

**NATIONAL WORKSHOP:
2017 NATIONAL POLICY ON MARINE FISHERIES, INDIA
AND THE SSF GUIDELINES**

Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

19th to 21st July 2019

International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)

Executive Summary

On July 2019, a National Workshop was organised to develop an implementation plan for India's National Policy for Marine Fisheries (NPMF), 2017, to discuss the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines).

The workshop held from 19th to 21st July 2019 at Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India, was organised by the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF Trust) with support from the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations. Over 80 participants with 52 representatives of small-scale-fishing communities from ten coastal states and union territories participated in the programme.

The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

- Develop long-term and short-term action points for the implementation plan of the National Policy on Marine Fisheries (NPMF), with special emphasis on the vulnerable and marginalised groups;
- Integrate elements of the SSF (Small-Scale Fisheries) Guidelines into the implementation plan of NPMF within the framework of a human rights-based approach; and
- Empower fishers and fishworkers, and their organisations by building capacities and raising awareness to implement the NPMF and the SSF Guidelines.

The Workshop had six sessions with presentations from experts on various aspects of the NPMF and its connect with the SSF Guidelines apart from group discussions, open forum and plenaries.

At the Inaugural session, Manas Roshan of the ICSF Trust said this was the first in a series of consultation workshops. Narendra Ramachandra Patil, Chairperson, National Fishworkers Forum, recalled early discussions regarding the NPMF in Veraval and said it was a good policy and needed to be taken forward.

In his overview, Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust, explained that the seven pillars of the policy could be clustered into three groups, the environmental-ecosystem dimension (sustainable development, intergenerational equity, precautionary approach), socio-economic upliftment of fishers and gender justice, while taking the guidelines to people through the principle of subsidiarity and through partnership. The two important announcements made in the preamble of the policy were that fishers were the core of the policy and that the actions would be guided by the Public Trust Doctrine. He concluded that it was important to promote and protect the human rights-based approach of the SSF Guidelines; espouse them and ensure that they were consistent with the fundamental rights, duties and directive principles of the Constitution of India

In the first session titled ‘Fisheries Management from the SSF Guidelines Perspective’, K. Sunil Mohamed, from the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI), Kochi, made a detailed presentation on the subject. He began by analysing small-scale fishers and drew his conclusions based on the 2015 Marine Fisheries Census. He said specific areas were reserved, based on the depth or distance from shore for traditional fishers where mechanised fishing was not permitted. These could be considered territorial user rights for small-scale fisheries and the states could consider extending the use of the full distance of territorial waters to them.

Mohamed highlighted some of the recent developments in Kerala where the Marine Fishing Regulation Act (MFRA) was amended in 2017 and the (Kerala Marine Fisheries Regulation Act) KMFRA Rules were introduced in 2018 regarding regulations on fishing methods, minimum legal size of fish (MLS), fishing gears and boat building yards. Describing the three-tiered co-management councils for Kerala based on the Ashtamudi short-neck clam management plan, he said that CMFRI was now advocating a similar plan at the national level based on a zonation of the country’s waters. He also made a case for ensuring better markets and price for the catch by small-scale fishers not only through eco-labelling and certification but also by ensuring cleaner and better products.

In the second session on ‘Fisheries Post-Harvest and Trade’, speaking from the perspective of the SSF Guidelines, Nikita Gopal, of the Central Institute of Fisheries Technology (CIFT), Kochi, talked about the trade-related sections of Fisheries Post-Harvest and Trade from the NMFP and the SSF Guidelines. She said that while there were not that many points with reference to post-harvest and trade, those that were present were very important as they would have a long term impact. She explained that post-harvest fisheries embraces the cultural, environmental, economic, institutional, social, technical and marketing aspects of the supply, demand, preservation, processing and distribution of fish and fish products.

She examined how primary infrastructure such as landing centres, harbours, net-mending spaces, roads, markets and ancillary infrastructure such as ice plants required for post-harvest were mentioned in the instruments under discussion and said that stakeholder involvement to govern such facilities was a must and capacity building was essential for ensuring that the facilities were used properly.

She emphasised that there should be minimisation of loss in the post-harvest phase. Traceability and chain-of-custody were important for both the export and domestic markets. Cooperatives were a good way of ensuring proper credit and marketing.

Session three was devoted to ‘Mariculture, Deep Sea Fishing and Other New Initiatives from the SSF Guidelines Perspective’. Gopakumar, formerly of CMFRI, made a strong case for mariculture as the only alternative to dwindling catches from capture fishers. He said that mariculture zones need to be defined based on various criteria and leasing or permissions should be relatively easy and made available at the panchayat level. While a number of technologies were available through CMFRI, currently there were constraints in seed and feed availability as the sector had not yet taken off.

Marianne Manuel of Dakshin Foundation felt that it was important to examine at the actual language of the policy. While the NPMF clearly reflects that its main focus is on the fisher community, the mariculture policy, it appears to treat fishers as a mere part of a group.

She also expressed concern that the section on ornamental fish trade included a statement regarding a mechanism to ‘detect, pre-empt and regulate trade of wild-caught ornamentals’ when it was well known that it was quite difficult to differentiate between cultured and captured animals. Referring to the policy’s suggestion to carry out capture-based mariculture as seeds were in short supply, she said that the policy should actually have stated that culture activities should start only after seed viability is achieved. At a time when it is well recognised that fish stocks are declining and fleets are plagued by overcapacity and overfishing, extracting wild seed is questionable.

Manas Roshan presented points related to deep sea fishing on behalf of C.M. Muralidharan, Fisheries Management Consultant, by flagging points from the NPMF and suggested precautions to protect the rights and resource-base of small-scale fishers. He said that the most encouraging provision for SSF in the NPMF was that the Government would introduce new scheme(s) to enhance the skills and capabilities of traditional fishermen to undertake and popularise deep sea fishing.

The speaker in the fourth session on ‘Coastal and Marine Environment, Climate Change and Blue Growth from the SSF Guidelines Perspective’ was E. Vivekanandan, formerly of the CMFRI. Explaining that ‘fish’ were deeply embedded in the ecosystem, he said, a healthy environment was essential for the health of fish; hence the entire ecosystem had to be examined if the fish population was to be protected, conserved and increased. A healthy environment and ecosystem translates into happy fish habitats which are also resilient to climate change. There is a need to protect right places and right species for which an assessment of vulnerable and critical habitats and the status of vulnerable species is required.

V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust spoke about ‘Social Development of Fishing Communities from the SSF Guidelines Perspective’ in the fifth session. He pointed out that the NPMF does not actually have “social development” as an agenda and in fact has a limited ‘welfare and institutional’ agenda. He highlighted the fact that the policy has provisions to support livelihood restoration after natural as well as man-made calamities. He said that current benefits and failures of the welfare measures need to be better understood, such as who is benefitting from them. There was also a need to see if fisheries schemes can ignore the conventional BPL (Below Poverty Line) classification and consider small-scale fishermen (non-motorised and motorised), fish vending women and crew on the mechanised sector as eligible for welfare schemes as often, the BPL category excluded the deserving and included those who did not really need it.

