery businesses that obtained licences, 632 do not yet have a tax identity number.

According to data from Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia (KNTI), in 2013 there were 615,130 vessels that fish in waters below 12 nautical miles. The 3,190 vessels that fish in the EEZ could easily deplete the fishery resources which ought to be accessed by the locals. This problem can be addressed by facilitating the fisherfolks to access the resources so the EEZ will be secured by locals fishers.

In our view in Indonesia, MCS activities will work well only with the involvement of fisherfolk, as per the provisions in the National Fisheries Act (Article 67), needs to be implemented properly and strengthened.
Built on Historic Success

WTO members should build on the recent Nairobi meeting to tackle the urgent challenges facing the WTO in 2016

In his speech at the University of the West Indies in Jamaica on 18 January Azevêdo said WTO members should build on the historic success of the recent Nairobi to tackle the urgent challenges facing the WTO in 2016, including trade negotiations. This is what he said...

Let me explain in a bit more detail what was delivered in Nairobi. The Nairobi Package contained a number of important decisions—including a decision on export competition. This is truly historic. It is the most important reform in international trade rules on agriculture since the creation of the WTO. The elimination of agricultural export subsidies is particularly significant in improving the global trading environment... For many years global trade negotiations yielded few results. But, as you can see, we are changing all that. The WTO has delivered a huge amount over the last few years. We are getting into the habits of success. The WTO’s 162 members monitor each other’s practices and regulations against those rules in order to improve transparency and avoid protectionism. In Nairobi ministers formally acknowledged their differences about our future work. This was a very significant moment. But, despite those differences, there is some convergence. For example, there is a clear openness to advance negotiations on the remaining Doha issues, and to keep development at the centre of our work. These issues include domestic support and market access for agricultural goods, market access for industrial goods, services, fisheries subsidies, and a number of other areas. So clearly these are important issues, which members want to address through negotiations. The question, given the differences I have mentioned, is how?

At the same time, some members want to explore the possibility of discussing and eventually negotiating on other issues. Certainly, all members believe that the WTO can do more—and that we can do it at a faster pace. So the challenge before us is very significant. It is not limited only to the question of what happens to the Doha issues, it is about the negotiating function of the WTO. It is about what members want for the future of the Organization as a standard and rule-setting body. It has wide systemic implications for trade multilateralism, and for multilateralism at large. And the challenge is urgent.

The world won’t wait for the WTO. Other trade deals will keep advancing. The WTO cannot stop delivering. The wider the gap between regional and multilateral disciplines, the worse the trade environment becomes for everyone, particularly businesses, small countries and all those not involved in major regional negotiations. But the outlook is not bleak. I said at the outset that 2016 was full of promise. I truly believe that—because, while we face real challenges, there are also real opportunities before us. The conversation that is already getting underway in Geneva will determine the future direction of global trade negotiations—and the future direction of the WTO. It is an opportunity to find solutions that have long eluded us.

It is an opportunity to ensure that trade delivers more—and that it supports growth and development for all.

So I trust members will rise to this challenge—and seize this opportunity. I have no doubt that Jamaica will play an active and central role in that debate.

Thank you.
The Priest of Multitasking

Pierre Gillet was the rare sort of clergyman who escaped classification—but fishers around the world will remember him as a godsend.

Priest, boat-builder, instructor, appropriate technology proponent, mechanic, carpenter, handyman, event organizer, blood donor, accountant, economist, counsellor, rights activist, humanist, negotiator, joker par excellence and ... much more! There is no single trade one could not associate with this maverick of a human being. The complete human, he was all over the place—the true multi-tasker in the days when multitasking had not even been conceptualized.

