

ESA Fish Workshop

**Fishing Communities and Sustainable Development in Eastern  
and Southern Africa: The Role of Small-scale Fisheries**

14 to 17 March 2006

Venue: Kurasini Training and Conference Centre  
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

**REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP**

**MAY 2006**

*Collaborating Organizations*



**International Collective in Support of Fishworkers**

27 College Road, Chennai 600 006, India

[www.icsf.net](http://www.icsf.net)

## CONTENTS

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Background and Introduction.....   | 1            |
| Report of the Workshop   |              |
| 1. Introduction.....   | 3            |
| 2. Problems and prospects for small-scale fisheries in Eastern Africa.....   | 4            |
| 3. Co-management in fisheries.....   | 10           |
| 4. Biodiversity conservation approaches and small-scale fisheries.....   | 17           |
| 5. Reporting back on group discussions on `Co-management, MPAs and<br>Community Organizations’.....                                    | 19           |
| 6. Aquaculture.....  | 21           |
| 7. Fishing by foreign fleets: issues for small-scale fisheries.....  | 23           |
| 8. Cross-cutting issues:   |              |
| 8.1 Trade.....   | 27           |
| 8.2 Gender.....  | 30           |
| 8.3 Alternative livelihoods.....   | 33           |
| 9. Fishworkers: Issues and organizational strategies:<br>Experiences from other parts of the world.....                                | 34           |
| 10. Regional instruments and processes.....  | 36           |
| 11. Reporting back on group discussion on `Organizations of Fishing<br>Communities and Follow-up Actions’.....                         | 37           |
| <i>Appendix I: Background Note.....</i>  | <i>i</i>     |
| <i>Appendix II: List of Participants.....</i>  | <i>viii</i>  |
| <i>Appendix III: Programme.....</i>  | <i>xiv</i>   |
| <i>Appendix IV: Reports of Group Discussions on Co-management, MPAs<br/>and Community Organizations, 15 March 2006.....</i>            | <i>xviii</i> |
| <i>Appendix V: Reports of Group Discussion on “Organizations of Fishing<br/>Communities and Follow-up Actions”, 17 March 2006.....</i> | <i>xxiv</i>  |

## Abbreviations

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| ACFA     | Advisory Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture                                     |
| ACP      | countries of the Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific Group                        |
| AOS      | Apostleship of the Sea  |
| BMU      | Beach Management Units  |
| BVC      | Beach Village Committees  |
| CBD      | Convention on Biological Diversity  |
| CFFA     | Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements   |
| CIA      | Central Intelligence Agency   |
| CLP      | Local Fisheries Committees  |
| CNPS     | National Collective of Senegalese Artisanal Fishermen                               |
| COMESA   | Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa  |
| CONAPACH | Confederación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales de Chile                           |
| CONIPAS  | National Inter-Professional Council of the Senegalese Artisanal                     |
| COSATU   | Congress of Trade Unions  |
| DWFN     | Distant Water Fishing Nations   |
| EC       | European Community  |
| ECOVIC   | East African Communities' Organization for Management of Lake<br>Victoria Resources |
| EEZ      | Exclusive Economic Zone   |
| EIA      | Environmental Impact Assessment   |
| EPA      | Economic Partnership Agreement  |
| ESA      | Eastern and Southern African  |
| EU       | European Union  |
| EU-ACP   | European Union-African Caribbean and the Pacific                                    |
| EUR      | Euro  |
| FAD      | Fish Aggregating Device   |
| FAO SAFR | FAO Subregional Office for Southern and Eastern Africa                              |
| FAO      | Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations                            |
| FiD      | Fisheries Department  |
| FMP      | Fisheries Master Plan   |
| FPA      | Fishery Partnership Arrangement   |
| GDP      | Gross Domestic Product  |
| GIE      | Groupements d'Intérêt Economique  |
| GOM      | Government of Mozambique  |
| HIPC     | Heavily Indebted Poor Country   |
| HIV      | Human Immunodeficiency Virus  |
| AIDS     | Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome  |
| ICAM     | Integrated Coastal Area Management  |
| ICM      | Integrated Coastal Management   |
| ICSF     | International Collective in Support of Fishworkers                                  |
| IDPPE    | Institute for the Development of Small Scale Fisheries                              |
| IFAD     | International Fund for Agricultural Development                                     |
| ILO      | International Labour Organization   |
| IMF      | International Monetary Fund   |

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| IOC    | Inergovernmental Oceanographic Commission                                |
| IOI    | International Oceans Institute   |
| IOTC   | Indian Ocean Tuna Commission   |
| ITF    | International Transport Federation                                       |
| IUCN   | International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources |
| IUU    | Illegal, Uncontrolled and Unreported fishing                             |
| KAHC   | Kenya Association of Hotel Keepers and Caterers                          |
| KASA   | Kenya Association of Sea Anglers   |
| KMFRI  | Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute                              |
| KPA    | Kenya Ports Authority  |
| KWS    | Kenya Wildlife Services  |
| LME    | Large Marine Ecosystems  |
| LVFO   | Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization                                     |
| MCM    | Municipal Council of Mombasa   |
| MCS    | Monitoring, Control and Surveillance                                     |
| MEA    | Multilateral Environmental Agreements                                    |
| MIMP   | Mafia Island Marine Park   |
| MPA    | Marine Protected Area  |
| NAMA   | Non-Agricultural Market Access   |
| NEMA   | National Environment Management Authority                                |
| NEPAD  | New Partnership for Africa's Development                                 |
| NGO    | Non Governmental Organization  |
| PFM    | Participatory Fishery Management   |
| RFMO   | Regional Fisheries Management Organization                               |
| RSA    | Republic of South Africa   |
| SADC   | Southern African Development Community                                   |
| SAP    | Structural Adjustment Programme  |
| SHG    | Self-help group  |
| SWIOFC | South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission                             |
| TCZCDP | Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation & Development Programme                  |
| TPU    | Tourist Protection Unit  |
| UFCCA  | Uganda Fisheries and Fish Conservation Association                       |
| UN     | United Nations   |
| UNCLOS | United Nation Convention on the Law of the Sea                           |
| UNDP   | United Nations Development Programme                                     |
| VMS    | Vessel Monitoring and Surveillance                                       |
| WFF    | World Forum of Fish Harvester and Fishworkers                            |
| WFFP   | World Forum of Fisher Peoples  |
| WIOMSA | Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association                          |
| WRI    | World Resources Institute  |
| WTO    | World Trade Organization   |
| WWF    | World Wildlife Fund  |

## **Background and Introduction**

### **Background**

In October 2001, the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF), in collaboration with the International Ocean Institute (IOI), organized a conference titled Forging Unity: Coastal Communities and the Indian Ocean's Future, recognizing the long and shared heritage of coastal fishing, seafaring and maritime trading that exists even today between Asian and African countries bordering the Indian Ocean.

The Conference brought together fishworker organizations, NGOs, research institutions, universities and policymakers from 13 countries bordering the Indian Ocean, including the East African countries of Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa and Seychelles.

The Conference provided the opportunity for Asian and East African representatives from countries bordering the Indian Ocean to exchange experiences and identify several areas of common concern. It further recommended that ICSF initiate a programme in East Africa.

The organization of the workshop on "Fishing Communities and Sustainable Development in Eastern and Southern Africa: The Role of Small-Scale Fisheries" was the first activity implemented in line with the recommendation. The Background Note developed for the workshop can be found in [Appendix 1](#).

### **Venue**

The workshop was held during 14-17 March, 2006 at Kurasini Training and Conference Centre, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

### **Collaborating Organizations**

The workshop was organized by ICSF, in collaboration with the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA) and the Masifundise Development Trust, with inputs from the Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements (CFFA).

### **Objectives**

The workshop was organized with the following objectives:

- ?? to identify and promote understanding of key issues in fisheries, aquaculture and coastal area development and management in the Eastern and Southern African (ESA) region, towards enabling fishing communities and organizations working with them to negotiate for programmes and policies that will sustain and improve their livelihoods; and
- ?? to develop and strengthen networks between fishworker organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community leaders and other stakeholders in coastal and inland fisheries in the ESA region.

## **Participants**

A total of 53 participants attended the workshop. Participants came from different organization, and included fishworker organizations, NGOs, community leaders, regional and international intergovernmental organizations, government authorities and other stakeholders in coastal and inland fisheries in the ESA region. A full list of participants is in [Appendix II](#).

## **Programme**

The four-day workshop was devoted to presentations as well as plenary and group discussions. The workshop included sessions with the following titles:

- Problems and Prospects for Small-Scale Fisheries in Eastern and Southern Africa
- Experiences and Perspectives from Southern Africa on Fisheries Co-Management: Implications for Coastal and Inland Fishing Communities
- Aquaculture Development in Southern and Eastern Africa: Prospects and Pitfalls for Coastal and Inland Fishing Communities
- Fishing by Foreign Fleets: Issues for Small-scale Fisheries
- Cross Cutting Issues: Gender, Trade and Diversification of Livelihoods
- A Way Forward

The full programme is attached in [Appendix III](#).

# Report of the Workshop

## 1. Introduction

Introducing the Workshop, Julius Francis, Executive Secretary, Western Indian Ocean Marine Sciences Association (WIOMSA), observed that it was rare for both the marine and inland fishing sectors to meet in the ESA region to explore issues that concern artisanal and small-scale fishworkers. He said the Workshop was rather unique in bringing together fishers, researchers, NGOs, traditional leaders (comprising one chief from Malawi and another from Zambia), fisheries departments and intergovernmental organizations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), to take stock of inland and marine fisheries issues in the ESA region from a small-scale fisheries perspective. Participants came from land-locked Malawi, Zambia and Uganda, which have significant lake fisheries; small-island developing States (SIDS) such as Mauritius and Seychelles, which have significant tuna fisheries; and from coastal States on the eastern seaboard of Africa, from Somalia to South Africa.

Chandrika Sharma, Executive Secretary of ICSF, provided a brief background of ICSF and the workshop. ICSF has been working on issues of concern to the small-scale fisheries sector since 1986, she said. The effort has been to make 'visible' the small-scale sector, and to ensure that small-scale fishworkers are better represented in decision-making processes affecting their lives. This workshop had its genesis in some of the earlier work of ICSF, most significantly, the Indian Ocean Conference—Forging Unity: Fishing Communities and the Indian Ocean's Future—held in Chennai, India, in 2001, which brought together, for the first time, fishworker organizations and those supporting them from Asian and African countries bordering the Indian Ocean region.

This present workshop, she said, was being organized to gauge the key issues facing fishworkers in the ESA region. It follows on an earlier workshop organized by the Masifundise Development Trust in South Africa, in 2004—The Southern African Small-scale Fishers' Conference—to discuss the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Fisheries. The present workshop, she said, was a collaboration between various organizations that have an interest in supporting small-scale fisheries in the ESA region.

Brian O'Riordan, Secretary, ICSF Brussels Office, gave an introduction to the workshop and how the sessions had been structured. The Workshop, he said, hoped to highlight key issues facing fishworkers in the region, and the kind of support that was needed.

Eirik Janssen of the Norwegian Embassy then inaugurated the workshop. He also released the ICSF Handbook, *International Legal Instruments of Relevance to Fisheries and Fishing Communities*. Receiving a copy of the book, Simeao Lopes, Director, Institute for the Development of Small-scale Fisheries (IDPPE), Mozambique, said that the handbook would be useful not only for NGOs and fishworker organizations but also for government departments. He said the handbook would be used to forge greater unity in the region.

## **2. Problems and Prospects for Small-scale Fisheries in Eastern and Southern Africa**

In this session, representatives of fishing communities or NGOs from Uganda, Kenya, Seychelles, Mozambique, Mauritius, Tanzania, Zanzibar, Malawi, South Africa and Zambia spoke. An FAO Programme Officer spoke about Somalia.

### **Kenya**

Athman Seif Muhammed, Director, Malindi Marine Association, said that small-scale marine fishing in Kenya is a low-investment, low-output, low-income operation, with poor credit and infrastructure facilities. The majority of small-scale fishers have no access to capital or credit and they earn their livelihood as workers on board fishing vessels owned by fish traders. Muhammed said the development of small-scale fishing is hampered by commercial and distant-water fishing operations, particularly shrimp trawling activities, which have precipitated overfishing pressure. Small-scale fishermen, as a result, are abandoning traditional fishing occupation and seeking other jobs. Foreign fishing vessels dominate the Kenyan fishing industry, he said. Small-scale fishermen would like to diversify fishing operations to target tuna resources in deeper waters with the aid of new fishing gear and navigation techniques. Such techniques are currently unaffordable, he said, and added that the state of fisheries infrastructure in Kenya is poor. He also drew attention to poor surveillance of coastal fishing grounds and the loss of fishers' lives due to absence of rescue boats.

### **Seychelles**

Albert Napier of the Apostolate of the Sea, Seychelles, said that fishing is regarded as a low status job in Seychelles—young people were reluctant to work as fishermen and the sector suffered manpower shortages. The small-scale fisheries sector is beleaguered with deficient supply of spare parts and engines, precipitated by the foreign exchange shortage in the country. There was also paucity of ice. There were conflicts between fishing and tourism. The majority of small-scale fishing vessel owners found it beyond their capacity to pay vessel insurance premiums. Working conditions on board small-scale fishing vessels are poor, he said, and there is insufficient sleeping space and no galleys. There is also a lack of safety equipment on board, and no training on safety aspects. Artisanal fishers do not enjoy any social security benefits, he said. Seychellois fishers were facing problems due to non-tariff barriers on their swordfish exports to the European Community (EC). While swordfish exports from Seychelles were prohibited, the EC allowed import of similar swordfish from the EC fishing vessels in Reunion, he complained. He also commented on the worldview of fishers—"whatever comes from the water, goes back to the water"-- that often led to poor management of the fisheries. The government has attempted to improve fishing, for instance, through the construction of a new artisanal fishing port with all facilities, and training programmes for small-scale fishers in longlining. Ice production has been increasing. Referring to the impact of the December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, he said that the Seychellois fishing industry suffered a loss of US\$40 mn. Many fishermen who had lost boats are yet to be compensated. The Apostolate of the Sea has created a co-operative of fishermen through which boats have been provided.



## **Mozambique**

Jose Domingos Bacan Saide, a beach-seine fisherman from Cabo Delgado, Mozambique, said that the main problem facing artisanal fishers of Cabo Delgado, the province bordering Tanzania, arose from illegal fishing activities undertaken by migrant fishers from Tanzania, who resorted to inappropriate fishing gear such as scuba outfits and mosquito nets. They also faced problems from allocation of islands for tourism development. Fishers in the vicinity of such islands are denied their fishing rights, as guards and patrols employed by private owners do not allow fishermen to fish near the islands. There is inadequate access to credit and the financial capacity of small fishers to invest in new fishing techniques is limited, he said, preventing them from accessing fishing grounds further offshore. Further, there are conflicts between the artisanal and industrial fishing units. The increasing number of fishers in Mozambique, as well as the growing differentiation within the community (arising from their differential capacity to fish), is also contributing to ethnic, social and economic problems, he said.

Simeao Lopes, Director, IDPPE, Mozambique, observed that there was political will to support and develop artisanal fisheries. The government has recently extended the artisanal zone from one nautical mile to three nautical miles, a decision resented by the industrial fishing sector, he said. Co-management initiatives were being developed in consultation with artisanal fishing communities, and artisanal fisheries associations were being set up. Under a programme of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), co-management committees have been set up in Nampula and Zambezi. However, it is clear that a legislative framework for co-management is a must, as is improved co-ordination. There is also a need to resolve conflicts between the small-scale and the semi-industrial sectors. The main challenges are to develop the institutional capacity for implementing co-management.

## **Zambia**

Mainza K Kalonga, Chief Fisheries Officer, Zambia, said that fish is the cheapest animal protein in Zambia. It contributes about 40 per cent of the animal protein intake of the Zambian people. There are about 30,000 people directly, and 300,000 people indirectly, benefiting from fishing, he said. There are a large number of women dependent on fish trade for their livelihoods (most of them are single mothers) and some women work in pelagic fish-processing activity (kapenta). There is both capture and culture fishery production. Capture fishery accounts for 65,000 tonnes and culture fishery (pond and cage culture) accounts for 5,000 tonnes. Based on production and number of fishers, Zambian fishery is classified into major and minor fisheries. The Zambian fisheries are managed under the 1974 Fisheries Act. The Act is to be amended to make provisions for decentralized management, community participation, regulation of aquaculture and setting up a fisheries development fund. The problems beleaguering the Zambian fisheries include high cost of inputs, poor infrastructure in landing centres, declining fish production, lack of cold storage facilities, and conflicts with other users such as the tourism industry along the lakes and rivers, incidence of poverty, HIV/AIDS, and lack of access to clean drinking water. There is need for alternative livelihood options, capacity building, decentralization and promotion of aquaculture, he said.

## **Mauritius**

Patrick Fortuno, Manager, Mauritius Fishermen's Co-operative Federation, and an associate of the Apostolate of the Sea, said there are over 4,000 artisanal fishers in Mauritius mainly conducting basket-trap and line fishing. The government policy is to phase out these types of fishing. Currently, most of the fishers are organized into three types of organizations: co-operative societies, friendly associations and small companies. However, lack of strong leadership and solidarity hinders the artisanal sector from influencing national fisheries policy.

Mangroves are being cleared for construction of private jetties and hotels. Effluents from textile factories, sewage disposal and other forms of land-based sources of pollution are destroying the coastal ecosystem in Mauritius. Every year, about 200 fishing licences are issued to foreign fishing vessels in their exclusive economic zone (EEZ) against a fee. Since Mauritius does not have an effective monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) regime, uncontrolled foreign fishing is feared to lead to overexploitation of fish stocks. Employment of foreign fishers on board vessels flying the Mauritius flag is leading to unemployment amongst local fishers. Fishers, he claimed, are not consulted on issues that affect them directly. Permits, for example, are issued to harvest sea cucumbers, although local fishers use them as bait. Fishers are also not consulted while demarcating mariculture zones. The local fishers are prohibited from entering such zones.

On the positive side, there is a Fishermen Welfare Fund to promote the welfare of fishermen and their families. Education grants are provided to the wards of fishers. Medical allowance for prolonged illness is provided. Subsidies to the artisanal fishing sector include financial assistance to repair fishing vessels and fishing equipment that are accidentally damaged at sea, provision of safety equipment, bad weather allowance, concessional credit, training in new fishing techniques, and duty-free access to fishing equipment. The government, with a view to "democratizing the fishery", is setting up a Fishermen Investment Trust. The fishers will become shareholders in their fishing enterprise through this trust. Fishing quotas are being established in bank fishing operations (offshore reefs).

The proposals to "relieve fishers from their present conditions" include joint ventures between local and foreign fishers to exploit marine fishery resources, and provision of subsidies to acquire effective and efficient fishing vessels. The following proposals were made to rehabilitate artisanal fisheries: total prohibition of the use of explosives in coastal waters; prohibition on extraction of sand; implementation of minimum size of fish that can be caught; treatment of sewage before discharge into the coastal lagoons; and development of a semi-industrial model of fishing using medium-sized fishing vessels (with fish-hold capacity of 15 tonnes) for bank fishing.