The NPMF, he said, has failed to grasp the nature of fisheries ‘cooperatives’ which do not satisfy any of the principles formulated by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) and instead are largely used for channelling government benefits. There is a need to evaluate fishery cooperatives and assess how they are functioning, as the effective bodies are genuine

people's organisations which are ideal for engaging with for work and business. He said that the major gaps in the policy vis-à-vis SSF Guidelines could be summarised as being mainly aimed at fishermen with only a limited concern regarding the community as a whole.

Session 6 was titled 'Gender Equity in Fisheries from the SSF Guidelines Perspective' and Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust was the speaker. She said that the SSF guidelines were peppered with references to the fishing communities while there were some places where men alone were referred to. The reason for this was that fishing was regarded as complementary work, involving both men and women. To protect small-scale fisheries, women's rights to safety and livelihood security needed to be protected.

Women's work in fisheries should receive inputs similar to that of men. She said that the SSF Guidelines state that the State should ensure that the Convention for the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) is put into practice. Even though India had strong laws to control harassment and discrimination, fisherwomen faced a lot of harassment and discrimination and there was no mention of this in the policy.

In the 'Open Forum', one member of each state made a presentation regarding the NPMF, the SSF Guidelines and other related matters. Six speakers spoke in the Plenary on Fishworkers Organisations/Civil society organisations Perspectives on the Implementation of the National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017. There were also three sets of concurrent discussions where the participants sat in groups to suggest short-term and long-term action points from the SSF Guidelines perspective, many of which found their way into the action plan presented at the end of the workshop.

In the closing session, Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust along with Dr. E. Vivekanandan, Principal Scientist (Retd.), CMFRI, presented the Short-term and Long-term Action Points for the Implementation of the NPMF, 2017.



International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)

NATIONAL WORKSHOP:

**2017 NATIONAL POLICY ON MARINE FISHERIES, INDIA
AND THE SSF GUIDELINES**

Asha Nivas Social Service Centre, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

19th to 21st July 2019

Workshop Report

DAY 1: 19th July 2019

INAUGURAL SESSION

Welcome

Manas Roshan welcomed the gathering stating that there were over eighty participants with 52 representatives from ten coastal states and union territories. The intention of the workshop was to develop an implementation plan for the National Policy for Marine Fisheries (NPMF) 2017 from the civil society perspective. He said a series of consultation workshops had been designed with this being the first. The action points developed would be presented in Delhi in October. The format followed would be expert presentations focused on a section of the NPMF, a comparison of the policy with FAO's Voluntary Guidelines for Small-Scale Fishers (SSF Guidelines) and concurrent group discussions.

Opening Remarks

Narendra Ramachandra Patil, Chairperson, National Fishworkers Forum recalled discussions about the NPMF at the Annual general Body meeting in Veraval and said that it was a good policy that needed to be taken forward.

Integrating the SSF Guidelines into the National Policy on Marine Fisheries

Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust, made a presentation on 'Integrating the SSF Guidelines into the National Policy of Marine Fisheries'. He said that it was the first national policy that recognised the SSF guidelines. The first national workshop was held in Kolkata for inputs into the guidelines. He said that ICSF had received tremendous support from the Government of India for negotiations at the 2014 meeting at Rome.

Recognising the extensive contribution from civil society, the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) of FAO had dedicated the SSF guidelines to Chandrika Sharma who had worked tirelessly for it. The guidelines have to be seen together with the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF). The SSF Guidelines actually complement the code which is mainly trying to see fisheries management and several other aspects from an ecosystem-based perspective.

An attempt was made to see the NPMF in the light of the SSF guidelines. The seven pillars of the policy could be clustered into three groups, the first was the environmental–ecosystem dimension (Sustainable development, intergenerational equity, precautionary approach), the second was the intergenerational equity and socio-economic upliftment of fishers [gender justice, a term used in the NPMF is not used in the SSF guidelines] and the third was regarding the way to take the guidelines to the people through the principle of subsidiarity and partnership. Two important announcements were also made in the preamble of the policy: That fishers are the core of the policy and that the actions would be guided by the Public Trust Doctrine.

The Public Trust Doctrine is taken from a very important Supreme Court judgment (Supreme Court of India; M.C. Mehta Vs. Kamal Nath 13/12/1996) which stated that it will drive the state policy and is quoted worldwide as a very important contribution to the legal system linking the Public Trust Doctrine and environmental human rights. One of the major studies on the Public Trust Doctrine mentions that India and South Africa are the only two countries in the world that provide this kind of justiciability for this kind of environmental human

rights. It is a very important contribution made by India to the world. It says that the State is the trustee of all natural resources which are by nature meant for public use and enjoyment. These resources meant for public use cannot be converted into private ownership. It is therefore important to keep this doctrine in mind. Sustainable development is a concept heard every day. The Sustainable development developed from the Bruntland Commission report of 1987, is the cornerstone of this concept and has been linked to another pillar, intergenerational equity which states that fishing activity today should not affect the chances of the next generation to be in fishing or from thinking that it is a worthwhile activity. Fishers should feel that this resource should be protected and sustained for generations so that subsequent generations are not forced to take up other jobs because of depleting resources in fisheries that affect its sustainability as a source of livelihood.

Gender justice is a concept that was used first in the UN Development Fund in 2010. Gender justice combines equality and equity. It states that men and women are equal and that inequalities are not reproduced in family, communities or the state. It talks about the mainstream institutions – from courts to policymaking and states that they are accountable for tackling injustice and discrimination.

Many fisheries laws use the term precautionary approach which relates to adopting caution when information is uncertain, unreliable or inadequate. One does not wait for enough data to be generated before managing fishery. One can say that fisheries is being managed with the precautionary approach when the absence of adequate information will not be used as a reason for postponing management measures. The UN Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA), 1995, which India has ratified, defines this precautionary approach. Hence we have to comply with the meaning given in the UNFSA.

‘Socio-economic upliftment, Mathew said, is a term used very often; meaning improving economic and social conditions of fishing communities and raising them to a new standard. First there is a need to see the kind of services available, and whether there are any problems related to access. If no services are available, then there is no point in saying that one has a human right to education, for example. Thus, it is necessary to first create social services: health, education, housing, food, drinking water, sanitation, decent jobs and livelihoods; and then social security including the kind of measures that are there in society to provide relevant support.

A rights-based approach may be needed to ensure access to services such as savings and credit programmes, insurance programmes for the fisheries sector and so on. He also spoke about the subsidiarity principle that promotes action at the lowest possible level. Various tiers for taking up tasks have to be considered with the state taking them up only if the lower levels are unable to do them. In case of partnership as indicated in the NPMF, clarity has to be obtained to ascertain whether the reference is to business partnerships or participatory management.