We first met in Mari nad, near Trivandrum, the capital of the south Indian state of Kerala, a week after he arrived in India in 1973. He made fibre-glass fish boxes for my fish marketing experiments in 1975. We led sessions together at the Indian Social Institute in 1979. He attended my wedding in 1981. He visited me in Hong Kong in 1983 to plan the historic Rome Fishworkers Conference. Together we took on a major role to organize it 1984. We worked on the first funding proposal for ICSF in 1987. He consecrated my new home in 1989. We exchanged ideas when he did a course in economics at Namur in 2000. We met up every time he visited India thereafter. He blessed the wedding of my son at Calicut in 2013 and the last email he sent me in July 2015, a month before he physically left us, was to welcome my first grand-daughter. That I and my whole family knew Pierre for 42 years was the greatest joy and blessing of a lifetime!

With Pierre around, there was never a dull moment. Serious and concerned discussions were always laced with jokes and humour. He never spared an occasion to joke about his own gaffes.

When he arrived in India he quickly learned Tamil, the local language, and even celebrated mass in it, much to the surprise of the fishing communities who were his congregation. Those of us in India have heard him recall his attempt to make conversation with a toothless old woman parishioner by asking, "Patti un pal enge?" (Granny, where are your teeth?). However, the slight error in intonation of the word 'pal' led to the question becoming "Granny, where is your milk?" (paal)! The resultant finger-pointing admonishment of the old...
woman—"Kettaswamy, kettaswamy" (Naughty priest, naughty priest!)— and the embarrassment for 'Fr. Pierre' have been recounted many a time by him leading to hilarious side-splitting laughter from his ardent listeners!

Pierre the handyman taught me a useful daily habit which has become second nature to me since I practice it many times a day. I always turn on a light switch with the back of my index finger.

Given the often poor quality of wiring and electrical parts (in our area of the world), using the front of your finger—particularly if it is wet—to switch on a light can be dangerous. If you use the back, even if there was a leakage of current, your hand will be thrust towards your chest and to safety!

In everything Pierre did for others—trivial and serious—there was always an aura of the special. Whether it was making the large chariot-like frame which would roll his famous plywood ‘Gilletkats’ down from the hill-top boatyard to the sea, or just sand-papering the little cross which hangs in my living room, he paid great attention to detail.

I will certainly miss his special physical presence. But now he is always around. Pierre, forever!
Roundup NEWS, EVENTS, BRIEFINGS AND MORE...

**Organizational Profile**

**Union of Latin American Artisanal Fishers**

The Union of Latin American Fishers, bringing together 10 national-level organizations, was launched in Chile in October 2015. Participating in the IV Meeting of Latin American Artisanal Fishers, organized by CONAPACH and sponsored by the Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs, artisanal fishing leaders from Argentina, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Panama, El Salvador, Guatemala, Peru, Costa Rica, Colombia and Chile committed themselves to forming a union and signed up to a common agenda.

The launch of the Union was announced by CONAPACH at the “Our Ocean 2015 Conference”, hosted by the governments of Chile and the US.

The Union seeks to represent the interests of Latin American artisanal fishers in all the forums where their rights need to be defended, taking up issues of concern to the organizations that they represent at both national and international levels. Key issues to be taken up by the Union include the implementation of the FAO Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and the promotion of food sovereignty.

The Union will also promote artisanal fisheries at national and international levels, forming alliances with organizations, platforms and movements, both public and private, in order to achieve their objectives. The Union will actively seek to incorporate other national-level organizations in Latin America.

Zoila Bustamente, elected President of the Union, highlighted the constant tensions that exist between producer organizations and NGOs, where NGOs may tend to undermine the autonomy of producer organizations. “It is important that producer organizations maintain their autonomy distinct from NGOs, representing their own members, and rejecting programmes that are not in the interests of artisanal fishers”, she said.

There is a long history of co-operation between national-level artisanal fishers’ organizations in Latin America, going back decades. Most recently, in 2013, meeting in Chile, the People’s Coalition for Food Sovereignty also adopted this year,” leaders of these NGOs remarked.


**Climate Change**

**Threats to Canada’s First Nations’ fisheries**

According to recent study, First Nations’ fishery catches could collapse by almost 50 per cent by 2050 as a result of climate change, further endangering the food and economic security of indigenous communities along coastal British Columbia.