Rumjeet, Scientific Officer, Ministry of Agro-Industry and Fisheries (Fisheries Division), Mauritius, provided an overview of the fisheries sector and fisheries management issues in Mauritius. The fisheries sector is very important for Mauritius, and annual per capita consumption of fish is almost 20 kg per head. There were about 2,256 registered fishermen in 2004, and an additional 10,000 people are estimated to derive a livelihood from fisheries. Catches from the artisanal fisheries sector are mainly consumed fresh by domestic consumers.

Several measures have been taken to relieve the pressure by the artisanal fishery in the lagoon, such as mesh-size regulation, buyback of large nets and gillnets, a five-month closed season during the spawning period, ban on destructive gear and methods, and so on. Apart from this, fishers are being encouraged to shift to off-lagoon fishing. Mauritius has a large tuna fishery and canned tuna accounts for more than 90 per cent of fish exports. This is caught both by European Union (EU) fleets fishing under access agreements (72 vessels in 2004) as well as by non-EU fleets, from Japan, Taiwan, etc. The vision of the government is to transform Mauritius into a world-class seafood hub, providing the platform for trading, warehousing, processing, distribution and re-export of fresh, chilled and frozen, or value-added, seafood products. Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing poses a big problem and it is estimated that Mauritius loses about Rs1.5 bn as a result in foreign income. Vessel monitoring and surveillance (VMS) systems have been in place since 2005 to control IUU fishing.

### **Tanzania**

Ruweya Khaifan, Chairperson, Fishing Group, Mafia, Tanzania, highlighted the acute problem of HIV/AIDS in Tanzanian fishing villages. The processing and transport facilities at landing centres are poor, he said. There is use of destructive fishing gear like mosquito nets. There is a move now to develop new fisheries legislation to bring about decentralization in Tanzanian fisheries, with community participation in fisheries management. Land-based aquaculture for shrimp and cage culture for finfish are being developed.

### **Zanzibar**

Narriman Jiddawi, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Marine Sciences, Zanzibar, said the Zanzibar waters are rich in fishery resources, However, Zanzibar has to contend with the problem of dago or migrant fishers using destructive fishing gear and fishing practices such as mosquito nets and dynamite fishing. The dago were responsible for the spread of HIV/AIDS, she claimed. Fishing communities also face problems with tourism development, habitat destruction and exposure to natural calamities. The importance of devolving fisheries management to the lowest level, reviewing existing legislation and ensuring effective enforcement, was highlighted. Although women in Zanzibar undertake seaweed farming, they do not get a decent price for their produce, she said. In addition, rudimentary technology and poor infrastructure (lack of ice and good roads) contributed to low levels of fish catch and low incomes of fishers. Women were also known to use mosquito nets, a very destructive gear. Education amongst fishing communities was poor and, as a result, there was poor awareness about many issues. There were inter-gear conflicts, too. Jiddawi also highlighted areas that hold promise. There were greater possibilities for economic diversification, for example, through tourism. A gear exchange programme has been recently introduced to encourage fishing in offshore waters. Ongoing experimentation with fish aggregating devices (FADs) may also prove beneficial, though results have not been encouraging so far. Additionally, there is potential to increase farming of mud crabs, bivalves, etc. by women's groups.

### **Malawi**

Friday Njaya, Fisheries Officer, Department of Fisheries, Malawi, said that the country is beleaguered by the lack of infrastructure such as landing centres and ice plants. It has commercial, artisanal and ornamental fisheries in the lakes. There are conflicts with

Mozambique with regard to shared lake waters, as management initiatives on the Malawian side cannot be enforced without adequate enforcement from the Mozambican side.

### **South Africa**

Jackie Sunde of the Masifundise Development Trust, South Africa, said that small-scale fisheries in South Africa is facing a crisis of “rights and recognition”. There has been a failure in restituting the rights of fishers disposed of their rights to harvest marine resources during the apartheid era. This is particularly problematic in a context where the government is introducing a system of long-term rights based on individual quotas that does not take into account traditional systems of harvesting. There has also been a failure to provide a framework for basic conditions of employment and labour rights for fishworkers, in a context of globalization and industrialization. As a consequence, casualization and feminization of labour is evident, and access to resources increasingly uncertain. For example, women in fish-processing plants are being retrenched. Apart from all this, there is high incidence of HIV/AIDS. Sunde stressed the need for small-scale fishers to organize, though this is often a challenge, given often remotely located communities. In South Africa, a network called Coastal Links was formed in 2004 to represent fishworkers, and fight for the recognition of the rights of artisanal fishers. It comprises fishers associations, women’s groups and youth groups. Alliances are being formed, including with groups with whom there were differences earlier, such as workers in big factories, and with regional and international organizations. Masifundise is seeking legal action for recognition of artisanal fishers’ rights. Alternative fisheries management systems are being explored and developed. The new policies have led to an increase in women’s access to marine resources, and some women are even going to sea now. The Women’s Network is part of Coastal Links, and fights against gender violence and other issues linked to discrimination against women.

### **Somalia**

Davide Signe, Programme Officer, FAO Somalia, said although Somalia has the longest coastline of 3,000 km in East Africa, it has the smallest fishing population. The fish stocks are underexploited in the nearshore waters, with the exception of lobster and shark resources, which have an export market in Southeast Asia and are the mainstay of local Somali fisheries. While lobsters are overfished, finning is endangering shark populations, he said. In the deeper waters of the Somalian EEZ, foreign fishing fleets, often illegal and heavily armed, operate. There are about 700 foreign fishing vessels in Somali waters. There is, as yet, no clear system of licensing. The foreign trawlers destroy fishing gear used by local fishers. The presence of foreign fishing vessels is a major hindrance to the development of local fisheries, he said. Data on fish catches is poor, as is infrastructure (ice, roads). Fuel prices are high. There is just one canning factory in Somalia, which supports several fishing communities. Resources like cuttlefish and squid are discarded. Through a recent FAO project, there is greater focus on the post-harvest sector, and ice plants are being set up. It was unfortunate, he said, that in the post-tsunami period, destructive gear was also distributed.

**The following is a summary of the issues/ problems highlighted in various presentations related to the problems and prospects for small-scale fisheries in the ESA region**

***Inadequate Infrastructure/Support***

Lack of cold storage and ice  
Lack of processing facilities  
Lack of infrastructure such as jetties and landing slips, roads  
Lack of access to credit  
Lack of power supply  
High cost of importing gear

***Conflicts Between User Groups***

Artisanal vs industrial fleets  
Migrant vs local fishers  
Users of harmful gear  
Different gear groups  
Local vs foreign vessels

***Social, Environmental and Cultural Aspects***

Fishing seen as low-status work, youth moving away  
High level of HIV/AIDS  
Poor health facilities  
Social and ethnic conflicts  
High level of poverty  
Depletion of fish stocks

***Marketing/Trade***

Dependency on middlemen  
Lack of access to other markets  
EU sanitary regulations as a barrier

***Safety at Sea***

High loss of life  
Lack of training and lack of access to safety equipment.

***Lack of Legislative and Policy Framework***

Inadequate management structure and capacities  
Co-management: a continuum of fishworker participation  
Indigenous knowledge base not always integrated  
Role of traditional authorities?  
Lack of access rights

***Cross-cutting Issues***

Weak organizations of fishworkers  
Lack of women's participation

***Inter-sectoral Issues***

Severe conflicts with tourism  
Conflict with conservation interests

***Donors***

Donors pushing certain agendas  
Sustainability of donor-led initiatives?

### **3. Co-management in Fisheries**

#### **Malawi**

Friday Njaya, Fisheries Department, Malawi, spoke about the status of participatory fishery management (PFM) arrangements in Malawi lakes. PFM was introduced at the behest of international agencies in the 1990s, in response to declining fishery resources of the lakes and intensifying conflicts between small and commercial fisheries in Lake Malawi. The national fish production declined from 88,000 tonnes to 50,000 tonnes. Historically, there were traditional controls over fisheries resources in some parts of Lake Malawi and Lake Chiuta, and, more recently, user committees and associations called Beach Village Committees (BVCs) were formed towards establishing PFM in all the lakes.

The composition of the BVCs varies from lake to lake. While some are associations of chiefs, others have mixed composition. The issue of devolution of fisheries responsibilities to local district assemblies is still an outstanding one. Even BVCs have to be redefined to allow for the participation of all representatives of different fishing activities. Formal bye-laws are yet to be developed to facilitate effective devolution of fishery management powers under the existing legal framework that permits such devolution. There are doubts whether or not PFM, or co-management, could work in Lake Malawi, which is a large water body with small-scale, semi-industrial and commercial fisheries, including trawling. The fishing communities along Lake Malawi are multi-ethnic. There are problems in successfully imposing access regulation on fishing, in demarcating boundaries and in enforcing fishery regulations, he said.

In spite of difficulties, he said it is possible to set up “broad-based co-management” in Lake Malawi (with the participation of stakeholders such as the police, magistrates, chiefs, natural resources-based government departments and the district assembly). There is a move now to introduce a closed season for trawlers. In smaller lakes such as Lake Chiuta, PFM structures are useful in providing transboundary conflict resolution mechanisms, as between Malawi and Mozambique. In conclusion, he said co-management should be based on local conditions, and should be defined and developed in a contextual manner. It is important to make a policy distinction between the rural poor and the village elite in co-management programmes; however, their views should be integrated into the management framework. There should be clarity regarding the introduction of property rights or access regulation regimes. There should be sufficient caution while applying theories in practice, he warned. Implementation of a co-management initiative is a learning process, which evolves with time, he concluded.

#### **Kenya**

Obiero Ong’ang’a, Executive Director, OSIENALA (Friends of Lake Victoria), Kenya, made a presentation on co-management in Lake Victoria. Traditionally, he said, local communities/clans had already taken on various roles such as naming beaches, demarcating areas of activities, listing out types of fish that could be harvested, determining who could fish and with what gear. Fish was harvested mostly for domestic consumption. Under colonial rule, however, the central government took on the role of managing fisheries. Several other changes took place as modern gear, nets and improved technology were introduced, demand for fish increased, new species were introduced, and old systems of access broke down to be replaced by open access. In the

post-colonial period, the drive towards modernization increased, and trawlers were introduced. Co-operatives were set up all over the lake; however, they did not succeed.

Given such developments, fishers today face high levels of economic vulnerability. Many people from outside the fishing community have entered the sector, and conflicts and piracy are common. Ironically, even though the fisheries sector is booming, fishing communities and fishermen live in poverty. Co-management has been introduced in such a context, through beach management units (BMUs). There is a lot of potential for communities to be given back their true roles, if these structures are well defined, and appropriate institutional arrangements are in place. The role of OSIENALA has been in capacity building through training in business and bookkeeping and organization management. It has introduced a 'beach bank' to assist fishers in investing their funds and stabilize their businesses. The organization has also worked to enhance information flow through radio broadcasts (Radio Lake Victoria, FM 92.2). It has also set up the Lake Victoria Centre for Research and Development at Dunga Beach, Kisumu, and is undertaking research in appropriate technologies that can assist fishers (solar lamps for dagaa harvesting, solar coolers/water pumps, etc.)

### **Mozambique**

Simeao Lopes, Director, IDPPE, Mozambique, spoke about fisheries co-management initiatives in Mozambique and their pros and cons. Giving a background to Mozambique fisheries, he said fishing contributes to employment, food security and foreign exchange earnings. The sector is organized into the industrial, semi-industrial and artisanal fisheries. Private and joint venture companies engage in industrial fisheries, especially for shrimp resources in Sofala bank. The semi-industrial fishing vessels are mainly Mozambique-based trawlers targeting shrimp. They also include handlines as well as freshwater fishing platforms for kapenta. The artisanal fisheries are spread along the seaboard and inland waters, employing about 130,000 people in canoe fishing and fish processing. There are about 15,000 artisanal fishing vessels, 5 per cent of which are motorized. Beach-seines, gillnets and handlines are the popular artisanal fishing gear.

The development of co-management in Mozambique began with structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) in the post-Cold War era. This period also brought with it increasing demands on Africa to democratize and implement SAPs from its traditional Western donors, led by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), whose approach leaned towards participatory resource management, devolution of authority and decentralization of powers. Thus, by the early 1990s, user participation had become almost a given requirement for donor-funded development projects in Mozambique.

In the late 1980s, Mozambique adopted a SAP under IMF/World Bank advice. Within the fisheries sector, studies were conducted to evaluate the various fisheries programmes and projects implemented during the previous two decades in order to draw lessons and propose appropriate future interventions. Through this assessment, a Fisheries Master Plan (FMP) was developed and approved by the Mozambican government in 1994. The process of elaboration of the FMP involved many central fisheries institutions, fishing communities and other stakeholders, Lopes said.

The FMP laid out the priorities and strategies for development to be pursued in the subsequent years, he observed. With regard to the management of small-scale fisheries, the FMP laid emphasis on the involvement of fishermen in setting and enforcing management regimes. It was from the FMP that co-management approaches were formally declared as part of the general new strategic interventions for fisheries management and development, Lopes said.

An evaluation of co-management initiatives a few years after their introduction underscored the importance of more careful and comprehensive analyses and discussions, and the need to develop new intervention approaches involving wider consultation and active participation of beneficiaries, especially for the establishment of more effective co-management mechanisms in fisheries, Lopes said. Pilot measures for user-sensitization began in the late 1990s. Several co-management committees were since set up in the marine coastal areas of the country to improve the efficacy of fisheries management through developing a sense of ownership of management programmes amongst active fishers. However, Lopes identified several constraints to realizing co-management goals in Mozambique.

Firstly, the State acts as the custodian of all natural resources, including marine resources. Through the Ministry of Fisheries (via directorates and autonomous institutes), the State has the right to manage marine resources for the benefit of the people. When it comes to artisanal fisheries, the users (coastal communities) have the right to use fisheries resources; however, they do not have the right to participate in planning for its use nor the right to legally act, individually or collectively, in respect of management of the fishery resource. This is serious constraint to achieving the goal of better resource management, Lopes pointed out.

Secondly, the application of the concept of participation is only partial. Thus, for example, as far as fishing communities and their traditional leadership are concerned, participation does not apply to the crew on board fishing vessels. It applies only to those who have political and economic power to take strategic decisions, to the local elite, the traditional and religious leaders and other individuals who are willing to offer their services on behalf of others. These people may not be the most appropriate to deal with issues related to fisheries co-management. There could thus be conflicts between participatory democracy, as demanded by the main donors, and effective fisheries management. However, in order to guarantee the success of co-management (as traditional leaders are still respected by the majority of rural people), it is important that the government understands these sociocultural aspects, and ensures that all relevant institutions, individuals or interest groups, which are considered legitimate by different members of fishing communities, are engaged in the process, he added.

Thirdly, the government has not been able to empower fishing communities (legally, through economic incentives or through capacity building) to cope with resource management responsibilities, he said. Neither has there been an effort to use local knowledge in decision-making processes or to explain the criteria used to make some management decisions. Poor understanding of fisheries management amongst the fishermen contributes to their unwillingness to comply with fisheries regulations, he observed. It is important to integrate traditional/local authorities, as well as local knowledge, into co-management as a means to connect the political and scientific objectives of the government to the community. For the fishing community, it



could be a way to reach full control of their marine resources through the devolution of power and responsibilities from government, he observed.

The pressures on the coastal fishing resources in Mozambique result from, among other things, the overall unhealthy economic situation in the country, he said. To raise enough income for subsistence, fishing communities are putting pressure on the resource by increasing fishing effort through the use of inappropriate fishing gear like fine-meshed nets in beach-seines that target small pelagic fish. Open access to fisheries resources further complicates the matter, resulting in serious threats both to the resource and to the economic development of fishing communities. The fishermen themselves say that the catch rates from the nearshore waters have declined, and the average size of commercial fish species has decreased. Falling productivity of fishing units indicates the need to manage the fishery, and exercise caution in increasing fishing effort. Co-management arrangements should be able to reconcile conservation with the subsistence or livelihood interests of fishing communities.

Competition for the marine coastal resources of Mozambique is becoming increasingly evident, with both artisanal fishing communities and tourism reliant upon these resources for their livelihoods and development. At present, the Government of Mozambique (GOM) is encouraging tourism as a means for the rapid development of the economy, Lopes said. As part of this process, the GOM has delegated the management responsibility of some areas of the coastal zone to private tourism developers.

The issue of concern to artisanal fishing communities is the use of, and access to, the same coastal resources that are designated to the tourism industry, causing local conflicts and impacts, he observed. These conflicts are occurring in locations where fishing communities have been displaced from their traditional living and fishing grounds. This is most obvious where tourism developments are promoting the preservation of marine coastal resources as their primary asset, which contrasts with the extractive value of the coastal fishery resource as perceived by the fishing communities.

On the one hand, the GOM is supporting the development of co-management in the artisanal fisheries sector without the legislative framework that can delegate resource management responsibilities to these communities. On the other hand, it is providing the legislative framework for delegating resource management concessions to private tourism developers without the co-management institutional framework that would consider the needs of all resource users. In both instances, the result of partial regulation and control over each resource user group risks overexploitation of marine coastal resources.

Co-management is seen by the GOM as means to better control the fisheries activities (specially the fishing effort and conflict of interest) through sharing or decentralization of some responsibilities to the local institutions. But the communities view this arrangement as a step to achieve full control over the fishery resources through the devolution of power and authority to the local institutions. However, the GOM may not be in position, or even willing, to devolve the authority, as it would require some changes to the country's constitution, and also require sufficient financial capacity to ensure that the appropriate collective organizations among the communities are in place.

Lopes raised the following questions in the light of the experience of Mozambique with co-management: (i) What are the different approaches of different players in co-management and what is their understanding of sustainable development? (ii) How could a balance between the conservation objectives of the government and the livelihood needs of fishing communities be established while implementing co-management programmes? (iii) Could co-management achieve the objectives of all players, given that the outcome might not always be exactly the same and are often contradictory in nature? (iv) How could participatory and traditional elements work together? (v) Are co-management institutions willing, or able, to use multiple sources of knowledge in management decision-making? (vi) Two approaches to co-management are possible: decentralization and devolution. What could be the implication of these two models for fisheries co-management arrangements? (vii) What are the impacts of participatory development approaches on the traditional and (new) economic power structures in a co-managed resource environment?

In the discussion that followed Lopes' presentation, it was observed that co-management basically referred to shared management responsibility between the government and the community. It was noted that it is important to have an understanding about what definition to use in the ESA context. It was further observed that the participation of women in co-management initiatives is poor.