The quality of a policy can be analysed by asking four questions: participation (communities of fishers take active part in decision-making); long term vision for fisheries as well as

eradication of poverty and hunger; inclusion of all sectors of fisheries and institutional structures and linkages at various levels with various groups. There is also a need to achieve policy coherence and ensure cross-sectoral collaboration (education, health, sanitation, human rights etc.) apart from having a holistic ecosystem-based approach.

The NPMF provides many handles to engage with the SSF guidelines. The policy talks about reducing overcapacity in territorial waters. There is corresponding language in the guidelines calling to avoid policies and financial measures that contribute to overcapacity. Capture fisheries statistics indicate that there is a linkage between depth and distance. The demarcations in UNCLOS¹ (United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea) are based on distance from the baseline and concepts that are not really internalised in the Indian policies. In Bengal for example, the baseline starts 50 miles from the shore. The marine space contained within the baseline is also important with respect to SSF. Mathew also wondered if from the perspective of artisanal fisheries, it would be possible to extend existing artisanal fishing zones.

With respect to surplus stocks, the SSF guidelines refer to the precautionary approach and risk management towards economic, social and environmental sustainability. Normally, the precautionary approach is used with reference to the environment; and the guidelines broaden this definition in fisheries, and also indicate the importance of the social perspective.

Mathew said that there was a need to come to terms with social development in India more than any other country, considering the number of people in fisheries. The SSF guidelines also suggested the use of preferential treatment where required to achieve equitable outcomes, particularly for vulnerable and marginalised groups. Mathew felt that this aspect needed to be reflected upon collectively.

An important point that needs to be transposed from the SSF guidelines into the NPMF relates to tenure rights of fishers. While talking about area-specific management plans, the SSF guidelines talk about tenure rights to fish and fishing grounds and demand the protection of small-scale fishing communities to ensure that they are not evicted and that their tenure rights are not taken away. The importance of traditional knowledge (TK) was also a key contribution of the SSF guidelines in terms of respecting and documenting it and its application to sustainable fisheries, while providing technical and financial assistance to organise, maintain, exchange and improve the traditional knowledge of aquatic living resources and fishing techniques; and to upgrade the knowledge of aquatic ecosystems. Mathew said that these are new language inputs that have come into the guidelines that tie up with traditional fisheries knowledge with science. He said that action points have been proposed and attempts should be made to raise the importance of these dimensions of traditional knowledge.

‘Tenure rights’ is a new concept and there is a need to engage with what it means in terms of the rights of people, communities and others to resources through tenure systems. There is a need for a system for tenure right which lies out who can use which resources, for how long

¹UNCLOS: UN Convention on the Law of the Sea

and under what conditions. There is also a need to recognise the fact that tenure right is not only for the community but for others as well and hence, there is a need to negotiate one's tenure right with the tenure rights of others. Consultation and participation is the only way to ensure that one's tenure rights are not getting extinguished with the entry of other stakeholders.

Referring to the need to protect tenure rights of traditional fishers affected by Marine Protected Areas (MPA), he said that there was a need to broaden the discussion on tenure rights to also address internal and external threats, allocation of fishery resources and fishing grounds, restoration of access to traditional fishing grounds; as well as access of fishing communities to their habitations, affected by natural calamities, as indicated in the SSF guidelines. He said that there were elements in the guidelines in section 5a which could actually be used by fishing communities to broaden the elements of tenure rights to protect some of their interests related to fishing.

Mathew said that it was the first time that co-management had been recognised in a national policy. The SSF guidelines had made many points clarifying the roles and responsibilities within the context of co-management arrangements, agreed through a participatory and legally supported process. The next step would be to look at the kind of participatory process that would enhance or deepen the meaning of co-management, its application and the kind of legal process at the local level that would be required so that it was permanent and not project-dependent. The question is - can co-management be brought into pre-harvest and post-harvest operations so that there is promotion of responsible fisheries? This is because co-management is not only for access to fishing grounds but also about how fishing can be managed responsibly.

The kind of knowledge that the community can contribute to resource conservation and management, the kind of perspectives that can be promoted and the kind of needs that can be articulated through the co-management structure also need to be looked at. These are interesting dimensions of the guidelines that can be incorporated in the national policy on co-management.

Saying that the policy unambiguously announces that the earlier deep sea policy is not going to be upheld and that the new approach will be to build the capacity of existing fishers, Mathew said that the SSF guidelines' language that 'capacity development should build on existing knowledge and skills and be a two-way process of knowledge transfer could be used. For example, resource assessment could be through a participatory process - to know about the resource situation, how many boats should be used, what should be the size of the boat - so that it does not replicate a model that we are not happy with but comes up with a new model that mimics the morphology or characteristic of one that satisfies us.

He concluded by going back to the seven pillars and said it was important to protect and promote the human rights approach in the guidelines that have also been mentioned in the national policy. These should be made consistent with the fundamental rights and directive principles of the Constitution of India. Mathew called for multiple strategies for different components of the policy.

Group photo and tea break followed this session.

Session 1

Fisheries Management from the SSF Guidelines Perspective

This session was chaired by Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust. K. Sunil Mohamed, Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Kochi, who made the presentation, said that the NPMF was a landmark document as it was the first policy to be formulated based on a stakeholder survey. Around 84 questions in different languages were sent to a large number of respondents in various states. Of nearly 4000 respondents, the maximum were from Maharashtra whereas in Kerala, many stakeholders and leaders boycotted the survey as they were unhappy with the committee. Mohamed emphasised that the expert members of the committee took strength from the responses, especially with regard to the Letter of Permit (LOP), as the LOP scheme was rescinded.

Sunil Mohamed said some of the articles in the NPMF were aligned to the SSF guidelines including those related to: blending traditional knowledge and science with business principles; the effective engagement of primary stakeholders and those engaged in ancillary activities; improved fisheries governance to address conflict resolution between traditional and mechanised sectors; emerging issues of common concern; and facilitation of national capacity building by encouraging coherent management approaches and better collaboration.

A point of direct relevance to small-scale fishers was the specific areas reserved based on depth or distance from shore for traditional fishers where mechanised fishing was not permitted. He pointed out that many states already had such demarcations (either distance from shore or depth-based: e.g. Kerala). These may be considered as territorial user rights for fisheries. The government would not only continue to provide support for artisanal / traditional fishers in consultation with user groups, but would consider increasing the area presently available to traditional fishermen in the territorial waters. Mohamed said there was scope for states to actually increase the area reserved for traditional fishermen or small-scale fishers, as they had the authority up to 12 nm.

Article 14 was related to the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM). This would be implemented with due consideration to the well-being of all living and non-living constituents of the marine ecosystem and the social attributes of stakeholders. 'Social attributes', he said, is a key word and participatory management or co-management in fisheries, recognised globally, as one of the successful management systems for multi-stakeholder, multi-species and multi-fleet fisheries, would be promoted. Such a co-management system, which could include local, regional, inter-state and national fisheries councils, would also play a key role in resolving conflicts among different fishermen groups.