The study was conducted as part of an initiative to carry out research on global indigenous fisheries through the Nereus Program, a global interdisciplinary initiative between UBC and the Nippon Foundation in Japan.

The team had been studying the impacts of climate change on coastal communities at a wider scale and seeks to gain a better understanding of the possible impacts on the coastal First Nations of British Columbia where marine resources are crucial for both economic security as well as for social and ceremonial practices.

The researchers analyzed the habitats and population dynamics of 48 fish and shellfish species of importance to First Nations communities in order to determine how these species’ ranges and abundances might shift under low-emission and a high-emission scenarios of climate change from 2000 to 2050.

**Fishery Subsidies**

**WTO Statement**

The following is the Statement from the World Trade Organization (WTO) in support of reducing fishing subsidies

WTO leaders believe that in many cases, subsidies encourage overfishing and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing.

“We will continue to seek appropriate enhanced WTO transparency and reporting to enable the evaluation of the trade and resource effects of fisheries subsidies programmes,” they stressed.

However, Indian authorities do not agree about the proposed punitive action for unauthorized fishing, which many developing countries have rejected because it goes back on the tentative agreement reached in 2008.

Referring to the fishing subsidies, New Zealand Trade Minister, Todd McClay, pointed out: “Fisheries subsidies are a serious issue. They impact negatively on trade, the environment and development”.

“Fish products are one of the world’s most highly traded commodities, and subsidies distort this trade. Fishing industries from many of the world’s smaller states cannot afford to compete with large heavily subsidized fleets,” McClay said.

The New Zealand minister is convinced it is also a serious environmental issue, since fish stocks around the world are overfished and subsidies are one of the most significant contributors to overfishing.

“And it is also a development issue, particularly in the Pacific. Subsidies contribute to there being too many vessels, and this impacts on the health of fish stocks which are one of the most significant resources available to many Pacific Islands,” stressed McClay.

New Zealand has a long history of working with other countries to address fisheries subsidies, in the WTO and elsewhere. “Unfortunately, fish stocks continue to decline while fisheries subsidies continue to increase,” the minister stated.

A number of countries have joined the statement, including Australia, Argentina, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Fiji, Iceland, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Solomon Islands, Switzerland, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, St Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines.

These supporting countries recognize that action at the national level should not be delayed however, and commit not to provide such subsidies. This reaction was welcomed by WWF and Oceana.

Both NGOs agree that the ocean is a major contributor to the global economy and billions of people depend on fish for their food security.

However, they agree that many fisheries are already stretched past sustainable limits and subsidies that contribute to depleting fish stocks are simply unacceptable.

These organizations have worked for many years to end subsidies that drive overcapacity and hinder sustainable marine management.

“The WTO has a historic opportunity to show the world that it can make a meaningful contribution to solving problems of global consequence and thus clearly align with the sustainable development goals adopted this year,” leaders of these NGOs remarked.

Aquaculture and Decent Employment

The following document, titled “Improving Livelihoods through Decent Employment in Aquaculture”, was submitted at the Eighth Session of the Sub-committee on Aquaculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), in Brazil, in October 2015.

This paper aims at discussing one of these challenges: How could decent employment in aquaculture help improving livelihoods and reducing poverty, with the view that decent employment could offer significant opportunities for the advancement of sustainable aquaculture within a Blue Growth framework?

In 2012, some 58.3 mn people were engaged in capture fisheries and aquaculture, with 18.9 mn working in aquaculture. Most fishworkers are working in informal employment, self-employed either in informal enterprises or as subsistence producers and contributing family workers, or unregistered workers with no written contracts and often as casual, seasonal, short-term workers.

Despite its contribution to employment, the fisheries and aquaculture sector still has decent work deficits, including: low and insecure levels of income; poor and hazardous health, safety and environmental conditions; lack of stable and formal contracts; gender inequality; presence of child labour and forced labour; exploitation of migrant workers; weak social protection and a lack of social dialogue.

Protection of labour rights in fishing and aquaculture is limited. Internationally recognized labour standards are available – but often not applied or enforced throughout fish value chains.