### **Experiences on Co-management from the ESA Region**

Mafaniso Hara of the University of Western Cape gave a presentation on the implications for coastal communities of co-management perspectives and experiences in the ESA region. The objectives of fisheries management mainly involve three aspects, he said: one, setting of management objectives; two, defining and providing the knowledge base for management decisions; and three, implementation of management decisions. Historically, fishery management decisions have been top-down, he said. The fisheries resources have been treated as State property, and objectives of fisheries management have mainly been confined to conservation of fishery resources, relying on biological sciences. The implementation of fishery management was through policing measures. Co-management of fishery resources was proposed in the light of the failure of conventional fishery management regimes to prevent overexploitation of fishery resources. It was also proposed as an effective mechanism to break the barriers between fishery administrators and user communities— a legacy of the top-down approach— through democratic decentralization, he said. Co-management of fishery resources—mostly as short-term, externally funded projects—was led by government line agencies through the creation of 'user' representative organizations ('democratically' elected committees). The process has sometimes lacked flexibility because of specific donor requirements.

The experiences with co-management in the ESA region have so far been mixed. The most common types of co-management have been 'instructive' or 'consultative', Hara said. He discussed several critical aspects of co-management as it is currently practiced in the ESA region.

Firstly, there are conflicting objectives between the conservation of fishery resources and socioeconomic development of fishing communities. The government approach has usually been instrumental; it co-opts users into management process to achieve the same old conservation objectives, without really accepting alternative knowledge, ideas and views from users, he observed. By and large, governments do not perceive co-management as a means of introducing more democratic principles of fisheries management, but as a means to better achieve government's original conservation objectives.

Secondly, co-management has been proposed as a way to deal with open-access problems. The introduction of access rights has been with the idea of enabling effort control; however, such measures often clash with historical fishing practices. Enforcing access control was particularly problematic in areas where alternative economic opportunities are lacking, he observed.

Thirdly, centralized systems of co-management are favoured that rely upon the natural scientists of governments. Very few inputs from users are incorporated into such systems. Usually, only tasks that the governments have failed to implement, or are costly (for example, local enforcement, etc.), are left to the user groups. The local communities are usually not legally empowered. Their negotiating position in relation to the government is still weak. The governments are also reluctant to devolve real power and genuine authority to user groups.

Fourthly, co-management usually requires customary sources of power held by traditional leaders for effective application of sanctions, he said. It has thus the need to involve traditional authority. The traditional authorities or local elites often capture power to offset any challenge to their authority that could crop up from co-management programmes.

Fifthly, while the governments may lack appropriate skills and capacity to undertake co-management, communities might not have the economic, social and political incentives or capacity to undertake some responsibilities required under co-management.

Finally, the definition of 'user community' and 'stakeholders' can be evolving and dynamic in a temporal and spatial sense. Existing mechanisms are unable to meet the demands of defining users and deciding about their representation in co-management structures. Similarly, there is the problem of lack, or low degree, of downward accountability of representative organizations. However, tacit threats of governments to revoke powers and authority force upward accountability, he said.

Hara had the following recommendations for achieving "efficient, equitable and sustainable fisheries management" in the ESA region. Firstly, co-management models should acknowledge and integrate the role of poverty in community/individual decisions and occupational and geographic mobility in community/individual livelihoods. The role of fishing in the community's livelihoods should be better understood, he said. The community should know the status of fishery resources. They should be better informed about alternative sources of livelihoods that could possibly combine with fishing. In this context, how far occupational and geographic mobility could help to improve their socioeconomic status is important, he added.

Secondly, he advocated “empowering co-management” by fully involving users in setting up management objectives, in integrating ‘user knowledge’ into formal science and in the implementation of management decisions.

And finally, he said it is important to improve the ability of communities to agitate. They should challenge formal science (including international conventions) using their local knowledge to balance conservation with local socioeconomic concerns. They should agitate for enabling legislation and improvement in the attitude of government to their concerns. They should agitate for better information and for better organization of co-management structures with improved human and financial resources, he concluded.

## **Discussion**

Several questions were raised in the discussion that followed. Regarding the scale at which co-management can be applied, it was said pointed out that there are various levels, from the village to the national and regional. Even though good legal frameworks are in place, the co-management process is still slow, as it is mainly government-driven. It was observed that the lack of knowledge, and the power derived from such knowledge, works against community groups. Regarding successful examples of co-management, one of the Ugandan participants pointed to some successful community organizations supported by his organization in Lake Albert. A participant from Zambia said that the management system in Lake Kariba, shared between Zambia and Zimbabwe, is an excellent example of successful co-management, through a bottom-up process, where local chiefs have been supported by the government to manage resources. Each chiefdom has put in place its own bye-laws that are approved by the government. Penalties are levied in case of violations. Vessels are registered and numbered, and access to resources is regulated.

Another participant from Kenya said co-management is a donor-driven process in ESA, and that the sustainability of most co-management initiatives was doubtful in the absence of support. He also drew attention to local co-management initiatives in Kenya that are not supported by any donor agency. It was pointed out that even in Lake Victoria, in the absence of external assistance, riparian countries were unable to sustain co-management initiatives initiated by donor agencies some years ago. In this context, it was pointed out that in Mozambique they were trying to find a way to deal with the problem. There is a proposal that 50 per cent of the revenue derived from fishing licences (in the industrial sector), will be used to support community fisheries organizations. The government budget for co-management is gradually increasing. Industry is supporting this process, if reluctantly. The Uganda participant from the UFCCA said that the effort of his organization was to ensure that local taxes are retained at source, at least partly, by local community organizations. This is being tried out through some beach management units (BMUs). The sums collected have been quite substantial and have been used to improve roads, toilets, etc.

A participant observed that, in the final analysis, fisheries management is a function of society. Proper fisheries management needs co-management, and the objectives of fisheries management are really no different from the objectives of co-management. In democratic societies, fisheries management is bottom-up. It was further observed that the objectives of fisheries management cannot be entirely determined through bottom-up processes, as they have to be compatible with

larger societal objectives, and need to be set within a larger framework. Also, while integration of fishers' knowledge is vital, good science also plays a role. It is important to collect data from fishermen, but their reliability and validity have to be ensured.

#### **4. Biodiversity Conservation Approaches and Small-scale Fisheries**

##### **Marine Protected Areas in the ESA Region**

Introducing the discussion on marine protected areas (MPAs), Julius Francis of WIOMSA said that different countries in East Africa are using different definitions of MPAs. MPAs in the East African region can broadly be classified into three categories, based on how they have been set up and managed. The earlier, first-generation MPAs, such as the Watamu and Malindi Marine National Park in Kenya, established in the 1960s, were set up with the objective of protecting specific habitats or areas of high biodiversity, such as coral reefs. The second-generation MPAs are typically large, multiple-use areas, such as the Mafia Island Marine Park, Tanzania. They are managed as integrated projects, and attempt to balance protection and livelihood objectives. A third type of MPAs is managed by private companies or NGOs, with the agreement of governments, as in Seychelles and Zanzibar. Francis said that another type of MPA is now emerging—those being set up and managed by community-based organizations, as in Comoros and Madagascar.

Francis then flagged several issues vis-a-vis MPAs and fishing communities, including the following:

- Have communities benefited from MPAs? The experience has been mixed, he said, and also depended on the capacity of the community to engage with the process. There should be some prior understanding about the best arrangement for local communities to effectively participate, he added.
- There is still a problem of establishing the right balance between conservation and people's livelihood needs.
- There is need for appropriate alternative livelihoods, to reduce people's dependence on marine and coastal resources. He gave the example of seaweed farming in Zanzibar. However, this often means a change of culture. There is need for a longer-term approach to the issue, rather than a short-term, project-based approach.
- Enforcement of MPAs has generally remained poor.
- The importance of marine parks as a tool for fisheries management or a tool for marine conservation is yet to be well demonstrated.

In the discussion that followed, the importance of effective institutional arrangements for the management of MPAs was stressed. There was also a need to understand differing perceptions and expectations, and to communicate clearly the benefits, including to local communities, that could be expected from well-managed MPAs.

##### **Collaborative Management: Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme (TCZCDP), Tanzania**

Melita Samoilys of IUCN-The World Conservation Union, shared the experience of IUCN in "collaborative management" of marine fisheries in the coral reefs of Tanga, Tanzania, with the

involvement of different stakeholders including the communities, local government and the private sector. The main objective of the Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme (TCZCDP) was to maintain healthy marine ecosystems and fisheries to support sustainable livelihoods. The programme involved a total of six management areas, an area of 1,600 sq km, and approximately 500,000 people. It was started after extensive discussion and consultation with local communities over a period of three years, and initiatives such as the closure of coral reefs were taken voluntarily by the community. The programme lays greater emphasis on the recovery of coral habitat from dynamite fishing, and on stock replenishment, habitat recovery and protection of nursery and breeding grounds. The involvement of women in the programme has been very high, with the participation of women in meetings and committees being as high as 40 per cent.

The programme has put great emphasis on regular monitoring and assessment of reef health, fisheries, mangroves, and socioeconomic aspects. The monitoring and surveillance of the area is undertaken in co-operation with the Navy. Data are analyzed and ploughed back to the community. Six years of data demonstrate that the handline fishery for snapper is showing signs of recovery. A limitation was that the analysis was based on catch data, and there was no corresponding effort data. Samoilyls suggested that from the data, it could be concluded that area-based management of demersal fisheries with full community engagement could be considered effective.

In response to a query, Samoilyls clarified that fishers are not paid an incentive, although for the days they do not fish, a small amount is paid as compensation. She also highlighted some of the challenges and constraints. Data, she said, continues to be a challenge as it is needed to comprehensively assess the impact of initiatives on fisheries resources and the socioeconomic situation of communities dependent on the resource base. Another issue is the financial sustainability of the project, now that IUCN has withdrawn from the project, and the project is being managed by the government and the community. There is a proposal to charge a levy on each fisher to make the programme sustainable in the long run. In response to a question pertaining to the enabling factors that had led to women's high participation in the programme, Samoilyls noted that, unfortunately, the gendered outcomes have not been documented throughout the process; however, lessons could be gleaned from the existing data.

### **Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM), Kenya**

In the presentation on an Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) programme in Kenya, Martha Wangari Mukira, Fisheries Department, Kenya, said that the programme was initiated following the Rio Conference in 1992 and the Arusha Resolution on ICAM in Eastern Africa that encouraged individual countries to institutionalize ICAM as a tool for the sustainable utilization of coastal resources.

In Kenya, an ICAM programme was initiated initially in a 12-km stretch near Mombasa, an area of high development and population density, and varied environmental problems. There were also several kinds of conflict in this region, as between fishermen and tourist interests, and with MPAs, with fishermen losing access to coasts and fishing grounds. Fishermen felt that their interests were being ignored during the setting up of MPAs, and even guns were used to deny them access to fishing grounds within MPAs.

The ICAM programme was based in the Coast Development Authority (CDA), which had the participation of several agencies, including the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), the Fisheries Department (FiD), the Kenya Wildlife Services (KWS), the Municipal Council of Mombasa (MCM), the Kenya Association of Hotel Keepers and Caterers (KAHC), the Kenya Ports Authority (KPA), and the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA).

Mukira pointed out that through the ICAM programme, the invisibility of fishing communities was challenged, and their problems gained visibility. Fishing communities also gained access to basic facilities such as water, and landing centres, and received various types of leadership and entrepreneurship training. Fishing communities are increasingly considered bona fide residents of the coast, and even tourist operators have begun to recognize them as such.

In the discussion that followed, a representative from the fishermen's association of Cabo Delgado, Mozambique, spoke about the conflict between fishing communities and the tourist industry in Cabo Delgado province. The government had leased out entire islands to private tourist operators and investors. For fishermen, this has effectively meant a denial of access to fishing grounds, as the developers have their own armed guards and patrols that attack and drive fishermen away. Participants from Zanzibar also echoed similar problems with the tourism industry. When hotels are set up, initially tall promises of employment are made to local people. However, not only do local people get little or no employment, they also lose access to their fishing grounds. Mukira said that there were similar problems in Kenya. However, the requirement specified by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) that there should be access to the sea at intervals of 100 m has proved useful in supporting the cause of fishing communities.

## **5. Reporting Back on Group Discussions on 'Co-management, MPAs and Community Organizations'**

Participants were divided into three groups: two English-speaking and one Swahili-speaking. The group reports are summarized below. The full reports are in [Appendix IV](#).

Group 1 on co-management discussed the history of co-management in different countries; the context within which it was introduced; the key objectives and principles guiding the practice of co-management; the key strategies adopted and the kind of community-level structures put in place; the positive impacts of co-management; some constraints still facing its implementation; and key recommendations. The group noted that while co-management has not been formally introduced in the island States (Seychelles and Mauritius), participatory and consultative mechanisms are nevertheless in place due to pressure from fishers associations. It was also noted that most East African States had put in place some form of association at the community level (such as BMUs, or village committees), some of which built on, or recognized, traditional community structures/leaders. It was stressed that co-management is a process that needs to be continually appraised and evaluated. While co-management could yield many benefits, there were also constraints that prevented the realization of its full potential. Ensuring `real

participation' was a big challenge. The group stressed that support for co-management must be long-term, internally driven and sustainable, and must be well integrated within the national framework.

Group 2 on MPAs and ICAM approaches looked at the history of their introduction; the processes that are giving impetus to these approaches; the objectives with which they are being set up; the extent of community participation; the extent to which communities are benefiting from them; as well as some of the negative and positive impacts for local communities and for biodiversity. It was noted that there is significant thrust to increase area under MPAs, given the obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Some of the newer MPAs are laying far greater stress on community participation. It was also noted that so far, communities have not benefited, in any significant way, from the establishment of MPAs, even as the tourist industry has been a major beneficiary. In the case of South Africa, a push by predominantly white land owners for coastal farm land to be declared 'conservation zones' has the effect of creating boundaries between farms and adjacent poor housing settlements, as well as blocking access to the coast for certain communities. It was also noted that increase in fish production has been recorded in at least one of the protected marine sites, a major indicator of this being the phenomenon of fishers 'fishing on the line', or the boundary of the protected area. The group stressed that MPAs should fit within a broader ICAM framework, with emphasis on issues such as land tenure, access to land/beaches, alternative livelihoods, and so on.

Group 3, which comprised mainly Swahili speakers, discussed aspects of all the three topics given for discussion, that is, MPAs, co-management and community organizations. The group said that fishers remain largely unorganized, though various government-supported associations have been set up in recent times, under co-management initiatives. The group also stressed that often partnerships under co-management arrangements were not equal. At the same time, village-level associations are often taken over by the more powerful interests. On the issue of MPAs, the group agreed that these had been initiated in different ways, including by communities themselves. In many MPAs initiated by the government/donor/ NGO/private sector, community participation remains minimal. The benefits from marine parks go either to private investors (especially tour operators) or to governments, with few benefits accruing to communities. The tourism industry is the main beneficiary, the participants stressed, while the negative impacts of MPAs fall mainly on fishers, whose access to grounds is restricted.

In the discussion that followed, an example was given, from Malawi, of a national park in inland waters. Islands that harboured fishers during rough weather have been declared as national parks, and are controlled by private interests. Fishermen do not have any access to these islands any more.

Another participant queried whether the phenomenon of fishers 'fishing on the line' could be taken to mean that the MPA had led to an increase in fish production. This was particularly significant as MPA sites were those that were very productive in the first place. It was further queried whether an MPA is the best instrument or one among several instruments that can be considered for fisheries management. Or is it that since MPAs are now almost a given, we need to necessarily look for benefits. It was stressed that MPAs should be seen as one available tool. Apart from area-based tools, it is essential to have a fishery-specific management plan, with



input-output control measures as well. MPAs should be seen in the broader context of ICAM, it was stressed.

A participant said that there was much that could be learned within the ESA region itself about community organizations, given the different models of village associations/ committees that have been initiated. Exchange visits and workshops could play a big role in exchanging experiences and learning from one another.

## 6. Aquaculture

### Coastal Aquaculture in Tanzania

Ian Bryceson, from the Norwegian University of Life Science, made a presentation on coastal aquaculture in Tanzania. He started by providing a brief history of aquaculture in the region. Commercial seaweed culture (of *Eucheuma* and *Kappaphycus spp*) was initiated in Zanzibar in 1989 and subsequently spread. The annual production is now approximately 6,000 tonnes. Prawn culture has been attempted since the mid-1980s, with little success. In the mid-1990s, communities, NGOs, lawyers, researchers, etc., thwarted a prawn farming project in the Rufiji delta, after a unified struggle. In 2005, a prawn farm has been set up in Mafia. More recently, there have also been some efforts to culture bivalves and introduce pearl farming.

Bryceson also drew attention to the declining returns to primary producers of seaweed. The price for *Eucheuma spp* was around US\$0.32 per kg of dried seaweed in 1989. This was a good source of income for coastal communities, particularly women, and for the country. However, the price has since been declining and is now as low as US\$0.06 per kg of dried seaweed. This has had a negative impact on farmers. It appears that while prices in the final market are high, the price to primary producers continues to be low, given the prevailing monopoly situation, with the market being controlled by a couple of multinational companies.

With respect to *Kappaphycus spp*, producers initially received US\$0.31 per kg. This has since declined to US\$0.17 per kg in 2005. Again, this is because of the monopolistic market situation. Bryceson also drew attention to the fact that between 1988 and 2004, prices paid to Filipino farmers for *Kappaphycus spp* had actually increased from about US\$0.26 per kg to US\$0.67 per kg.

Bryceson then provided information on the farming of molluscs that was initiated in 2003 in Zanzibar, and has since been expanding. He also provided an overview of the culture of tiger shrimp (*Penaeus monodon*), a widely cultivated export species in Asia and Latin America, and some of the problems, both environmental and socioeconomic, related to this.

Bryceson concluded by highlighting that coastal aquaculture can have both positive and negative impacts, depending on the type of aquaculture practised, the actual benefits to producers, etc. He listed out some of the challenges for coastal aquaculture:

- Does it eradicate or exacerbate poverty?
- Equity considerations important, since socioeconomic benefits/costs are uneven
- Need to analyze endowments, entitlements, capability status

- Need for internalization of externalities
- Recognize the advantages of lower trophic-level systems
- The aquaculture context should determine choices of technology
- Learn from sophistication of Asian polyculture systems
- Tap into opportunities for international exchange of knowledge
- Opt for an interdisciplinary approach that combines biotechnology, hardware, ecology, social sciences and traditional knowledge
- Need for holistic and integrated coastal management

In the discussion that followed, it was pointed out that it was often difficult to negotiate for better prices for farmers, especially as production was low in most countries in Africa. Therefore their bargaining power was poor. It was noted that it was important for farmers to organize to be able to bargain for better prices and to put forward demands for their rights more effectively. In Mozambique, when efforts were made to get companies to hike prices, the companies terminated their operations. It was difficult for a government to intervene in such a context, it was said.