According to Article 16, the Government will introduce new scheme(s) to enhance the skills and capabilities of traditional fishermen to undertake and popularise deep sea fishing. This is a sector in which small-scale fishers and traditional groups do not have access because of lack of ability. So the scheme(s) will, *inter-alia*, consider the modernisation of existing

indigenous deep sea fishing fleet, introduction of new indigenous deep sea fishing vessels through fishermen cooperatives/self-help groups (SHGs), on-board training and linkages to markets and export.

Mariculture and ecotourism are considered important alternate/ additional livelihoods. One of the points put forward – Game Fishing and the concept of Catch, Photograph and Release (CPR) is gaining importance throughout the world as part of fisheries tourism. Andaman & Nicobar Islands and the Lakshadweep Group of Islands, besides some coasts on the mainland, are ideally suited for the promotion of such activities.

Keeping in view the beneficial effects of the ban and cooperation of stakeholders, the Government will further strengthen the existing compensatory package available to fishers during the fishing ban period, according to the NPMF. Mohamed explained that since fishers were making a sacrifice to ensure resource conservation and sustainability, the government had assured adequate compensation. This would not only promote increased engagement of stakeholders in the conservation of resources, but also help in rejuvenation and restoration of fish stocks that have been showing signs of decline/depletion. He also referred to the policy's statement about updating the MFRA and aligning it with International Instruments/Arrangements by preparing a Model Bill.

Unpublished results from the Marine Fisheries Census 2016 indicate that nearly 70-75 % of the traditional fishermen families are below the poverty line. Catch trends remain reasonably positive. The non-motorised artisanal sector is decreasing while the mechanised trawl sector is increasing and becoming dominant. In 1985, the non-motorised artisanal sector contributed 23% of total estimate of fish production, mainly through traditional small-scale fishers. It dropped to less than 10% in 1995, 5% in 2005 and is now below 3%. On the other hand, the trawl sector which was 37% in 1985 has now escalated to 55%.

Mohamed pointed out that going by international standards, most of our fisheries would be considered small-scale. There were over 25 craft-gear combinations and it was important to develop a criteria regarding what constituted 'small-scale' because only then could government support be aligned to the really needy people.

Part two of the SSF guidelines discusses responsible fisheries and sustainable development. Tenure rights to fishery resources and preferential access to small-scale fishers already exist to some extent in our law and come under fisheries management. Under responsible governance of tenure, long-term conservation and sustainable use of resources is essential. SSF guidelines encourage fishing that minimises damage to environment and species. There is a need to consider the ecosystem and species when laws are framed. SSF also encourages participatory co-management to which MCS (Monitoring, Control and Surveillance) and AIS (Automatic Identification Systems) are aligned. These are necessary for the government to be able to implement preferential access to small-scale fishers. Policies leading to overcapacity need to be avoided; sometimes the government contributes to overcapacity by giving more subsidies for gear and craft. Refraining from fishing in waters of other countries is also essential.

Showing a table of preferential tenure rights in the different states, Mohamed said that the year of adoption indicates that these are all outdated. He said that according to NPMF 2017, states can increase the distance up to 12nm, although much of the mechanised fishing is happening beyond 12 nm with 70% of our catch coming from beyond this limit. Hence, it would make sense for the government to give exclusive access to traditional small-scale fishers upto 12 nm.

Regulatory mechanisms could be classified as input and output control. Input controls are the efforts put into fishing and include vessel registration, fishing licences, closed fishing seasons, trawl bans, closed fishing areas, gear specifications and controlling destructive fishing practices such as dynamiting or Fish Aggregating Device (FAD) fishing. Output controls include minimum legal size below which fish cannot be caught and controls over species that may not be caught such as protected species like marine mammals, turtles and seahorses listed under the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. Input controls are also being planned through zonal or spatial management where licences are given for fishing.

Recent Developments in Kerala

He then explained some of the recent developments in Kerala where the MFRA was amended in 2017 and the KMFRA Rules were introduced in 2018. The amendments relate to regulation on fishing methods, regulation on minimum legal size of fish (MLS), regulation on fishing gears and boat building yards. The last was important because overcapacity comes from the constant building of new boats. Other amendments included regulation on illegal entry of registered fishing vessels, regulations on closed season (this was a work in progress as some of the current closed seasons were not aligned to protecting species breeding at that time), fishing effort and co-management of fishery resources, Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification for sustainability and ecosystem approach to fisheries management.

Mohamed said regulations on Minimum Legal Size (MLS) of fish were necessary because a lot of juveniles were caught. Fishermen alone could not be blamed for this as most of the fish breed through the year and young ones exist almost all the time in the ecosystem. But some of the gears used had very small mesh sizes and did not allow the juveniles to escape. There was also a demand from the fish meal plants that had come up lately to support the aquaculture industry which were looking to convert low value fish (including juveniles) into fish meal. Thus, this had increased the targeted fishing for juveniles affecting some of the stocks. MLS had been recommended by CMFRI to the four southern states: Kerala (58 species – the state has already made changes in the rules and strict enforcement is in place), Karnataka (72 species), Tamil Nadu (113 species) and Andhra Pradesh (61 species) but these states have not yet taken action. In Maharashtra and Gujarat, the list has not yet been given to the government and in West Bengal and Odisha it has not yet been prepared.

He informed that the NPMF had recommended the creation of fish refugia and protected areas for conservation of vulnerable marine ecosystem and protection of iconic and endangered, threatened and protected species through a consultative process. Throughout the world, people recognised that this was a passive method of fisheries management. By not fishing in

a particular area, stocks were allowed to regenerate and the area served as a kind of refuge for fish stocks. It also said that the rights of the traditional fishermen should be secured and their livelihoods should not be impacted by such conservation measures. Mohamed said the cooperation and understanding of fishers regarding why such areas were required, was imperative. He pointed out that there were examples from the rest of the world where such systems worked well because just by earmarking areas where fish breeding was maximum and protecting it from any fishing; fish stock were allowed to regenerate faster and there was also a spill-over effect.

He said consultations with fishermen in Kerala indicated that they did not agree with the concept of fish refugia, claiming it was not possible, but they could not support their views with reasons. Mohamed said it was worth trying the idea before discarding it if it did not work. In 2013 the trawl ban committee had recommended that MPAs were a very successful passive form of fisheries management and could also work as mariculture zones, as mariculture was the culture of organisms in the sea using cages or structures, which also needed protection. Kerala had recently amended its rules in order to accommodate these two concepts together.

The Kerala government amended its rules regarding the illegal entry of registered fishing vessels. The penalty has been made very high to serve as a deterrent to fishing vessels trespassing in other waters. UNCLOS allows innocent passage for vessels from other countries and the Chinese vessels that came recently to Ratnagiri have come under this clause. The AIS (Automatic Identification System) is essential for monitoring the movement of boats, especially from a sea-safety angle and Kerala amended its rules to make AIS effective from Nov 30, 2019. The Kerala government has also amended rules placing a moratorium on new fishing crafts for the next ten years allowing only replacements. Registration of boat building yards is mandatory now as overcapacity is as much as 430 % in some sectors.