Limited organization and voice of most stakeholders including small-scale fishers, fish farmers, and workers in fish value chains, hinder their capacity to influence policy and legislation and access markets and better employment opportunities.

Fisheries and aquaculture policies, strategies and processes do not systematically address labour conditions, employment dimensions nor adequate representation of fish workers’ concerns and needs.

Main decent work issues in aquaculture and possible actions are introduced here with reference to the four pillars of the globally agreed decent work agenda:

1) Employment creation and enterprise development; 2) Social protection; 3) Standards and rights at work; and 4) Governance and social dialogue

A range of key issues are presented for which attention and critical action might be needed to both improve labour dimensions in aquaculture and address rural poverty. The issues highlighted are followed by potential actions which primarily focus on how aquaculture governance mechanisms can address labour dimensions as a precondition to achieve decent work in the sector. The actions are identified without pre-defined precedence, leaving decisionmaking on priority actions to relevant stakeholders within a determined context.

Clearly, there will be differences depending on geographical context, types of commodity, nature of production, scale of operation, involvement of stakeholders, and vulnerability and exposure of fishworkers, their households and communities to poverty, and their access to health, education and other social services. The table provides a summary overview of major decent work issues in aquaculture and related possible actions.

Aquaculture stakeholders face a wide range of decent work issues which, however, can be addressed through a variety of possible actions. Promoting decent employment in aquaculture operations and practices and implementing the decent work agenda in the aquaculture sector contributes to efforts of improving livelihoods and community development in many rural areas.

Table: Major decent work issues in aquaculture and examples of possible actions (extracted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar 1: Employment creation and enterprise development</th>
<th>Low earnings and labour productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data and policy gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threats to sustainable livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 2: Social protection</td>
<td>Lack of social protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 3: Standards and rights at work</td>
<td>Ineffective labour regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of child labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerable migrant labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 4: Governance and social dialogue</td>
<td>Low levels of organization and participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secretary-General’s message on the 20th Anniversary of the Opening for Signature of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, made at New York, on 4 December 2015

On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the opening for signature of the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement, it is important to recall the critical importance of sustainable fisheries to food security, economic prosperity, poverty alleviation, employment and the sustainable development of many States, particularly developing States. Sustainable fisheries are also essential for the long-term health and resilience of the oceans and seas on which humanity relies so greatly.

The Agreement promotes the sustainability of some of the world’s most commercially important fish stocks, by setting out a comprehensive legal regime for the conservation and sustainable use of straddling and highly migratory fish stocks.

However, the world’s fisheries are still in crisis, as many important fish stocks remain subject to overfishing, even to the point of depletion. As we embark on efforts to meet the ambitious Goals and targets agreed in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including Goal 14 to “conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources”, we need to redouble our efforts to safeguard the world’s fisheries.

In marking this anniversary, let us recognize both the successes the Agreement has made possible and the distance still to travel towards achieving universal participation as well as its full and effective implementation.

Roundup

NEWS, EVENTS, BRIEFINGS AND MORE...

INFOLOG: NEW RESOURCES AT ICSF

ICSF’s Documentation Centre (dc.icsf.net) has a range of information resources that are regularly updated. A selection:

Publications

National Plans of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks in the Maldives (NPOA-Sharks)

Maldives is committed to sustainably manage the marine resources of the country. In 2010, shark fisheries of Maldives were completely banned to address the growing concerns of depleting shark stocks. NPOA-Sharks was developed to address these concerns and to ensure the conservation of the shark fauna while safeguarding the interests of all stakeholders. NPOA-Sharks provides a history of shark fishing in Maldives, examines the level of alignment of the fisheries management system of Maldives with the objectives of the NPOA-Sharks and sets out an action plan to sustainably conserve the shark resources. The NPOA-Sharks was developed by Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture with assistance from the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project (BoBLME). http://www.fao.org/3/a-x644e.pdf

SSF Guidelines


Videos

United Nations University: Fisheries Training Programme: Success Stories of Fisheries Management. This four-minute film documents the fisheries management in Iceland, and how this has helped fisheries professionals in Jamaica. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5SRZXAGPxl4

Sustainable Fisheries for Sustainable Development

A short, animated video about the importance of fisheries for food security, health and growth in developing countries, highlighting the commitment of the EU with third countries to help promote sustainable management of seafood resources and inclusive opportunities for trade and growth. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1TWeIRky78c

FLASBACK

What price subsidies?