### **Opportunities and Challenges of Aquaculture for Small-scale Fisheries**

Daniel Jamu from the World Fish Centre, Malawi, spoke of the opportunities offered by, and challenges facing, aquaculture expansion in Africa. After providing a brief introduction to aquaculture in the global context, he outlined the opportunities and challenges of aquaculture for small-scale fisheries—how small-scale fisheries and aquaculture can co-exist. He also spoke of the NEPAD programme in relation to aquaculture. Globally, while 38 per cent of fish production now comes from aquaculture, the share of Africa is only 2 per cent. In Africa, the bulk of production is from Egypt. He emphasized the importance of increasing production from aquaculture to cater to food security needs, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa where per capita consumption is declining, and where the potential for increasing production from capture fisheries is limited.

Aquaculture in Africa offered several opportunities including increased fish production, nutritional security, higher incomes, higher exports, and welfare benefits through lower fish prices. Aquaculture could also be used to reduce pressure on depleted stocks, as in Malawi. Some challenges could be related to water and sediment eutrophication, the potential for genetic contamination, and the introduction of exotic species through escape of cultured species, and diseases. Aquaculture could also lead to social and economic conflicts through the privatization of the commons, reduced access to fishing grounds, blocking of navigation routes, and reduction of fisheries production in open waters in areas where fish aggregating devices are used.

Has Africa learnt from the experiences with aquaculture in Asia? Jamu pointed out that aquaculture initiatives in Africa are sensitive to the danger of environmental degradation. For example, comprehensive environmental impact assessment (EIA) and monitoring systems are in place in Lakes Kariba and Malawi. There is emphasis on the use of native species such as chambo in Malawi, and *O. niloticus* in Uganda and Ghana, and aquaculture practices are consistent with the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. There is also awareness about the issue of genetic erosion and the need for safeguards.

Jamu stressed that it was possible for small-scale fisheries and aquaculture to co-exist, if participatory planning processes were put in place, and if measures such as zoning to reduce pollution potential and conflicts with small-scale fisheries, comprehensive EIA and monitoring process to guide production, etc., were adopted. It was even possible to develop complementarities, such as through restocking of depleted fisheries and sanctuaries.

In terms of the future, he said that the question was not if there will be a growth in aquaculture, but when this growth will take place. Demand for fish, both domestic and export, was growing, affordable technologies for aquaculture were available and more investment models were available for finance institutions. Jamu stressed that aquaculture should not be promoted as an alternative livelihood for small-scale fisheries but as an investment option in its own right.

Speaking of the NEPAD programme for sustainable aquaculture, Jamu said that the programme recognized the importance of aquaculture, the need to scale up and to integrate aquaculture with other land and water uses. The programme also stresses the need for a macroeconomic environment and priority zones conducive to the promotion of small-scale and commercial aquaculture. The programme's components included capacity building, technology transfer, technology development and improved market access.

In the discussion that followed, several queries were raised. Some participants said that while aquaculture could be beneficial for increasing food production and food security, the kind of aquaculture that should be promoted needs further debate. Cultivation of herbivorous species could be comparatively advantageous from a longer-term food security and environmental perspective. The issue of inefficient conversion of protein for culturing carnivorous species such as shrimp (5 kg of fishmeal to produce 1 kg of cultured fish) was raised in this context. The need for effective monitoring and regulation was also stressed.

## **7. Fishing by Foreign Fleets: Issues for Small-scale Fisheries**

Introducing the issue, the moderator, Brian O'Riordan of ICSF, drew attention to some of the issues vis-a-vis foreign fishing in the region, both legal and illegal, as related, for example to underreporting of catch, the indirect impact of fishing for tuna on local resources in cases where FADs or live bait were used, the poor wages and conditions of work of crew, etc.

As far as bilateral fisheries agreements between the EU and countries in the ESA region are concerned, they were either 'tuna agreements' (for access to tuna and tuna-like species), or 'mixed agreements' (access to a variety of resources, including small pelagics, demersal and tuna resources). Specific mention was also made of the EU's proposal for a fisheries agreement with Tanzania. This was for a tuna agreement for a period of three years, with fishing possibilities for 39 tuna seiners, and 31 surface longliners. In return, the EU was offering a financial compensation of Euro600,000 per year, covering a total catch of 8,000 tonnes of tuna (and tuna-like species) per year, with compensation to be increased proportionally at the rate of Euro75 for each additional tonne caught. Of this, Euro390 000 per year was to be earmarked for the financing of "targeted actions", of which Euro200,000 was for surveillance and control of fishing activities in Tanzania's fishing zone; Euro75,000 for institutional support to the administrative department

responsible for fisheries; and Euro115,000 for the development of local small-scale fisheries. License fees for ship owners was set at Euro25 per tonne.

Other features of the agreement included an exclusive clause prohibiting any private licence or other arrangement by EC shipowners; mutual agreement between the Tanzanian authorities and the EC on the measures to be financed after submission of a detailed programming; obligation for the EC fleet operating in Tanzania's fishing zone to embark at least 30 local seamen and to apply the social clause; fishing outside 12 miles from the coast; collection of by-catches and ban of by-catch dumping; and sanctions for non-compliance with the Protocol and the relevant Tanzanian legislation. Three presentations on this topic followed:

### **IUU Fishing and Indian Ocean Piracy**

This presentation was by Andrew Mwangura, Programme Co-ordinator, Seafarers' Assistance Programme, Kenya, an organization that monitors maritime safety and the welfare needs of seafarers and fishers on board ships and at port. Mwangura said that an estimated 400 vessels were fishing illegally in Kenya and Somalia, leading to huge losses, to the tune of US\$10 mn. In Somalia, IUU fishing was by vessels registered in Kenya, Thailand, Korea and Taiwan. Reports of human rights abuses, poor wages and conditions of work on board these vessels, were common. Cases of abandonment of crew have also been reported. There have also been several cases of Kenyan seafarers being held for months in captivity by Somali militiamen/warlords, forcing ship owners to seal deals with warlords to protect the crew. The Kenyan government needs to restrict illegal fishing by local fishing vessels in Somali waters, he said.

Mwangura drew attention particularly to the poor conditions of work under which crew from Kenya were employed on fishing vessels. There are no regular hours of work or rest periods, and most of the crew are underpaid. They earn an average of US\$100 per month, which is far below the US\$800 earned by their crewmates from other countries. The fishers maintain a culture of fear because they know that if they complain, they will lose not only their present but also possibly their future jobs. The record on safety at sea has been equally poor. Between 1983 and 2006, one Senegalese, 16 Tanzanians and 49 Kenyan fishers have lost their lives at sea, while 122 have been seriously injured and 37 have suffered from frostbite on their fingers.

It is also regrettable, he added, that there are few international instruments regulating safety and welfare standards on fishing vessels, and those that exist are poorly ratified and have many shortcomings. With a few exceptions, the instruments apply to flag-State, not port-State responsibilities, and there is no effective system of port-State control in place for fishing vessels. The existing conventions cover only those vessels over 24 m in length, while most accidents and deaths occur on smaller vessels, he said.

Apart from the deficiencies in existing international instruments, the international community is failing to address other issues, said Mwangura. For example, many flag States are lax in their responsibilities to exercise effective jurisdiction and control over vessels that fly their flags, as required by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Port States violate UNCLOS by failing to release crew on ships detained for fishing violations.

Mwangura stressed the need for effective mechanisms to deter violence, abuse and

discrimination of crew on fishing vessels. Flag States need to be encouraged to ratify and implement international instruments relating to fishing safety, and greater control needs to be given to port States. Coastal States should require compliance with international instruments for issuing fishing permits, and insurance agencies should also require compliance with these instruments as a precondition for providing insurance cover. Above all, the fishing industry itself should be encouraged to change its attitude towards fishing vessel safety issues, and must find ways to work with the government and international organizations to produce and enforce reasonable and practical measures to protect the industry's most valuable asset: the crew on fishing vessels. Mwangura also welcomed the recent efforts of the International Labour Organization (ILO) towards a consolidated maritime convention that will update existing international instruments regarding conditions of employment for seafarers aboard ocean-going vessels.

In conclusion, Mwangura stressed the need to phase out licensing arrangements for fishing, and for replacing these with fisheries partnership agreements with distant-water fishing nations, ensuring fair financial compensation for accessed stocks, assistance in development of the country's fisheries, and support for value-addition activities and for monitoring, control and surveillance.

### **Legal Fisheries Arrangements: The Role of Small-scale Fisheries in Tanzania**

A presentation by Magese E. Bulayi of the Fisheries Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania, provided a profile of Tanzanian fisheries and outlined efforts to prevent, control and deter IUU fishing. IUU fishing, it was stressed, is leading to the loss of both short-term and long-term social and economic opportunities, while also having negative effects on food security and environmental protection. Tanzania had in place several acts of legislation relevant to this issue, including the new Fisheries Act No. 22 of 2003 Part 5 (which recognizes the need for collaborative fisheries management and provides for the establishment of BMUs for the purpose of encouraging co-management in fisheries); The Deep Sea Fishing Authority Act No. 3 of 1988; and the Marine Parks and Reserves Act No. 29 of 1994.

MCS activities undertaken include establishment of enforcement units; introduction of VMS, particularly in the marine fishery where large vessels operate; conducting inspections and patrols; and putting in place observer programmes. The Fisheries Department also works on co-management arrangements with local communities, through BMUs. All fishers, except industrial fishers, are now required to be a member of a BMU, formed for the purpose of conserving resources. It is specified that fishers who are not members of BMUs shall not be given a licence to fish. Management activities of BMUs are agreed upon, and could include law enforcement, patrol and surveillance against illegal activities, control and monitoring of fishermen's migration, data collection, etc.

### **IOC/IOTC-MCS programme**

Aubrey Harris, Senior Fisheries Officer, FAO Subregional Office for Southern and Eastern Africa (FAO SAFR), provided information on the IOC/IOTC-MCS programme. He informed participants that the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) has been invited to sit on the Steering Committee of the IOC/IOTC-MCS programme.

The IOC/IOTC–MCS programme has a budget of Euro5.5 mn over three years, of which Euro1.9 mn is from counterpart country contributions. The co-ordination unit is based in Mauritius. The objective of the programme is to obtain tangible estimates on IUU fishing by using a range of different approaches, including remote sensing, targeted aerial surveillance, platform observer programmes, maritime patrols, port sampling schemes, etc. The activities planned include creation of a regional port inspection regime, reinforcement of VMS, and joint maritime patrols. The emphasis on a port inspection regime is because regional co-ordination in this regard is likely to be the most cost-effective option to reduce IUU fishing. Several regional initiatives, including regional inspection training workshops and inspector training exchange programmes, are envisaged.

SWIOFC is linked to the IOC/IOTC–MCS programme as part of the Steering Committee, in port inspection training and collaboration, through attendance of training courses and workshops (funding/language), etc. There is also the longer-term possibility of the programme becoming regional and including East African coastal States.

In the discussions that followed, it was clarified that the jurisdictional boundary of the MCS programme also included the high seas, apart from the EEZ, as the programme was under the auspices of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). It was also informed that while there was yet no Regional Fisheries Management Organization (RFMO) in the region as required under the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement, there was a likelihood of this developing. The process normally takes from five to 10 years. It was further clarified that the port inspection regime basically stressed on harmonizing programmes that already exist. Problems could arise, as in other parts of the world, when one country is not part of the regime. The delegate from Somalia stressed the importance of port-State controls, given the highly negative impact of IUU fishing on the Somalian economy and environment. It was also felt that some countries in the region were not benefiting adequately from licensing arrangements, given the low licence fees charged.

The government delegate from Kenya said that in the past five years, after MCS systems had been put in place, there had been a lot of improvements. Many more vessels are now fishing under licences and are landing tuna catches within the country for processing, prior to export.

The issue of conditions of work of crew also came up for much discussion, with the participant from Seychelles stressing the need for African nations to implement the social clause in fisheries agreements with distant-water fishing nations (DWFNs). O’Riordan clarified that though the social clause was part of all EU agreements, several ways had been found to dilute its provisions. There is also a need for organizations within Africa to put pressure on their own governments to improve training of fishermen and thereby their employability and employment on fishing vessels, as required by the social clause.

## **8. Cross-cutting Issues**

### **8.1 Trade**

#### **Fish Trade in Lake Victoria: Status and Challenges**

Richard Abila from the Kenya Marine Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI) said that trade in Lake Victoria fisheries was of various types—local, national, intra-regional, inter-regional, and export, with the main commercial species being Nile perch, tilapia and dagaa. Local/national trade was informal, with no standards in place, and was for tilapia (fresh/smoked/fried/dried), dagaa (dried/fresh) and Nile perch (undersize/low-quality/frames). This was also true of national, inter- and intra-regional trade. International trade, on the other hand, was formal and highly regulated, with strict quality standards. It received much support from the government. Tanzania was the leading exporter of Nile perch (43 per cent in value terms), followed by Uganda (34 per cent) and Kenya (23 per cent).

Taking the case of Kenya, in 2003-04, Nile perch exports were to 26 countries in the EU, the Far East and the Middle East. Kenya is negotiating with the EU for preferential market access (under the Cotonou partnership agreement) as part of the ESA block comprising 16 countries.

There were several concerns for producers, however, vis-a-vis the trade in Nile perch. These related to declining catches; access to cross-border fishing grounds; barriers to cross-border markets; cross-border conflicts, insecurity; prices to fishers; fluctuating prices; access to credit facilities; and access to market information.

At the same time, growing competition for fish frames and their declining quality were issues of concerns to traders in by-products of Nile perch. With respect to fish consumers, the issue of concern related to supplies of fish and its affordability. Prices were being affected by expansion of national/urban markets, growing fish exports, declining catches, and the conversion of fish to fishmeal.

Abila reiterated some general issues relating to fish trade, namely, backward transfer of benefits from trade; export trade vs food insecurity; export vs resource sustainability; conflicts due to stock decline; moving fishers up the export chain; direction of fisheries trade policies; and maximizing benefits from new technology.

Abila concluded by pointing out the threat to trade posed by stock declines, and the need for better management. The potential role of aquaculture in export trade also needs to be better explored, he said. At the same time, the possibilities of greater inter-regional trade and of value addition for export trade, needs to be better explored.

#### **Trade in Fish and Fish Products**

Sebastian Mathew of ICSF provided an overview of trade in fish and fish products from a developing-country perspective. Fish trade is of growing importance to developing countries—over 50 per cent of exports of fish and fish products came from developing countries in 2001. Net fish exports from developing countries have increased from US\$10 bn in 1990 to US\$18 bn in 2000.

Mathew highlighted some of the tariff and non-tariff measures related to fish trade. Tariffs on primary fish products are low in most developed-country export markets, he said, except in the EC markets, where tariffs on primary shrimp, for example, can vary from 12 to 18 per cent. Tariffs on processed fish and fish products, however, can go up to 25 per cent. Several non-tariff barriers are also used by developed countries to restrict imports, such as those related to sanitary and phytosanitary measures, and measures used to discriminate against import of fish and fish products that do not meet with obligations under existing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

Mathew also briefly introduced the ongoing debates relevant to fisheries in ongoing World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations. The Doha Round of the WTO (2001) proposed the following:

- Removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers
- New negotiations aimed at clarifying and improving WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies
- Negotiations on the relationship between WTO rules and specific trade obligations under MEAs

Mathew also reflected on the current discussions on non-agricultural market access (NAMA), regarding removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers on fish and fish products. It was important to reflect on whether fish and fish products need to be treated separately, and not like other non-agricultural products, he stressed. Should there be a sectoral approach to fish and fish products and NAMA? It was also important to ask whether movement of tariffs towards zero was desirable for fisheries. Should not tariffs be higher for fisheries to put in place management measures?

Mathew informed that the WTO Hong Kong Ministerial in 2005 decided to further the work on fishing subsidies and NAMA. Members have been asked to propose which subsidies should be, and which should not be, disciplined. Proposals are already on the table from New Zealand and Brazil proposing a new language on fishing subsidies. African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries also have given a proposal that includes a section on fishing subsidies

Mathew concluded by stressing that international trade in fish and fish products could yield benefits, provided measures were in place to manage and protect the resource from overexploitation, and provided that producers received decent returns, and protection of their right to life and dignified livelihoods.

In the discussion that followed, it was commented that the negotiating capacity in ACP countries is weak in most cases, and country delegations are not well prepared enough. There is need for greater in-country consultations, especially with producers, before arriving at negotiating positions. Regarding the issue of subsidies, it was informed that since 2003, there has been no subsidized transfer of vessels from the EU. The model in place now is that of Fishery Partnership Arrangements (FPAs).



## **ESA-EU Fishery Relations**

Brian O' Riordan of ICSF made a presentation on ESA-EU fishery relations. In his presentation, he touched on the following themes: market and fishery resource access, EU fisheries agreements, and EU-ACP fish trade relations.

Since 1975, many countries in the ESA region, part of the ACP group of countries, have benefited from special trade and aid arrangements with the EU, first under the successive Lomé Conventions (Lomé I – IV), and since 2000, under the Cotonou Agreement. The EU provides the ACP countries, particularly South Africa, Namibia, Tanzania, Mozambique, Uganda, Kenya, Madagascar and Seychelles, with their most lucrative market for fish.

European fleets also access ACP fishery resources through bilateral fisheries agreements. In the ESA region, Mozambique, Comoros Islands, Seychelles, Mauritius and Mozambique all have bilateral fishery access agreements with the EU. Fishery agreement negotiations with the EU are also under way in Kenya and Tanzania.

The trade liberalization policies of the WTO, together with the negotiations between WTO members on fisheries subsidies, are changing the nature of EU-ACP fishery relations—both as regards EU market access for the ACP, and ACP resource access by the EU fleets.

In the case of market access, the current competitive advantage enjoyed by ACP fish products is being slowly but inexorably eroded away. Non-reciprocal tariff preferences currently enjoyed by ACP States under the Cotonou Convention will be replaced by new bilateral reciprocal arrangements that are due to begin in January 2008—Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs). It is envisaged that the process should be concluded by 2008 with 'WTO-compatible trade agreements' that will replace the Cotonou Agreement.

In the case of fishery resource access, the EU is adopting a new policy framework to establish WTO-compatible Fishery Partnership Agreements (FPAs) to replace existing "pay, fish and go" agreements. Under the new framework, it is argued that the financial contribution to be made available by the EC in exchange for fishery access cannot be considered as a subsidy to the European fishermen. Rather, it is justified by the need for the Community, by mutual interest, to provide adequate support to the development and the management of a sustainable fishing policy in the third countries where the European fleet is operating.

O'Riordan noted that at least 20 per cent of the EU's direct fish supplies that come from its own fleet originate outside EU waters, in international waters and waters under the jurisdiction of third countries. Access for the EU fleet to third-country waters is achieved through the negotiation of fisheries agreements. These are either bilateral agreements with financial compensation (known as "cash for access" agreements) or "reciprocal agreements" that involve exchanges of fishing opportunities/rights between Community fleets and the fleets of non-member countries.

Under the provisions of "cash for access" agreements, the EU pays an agreed amount of compensation to the third country concerned, in exchange for an agreed amount of access for its

fleets. There is often a distinction made in the way the financial compensation is allocated, with a proportion being allocated to “targeted actions”. According to the EC, these are designed for co-operation and development actions. However, all fisheries agreement protocols specify that the third-country government “shall have full discretion regarding the use to which the financial compensation is put.” This means that the targeted actions are often not implemented as proposed.