The section on co-management or participatory management which recognises fishermen participation indicates that governments cannot manage fisheries and tackle problems without the involvement of all stakeholders. Fishers are empowered to become active members of the fisheries management team, balancing rights and responsibilities, and working in partnership, rather than antagonistically, with the government. Very often it has been seen that fishers have differences of opinion with the government, usually when the latter makes a top-down decision, affecting fishers. In the co-management system a bottom-up approach is proposed where decisions are taken at the bottom and the government approves it based on a consensus approach.

Currently, the Government of Kerala has implemented a consultative co-management approach where the government consults all stakeholders and takes the final decision. The Kerala MFRA was amended in September 2017 to bring in three-tiered co-management councils for which terms of reference were developed; state fisheries management councils (SMFC) meetings started in 2019 and district councils will begin functioning this year. These council management systems were developed based on trials with the short-neck clam species

in the Ashtamudi Lake. CMFRI developed a clam fisheries management plan and advocated an Ashtamudi Clam Fisheries Governance Council. It was a 20 member council with the district collector of Kollam as Chairman. It meets four times in a year. The catch trends of Ashtamudi clam vary between 10,000-12,000 tonnes with catch rates of about 60-70 kg.

In 2015, CMFRI found from their regular biomass surveys in the Ashtamudi Lake the clam biomass was very low and suggested an additional day of fishing holiday, other than Sunday. Saturday and Sunday were taken as holidays; fishermen members agreed to this and this helped the catch rate to continue at the same level. There is surveillance and inspections and violations are punished.

CMFRI is now proposing a similar system for the entire country. Thus there will be the National Marine Fisheries Council, the Regional (multi-state) Council and the state Fisheries Monitoring Centre (FMC). The regional councils will be as follows: The North East Arabian Sea Regional Fisheries Management Council (NEAS RFMC) will include Gujarat and Maharashtra, and the South East Asian Arabian Sea Regional Fisheries Management Council (SEAS RFMC) for the South East Arabian Sea will include Goa, Karnataka and Kerala. The South West Bay of Bengal Fisheries Regional Fisheries Management Council (SWBOB RFMC) will be for the South West Bay of Bengal including Tamil Nadu, Puducherry and Andhra Pradesh, while the North West Bay of Bengal Regional Fisheries Management Council (NWBOB RFMC) will look after North West Bay of Bengal, including Odisha and West Bengal. The LAKS/ EBOB/ ANS FMC will include the island ecosystems such as Lakshadweep, Eastern Bay of Bengal and the Andaman Sea. There will also be multiple state councils.

Fisheries certification or eco-labelling, a market-based tool is gaining importance with the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), an international non-profit organisation certifying if a fishery is sustainable. Such certification could enable getting a premium price apart from the product reaching better markets. Around 15 % of the global market is now certified by the MSC. There is a need for fisheries certification because India's share in global seafood exports is 4% and is growing. A number of species are now moving towards certification because of the demand from importers as they are mostly looking for sustainably certified fisheries. Currently, more than twelve fisheries in India are moving towards MSC certification after the Ashtamudi clam. Most exporters are looking at shrimp, cephalopods etc. Among these, gillnetters caught the Indian oil sardine in Kerala (Kollam) and the blue swimming crab in Tamil Nadu; pole and line caught skipjack tuna from Lakshadweep Islands and trap caught lobsters in Tamil Nadu; all of them were from the SSF sector.

In the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM), not only living species but also non-living components and human interactions are taken into consideration. This was the approach used for the Ashtamudi short-neck clam management. In the precautionary approach, not having sufficient knowledge should not prevent one from taking a decision regarding fish stock conservation. Thus, even if the breeding period is not exactly known, a regulation to conserve breeding stock can be put in place. In the adaptive management system, there is an annual biomass survey conducted by CMFRI based on which

recommendations are given to the governing council which takes the decisions. With reference to the principles of participation, there is already a twenty-member Ashtamudi Clam Fisheries Governance Council (ACFGC) with multiple stakeholder representation and decisions for managing the fisheries are taken by it. Incentives can be used in management but currently only negative incentives (punishment) are in place. To ensure sectoral integration, representatives from the core sector, tourism, exporters and others are members of the governing council.

Mohamed summarised his presentation as follows:

- Advisories to SFDs (Sustainable fisheries Division) to earmark the entire 12nm territorial water zone as reserved for SSF
- Make Automatic Identification System/Vessel Monitoring System mandatory to enforce the above
- Transition to participatory co-management systems in all states and at national level
- Make SSFs more amenable to fisheries management advisories
- Set targets to reduce the number of BPL families among SSFs
- Ensure better markets and price for SSF catch not only through certification but also by ensuring cleaner and better products from SSF.

Sebastian Mathew thanked Mohamed for his comprehensive presentation and threw open the floor for discussion.

Discussion

Ravikiran wanted to know whether the census of fishers 2016 was available on the CMFRI site. Sunil said it was not. He added that the census was conducted on the mainland by the CMFRI and in the islands by the FSI. Since it was funded by the earlier department of animal husbandry, dairying and fisheries (now, department of fisheries), it was the custodian of the data. The figures were finalised and handed over six months ago but the department has not yet published the report.

A participant referred to the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) said that ships from various states were encroaching on each other's areas and the lethargy in VMS implementation by states led to conflicts. He wanted to know the role of CMFRI in forcing governments in implementing the VMS. Sunil said that currently Maharashtra was the only state implementing VMS, but only for purse-seine vessels because of a conflict between purse-seine and trawlers in the state, to ensure that they did not operate within 12 nm. He said that the Global Fishing Watch funded by the Leonardo de Caprio foundation shows all vessels having AIS in the world. By registering on the site, one can know the name of the vessel, call sign etc. He pointed out that CMFRI could only advise the state government but could not force anybody to do anything; however, based on their advisory, the Kerala government had amended its rules to introduce AIS in all its vessels.

A participant pointed out that while territorial waters up to 12 nm were supposed to be for small-scale fishers but in West Bengal, they went up to 50 km. He wanted to know why small-scale fishers should be restricted to 12 nm. To this, Mohamed said that currently, West Bengal had only up to 3 nm reserved for small-scale fishers. As per the Constitution of India, territorial waters should be under the control of the respective maritime state. To increase the distance beyond 12 nm, the Constitution would have to be amended; not impossible but a larger question.

Pradip Chatterjee from West Bengal said that it should be connected with depth. He said that they had demanded that there should be a central Act for the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) as fishers went well beyond the 12 nm for fishing. Mohamed responded that reservation up to a distance did not mean that they could be told not to go beyond that distance. He also said that managing by depth was difficult.