One of the most important reasons for overfishing is excessive fishing capacity. This was the main focus of the recent FAO Consultation on the Management of Fishing Capacity, Shark Fisheries and Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries (see page 36). According to FAO, between 1970 and 1989, total gross registered tonnage (GRT) of the world’s fishing fleets increased from 13.6 million to 25.3 million GRT. About three-quarters of this capacity belonged to the large-scale, industrial sector, which accounts for about 75 per cent of total capital investment and global marine fish production. This situation is further complicated by the fact that new fishing vessels have enormously increased their fishing power. A recent study by Greenpeace International shows that the efficiency of fishing vessels has increased over time with advancements in fishing technology. A vessel built in 1990, for example, is no longer comparable, in terms of efficiency, with a vessel of the same tonnage built in the 1970s.

As we have argued earlier, such subsidies not only help add to excess capacity, they also facilitate fleet migration to the waters of several low-income, food-deficit countries, under the aegis of international fishery access agreements or joint ventures. In the process, the highly efficient and locally beneficial domestic artisanal fleets are often put to disadvantage. Without effective monitoring, control and surveillance systems, and in the absence of competent Flag State control, many of these fishing arrangements—for example, between the European Union and China with other developing countries—have clashed with the livelihood interests of disadvantaged coastal fishing communities.

Distorted economic incentives, in the form of subsidies and concessional credit, have also fuelled the anarchic growth of large-scale, industrial fisheries, even in developing countries. Many of the large-scale, industrial vessels, which depend on destructive and non-selective fishing methods and practices, may not even remain economically viable without such incentives.

—from Comment in SAMUDRA Report No. 21, December 1998

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MEETINGS

Ad Hoc Tripartite Maritime Committee for the amendment of the Searfapers’ Identity Documents Convention (Revised), 2003 (No. 185)

10 - 12 February 2016, Geneva

At its 332nd Session (March 2015), the IMO Governing Body decided to constitute an Ad Hoc Tripartite Maritime Committee and convene a meeting of this Committee in 2016 for the amendment of Convention No. 185, with the task of making proposals, based on the recommendations of the Meeting of Experts, for appropriate amendments to the Annexes to Convention No. 185 with a view to their submission for adoption by the International Labour Conference in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 1, of Convention No. 185.

34th Session of the Asia-Pacific Fisheries Commission (APFIC)

12 - 14 February 2016, Colombo, Sri Lanka

The agenda items for the 34th session include: APFIC Regional IUCN assessment method and results; APFIC regional guidelines for responsible culture-based fisheries and indicators for the enhancement of inland fisheries; The Bay of Bengal Strategic Action Programme; Outcomes of the Regional Initiative on Blue Growth and Voluntary Guidelines on Small-scale Fisheries, and regional action plans.

WEBSITES

Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI)

cssi is a global platform and partnership of seafood companies, NGOs, experts, governmental and intergovernmental organizations working towards more sustainable seafood for everyone. GSSI’s Global Benchmark Tool includes cssi Essential Components that are based on the CBD and the FAO Guidelines and which seafood certification schemes must meet to be recognized by GSSI. GSSI has also created GSSI Supplementary Components, which show a seafood certification scheme’s diverse approach and help stakeholders understand where differences exist.

http://www.ourgsi.org/
Journal Entry

I am encouraged when I see a dozen villagers drawn to Walden Pond to spend a day in fishing through the ice, and suspect that I have more fellows than I knew, but I am disappointed and surprised to find that they lay so much stress on the fish which they catch or fail to catch, and on nothing else, as if there were nothing else to be caught.

— by Henry David Thoreau