On the issue of EU-ACP fish trade, there are four main challenges facing ACP exporters of fisheries products, to access the EU market in the future. These are: (i) the erosion of preferences and the loss of the ACP’s competitive advantages; (ii) compliance with the rules of origin; (iii) compliance with non-tariff barriers (health and hygiene regulations, HACCP standards, etc.); and (iv) the quid pro quo that the EU may demand in the new reciprocal arrangements post-2007. The latter may include liberalization of investment (as in the case of Chile), and linking access to the EU market to the signing of fisheries agreements (as in the case of South Africa).

Although the fisheries sector may present opportunities for ACP countries, international market demands exert huge pressures on fishery resources, and meeting such demands may encourage intensive, destructive and illegal fishing, to the detriment of sustainability. There are also concerns that promoting international trade in fishery products could have negative consequences for local food security. Negative impacts may include reduced physical and economic access to fish, by channelling fish away from local markets to international markets, and by increasing the price of fish locally.

Although the process of erosion of ACP margins of preference is inevitable, it is vital that ACP fish-exporting countries adapt to the new global context, and improve their competitiveness. In the context of EPA negotiations, ACP States should use the opportunity to secure EU development support to improve their fish-landing, transport, and processing infrastructure, and improve the capacity of their fish-processing and export sector to comply with international standards of sanitation, etc. At the same time, there is a need for caution: improving competitiveness should not be at the expense of labour standards, quality of life, and the local environment.

There is also a need to explore alternative markets for ACP fish products, locally, regionally and internationally. Improving regional markets for fish is an issue that could be achieved through the framework of EPAs.

## **8.2 Cross-cutting Issues: Gender**

### **Women in Fisheries, Zanzibar**

Narriman Jiddawi of the Institute of Marine Sciences, Zanzibar, touched upon the lower status of women in fishing communities in Zanzibar, the fact that their role in fisheries (in fishing, processing, trading, gathering, etc.) was not well acknowledged, and their lower access to resources, such as credit and capital. Things are changing, however. For example, while there were only two women traders in Zanzibar in the mid-1990s, today there are almost 200. Women are also better represented in BMUs. They have been able to benefit from seaweed farming and

farming of bivalves. More work, though, is needed to develop women's leadership skills and to help them with setting up better marketing linkages, she said.

### **Women of Fishing Communities from Lake Victoria, Uganda**

Margaret Nakato of the Katosi Women Development Trust and the World Forum of Fish Harvester and Fishworkers (WFF) outlined some of the problems facing women of fishing communities near Lake Victoria, Uganda. With greater exports, many women lost access to fish and employment from fish smoking. Some women, like those in her group, turned to fishing. However, as resources have declined, this source of income has become uncertain as well. With boats needing to fish farther out at sea, women are losing control over the operations of their boats.

Nakato pointed to another problem that has exacerbated as catches decline and boats go farther out to fish—the increase in illegal sex and higher incidence of HIV/AIDS. The incidence of HIV/AIDS is as high as 16 per cent in fishing communities, as compared to a national average of 6 per cent. Women are increasingly seeking income from selling sex.

Nakato also drew attention to the growing pollution levels in Lake Victoria. She said that higher pollution levels also had an impact on the Nile perch, and led to its decline. She highlighted the fact that women of fishing communities are organizing for fishing, for access to credit, for alternative income, and so on. Women have been active in the co-management process and in improving the condition of the lake (removing water hyacinth, for example).

In the discussion following the presentation, it was noted that the experience from elsewhere also indicates that women are often displaced when the market became lucrative, leaving them to try and eke a living from less lucrative work.

### **Shifting Gendered Identities in Small Scale Fisheries in South Africa**

The presentation, by Jackie Sunde of Masifundise Development Trust and Maria Magdalena Hoffman of Coastal Links, South Africa, provided a brief background to South African fisheries. Women's work and involvement in small-scale fisheries in South Africa are largely hidden and have not been documented in any depth, and, until last year, government data was seldom disaggregated along gender lines. Women from subsistence fishing communities have a long history of harvesting and using marine resources along the shoreline of the east coast. On the west coast, women have been more involved in pre- and post-harvest activities, in addition to their reproductive labour within households and communities. Women did not go to sea, and there were widely and very strongly held beliefs regarding what was 'women's work' and 'men's work'. It was considered bad luck for a woman to be on the water at sea. These beliefs persist even today.

In the Western Cape, with the gradual industrialization and commercialization of the sector, there was a process of proletarianization. Male fishers entered into wage labour for wealthy fish merchants and factory owners, whilst women entered into seasonal labour within the processing plants. During the apartheid years, black fishers were largely not allowed to fish in their own right—they could only fish for a white-owned factory. The fisheries were mainly dominated by large, white-owned companies.

In the post-apartheid era, there was considerable hope for a new, equitable fisheries management system. The 1997 Marine Living Resources Act empowered the Minister to allocate fishing rights in the form of quotas, permits and exemptions. Three categories of users of fisheries resources—subsistence, recreational and commercial—were defined. In 2001, a new Fisheries Management Policy was developed, and for the first time, women were granted subsistence exemptions to catch lobster. The 2002-2004 Medium Term Rights policy granted rights to several groups of women in the Limited Commercial category for West Coast Rock Lobster (estimated 243 female rights holders). Many women went to sea for the first time in their lives, usually with male relatives or friends. This also met with mixed response, and sometimes resistance, from the men. For women, the most difficult part was related to lack of proper toilets on the boats.

The Long Term Rights Policy has been introduced in 2005, to give quotas for 10 years for all of the ten major commercial species. Out of 4,070 applicants for Western Cape rock lobster, 2,564 were women. It is estimated that 50 per cent of those who will be given rights (only 700 rights of 700 kg each) will be women.

It remains to be seen how gender equity policies impact on women's marine resource tenure, and how these shifts impact on gender roles and relationships within fisheries at all levels—household, community, workplace, State and the local and global markets. Will the presence of women rights holders facilitate a much-needed paradigm shift in South African fisheries, contributing in any way towards the transformation of an exploitative industry into a more sustainable one that will promote sustainable livelihoods for their communities?

In the discussion that followed, questions relating to safety at sea were raised, given that women were going to sea for the first time. Sunde said that women had received some training on safety aspects. However, it was not easy initially for some women to go to sea.

### **Women in Organizations**

Chandrika Sharma of ICSF gave a brief background on the Women in Fisheries programme of ICSF, its objectives, and the perspective that had evolved. Women play a variety of roles with the fisheries sector, including as workers within the fisheries (paid and unpaid), as workers in processing plants, as those responsible for the family and community, as workers outside the fisheries, and within fishworker movements. The roles women play differ by region, by religion and culture, by age, by levels of economic development, by proximity to urban centres, etc. The common factor, however, is that these are rarely seen as 'productive', and are considered an extension of the 'domestic' space. Available data does not capture the work of women, its multidimensional nature, or the way in which they change in response to various developments.

With respect to women's organizations, Sharma said that women tend to be more organized at the local and community levels in most countries, though they are rarely well represented at the national/regional levels. It had also been seen that women's participation, where present, has strengthened the larger organization and broadened its agenda, bringing in issues of women as workers and women as members of communities. Most significantly, women have raised issues

that concern the quality of life within fishing communities—issues such as access to health, sanitation and education—and have brought in a community perspective to the fisheries debate.

It was unfortunate, however, that women continue to remain under-represented within fishworker and other organizations due to a variety of reasons, such as resistance from fishermen, patronizing attitudes to their participation, etc. Sharma concluded by stressing that while women need to be better represented within organizations, this participation should enable them to bring focus on issues that concern them. Women need to be clear on what they want to achieve within organizations and what form of organization would best achieve their objectives. Participation of women in organizations should also be able to lead to a questioning of the mainstream concept of production, that excludes work related to reproduction; a greater valuation and recognition of the work of women; reshaping of gender relations; and the sustainable use of resources and questioning of development that is based on overexploitation of natural resources for short-term profit.

In the discussion that followed, it was noted by the delegate from Zambia that women enjoy substantial powers in fishing communities. In the Chief's council, there was 50 per cent representation of women. They are also actively part of the fishing economy, in market transactions. The delegate from Mozambique spoke of the women's groups in his province, which were active on issues of credit, fish processing, managing resources, etc.

### **8.3 Cross-cutting Issues: Alternative Livelihoods**

Modesta Medard of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Tanzania, in her presentation on the Rumaki Seascape Programme in the Rufiji, Mafia and Kilwa districts, Tanzania, provided some information on the alternative livelihood options being explored through the programme. The coastal population in this region is estimated to be 137,728 people. The region is rich in biodiversity (corals, mangroves, fish). Issues related to fisheries include destructive fishing practices, and conflicts between the trawler and artisanal sectors. Other issues include tourism development, oil and gas exploration, and the development of transport and communication infrastructure. Local people primarily depend on the following activities for a livelihood: mangrove cutting, curio collection, mariculture, coral mining, beekeeping, handicraft making, subsistence farming, and fishing.

Given threats to biodiversity, the WWF programme in the region has the following objective: "Improved socioeconomic well-being of coastal Rufiji-Mafia-Kilwa communities through sustainable, participatory and equitable utilization and protection of their natural resources". The programme stresses collaborative management; communication, awareness and education; improved livelihoods; and habitat and species protection. However, there are several issues that have come up, including the fact that some community members do not accept MPAs as a tool for sustainable resource management, as well as the problems posed by illegal fishing by commercial fishers from other parts of the country.

The project is trying to promote sustainable mariculture of seaweed, pearl and fish. With respect to alternative livelihoods, Medard said that this was often a sensitive issue. Communities

sometimes perceive such efforts as putting in place exit strategies to fisheries, to eliminate local communities from fishing. Communities are often also apprehensive of taking loans to improve their livelihoods. Another problem has been that since the project has helped replace destructive fishing gear with more selective gear (through buyback schemes), those who were fishing using sustainable gear in the first place feel that non-compliance has yielded more benefits than has compliance. In general, adaptation of livelihood practices is often a difficult and slow process, involving cultural changes.

In the discussion that followed, it was queried whether efforts to improve livelihood opportunities for fishing communities from tourism had been undertaken, and whether they had proved effective. This appears to be an area that needs greater reflection, it was felt, as the common perception among communities is that while tourism has expanded in MPAs, it has yielded few benefits for local communities.

## **9. Fishworkers: Issues and Organizational Strategies: Experiences from Other Parts of the World**

### **International Organizations of Fishworkers**

Margaret Nakato of the Katosi Women Development Trust and the World Forum of Fish Harvester and Fishworkers (WFF) outlined the objectives of the WFF, whilst Jackie Sunde briefly outlined the history and key aims of the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP).

### **Organizations of Fishing Communities**

Sebastian Mathew of ICSF, in his presentation, highlighted that organizations exist at various levels: local, provincial, national and international. They can be either top-down or bottom-up structures, and can be formed to perform functions of an economic, social or political nature.

Organizations can be formed with an economic function, such as to supply inputs and to market output, tap into subsidy schemes, organize cheaper credit, generate savings, etc. Such organizations take the form of co-operatives (often membership-based), credit societies, marketing societies, etc., and are mainly of benefit to owners and owner-operators.

Organizations may also be formed with a social function, as to improve education, social security, provide amenities in fishing settlements (better housing, toilets, etc.) and to address other kinds of specific social issues. Such organizations could take the form of associations based on community/gender/religion/caste/ethnicity (First Nations, for example), etc. And finally, organizations, such as trade unions, could be formed to play a political role, such as to advocate for recognition of rights of fishworkers, processing workers, small traders, etc, for appropriate policy and legislation, and to fight against what is considered to be against the interests of the subsector. Trade unions are often membership-based (could be of owner-operators and workers, or workers alone)

Mathew drew on examples from India, where all these forms of organizations exist. He gave examples of issues that have been taken up by these organizations at the national, provincial and local levels. At the national level, for example, issues taken up have related to conservation, allocation and management of fisheries resources, such as the demand for regulation of bottom

trawling, and a ban on joint-venture arrangements. At the local level, on the other hand, specific issues taken up have been to improve water supply, sanitation, education, market facilities, transport, etc.

### **Fishworker Organizations in Chile and Senegal**

Brian O’Riordan of ICSF provided brief information on fishworker organizations in Chile and Senegal. In Chile, of the 54,751 fishermen registered, around 42,091 belong to some kind of organization, that is, 77 per cent of registered fishermen are unionized. This is far higher than the national average of around 15 per cent for workers in Chile as a whole, and it highlights one of the main strengths of the artisanal sector.

Artisanal fishing organizations fall into three main categories, including 505 sindicatos (unions), 28 co-operatives, and 119 gremial (associations). In parallel, commercial societies have been set up as a response to small enterprise promotion and to the other demands of government programmes in the productive sectors. Currently, 40 per cent of the caletas (communities) are administered by artisanal fishermen’s organizations, and can take advantage of the system of “caleta and maritime concessions”. In the caletas, these concessions may only be granted to legally constituted fishermen’s organizations, and require that their administrative plans for the port and related caleta infrastructure be officially approved by the Directorate of Public Works.

At the caleta level, artisanal fishers are organized into associations/unions; at the regional level, into federations; and at the national level, into confederations. The principal organization representing artisanal fishers is CONAPACH, the National Confederation of Chilean Artisanal Fishermen. The organizational form in Chile is along trade union lines. CONAPACH has around 50,000 members. It is entirely supported by donations from NGOs. It works on several issues, including allocation of access rights; literacy, street theatre and fishermen training; fish auction and first point-of-sale; agitation, lobbying and communication.

In Senegal, fishermen are organized at the village level into beach committees to organize fishing activities. There are two main kinds of organizations: government-stimulated (the GIEs) and the autonomous beach committees. There are also national-level organizations that group beach committees in different areas. These include:

- FENEGIE Peche, the apex body of the GIEs;
- the CNPS (the National Collective of Senegalese Artisanal Fishermen), an autonomous body, now largely defunct, due to reasons that include regional differences that caused much friction, weak leadership, and frustrated younger members;
- CONIPAS, the National Inter-Professional Council of the Senegalese Artisanal Fishing Sector. This is a new national-level organization supported by the government, which groups together artisanal fishermen (CNPS and FENEGIE), fish traders, and women fishmongers and fish processors.

In France, the Comités Locales de Peche (CLP) or Local Fisheries Committees are the main formal fishermen’s organizations. These represent the interests of vessel owners at the local, regional and national level. Fishing crew may belong to fishermen’s unions (syndicats) that represent their interests as workers. The CLPs bring the various “producer” interests together at

the level of the first sale of fish in the local auctions (linking vessel owners and fish merchants) in an attempt to try and link fish catches to market demand.

## **10. Regional Instruments and Processes**

### **South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC)**

Aubrey Harris, Senior Fisheries Officer, FAO Subregional Office for Southern and Eastern Africa (FAO SAFR), provided information on the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC), a high-level forum to address common problems of fisheries management and development in the Southwest Indian Ocean. He informed participants that SWIOFC was an advisory fisheries commission under Article VI of the FAO Constitution with agreed Statutes, Articles of Constitution and Rules of Procedure. The objective of the organization was as follows: “Without prejudice to the sovereign rights of coastal States, the Commission shall promote the sustainable utilization of the living marine resources of the area of the Commission, by the proper management and development of the living marine resources, and address common problems of fisheries management and development faced by the Members of the Commission”.

The eligible (voting) members were Comoros, European Community, France, Kenya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, Tanzania and Yemen. Besides members, relevant UN organizations and observers, including NGOs, could also participate in meetings. Local NGOs can either be represented in country delegation, or be part of delegations of regional/international NGOs.

The work programme of SWIOFC has a focus on Review of Marine Capture Fisheries Management in the South West Indian Ocean, Regional Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS), Ecosystem approaches to Fisheries Management, safety at sea for fishers, etc. A report on the status of fisheries development in the region and its contribution to food security and poverty alleviation is under preparation. This will include issues related to tuna fisheries, ecolabelling and improvement of fish quality and standards.

### **South African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Fisheries**

Jackie Sunde provided a background on the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Fisheries that came into force in 2003. She drew attention to Article 12 of the Protocol that deals with artisanal, subsistence fisheries and small-scale fisheries. She said that it covers a range of issues aimed at promoting and protecting the rights of small-scale fisheries, including the protection of fishing rights, fishing tenure and fishing grounds as well as ensuring an equitable balance between social and economic objectives. Member States are required to develop a strategy and plan of action to implement the Protocol. She also provided an overview of the organizational structure of SADC, and pointed out that a Fisheries Technical Committee is in the process of being established that will oversee implementation of the Protocol on Fisheries. The strategy and implementation plan is currently being drafted, and provides an opportunity for civil society and government departments to be part of the process.

Sunde also briefly drew attention to the recent Abuja Declaration on Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture in Africa (2005) through the NEPAD process. Governments present agreed to



“implement the provisions of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, in particular through improved governance of fisheries, ensuring the environmental sustainability of fisheries...and ensuring an equitable balance of resource allocation between small scale and industrial fishers.” She stressed that fishworkers should be able to advocate for the implementation of key provisions of these regional instruments.

## **11. Reporting Back on Group Discussion on ‘Organizations of Fishing Communities and Follow-up Actions’**

Participants of the three groups formed earlier were asked to reflect on the status of fishworker organizations in the region, their capacity-building needs, and key areas for follow-up as emerging from the workshop. The group reports are in [Appendix V](#). The consensus was that fishing communities, in general, were not well organized. The organizations that existed were often weak, and lacked capacity. There were few organizations, like unions, that could enable communities to become a more powerful force, or co-operatives, that could address some of the problems of an economic nature facing producers and processors. There was need to strengthen existing organizations and to create new ones to address issues not currently being addressed.

### **Follow-up Action and the Way Forward**

In the final session, a discussion was held on the way forward, a means of taking the outcomes of this workshop forward. Several areas for follow-up action were also identified. In the short term, the following should be prioritized:

- A list/database of associations that already exist in the region should be developed, detailing their objectives and activities.
- Exchange programmes between fishing communities should be initiated.
- The visibility of small-scale fisheries and its contribution should be enhanced, including through appropriate media, radio programmes, etc.
- Training programmes should be organized using the ICSF fisheries legal handbook.
- A workshop on the proposed ILO convention, with participants from Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Madagascar, Seychelles and Mauritius, should be organized by ICSF, AOS and ITF.
- A working group should be formed from organizations present at this workshop. This should liaise with NEPAD, LVFO, SADC, COMESA and SWIOFC, to push the agenda of the small-scale fisheries sector, particularly the need for training and capacity building.