Deepak from Andhra Pradesh said that with reference to restricting juvenile fishing, it would be better to ban the netting used to catch juveniles. Mohamed said that this was what Kerala had done, they had specified different mesh sizes and net sizes for each type of gear – for trawlers, gillnetters etc. the government had also put controls on net making factories so that they could not manufacture illegal mesh-size nets.

Jones from Tamil Nadu said that he had several doubts regarding the way that the marine fisheries policy was formulated. He said the premise on which small-scale fishers were to be defined was not enunciated in the policy. The second point he made was related to overcapacity. According to the Fishery Survey of India (FSI) statement in parliament, there was no fish depletion at all. However, CMFRI's 2018 report said that there was a depletion of resources due to climate change and other anomalies. But this was not addressed in the policy. The third point he referred was regarding the arrest of fishers in other countries and the support provided by the government. Fishers were unfamiliar with the UNCLOS. The trawl boats were given by the Government of India. For example, when trawlers were given to Rameshwaram fishers, they needed to be told about the distance to the Sri Lankan border and that it should not be crossed. The policy talks about eco-labelling but this would curtail the rights of headload vending women; under such conditions, how could one talk about gender equality? The mariculture area within the protected areas was a contradictory notion. The online survey regarding the policy had only yes and no options. Besides, how many fishers had accessed the online questions was another question mark.

Mohamed said before 2017, no fishers were consulted during the formulation of earlier policies and thus, this was a step forward. Only 10% of the survey was online. While there were drawbacks, the fact was that solutions were not easily found. With reference to certification, he said, it did not take away the livelihood of the fish vending women. It was looking at obtaining more from domestic exports. Regarding BPL numbers in the fishing community, Mohamed felt, the data may not be really correct but it did indicate considerable poverty among fishermen.

Kiran Koli from Maharashtra demanded that destructive fishing should be clearly explained in the NPMF. He said 86% of fish are available in coastal waters and there are not too many fish in the deep sea. Under such conditions, why push small-scale fishers into deep sea fishing? Destructive fishing in places where the catch is good should be banned.

Vengadesaperumal said that the sea was not a factory and fishing was akin to hunting; hence, how could catching certain species be prevented. Mohamed said that it was a good question but he had no answers. The Indian Wild Life Protection Act (WLPA) prohibits fishing of whale sharks, mammals and turtles but agreed that it was difficult to know when a net would come up with such animals. Hence, what could help would be to release animals like turtles once they were caught in the net.

A participant from West Bengal said that for boats less than 30 Horse Power (HP), registration had been closed. The GoI was giving loans for making large boats, but was not allowing registration of small boats. With regard to commercial mariculture, they had raised objections during consultations because mariculture would block navigational channels. It was also emphasised that there could not be alternate livelihoods for small-scale fishermen. Those small-scale fishers who had lost their livelihood as there were no fish in the sea were forced into other activities. Only community-based ecotourism could serve as an alternate livelihood as ecotourism could also be done by corporates.

Nikita Gopal said that nowhere in the policy does it say that community-based ecotourism should not be carried out. Rather, one should take examples from Southeast Asia where they have been very successful. Mohamed also said that the public-private partnership (PPP) mode referred only to infrastructure and that the policy only broadly talked about ecotourism.

Session 2

Fisheries Post-Harvest and Trade from the SSF Guidelines Perspective

This session was chaired by Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust.

Nikita Gopal, Principal Scientist, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, spoke about 'Fisheries Post-Harvest and Trade related sections from the NMFP and the SSF Guidelines. She began by saying that post-harvest fisheries comprise the activities that take place from the time the fish is landed or harvested until it is consumed. Post-harvest fisheries means everything that comes after the fish is caught till it reaches the end consumer who could be a direct consumer, importer/ exporter or any factory or fish meal processor. Fish may go directly from the landing centre to wholesale or retail or other markets. In landing centres, seafood agents may collect it and send it either for pre-processing or processing; it may go for traditional drying or curing or it could go into make fish meal or oil. Once it reaches the landing centre, it takes many channels. Thus post-harvest embraces the cultural, environmental, economic, institutional, social, technical and marketing aspects of the supply, demand, preservation, processing and distribution of fish and fish products. Marketing can be described as a post-harvest activity though it is usually dealt with separately in all instruments, Acts etc.

According to Nikita, primary infrastructures such as landing centres, harbours, net mending spaces, roads, markets and ancillary infrastructures such as ice plants are required for post-harvest from any instrument. She then proceeded to examine if they were mentioned in the instruments under discussion. Section 7 of the SSF guidelines has ten points that talk of value chains, post-harvest and trade. Section 8 talks of gender equality. In Section 7 of the SSF guidelines, point two recognises women's role in post-harvest fisheries as 66% of all activities are done by women.

Paragraphs 29-32 of the NPMF discuss post-harvest and processing sectors. In paragraph 29, the first point carries a general observation regarding the *hygiene and sanitary aspects of fish landing centres, harbours and fish markets in the country need improvement*. This is directly related to infrastructure. It is well known that infrastructure is poor and insufficient in meeting requirements. This is reflected in Section 7.3 of the SSF guidelines where it says that *the state has a central role in post-harvest in creating infrastructure, organisational structures and capacity building for post-harvest activities*.

There should be stakeholder involvement to govern existing facilities. All the people who use these facilities, whether fish landing centres or harbours, have to be involved by forming committees to ensure that all the existing facilities function properly and are properly maintained. People are unaware of the requisite requirements, hence, capacities building must take place through training programmes which must include how a fish landing centre should be, how hygienic and sanitary conditions should be maintained and so on.

Point 30 says *Provision of adequate infrastructure facilities is critical to the value chain of marine fisheries and is also crucial for many MCS functions*. For this adequate infrastructure should be created. To create it, needs have to be reassessed by looking at the requirements, checking if existing facilities are enough or whether they need to be augmented. These additional facilities, including harbour-based fish dressing centres and fish processing estates should be created by the government in a manner that ensures a minimal impact on the coastal ecosystem. There should be direct engagement of stakeholders for this, including cooperatives. This point is directly related to 7.4 of the SSF guidelines and also includes traditional forms of organisations. This means traditional fisher cooperatives in the country should also be included in infrastructure development.

Point 31 says an estimated 15 per cent of the fish caught are lost in post-harvest phase which has to be minimized. The SSF guidelines also mention this and suggest that it is taken for value addition: that is, every fish caught is utilised and not wasted. Waste is not losing fish while catching; sometimes fish are also thrown back into the sea. While this is less in small-scale fisheries, it is known that fish not fetching the right price, are occasionally thrown back into the sea.