Other areas identified included:

- Work towards formation of co-operatives, trade unions, ensuring gender representation, needs to be initiated.
- There is also a need to review legislation for co-operatives.
- There is need to strengthen associations/ organizations through training and capacity building, including on project development and management skills.
- It is important to identify resources that can be used to support such activities, for example, by ensuring that part of the licence fees collected through fisheries agreements be earmarked for activities that support the small-scale sector. A strategy for this at the regional level would be needed.
- There is also need to explore alternative livelihood options in certain situations.

## **BACKGROUND NOTE**

### **ESA Fish Workshop Fishing Communities and Sustainable Development in Eastern and Southern Africa: The Role of Small-scale Fisheries**

#### **1. Background**

In October 2001, ICSF, in collaboration with the International Ocean Institute (IOI), organized a Conference titled *Forging Unity: Coastal Communities and the Indian Ocean's Future*, recognizing the long and shared heritage of coastal fishing, seafaring and maritime trading that exists till today between Asian and African countries bordering the Indian Ocean. The Conference brought together fishworker organizations, NGOs, research institutions, universities and policy makers from 13 countries bordering the Indian Ocean, including from the East African countries of Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa and Seychelles. The Conference provided the opportunity for Asian and East African representatives from countries bordering the Indian Ocean, to exchange experiences, identifying several areas of common concern. It further recommended that ICSF initiate a programme in East Africa.

#### **2. Context**

The geographical area to be covered includes both marine and inland fisheries in 14 countries of the East African region, that is, Tanzania, Mozambique, Kenya, Madagascar, South Africa, Somalia, Uganda, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Seychelles, Mauritius, La Reunion and Comoros.

The coastal fisheries in East Africa are characterized by two large marine ecosystems (LMEs). To the north, the Somali Current LME includes the coastal areas of Somalia, Kenya and Tanzania. To the south, the Agulhas Current LME covers Mozambique, the Comoros Islands, Madagascar, and the east coast of the Republic of South Africa. The oceanic islands of Mauritius and the Seychelles fall outside these two LMEs. The coastal and marine ecosystems include a wide diversity of habitats that serve as important breeding, nursery and feeding grounds for many species. These include coral reefs, seagrass beds, mangrove forests, estuaries and lagoons, and areas of coastal upwellings.

The inland fisheries are dominated by three rift valley lakes – Lake Victoria, Lake Malawi/Nyasa, and Lake Tanganyika – that are located within the territories of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia. To a lesser extent, rivers, small lakes and man-made lakes and reservoirs contribute to inland fisheries production and fishery-related employment.

Artisanal fisheries exist along the coasts of all the countries in the region, and in lakes, rivers and other inland water bodies. According to available data, there are at least 500,000 persons employed in the fishing (primary sector). It can be estimated that about 2 mn people are likely to be employed in processing, trading, input supply and allied activities. It is also worth noting that existing data, in all likelihood, underestimates the number of people involved in, and dependent on, the sector, particularly in the diverse inland fisheries.

With a few notable exceptions, such as Seychelles and Mozambique, fishing and fishery-related activities make a relatively limited contribution to gross domestic product (GDP) and export earnings, and to overall employment and income. This, however, masks the local importance of fishing and related activities. In most coastal and landlocked States, fishing is dominated by artisanal, small-scale and subsistence fisheries. Conflicts between the artisanal and industrial/trawling fleet have been reported from the mainland coastal States of east Africa. There are also reports of conflicts with, and arrest of, migrant fishermen, both in inland waters and along the coasts of mainland States.

The marine capture fisheries yield for the east African countries bordering the Indian Ocean<sup>1</sup>, including the various island States of the western half of the ocean, was only 378,337 tonnes in 2003, representing only about 0.5 per cent of the global marine capture production. Despite these low catch levels, most of the coastal fish stocks of the region are considered to be fully exploited. Another anomaly is that in the southwestern Indian Ocean, the contributions of coastal and oceanic fisheries are approximately equal, while generally, coastal fisheries production far outweighs production from oceanic species such as tunas. A major management problem identified by the FAO is weak or non-existent data collection. Furthermore, as much as 33 per cent of the catches are not identified by species, making analysis of the status of stocks and management options difficult.

The western Indian Ocean, seen as a major tuna fishing ground, is estimated to contribute to about three-fourths of the total tuna catches of about 998,000 tonnes (in 2002) from the Indian Ocean region. The proportion of total marine production caught by long-distance fleets, targeting tuna, off the eastern coast, has been increasing, with France, Spain and Asian countries like China, Taiwan Province of China and Japan being major players. Illegal fishing, mainly for tuna, is considered a big problem in the region, both within the EEZ and in the high seas. The region is seen as one of the world's last areas where fishing activities are mostly unregulated, and where capacity, or effective institutional frameworks, to exercise jurisdiction over the EEZ of most countries, is inadequate. Local capacity to target offshore resources is considered limited, at best, though there are some reports of limited small-scale fishing for tuna. In such a context, there is need to reflect on how the benefits to littoral States and to their fishing communities from offshore fisheries resources, can be maximized, while ensuring the sustainability of the resource base.

Inland fisheries is of great importance in east Africa, a region with large natural lakes (the Great Lakes) and varied inland waters. There has been general concern over the

---

<sup>1</sup> Marine capture production from only the Indian Ocean side of South Africa included

overexploitation of fish stocks in inland waters, particularly in the export-oriented fisheries of Lake Victoria, given the growing demand due to high rates of population growth in the region and/or demand from export markets, coupled with the lack of effective governance/regulation of the sector.

Livelihoods of small-scale fishworkers, both along the coasts and along lakes and inland water bodies, are being affected by activities outside the fisheries sector, that deplete/degrade resources and, in cases, lead to displacement of communities from coastal/shore lands. In response to the damaging impacts of human activities, increasing attention is being given to coastal area management initiatives and to the use of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). From all accounts, however, effective implementation continues to be a challenge, with implications for livelihoods of small-scale fishing communities. Another problem relates to the use of non-participatory approaches to the management of coastal and marine biodiversity that alienate local populations.

Aquaculture production is still in the very early stages of development in most countries of the region (described by FAO as “incipient” or “erratic”). Aquaculture production is generally low, accounting for only about 1.5 per cent of total fisheries production in 2003. In three countries, aquaculture is beginning to make a significant contribution to overall fisheries production—Tanzania (2 per cent), Madagascar (5 per cent) and South Africa (0.5 per cent). The main concern is that the emphasis on aquaculture, particularly on its export-oriented and intensive forms, should not be at the expense of ecosystems to maintain biodiversity, and should sustain social and economic development.

With three notable exceptions (Seychelles, Comoros and Mauritius), the region is characterized by relatively low per capita fish supplies – well below the 10 kg average for developing countries. Fish also makes a relatively low overall contribution to protein supplies, except in the island States.

The region is generally seen as vulnerable. Of the 13 countries (not including La Reunion), the Human Development Report (2005), using the Human Development Index, classifies six as Low Human Development—Madagascar, Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique. The life expectancy in eight of them is below 50, and in three countries—Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe, it is below 40. Eight countries are part of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) grouping of the World Bank.

| Value of Fisheries for Employment, Food and Export Earnings of selected East African countries (from various sources) |                               |   |                                |                            |  |  |   |                                     |  |  |   |  |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| Country Name  | No. of fishers, WRI 2000      | Secondary sector employment (various sources) | Water area (sq km, source CIA) | Coast line in km WRI, 2000 | % of population within 100 km of the coast (WRI, 2000) | Contribution of fishery to GDP (various sources) | Per Caput supply of fish-kg/yr FAO year-book 2002 | Fish in total protein (%) WRI, 2000 | Total Prod (in MT) FAO FISHSTAT, 2003 (without aquatic plants) | Total Marine Capture Prod (in MT) FAO FISHSTAT, 2003 | Total fresh-water capture production (in MT) FAO FISHSTAT, 2003 | Fish Exports Value 000US\$FAO FISHSTAT, 2003 | Fish Imports value (000US\$) FAO FISHSTAT, 2003 |
| Comoros   | 7,676                         | 24,000  |                                | 469                        | 100  | NA   | 18.6  | 14                                  | 14,115   | 14,115   |   | 5  | 1,291   |
| Kenya (marine)  | 59,565 (3,500)                | 150,000                                       | 13,400                         | 1,586                      | 8  | 2% (FAO, 2004)                                   | 5.6   | 3                                   | 120,508  | 6,832  | 112,663   | 57,323                                       | 2,769   |
| Madagascar  | 83,310                        |   | 5,500                          | 9,935                      | 55   | NA   | 7.6   | 5                                   | 149,846  | 110,338  | 30,000  | 79,532                                       | 9,978   |
| Malawi  | 42,922                        |   | 24,400                         | 0                          |  | 4% (FAO 2003)                                    | 4   | 2                                   | 54,210   | 0  | 53,543  | 75   | 714   |
| Mauritius   | 8,408                         | 1,400   | 10                             | 496                        | 100  | <0.5% (SADC)                                     | 22.9  | 9                                   | 11,170   | 11,136   |   | 75,023                                       | 93,476  |
| Mozambique  | 20,000 (70,000 acc to SWIOFC) |   | 17,500                         | 6,942                      | 59   | 8% (1997 SADC)                                   | 2.5   | 2                                   | 89,483   | 78,125   | 10,948  | 86,317                                       | 9,457   |
| Le Reunion  | 805                           |   | 10                             | 219                        | 100  | NA   | 5.6   | NA                                  | 2,967  | 2,845  |   | 0  | 0   |
| Seychelles  | 1,330                         | 2,500   |                                | 746                        | 100  | 20% (SADC)                                       | 57.6  | 23                                  | 86,146   | 85,062   |   | 210,869                                      | 67,459  |
| Somalia   | 18,900                        | 60,000  | 10,320                         | 3,898                      | 55   | 2% (FAO, 1990)                                   | 2.1   | 2                                   | 18,000   | 17,850   | 150   | 3,394  | 392   |
| RSA total (Indian Ocean, side)  | 27,000 (10,500)               | 100,000                                       |                                | 3,751                      | 39   | 0.4% (source: SADC)                              | 6.9   | 3                                   | 827,750 (5,271)  | 821,954 (2,123)                                      | 900   | 393,127                                      | 75,959  |
| Tanzania (marine)   | 92,529 (19,000)               | 1,000,000                                     | 59,050                         | 3,461                      | 21   | 2.9%(FAO)  | 7.4   | 6                                   | 351,052  | 49,195   | 301,855   | 131,965                                      | 586   |
| Uganda  | 57,862                        |   | 36,330                         | 0                          |  | 2.2% (UNEP, 1998-99)                             | 8.1   | 5                                   | 245,431  | 0  | 239,931   | 23,493                                       | 1,038   |
| Zambia  | 23,833                        |   | 11,890                         | 0                          |  | 2.55% (www.intracen.org)                         | 6.8   | 4                                   | 69,501   | 0  | 65,000  | 526  | 1,649   |
| Zimbabwe  | 1,804                         | 6,300   | 3,910                          | 0                          |  | NA   | 1.7   | 1                                   | 15,600   | 0  | 13,000  | 2,698  | 1,528   |
|   |                               |   | 182,320                        | 31,503                     |  |  |   |                                     | 2,055,779  | 1,197,452  | 827,990   | 1,061,649                                    | 264,768   |

### **3. Objectives**

The workshop will be organized with the following objectives:

- ?? to identify, and promote understanding of, key issues in fisheries, aquaculture and coastal area development and management in the Eastern and Southern African (ESA) region, towards enabling fishing communities and organizations working with them to negotiate for programmes and policies that will sustain and improve their livelihoods; and
- ?? to develop and strengthen networks between fishworker organizations, NGOs, community leaders and other stakeholders in coastal and inland fisheries in the ESA region.

### **4. Expected Outcomes**

- ?? Better documentation of knowledge/ gaps on ESA coastal and inland fisheries, and fishery-dependent communities;
- ?? Better understanding of key issues of relevance to small-scale fishworkers and fishing communities in the ESA region;
- ?? Clearer perceptions of potential options and approaches for fisheries, aquaculture and coastal area development and management that could promote sustainability and equity in the fisheries;
- ?? Greater awareness about fisheries-related regional management initiatives and legal instruments relevant for fisheries;
- ?? Better understanding of information and training needs of fishing community and support organizations; and
- ?? Greater interaction/ networks between fishworker organizations and organizations working to support them within the ESA region, on issues of common interest.

### **5. Collaborating Organizations**

The workshop will be organized by ICSF in collaboration with the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA), Masifundise Development Trust and the Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements (CFFA).

WIOMSA is a regional professional, non-governmental, non-profit, membership organization, registered in Zanzibar, Tanzania. The organization is dedicated to promoting the educational, scientific and technological development of all aspects of marine sciences throughout the region of Western Indian Ocean (Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa, Comoros, Madagascar, Seychelles, Mauritius, Reunion (France)), with a view toward sustaining the use and conservation of its marine resources. The Association has about 1,000 individual members as well as about 50 institutional members from within and outside the region. Website: [www.wiomsa.org](http://www.wiomsa.org)

The Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements (CFFA-CAPE) is a coalition of international NGOs concerned about the social, economic and environmental impacts of EU fisheries agreements with ACP and other Southern coastal States. Founded in Brussels in 1992, CFFA established a permanent secretariat there in 1994. Its main activity is to provide information on ACP-EU fisheries relations to ACP artisanal fishing sector organizations, ACP and EU Institutions and NGOs, in order to help them participate and influence the decision-making processes governing ACP-EU fisheries relations (fisheries agreements, now called “partnerships agreements”, and EU development programmes). CFFA organizes meetings, arranges exchanges, runs training programmes, and produces information for policy advocacy. Since 1998, CFFA has been participating in the NGO group that sits on the European Commission’s Advisory Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture (ACFA). CFFA is also accredited to attend, as observer, various FAO technical consultations. Website: [www.cape-cffa.org](http://www.cape-cffa.org)

Masifundise Development Trust is an NGO working with fisher and coastal communities in Western Cape, South Africa. Masifundise strives to raise awareness and facilitate access to information among fisher and coastal communities in southern Africa, to enable them to realize their right to sustainable development within the local and global context of sustainable marine and aquatic resource management and utilization. In November 2004, Masifundise had organized a SADC-level workshop, the Southern African Small-scale Fishers’ Conference, at Cape Town. This had brought together fishers and fishermen, fisherwomen, traditional leaders and government representatives from SADC countries, to discuss the SADC Protocol on Fisheries.

## **6. Venue and Participants**

The four-day workshop will be organized in Tanzania between 7 to 10 February 2006.

It will seek the participation of fishworker organizations, NGOs working with fishing communities, traditional leaders, and policy makers from the following 14 ESA countries: Tanzania, Mozambique, Kenya, Madagascar, South Africa, Somalia, Uganda, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Seychelles, Mauritius, Reunion and Comoros.

A few representatives of fishworker organizations and NGOs from other parts of Africa and from Asia may also be invited, to share experiences on issues under discussion (example, on aquaculture, on community-based management, on joint venture and fisheries access agreements, on organizations of fishing communities)

## **7. Content**

The programme will provide information about, and stimulate discussion on, the following broad themes:

- ?Management of coastal fisheries resources
- ?Management of inland fisheries

- ?Integrated coastal area management (ICAM) and marine protected areas (MPAs): implications for fishing communities
- ?Aquaculture
- ?Fisheries for highly migratory fish stocks such as tunas
- ?Cross-cutting issues: gender, trade, diversification of livelihoods, and institutions in fisheries

Each session will weave in regional and international initiatives and instruments, such as the NEPAD process, the Nairobi Convention and SADC/COMESA, relevant to the subject being discussed.

## **8. Process**

In the preparatory phase, resource persons on each of the themes of the workshop will be identified. Participants will be identified, in consultation with collaborating organizations. Participants, particularly fishworkers and NGOs working with them, will be requested to prepare a brief presentation on one of the selected themes, most relevant to their context. The last day of the workshop will seek to explore future directions of work, and to work out practical arrangements to coordinate for this follow-up phase.



## ESA Fish Workshop

### Fishing Communities and Sustainable Development in Eastern and Southern Africa: The Role of Small-scale Fisheries

14 to 17 March 2006

Venue: Kurasini Training and Conference Centre  
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

#### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

##### GHANA

- 1. David Eli**  
Field Director  
TESCOD, P.O. Box DS 1469  
Dansoman Accra, GHANA  
Tel: 233 21 308146  
[tescoda@yahoo.com](mailto:tescoda@yahoo.com)

##### KENYA

- 2. Andrew Mwangura**  
Programs Coordinator  
Sea farers Assistance Program  
P.O. Box 92273, Mombasa  
(80102), KENYA  
Tel: 254 721 393458  
Fax: 254 41 230001  
[mwangura@yahoo.com](mailto:mwangura@yahoo.com)
- 3. Athman Seif Mohammed**  
Director  
Malindi Marine Association  
P.O Box 5861  
Malindi, KENYA  
Tel: 254 42 30123/0722  
613858  
[infor@mamasea.org](mailto:infor@mamasea.org)  
[athman@mamasea.org](mailto:athman@mamasea.org)
- 4. Davide Signa**  
Programme Officer – Fisheries  
FAO Somalia  
Box 40370 00100,

Nairobi, KENYA  
Tel: 254 723 363433  
Fax: 254 20 4451198  
[Davide.Signa@fao.org](mailto:Davide.Signa@fao.org)

- 5. Martha Wangari Mukira**  
District Fisheries Officer  
Fisheries Department  
P.O Box 90423  
Mombasa, KENYA  
Tel: 254 41-2222554  
Fax: 254 41-2222554  
[mar\\_mukira@yahoo.com](mailto:mar_mukira@yahoo.com)  
[adf@coastfish.co.ke](mailto:adf@coastfish.co.ke)

- 6. Dr. Melita Samoily**  
Regional Coordinator - Marine  
and Coastal Ecosystems  
IUCN Eastern Africa Regional  
Office, PO Box 68200, Nairobi  
00200, KENYA  
[melita.samoilys@iucn.org](mailto:melita.samoilys@iucn.org)  
Tel: 254 2 890605 – 12  
Fax: 254 20 890615  
mob:254 721498713 (Ke)  
255 748543499 (Tz)  
Website:<http://www.iucn.org/themes/marine/>

- 7. Dr Obiero Ong'ang'a**  
Executive Director  
OSLENALA (Friends of Lake  
Victoria)  
P.O Box 4580

Kisumu, KENYA  
Tel: 254 57 2023487  
Fax: 254 57 2021992  
[oonganga@swiftkisumu.com](mailto:oonganga@swiftkisumu.com)

**8. Dr Richard O. Abila**  
Assistant Director  
Kenya Marine & Fisheries  
Research Institute  
P.O Box 1881  
Kisumu, KENYA  
Tel: 254 733 922643  
Fax: 254 57 530045  
[abilarichard@hotmail.com](mailto:abilarichard@hotmail.com)

**9. Salim Ali Mohammed**  
Fisherman  
Malindi Marine Association  
P.O Box 5861  
Malindi, KENYA  
Tel: 254 42 30123  
[info@mamasea.org](mailto:info@mamasea.org)

## MALAWI

**10. Senior Chief Mkumba**  
Traditional Authority  
Box 24 Phalombe  
Blantyre, MALAWI  
Tel: 265 (0) 9386771

**11. Dr Daniel Jamu**  
Regional Director  
World Fish Centre,  
National Aquaculture Centre  
Box 229, Zomba  
MALAWI  
Tel: 265 1536298  
Fax: 265 1536274  
[djamu@cgiar.org](mailto:djamu@cgiar.org)

**12. Friday Njaya**  
Fisheries Officer  
Fisheries Department  
Box 47 Mangochi  
Mangochi, MALAWI  
Tel: 265 1 593835  
Fax: 265 1 594683  
[njaya@sdpn.org.mw](mailto:njaya@sdpn.org.mw)

## MAURITIUS

**13. Seremos Kamuturaki**  
Executive Director  
Uganda fisheries and fish  
conservation Association  
(UFFCA)  
P.O. Box 25494  
Kampala, UGANDA  
Tel: 077 2474228  
Fax: 041 344636  
[Seremos802@hotmail.com](mailto:Seremos802@hotmail.com)

**14. Jean Vacher**  
Regional Coordinator  
A.O.S, Sea Farers Centre  
Roches Bois, Port-Louis  
MAURITIUS  
Tel: 2174330  
Fax: 2174329  
[lamer@intnet.mu](mailto:lamer@intnet.mu)

**15. Patrick Fortuno**  
Manager  
Mauritius Fishermen's  
Cooperative Federation Ltd./  
A.O.S  
Sea Farers Centre  
Roches Bois  
Port-Louis, MAURITIUS  
Tel: 2174330/ 7125290  
Fax: 2174329  
[Lamer@intnet.mu](mailto:Lamer@intnet.mu)

## MOZAMBIQUE

**16. Jose Domingos Bacan Saide**  
Fisherman  
Cabo Delgado Fisheries  
Association  
Av. Marginal Parcela 141/8 –  
Maputo, Pemba  
MOZAMBIQUE  
Tel: 258 823838593  
[idppe@idppe.org](mailto:idppe@idppe.org)

**17. Simeao Lopes**  
Director  
IDPPE  
P.O. Box 2473 Av. Manginal

Parcela 141/8  
Maputo, MOZAMBIQUE  
Tel: 258 21 490807  
Fax: 258 21 498812  
[slopes@idppe.org](mailto:slopes@idppe.org)

## NORWAY

**18. Prof. Ian Bryceson**  
Department of International  
Environment and Development  
Studies (Noragric)  
Norwegian University of Life  
Science, P.O Box 5003  
1432 AAS, NORWAY  
Tel: 47 64965507  
Fax: 47 64965201  
[ian.bryceson@umb.no](mailto:ian.bryceson@umb.no)

## SEYCHELLES

**19. Albert Nicolas Napier**  
National Director  
Apostleship of the Sea  
P.O Box 43  
Victoria Mahe  
SEYCHELLES  
Tel: 248 323360/770711  
Fax: 248 323360  
[albertnapier@yahoo.com](mailto:albertnapier@yahoo.com)

## SOMALIA

**20. Abduwahid Mohamed Hirsi**  
Director General  
Ministry of Fisheries,  
SOMALIA  
[MOF.Joar\\_2005@yahoo.com](mailto:MOF.Joar_2005@yahoo.com)

## SOUTH AFRICA

**21. Jackie Sunde**  
Researcher  
Masifundise Development  
Trust  
601 Premier Building,  
451 Main Rd,  
Observatory 7925  
Cape Town, SOUTH AFRICA

Tel: 27 21 44 75164  
[Jackie@mafundise.org.za](mailto:Jackie@mafundise.org.za)

**22. Maria Magdalena Hoffman**  
Coastal Links Representative  
Masifundise Coastal Links  
601 Premier Building,  
451 Main Rd, Observatory  
7925  
Cape Town, SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: 27 72 664 7324  
Fax: 27 28 381 9637

**23. Dr Mafaniso M. Hara**  
Senior Researcher  
PLAAS, University of the  
Western Cape  
P/Bag X17 Bellville, 7535  
Cape Town, SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: 27 21 959 3772  
Fax: 27 21 959 3732  
[mhara@uwc.ac.za](mailto:mhara@uwc.ac.za)

**24. Michelle Joshua**  
Programme Coordinator  
Masifundise Development  
Trust  
601 Premier Building,  
451 Main Rd, Observatory  
7925  
Cape Town, SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: 27 21 4475164  
Fax: 27 21 4476722  
[michelle@masifundise.org](mailto:michelle@masifundise.org)

**25. Norton Douglas Dowries**  
Coastal Links Representative  
Masifundise Coastal Links  
7 Aandblom St Langebaan,  
SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: 27 22 7722716  
c/o [Jackie@masifundise.org.za](mailto:Jackie@masifundise.org.za)

## TANZANIA

**26. Dr Benjamin Ngatung**  
Director of Research  
Tanzania Fisheries Research  
Institute, P.O. Box 9750  
Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
Tel: 255 22 2650043

- Fax: 255 22 650043  
[bpngatunga@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:bpngatunga@yahoo.co.uk)  
[bpngatunga@hotmail.com](mailto:bpngatunga@hotmail.com)
- 27. Bishara Ali Juma**  
 Fisheries Officer  
 Department of Fisheries &  
 Marine Resources  
 P.O Box 774  
 Zanzibar, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 24 2237285  
 Fax: 255 24 2237285  
[fabishara@yahoo.com](mailto:fabishara@yahoo.com)
- 28. Daud Mohamed Shaaban**  
 Fisherman  
 Menai Bay Conservation  
 Kizimkazi/ Zanzibar  
 TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 (0) 777 485967  
[kizidi@hotmail.com](mailto:kizidi@hotmail.com)
- 29. Dianna Chambi**  
 Student,  
 University of Dar es Salaam,  
 Box 35064, Dar es Salaam,  
 TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 (0) 748 733255/022  
 Fax: 255 22 2410480  
[dchambiuk@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:dchambiuk@yahoo.co.uk)
- 30. Flora Stephano**  
 Student  
 University of Dar es Salaam  
 Box 35064  
 Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 (0) 744 855854  
[Nyaki76@yahoo.com](mailto:Nyaki76@yahoo.com)
- 31. Fr Galas Marandu Cssp**  
 Executive Secretary  
 Tanzania Episcopal Conference  
 (TEC), P.O Box 2133  
 Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 022 2851076-79  
[info@tec.co.tz](mailto:info@tec.co.tz)
- 32. Issa Ameir Suleiman**  
 Fisheries Officer-Planning &  
 Projects
- Department of Fisheries &  
 Marine Resources, P.O. Box  
 774  
 Zanzibar, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 24 2237285/  
 0777 487990  
 Fax: 255 24 2237285  
[wwfmenai@zitec.org/](mailto:wwfmenai@zitec.org/)  
[mcs@zanlink.com](mailto:mcs@zanlink.com)
- 33. Dr Julius Francis**  
 Executive Secretary  
 WIOMSA, P.O. Box 3298  
 Zanzibar, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 24 2233472  
 Fax: 255 24 2233852  
[Julius@wiomsa.org](mailto:Julius@wiomsa.org)
- 34. Lilian Lukambuzi**  
 Senior Environmental  
 Management Officer,  
 National Environmental  
 Management Council,  
 P.O. Box 63154, Dar es  
 Salaam, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 744 265158  
[Lilian\\_luka@yahoo.com](mailto:Lilian_luka@yahoo.com)
- 35. Magese E. Bulayi**  
 Senior Fisheries Officer  
 Fisheries Division- Tanzania  
 Mainland  
 P.O Box 2462  
 Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 22 2122930/  
 0787 321348  
[Magesebulayi551@yahoo.com](mailto:Magesebulayi551@yahoo.com)
- 36. Makame Makungu Juma**  
 Fisherman  
 Individual Fisherman  
 Matemwe Kigomani  
 Zanzibar North, TANZANIA  
 Tel: 255 (0) 777 422808/ 0777  
 851243
- 37. Dr Magnus Ngoile**  
 EGFT- Leader  
 MACEMP  
 Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA

Tel: 255 748 490049  
[makngoile@yahoo.com](mailto:makngoile@yahoo.com)

**38. Modesta Medard**  
Region Community Fish  
Development Officer  
WWF Eastern Africa Marine  
Ecoregion  
P.O. Box 63117  
Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
Tel: 0744 398892  
Fax: 255 22 2775535  
[mmedard@wwftz.org](mailto:mmedard@wwftz.org)/  
[modesta\\_medard@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:modesta_medard@yahoo.co.uk)

**39. Musa Juma**  
Community Facilitator  
WWF- Rumaki  
P.O Box 63117  
Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
Tel: 255 22 2775535  
[khamis\\_Juma@wwftz.org](mailto:khamis_Juma@wwftz.org)  
[khmsjuma@yahoo.com](mailto:khmsjuma@yahoo.com)

**40. Dr Narriman Jiddawi**  
Senior Research Fellow  
Institute of Marine Sciences  
P.O. Box 668, Zanzibar  
TANZANIA  
Tel: 255 741  
259126/777423183  
Fax: 255 24 2233050  
[jiddawi@ims.udsm.ac.tz](mailto:jiddawi@ims.udsm.ac.tz)

**41. M. Ngoyogo**  
Shirikisho NGO  
Box 71 Kilwa Masoko  
Kilwa, TANZANIA

**42. Ruweya Khalfan**  
Chairperson  
Fishing Group  
P.O Box 11 Kitoni  
Mafia, TANZANIA  
Tel: 255 (0) 745 861931

**43. Valeria E. Mushi**  
Principal Fisheries Officer  
Fisheries Division  
P.O Box 2462

Dar es Salaam, TANZANIA  
Tel: 255 22 2122930  
Fax: 255 22 2110352  
[valeriamushi@yahoo.com](mailto:valeriamushi@yahoo.com)

## UGANDA

**44. Margaret Nakato Lubyayi**  
Coordinator  
Katosi Women Development  
Trust  
P.O Box 3329  
Kampala, UGANDA  
Tel: 256 41 348774  
Fax: 256 41 348774  
[katosi@ntlonline.co.ug](mailto:katosi@ntlonline.co.ug),  
[katosiwomendt@yahoo.com](mailto:katosiwomendt@yahoo.com)

**45. Seremos Kamuturaki**  
Executive Director  
UFFCA, P.O. Box 25494,  
Kampala, UGANDA  
Tel: 077 2474228  
Fax: 041 344636  
[Seremos802@hotmail.com](mailto:Seremos802@hotmail.com)

## ZAMBIA

**46. His Royal Highness Chief  
Chipepo**  
Tradition Leader – Chairperson  
Lake Kariba Interzonal  
Fisheries Management  
Association,  
P.O Box 12  
Siavonga District, ZAMBIA  
Tel: 260 97789054/ 260  
1213916  
Fax: 260 1213916  
[chiefchipepo@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:chiefchipepo@yahoo.co.uk)

**47. Mainza Kalonga**  
Chief Fisheries Officer  
Department of Fisheries  
P.O. Box 350100  
Chilanga, ZAMBIA  
Tel: 260 1 278418  
Fax: 260 1 278618  
[shikalonga@yahoo.com](mailto:shikalonga@yahoo.com)

## ZIMBABWE

### 48. Aubrey Harris

Senior Fisheries Officer,  
FAO Subregional Office for  
Southern and East Africa,  
P.O. Box 3730  
Harare, ZIMBABWE  
Tel: 263 4 253655-7  
Fax: 263 4 700724, 703497  
[aubrey.harris@fao.org](mailto:aubrey.harris@fao.org)

## ICSF SECRETARIAT

### 49. Brian O’Riordan

Brussels Office Secretary  
ICSF, Sentier Des Rossignols 2  
1330 Rixensart, BELGIUM  
Tel: 32 2 6525201  
Fax: 32 2 6540407  
[briano@tiscali.be](mailto:briano@tiscali.be)

### 50. Chandrika Sharma

ICSF  
No. 27 College Road  
Chennai – 600 006  
Tamil Nadu, INDIA  
Tel: 91 44 2822 3630/ 2827  
5303  
Fax: 91 44 2825 4457  
[icsf@vsnl.com](mailto:icsf@vsnl.com), [icsf@icsf.net](mailto:icsf@icsf.net)  
Website: [www.icsf.net](http://www.icsf.net)

### 51. Sebastian Mathew

ICSF  
No. 27 College Road  
Chennai – 600 006  
Tamil Nadu, INDIA  
Tel: 91 44 2822 3630/ 2827  
5303  
Fax: 91 44 2825 4457  
[icsf@vsnl.com](mailto:icsf@vsnl.com), [icsf@icsf.net](mailto:icsf@icsf.net)  
Website: [www.icsf.net](http://www.icsf.net)

## ESA Fish Workshop

### Fishing Communities and Sustainable Development in Eastern and Southern Africa: The Role of Small-scale Fisheries

14 to 17 March 2006

Venue: Kurasini Training and Conference Centre  
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

| <b>PROGRAMME</b>                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Day I: Tuesday, 14 March 2006</i> |  |
| 0830 – 0900 hrs                      | REGISTRATION   |
| 0900 – 1000 hrs                      | <p>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION TO WORKSHOP</p> <p><i>Chair: Julius Francis, WIOMSA</i></p> <p><i>Background to Workshop - Chandrika Sharma, ICSF &amp; Jackie Sunde, Masifundise</i></p> <p><i>Introduction to the Workshop and Expected Outcome - Brian O’Riordan, ICSF</i></p> <p><i>Norwegian Programme of Support for Managing Tanzania’s Marine Resources - Eirik Janssen</i></p> <p><i>Book Release: ICSF Handbook on “International Legal Instruments of Relevance to Fisheries and Fishing Communities”</i></p> |
| 1000 – 1100 hrs                      | <p>PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES IN EAST AFRICA</p> <p><i>Kenya / Seychelles / Mozambique / Zambia</i></p>  |
| 1100 – 1130 hrs                      | <i>Tea Break</i>   |
| 1130 – 1230 hrs                      | <p>PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES IN EAST AFRICA (CONTD..)</p> <p><i>Mauritius / Tanzania / Zanzibar</i></p>   |
| 1230 – 1400 hrs                      | <i>Lunch Break</i>   |
| 1400 – 1530 hrs                      | <p>PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES IN EAST AFRICA (CONTD..)</p> <p><i>Malawi / South Africa / Somalia</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 1530 – 1600 hrs                         | <b>Tea Break</b>   |
| 1600 – 1830 hrs                         | <p>CO-MANAGEMENT IN EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA</p> <p><i>Status of Participatory Fishery Management Arrangements (PFM) in Malawi Lakes - Friday Njaya</i></p> <p><i>Co- management in Lake Victoria - Dr. Obiero Ong'ang'a</i></p> <p><i>Fisheries (Co) Management in Mozambique: The Situation, Constraints and Challenges - Simeao Lopes</i></p> <p><i>South and East African Co-management Experiences and Perspectives: Implications for Communities - Dr Mafaniso Hara</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>                                    |
| 1830 – 1930 hrs                         | <b>Free Time, Informal Discussions / Dinner</b>  |
| <b>Day II: Wednesday, 15 March 2006</b> |  |
| 0900 – 0930 hrs                         | PLENARY, RESUMÉ OF DAY 1   |
| 0930 – 1100 hrs                         | <p>BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION APPROACHES AND SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES / FISHERY MANAGEMENT: ISSUES AND CONCERNS FOR SMALL-SCALE FISHING COMMUNITIES</p> <p><i>Chair: Magnus Ngoile, Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP)</i></p> <p><i>MPAs in Tanzania - Julius Francis, WIOMSA</i></p> <p><i>Collaborative Fisheries Management Tanga - Melita Samoily, IUCN</i></p> <p><i>The Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) Process and Kenya Coastal Management Program (KCMP) - Wainaina Mburu</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> |
| 1100 – 1130 hrs                         | <b>Tea Break</b>   |
| 1130 – 1200 hrs                         | WORKING GROUPS ON CO-MANAGEMENT, ICM, MPAS   |
| 1200 – 1300 hrs                         | WORKING GROUPS ON CO-MANAGEMENT, ICM, MPAS (contd...)  |
| 1300 – 1430 hrs                         | <b>Lunch Break</b>   |
| 1430 – 1530 hrs                         | WORKING GROUPS ON CO-MANAGEMENT, ICM, MPAS (contd...)  |
| 1530 – 1600 hrs                         | <b>Tea Break</b>   |
| 1600 – 1700 hrs                         | <p>PLENARY FEED BACK FROM WORKING GROUPS</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p>  |
| 1700 – 1830 hrs                         | <b>Free Time, Informal Discussions / Dinner</b>  |
| Evening Event                           | VIDEO – DARWIN'S NIGHTMARE   |



| <i>Day III: Thursday, 16 March 2006</i> |  |
|---|--|
| 0900 – 0930 hrs                         | PLENARY, RESUMÉ OF DAY II  |
| 0930 – 1100 hrs                         | <p>AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHERN AND EASTERN AFRICA: PROSPECTS AND PITFALLS FOR COASTAL AND INLAND FISHING COMMUNITIES</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Coastal Aquaculture in Tanzania – Dr Ian Bryceson</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Blue Revolution - Dr Daniel Jamu</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>   |
| 1100 – 1130 hrs                         | <b>Tea Break</b>   |
| 1130 – 1300 hrs                         | <p>FISHING BY FOREIGN FLEETS – ISSUES FOR SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES: LEGAL FISHERIES ARRANGEMENTS AND IUU FISHING</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>IUU Fishing and Indian Ocean Piracy - Andrew Mwangura</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Legal Fisheries Arrangement - The Role of Small-scale Fisheries - Magese E. Bulayi</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Some MCS Issues - Dr Aubrey Harris</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>   |
| 1300 – 1430 hrs                         | <b>Lunch Break</b>   |
| 1430 – 1545 hrs                         | <p>CROSS CUTTING ISSUES: TRADE</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Fish Trade in Lake Victoria: Status and Challenges- Dr Richard Abila</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Trade in Fish and Fish Products - Sebastian Mathew</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>ESA- EU Fishery Relation - Brian O’Riordan</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>   |
| 1545 – 1600 hrs                         | <b>Tea Break</b>   |
| 1600 – 1800 hrs                         | <p>CROSS CUTTING ISSUES: GENDER AND ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOODS</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Women in Fisheries, Zanzibar - Narriman Jiddawi</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Women of Fishing Communities from Lake Victoria - Margaret Nakato</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Shifting Gendered Identities in Small-scale Fisheries in South Africa - Jackie Sunde &amp; Maria Magdalena Hoffman</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Women in Organizations - Chandrika Sharma</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Rumaki Seascape Programme - Modesta Medard</i></p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> |
| 1800 – 1900 hrs                         | <b>Free Time, Informal Discussions / Dinner</b>  |

| <i>Day IV: Friday, 17 March 2006</i> |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0900 – 0930 hrs                      | PLENARY, RESUMÉ OF DAY III   |
| 0930 – 1030 hrs                      | <p>FISHWORKERS: ISSUES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES – THE EXPERIENCE IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers (WFF) - Margaret Nakato</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>World Forum of Fisher People (WFFP)– Jackie Sundae</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Organizing Fishing Communities - Sebastian Mathew</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Fishworker Organizations - Brian O’Riordan</i></p> <p><b><i>Discussion</i></b></p> |
| 1030 – 1100 hrs                      | <p>INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>International Instruments: A Tool Box for Fishworkers - Chandrika Sharma</i></p>  |
| 1100 – 1130 hrs                      | <b><i>Tea Break</i></b>  |
| 1130 – 1215 hrs                      | <p>REGIONAL INSTRUMENTS AND PROCESSES</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission - Aubrey Harris</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Southern African Development Community (SADC) Fisheries – Using Regional Instruments and Opportunities to Protect and Promote Small-scale Fisheries in Southern and Eastern Africa Regional Instruments: The SADC Fisheries Protocol - Jackie Sunde</i></p> <p><b><i>Discussion</i></b></p>   |
| 1215 – 1315 hrs                      | <p>WORKING GROUPS</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strengthening Organized Fisherfolk in Eastern and Southern Africa</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Forms of Organisation</i></li> <li>- <i>What kind of support needed</i></li> <li>- <i>What issues</i></li> </ul>   |
| 1315 – 1430 hrs                      | <b><i>Lunch Break</i></b>  |
| 1430 – 1530 hrs                      | WORKING GROUPS (...CONTD.)   |
| 1530 – 1600 hrs                      | <b><i>Tea Break</i></b>  |
| 1600 – 1730 hrs                      | PLENARY, FEED BACK, CLOSE OF WORKSHOP  |
| 1730 – 1830 hrs                      | <b><i>Free Time, Informal Discussions / Dinner</i></b>   |