The next point (32) says that use of low-value fish species in the fish feed industry is becoming a matter of concern. This was mentioned by Mohamed in his presentation when he mentioned that large numbers of fish meal plants were coming up which were using low value and juvenile fish for fish meal purposes. This has to be regulated. According to the

NPMF, the *Government will address this issue by taking steps to control and regulate proliferation of fish meal plants.*

Paragraphs 33 to 36 are about trade. The first point is that it is well known that Indian seafood finds a significant place in the global seafood market but has low value realisation because it has low levels of value addition and poor product branding with regard to the export market. But it also talks about the growing consumer demand for fish and fish products in the domestic sector. The *Government will undertake a thorough review of the existing infrastructure, value chain and other important attributes of domestic fish marketing to ensure that consumers get high quality fish.*

The next point is traceability and chain-of-custody. This is again with reference to exports but it is also important in the domestic market because of the presence of the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) which is creating benchmarks/ standards for the domestic market to improve the value chain. Not only should good quality products be exported so that people outside India eat good fish but the same should also be available to consumers within the country.

Paragraph 35 says that traceability of seafood and eco-labelling are gradually gaining importance as market-based interventions to ensure environmental sustainability of fisheries. An eco-label, for instance, fetches a premium price in the market and provides access to better markets. This also finds mention in the trade section of the policy.

Paragraph 36 says the wide difference between fish sale price at landing centres and retail markets indicates that middlemen take a substantial share of the prices. Having taken loans from middlemen, fishers fall prey to credit bondage and come under the control of their creditors. To overcome this marketing needs to be strengthened through fishermen-run and/or state-run harbour-based co-operatives, to ensure that fishers have enough credit or natural resources, and possess their own cooperatives to do their marketing for them. Several people are doing this already and it can be strengthened further. This is the biggest issue fishers are facing with regard to trade and there is a sharp price difference between the price the fisherman gets at the landing centre and what the consumer ultimately pays.

The SSF guidelines in points 7.6 to 7.10 says that states should ensure that small-scale fishers also get access to markets, whether local, national, regional or international. At the same time, the nutritional needs of the community should also be safeguarded, as they depend largely on fish and this should not be snatched away from them. The benefits of international trade should be equitably distributed. At the same time, there should be no overexploitation or adverse impact on small-scale fishers and safeguards should be imposed with stakeholder consultation, a prime requirement in the SSF guidelines though not much is mentioned in the policy except for points like managing FLC. Here, there needs to be a mention that stakeholder committees need to be formed for day to day management.

The SSF guidelines also state that access to all relevant market and trade information for stakeholders should be enabled. A special mention must be made of point 48 on gender equity. The SSF guidelines refer to it as gender equality but the NPMF terms it as gender

equity. This may be related to post-harvest as 66% of the workforce engaged in post-harvest activities are women. The policy clearly states that the government has to enhance support for forming women's cooperatives, to give them financial support schemes, to have good working conditions including safety, security, hygiene, transportation for retail marketing etc. They should be encouraged to ensure value addition in the small-scale sector and should also be part of fisheries management. Section 8 of the SSF guidelines is about gender equality and is related to post-harvest and trade.

Nikita summarized her presentation as follows:

Post-harvest

- Infrastructure – existing/ new- stakeholder involvement in setting up and maintenance
- Post-harvest losses – minimise/ nil
- Protection of traditional rights, involvement in decision-making
- Role of Women

Trade related

- Market Access
- Traceability, eco-labelling – resource sustainability, benefits that may accrue to the fishing community
- Impact – mitigation
- Information that needs to be passed on to the fishers which may be used to improve income.

She concluded her presentation stating that while there are not many points with reference to post-harvest and trade but those that do exist are very important as they will have a long term impact.

Discussion

Kumaravelu from Tamil Nadu said that in the last Government of India budget, INR 7500 crore (One Crore= 10, 0000/ INR 70 = 1 USD) were allocated to develop infrastructure and value addition under the Matsya Samprada scheme. In the trade session, there was no mention of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Without WTO, no import/export or trade takes place. He wanted to know the position of CMFRI, CIFT, ICSF etc regarding WTO, trade, budget allocation under Matsya Samprada etc. Nikita pointed out that the question was not directly related to the Policy.

Kumaravelu said that under the Matsya Samprada scheme, all the marketing goes to multinational fishing companies and there is no access to small-scale women fish vendors etc. This is a major problem in the trade.

Jesu Rethinam added that policy should be translated into budget allocation. In fisheries, she mentioned that out of about INR 7000 crore, nearly INR 2000 crore was allocated to fisherwomen. Wondering who these fisherwomen were and how they were trading, Jesu Rethinam said it was only for traders and not vendors or women in fisheries. This may not be in the policy. But the activity of the state clearly revealed this. They may claim they are

including fisherwomen in all policies and budget allocation, but they actually mean traders and big companies including online traders.

Nikita said that with regard to WTO in the policy, every single thing could not be mentioned but that there was a general reference that international agreements etc. should be taken into consideration. Regarding budget allocations and schemes, she said that the schemes should come from the people. Before the budget was prepared, people were asked to give inputs; they could also exert greater pressure as the inputs they gave were limited.

Nalini Nayak commented that the policy talks about traditional access. But there is no mention of how women have traditional access even to fish or tenure or space. Nobody speaks about the space that women use to dry their fish. Everyone speaks about traditional knowledge but nobody discusses traditional access to fish and space. She exhorted women to engage more otherwise they would lose all their rights. If women cannot enter harbours to buy fish and have to pay a high tax, they will not get the fish. She said complaining that harbours were overrun by men, albeit small vendors and not big traders, was ineffectual. If men were coming from the interiors to buy fish, it was because women had not safeguarded their rights at landing centres. Nikita said this was true for marketplaces as well.

V. Vivekanandan said since cooperatives have been mentioned with reference to low prices and middlemen exploitation, the issue of women's cooperatives was emerging. The importance of cooperatives was stressed in this policy and was welcome at one level. But the problem was fisheries cooperatives, whether for men, women or both, were that they were all, with some exceptions, governmental. They were not real people's organisations and had no business acumen. They only functioned as channels for funnelling for government schemes. It is very difficult to form genuine cooperatives as people running them (genuine cooperatives) do not get any encouragement and are discriminated. This also needs to be addressed in the context of women. . If the fisheries department is running cooperatives only to give doles or welfare measures, they can continue to do so. But the problem is, to be effective in the market and have some market power and change the power equations in value chains, independent organisations are the key. At the national level, cooperative support has already declined and the government is now encouraging producer companies and new forms of organisations. The autonomy and independence of people's organisations for business - cooperative bodies – need not legally be only cooperatives. Vivekanandan went on to link this to another trend which is connected to the entire National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM). The logic of forming SHGs with just 20 members was that they would not be subject to elite capture. However, the Government in its anxiety to use the SHG 'infrastructure' as the best system to reach out to the poor has made it the primary poverty alleviation instrument. Now it has compulsorily taken over the sector by nationalising SHGs and putting panchayat and area level federations and higher bodies to control them. The original promoters and the ideals with which the SHG movement began, has faded.

A fish vendor from Kerala, who sells fish on the roadside, explained the difficulties she and her colleagues face. They have to travel almost a hundred kilometres to source fish, return home and sell it on the roads under every conceivable weather condition. She said they faced

a lot of problems due to goondas, police and absence of basic facilities such as toilets. She suggested the need to unite in order to pressurise and demand facilities.