## Appendix 4

### **Reports of Group Discussions on Co-management, MPAs and Community Organizations, 15 March 2006**

#### **Group I**

##### **Co-management**

(Participants were from Zambia, World Fish Centre, ICSF, Mauritius, Seychelles, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique and Ghana)

##### **Histories of Co-management in Different Countries**

###### **Catalyst**

- Seychelles: Reaction to creation of fishery reserves without fisher consultation
- Mauritius: Reaction to poor conditions of work and resource status of the Banks fishery; achieved only through pressure from local associations and unions
- Uganda: government-initiated, beach management units, community-driven
- Tanzania: Part of a larger process of change linked with previous socialist community structure; resource concerns (Lake Victoria), and donors came later
- Kenya: Reasons in Lake Victoria similar to Uganda and Tanzania but co-management along the coast was a result of move towards Integrated Coastal Zone Management
- Mozambique: International pressure, IMF, realization that there was only 'virtual' central control, push for decentralization
- Malawi: Assertion of communities (with assistance of partners such as DFID, FAO, UNDP) of their traditional role of managing forestry and fisheries.
- Zambia: Pressure on resources

###### **Context**

- A whirlwind of democratization in the region in early 1990s and subsequent pressure of multiparty politics (in all countries, except Mauritius)
- Establishment of Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) (Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania)
- Increased requirement for stakeholder consultation before parliamentary approval and legislation
- Realization that managing resources means managing people

##### **Key Objectives, Principles**

- Seychelles: Management, conservation and sustainability for government. Fishers did not understand this at first because of inadequate communication.
- Mauritius: Conservation of biodiversity; to resolve multiple-use issues
- Zambia: Poverty reduction, conservation of resource
- Uganda: Government-initiated, beach management units, community-driven
- Tanzania: Sustainable development and utilization; restructuring programme pushed for reducing management cost, and BMU seen as cost-effective option (are also cost-effective ways to collect revenues, of which the BMUs also get a cut).

- Kenya: Reducing management costs, preventing resource decline, community development, reduction of conflict
  - Mozambique: Changed with reassessment over time. Initially:
    - o For government: minimize overfishing; reduce costs and improve enforcement effectiveness as insufficient capacity to control an extensive coastline; keen to involve fishers, but reluctant to release power
    - o For communities: opportunity for recognition of their key role and traditional rules not only in fishing but also in broader socioeconomic context. Control of their resources.
- Mozambique: Five years later:
- o Government: prepared to decentralize responsibilities
  - o Communities: requesting a greater role and more devolution of responsibilities and competencies

### **In Relation to Industrial Fisheries**

Important that industrial fisheries be included in co-management and not merely as a means of reducing conflict (Zambia, Tanzania, Seychelles, Mauritius, Mozambique). It was recognized that industrial fisheries are usually better organized and pursue their issues more forcefully. Artisanal fisheries, being less organized, are at a disadvantage.

### **Key Strategies Adopted and Community-level Structures**

- Seychelles: consultation by Government with primary stakeholders, NGOs, processors within fisheries management plans
- Mauritius: consultation, pilot studies, effort to reduce bureaucratic procedures
- Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania (mainland): BMUs with well-defined structure and powers. Specificities between inland and coast covered with bye-laws consistent with primary Fisheries Act/Instrument. Increasing their resource management responsibilities will require some centralized financial support. Processes for migrant fishers have been established. Village government overarching structure to BMUs.
- Tanzania (Zanzibar): Village Management Committee
- Mozambique: 12-member community committees consisting of owners, traders, processors, traditional leaders (advisers/chair) that are concerned with community fisheries resource management. Women's representation tends to be low. Government seeking a means of funding the community committees through part of the licence fees. There are also fisheries associations that are different in that they have a purely economic function.
- Malawi: Beach Village Units much like BMUs are found to work well in homogenous communities but not so well in heterogeneous communities.
- Somalia: Community committees with similarities to the Mozambique structure
- Zambia: Women are active in co-management arrangements.

### **In general:**

Co-management is a journey rather than an event. Fisheries management must be dynamic to respond to changes in the resource and in the aspirations and

expectations of primary and secondary stakeholders, as well as the community and government.

It is important that co-management is formally evaluated at regular periods (for example, five years). This was well illustrated by Mozambique where the objectives and principles of both government and communities changed over time.

### **Positive Experiences**

Co-management is a good tool to guide management because

- it explicitly incorporates the stakeholders;
- it opens the mind of government, private sector, communities and users, and requires all to sit, evaluate, negotiate and deal with the problems;
- all parties become sensitized to the resource constraints –if we do not worry about it now, we are likely to lose it in the future;
- fisheries co-management has contributed to decentralization of structures nationally; and
- reduces conflict between stakeholders, as well as between stakeholders and government.

### **Negative Experiences/Constraints**

These are constraints, rather than negative experiences:

- It is important to ensure real participation. Sometimes co-management is vulnerable to a few strong individuals. Needs equity of representation and not elitism.
- Communities must be adequately empowered so that they can contribute within consultative structures.
- It is important to consider livelihoods and employment. To survive while adhering to regulations and conserving the resource are sometimes contradictory issues.
- Alternative incomes and strategies that are outside of the fisheries sector must be also considered.
- It is important to consider the incentives for communities to engage in co-management, in terms of improved livelihoods/catches. Communities may feel otherwise that while most of the costs are being borne by them, the returns are inadequate.
- We sometimes do not talk the same language among ourselves in government and in our institutions. Extension services, capacity to support co-management and policy directions must be in harmony. Patience -- allowing time for people to change -- is important.

### **Recommendations**

Support for co-management must be long-term and sustainable. It must be well integrated to the national framework. The support of donors, partners and NGOs must not be through dollar incentives as these raise expectations that the country will not be able to meet after the project has ended. Modern resource advice that is attuned to co-management must be used such as risk assessments, options, and likely scenarios. Single MSY estimates are mostly useless.

## Group 2

### Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM)

#### *Histories: two main approaches*

- Government driven-top-down (experience from South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania and Malawi), where the effort is to meet commitments under international conventions. Some of the earliest MPAs are in Kenya.
- Community-based, bottom-up (example of Somalia where the community has started its own MPA without government support).

There is an impetus to bring more areas under MPAs, given the obligations under CBD.

#### *Objectives*

Conservation

Sustainable fisheries management

#### *Communities' Involvement*

In general, very low in all countries.

#### *Who Benefits?*

Main beneficiaries in countries are tourist operators; minimal benefits to local communities or even to governments. (For example, Kenya local communities have no benefits. In Mozambique fishers do not have power, and do not benefit from MPAs. All benefits go to tourism.)

#### *Negative Effects*

Access restricted to areas under MPAs

Relocation of communities (South Africa as an example)

Increase in conflict/cases of poaching

Private lands using force to keep users out

#### *Positive Effects*

Increase in catches (IUCN project example—fishermen fishing on the line or boundary of MPA is an indicator of this), more income

#### *Community Participation*

Need to be move from top-down to bottom-up approaches. New MPAs being undertaken using community-based approach. In Mauritius, the government has committed to setting up eight MPAS, and is setting up co-management committees.)

Case 1 (Already established MPAs)

Enable communities to agitate (awareness and training).

Through support from NGOs - international network

Insure that the representatives are democratically elected.

Use opportunity of reviews of management plans

Legal action against government within existing legal framework (South Africa)

Case 2 (New MPAs)

Proper information pre-establishment

Setting objectives together

Establishing management committees

Setting gender quotas

In general, MPAs should be set up, but should under strict criteria

### ***Recommendations***

MPAs should fit within a broader ICAM, national framework, focusing on:

Land/beach access and land tenure; and

Alternative livelihoods.

Set up effort limits on population growth, migration and role of private-sector players.

---

### **Group III**

This group (the Swahili Group) chose questions from all the three topics, that is, co-management, MPAs and community organizations.

### ***Community Organizations***

Kenya: The co-operative structures in place earlier have crumbled. The BMU structure present in Lake Victoria is sought to be replicated on the coast as well, pushed by donors. This has marginalized traditional elders; BMUs have become an arm of the government. They are, in some cases, dominated by traders.

Zanzibar: Village committees have been set up, and they liaise with the government. Traditional leaders have played an important role in building consensus.

Tanzania: Local communities in Mafia have been working closely with the government.

Mozambique: Fishers are largely unorganized along the coast. Fishers have formed committees for economic purposes, to get loans.

### ***Marine Protected Areas***

There are various types of MPAs, initiated by a range of actors such as communities, government, private investors, or NGOs/donors.

Zanzibar: MPAs were initiated by locals in 1997. 19 villages now part of this, partially supported by WWF.

Tanzania: In the Mafia Island Marine Park (MIMP), participatory and longer-term processes have been put in place. There are, however, some internal conflicts.

Protection has been given to breeding grounds and this has been beneficial.

Destructive methods like dynamiting have also been controlled. However, there are some problems, as fishers claim that loans have only been given to those who were earlier engaging in destructive fishing, to switch to more selective methods.

In general, fishermen have a difficult time, as it is common for tourists not to want them around.

Kenya: In the Malindi marine reserve, there is almost no community participation, and this has led to a lot of conflicts. The approach is top-down and the Kenyan

Wildlife Service (KWS), the enforcement agency, has used harsh enforcement methods. There is a Tourist Protection Unit (TPU) that is also a source of conflict. Fishermen who carry knives, for example, get arrested.

Mozambique: Islands have been given to private investors for tourism development. Armed guards are employed, and many fishermen are harassed, and their nets taken away.

The benefits from marine parks go either to private investors or to governments, with few benefits accruing to communities. The tourism industry is the main beneficiary. The negative impacts, on the other hand, are mainly on fishers whose access to grounds is restricted.

### ***Co-management***

Participants said that the partnership under co-management arrangements were often not equal.

Also, the often high levels of differentiation within communities were reflected in BMUs (or similar associations) formed, and the more powerful interests, such as the traders, often dominated these.



**Reports of Group Discussion on “Organizations of Fishing Communities and Follow-up Actions”, 17 March 2006**

**Group I**

***Existing Organizations***

Participants in this group were from Mauritius, Seychelles, Zambia, Malawi, Kenya and Uganda. The group discussed the kinds of organizations that already existed within these countries, their functions and objectives, and the kinds of organizations that were still required.

**Mauritius**

- Associations: These are non-profit, based in fishing villages, organized by gear. There are a total of 25 such associations. A minimum of seven persons are needed to form an association.
- Co-operatives: There are 23 co-operatives that are organized into a federation—the Fishermen’s Co-operative Federation Limited. The co-operatives are under the control of the State, and are also audited by the State
- Small companies (under the Companies Act): Even one person can form a company and State control is minimal.
- Maritime Transport and Port Workers Union—this comprises the Banks fishermen.

The Apostleship of the Sea is an NGO that works with village associations.

**Seychelles**

- Associations: There are several associations: the Seychelles Fishing Boat Owners Association, the Belombre Fishers Association, the Seychelles Christian Fishermen Association, and the Apostleship of the Sea.
- Co-operatives: There is only one co-operative, the Koudmen Co-operative Society, which has just been formed.

**Zambia**

- Kapenta Fishermen Association (white-dominated)
- Lake Kariba Fisheries Management Association. This is a registered association comprising four chiefdoms.
- Many village associations
- No unions, no co-operatives, no NGOs

**Malawi**

- Beach-level associations
- Each lake has an association.
- There is an apex body of fishers associations of Malawi (Fisheries Association of Malawi), which is very strong and can influence the government.
- Commercial fisheries have a loose association.

## **Kenya**

- Co-operatives, as a form of organization, have a long history in Kenya, but are now defunct. Though the government is trying to revive them, fishermen are wary of them.
- Associations are coming up in Lake Victoria and are relatively strong.
- Self-help groups (SHGs) are being formed on the coast.
- Big processors have a very strong association at the regional/national level.
- There is a Kenya Association of Sea Anglers (KASA), which is very strong.
- At the larger level, there is a weak union—the Kenya Union of Fishworkers.

## **Uganda**

- Community associations exist, though not in all communities. In some communities, women's groups exist.
- There are no co-operatives any more.
- An important association is the Uganda Fisheries and Fish Conservation Association (UFFCA).
- Many NGOs

## **Regional: Lake Victoria**

There is a regional association of fishermen around Lake Victoria called ECOVIC.

### ***What is Needed***

In general, most associations are weak, top-down, subject to over-regulation and political interference, and unable to be a strong force in influencing policy. They lack access to training and finance. Associations that exist need to be strengthened.

There is a need for a greater number of trade unions playing a political role of seeking better recognition of the rights of the small-scale sector. There is also a need for more co-operatives for improving the economic situation of fishing communities, and their access to capital and credit.

Thus there is a need to both strengthen existing organizations and form new ones capable of playing an economic and political role.

### ***What to Do***

- Need to work towards formation of co-operatives, trade unions. Need to review legislation for co-operatives.
- Need to strengthen organizations, training, capacity building. Perhaps the ILO convention can be used as a tool to mobilize fishermen.
- Can raise money for this through various ways: part of licence fees of fisheries agreements should go to the small-scale sector. Need joint strategy to lobby for this at the regional level.
- A working group should be formed from organizations present at this workshop. This should liaise with NEPAD, LVFO, SADC, COMESA and

SWIOFC, to push the agenda of the small-scale sector, particularly the need for training and capacity building.

---

## **Group II**

Group Two comprised representatives from Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Malawi, Mauritius, Zambia and South Africa.

The group felt strongly that, in general, there was an organizational and institutional vacuum in most countries, with weak fishworker organizations in all categories, but particularly, political and social organizations. This was attributed to a very widespread lack of consciousness amongst fishers of their rights, and a rather individualistic focus in many countries.

In Somalia, a number of district-level co-operatives have emerged since the tsunami interventions. These have a largely economic focus, and function to enable local associations to access and manage revolving funds, which they obtain at a rate of 15 per cent, and have six months to pay back.

In Kenya, associations have been formed with government initiative and are hence primarily top-down. They have been established in a number of sectors such as the tea, coffee and fisheries industries. The government has established 'Beach Banks', which make loans available to the fishers at a rate of 16 per cent. There is a trade union in the fish-processing sector.

In Uganda, the process of organizing has also been government-driven, with a few exceptions such as the Katosi group. It was felt that the lack of consciousness has had an impact on fishers who do not organize around their rights. There is no mechanism for subsidies in Uganda.

Malawi does not have a history of organizing in the fisheries sector and, until relatively recently, trade unions were not allowed. Although BMUs now offer some opportunities for organizing, these have largely been established through a top-down approach to 'co-management'. There are many differences between boatowners and fishers, and these power differences mitigate against collective actions.

In Zambia, fishworkers have had the freedom to organize, but there remains little organization. This was attributed to a lack of consciousness and an individualistic approach. The introduction of co-management is opening up possibilities for organizing. There are strong organizations of Kapenta fishers but they are for the boat owners and not the ordinary crew.

In Mauritius, the co-operative system imposed by the government has largely collapsed, but new initiatives are now emerging. There are many associations and unions at the local level. Fishers are able to access finances through a revolving

credit fund in order to get boats and outboards, and, although they pay interest, these purchases are exempt from tax. Subsidies are given to individuals.

The very top-down nature of most organizations was noted – particularly in countries such as Kenya, Uganda and Zambia, although new, more bottom-up initiatives are emerging in Mauritius, Seychelles and South Africa.

In South Africa, fishers have launched a network of fisher organizations called ‘Coastal Links’ that acts as an umbrella body for a range of community organizations in coastal communities, including fishers, women’s organizations, youth and HIV/AIDS groups. The group has a political and social focus, and aims to advocate for the rights of fishers as well as organize for access to sustainable livelihood alternatives. The group has formed an alliance with other fisher groupings, including the national congress of trade unions (COSATU), which organizes fishworkers in the industrial sector, as well as other groupings such as the Artisanal Fishers of South Africa.

### **Possibilities for Regional Organising and Networking**

It was agreed that, whilst regional networking could be an important advocacy strategy, there were only a limited number of advocacy and lobbying issues common to all countries across the ESA. The issues identified as issues of possible common concern included:

- Poverty
- Food security issues
- HIV/AIDS
- Illegal trade in arms

---

### **Group III**

This group (Swahili-speaking), which had representatives from Kenya, Tanzania and Mozambique, identified some of the issues not covered by existing organizations. These included:

- The problem of HIV-AIDS in migratory fishers
- Provision of credit
- Extension services
- Control of destructive gear and methods
- No framework to bring together associations/co-operatives at the district and national levels.

The group also identified what needs to be done:

- Training is needed on project development and management skills.
- Inputs are needed on organizational strategies and forms of organizations.
- Encourage a culture of saving.
- Ensure gender representation in co-operatives and associations.
- Enhance capacity of groups to lobby, and develop a strategy for this.
- Explore alternative livelihood options.

The following activities were suggested in the short term:

- List/database of associations that already exist in the region should be developed, detailing their objectives and activities.
- Exchange programmes between fishing communities should be initiated.
- The visibility of small-scale fisheries and its contribution should be enhanced, including through appropriate media, radio programmes, etc.
- Specific projects such as supporting women's groups for aquaculture activities, etc. should be taken up.