Sita Dasan of SEWA said that though the formation of fisheries cooperatives is mentioned in the policy, cooperatives disburse the money goes to groups and not women vendors. Market facilities and spaces in fish markets, especially when new markets are being designed, are being built in a very unscientific way without taking into account the needs of the women there. She demanded that women and stakeholders must be involved in the control and renovation of markets. She also mentioned the needs of women in roadside markets.

Vijayan detailed how the 2017 NPMF evolved before it was finally announced. He said that there were a few deliberate changes and all highly political. One related to deep sea fishing. After the LOP scheme, the expert committee had proposed that small-scale fishers should be equipped and trained to tap these resources. But point 15 in the policy, pays no heed to the suggestion and states: *'Considering that LOP scheme has not had the expected impact of the inclusive development on the deep sea fisheries, the Government will consider an alternative mechanism for development of this sector and rescind the existing LOP scheme.'* After that, all the sentences have been inserted by the Ministry and not by the committee which took into consideration the points that had suggested. The changed version reads as follows: *"Deep sea resources necessitates optimum fleet size of modern fishing vessels capable of undertaking extended voyages and wherever required, support of overseas technology will also be considered for the development of the sector"*. This was not there in the recommendation given by the expert committee. *'A single window approach will be adopted to enable all stakeholders in capacity building of the Indian fishing fleet for deep sea fishing. Entrepreneurship development, private investment, PPP and better leveraging of institutional finance for marine sector may be encouraged. For the integration of seafood processing and export....'* These are all new additions. According to Vijayan, this gives the policy scope to bring in foreign technology, private investment and they can be joint collaborations. What was opposed earlier has entered the new policy through the back door instead of consultations with the public.

Another very important point - Point 38 – comes under marine environmental pollution. This is regarding the development of ports. He pointed that many in the audience were also fighting against the hazards created by ports. He said that the committee had made a very good recommendation but vast changes were made so that it now states, *'development of ports sometimes leads to erosion and accretion along the coast. These developments may bring changes in coastal configuration which may have an impact on the coastline, ecology and fisheries. The government will consider placing adequate mechanisms to address these aspects while planning infrastructure development on the coast.* The original proposal was: *'Development of ports often leads (often has now been changed to sometimes) to erosion and accretion and changes brought about to coastal configuration from such developments impact coastline, damage fisher habitations and affect the ecology of the coast.'* This is a matter of utmost concern affecting fisher livelihoods. The committee had also said that fishermen should be consulted before creating any ports in the country so that new ports are created only with the consent of the fishermen. This point has been removed completely now.

The committee had also said that if a port was created and adversely impacted the coastal community living there, its members should be considered project-affected victims and should be compensated by those who develop the ports. This clause too has been removed. These kinds of basic changes adversely impacting fishermen were removed and are some of the crucial issues that affect us now.

Mohamed agreed that there have been subtle changes and that it was a policy of the government, and not of the scientists or CMFRI. However he suggested that as the policy was already in place, even while being critical of several statements clauses in it, there was now a need to look forward and figure out how to preserve fisher rights, conserve fish stocks, ensure sustainability etc. He said that the biggest shift that can take place is the participatory management that is envisaged in the policy which gives fishers roles in decision-making and therefore they must all press for the implementation of co-management principles.

Sebastian Rodrigues from Goa had comments regarding Article 49 of the NPMF. He had split the sentences into four sections for deeper probing.

The first part:

1. Keeping in mind dwindling marine resources
 - Acknowledge dwindling marine fisheries.
 - Composition of fish species is dwindling.
 - Who is responsible for dwindling?
 - What are the identified factors; who are the actors?
 - Is tourism one of them?
 - Is trawling and purse seining one of them?
 - Who are responsible for allowing dwindling marine resources?
 - Is it the case that instead of identifying the cause of dwindling fisheries resources, further deterioration of marine fisheries resources has been allowed?
 - Is it ethically correct to adopt this approach?
 - Is it not dereliction of duty on part of the government and other agencies?
 - Is it impossible to restore the dwindling trend of marine biodiversity and resources?
2. Additional/ alternative sources of livelihoods will be essential for the vast number of fisher communities spread all along the coastline
 - Why focus on alternatives to fishing instead of restoring marine health?
 - Is it not a violation of SSF Guideline 5.5 which says: “States should recognise the role of small-scale fishing communities and indigenous peoples to restore/conservate, protect and co-manage local aquatic and coastal ecosystems? And is accepted through article 54 of the Marine Policy.
 - Is it not our duty and responsibility to press for the implementation of SSF Guideline 5.5? Or should we allow the dwindling trend of marine fisheries resources to degrade further due to these predatory agents?

- The existence of vast numbers comprising the fisher community is acknowledged but what about enhancing awareness among them regarding their roles under SSF Guideline 5.5?
 - What are the varieties of existing threatening livelihoods of vast coastline people dependent upon marine fisheries?
3. Mariculture and ecotourism are considered important in this regard
- How they considered important?
 - Who was consulted?
 - What is the availability of the records of such consultations with fishing communities of the Indian coast asking for mariculture and ecotourism?
 - If no consultations were conducted, then who considered them important?
 - Will mariculture not block access to fishing spaces in coastal waters
 - Will mariculture not pollute marine waters?
 - Will mariculture be carried on by vast number of fishing communities?
 - Or will it be carried out, owned and operated by corporates for profits?
 - What is 'eco' about the proposed tourism?
 - Who will control ecotourism?
 - Is there a line of difference between the ecotourism of community and ecotourism of corporates?
 - Is it a ploy to open and control Indian coasts by corporates by way of mariculture and ecotourism?
 - Isn't it strange that marine policy is advocating eco-tourism instead of tourism policy?
4. Game fishing and the concept of catch, photograph and release (CPR) is gaining significance throughout the world as part of the importance fisheries importance
- Which class of people find game fishing and CPR important?
 - Is it the fishing communities of India's coast?
 - If marine fisheries resources are dwindling then how will they be available for game fishing and CPR?
 - Is game fishing and the concept of CPR ethical from the environmental ethics point of view?
 - Is it not a ploy to open up the coast to corporates through fisheries tourism?
 - Is conquest of the coast by corporates the political intention?

Nayak lauded Sebastian for raising all the contradictory statements in the whole policy and said that they needed to be discussed in small groups. She observed that the experts at the workshop may not be able to answer them, but there was a need to strategise within the network and exert pressure for more changes at the local level.

Mohamed said that he felt the text had been read out of context. There is a heading on top which says 'alternate livelihoods'. The expert committee considered the alternate livelihoods considering the overcapacity that existed in the system and that was why the statement on dwindling stocks was made and such alternate livelihoods were explored by the committee.

A participant wanted to know if at the time of making the policy, the government had ensured the participation of members of the fishing community or experts from fishers' organisations. Kiran Koli wanted to know what constituted destructive fishing gears and which fishing gears were safe.

Mohamed replied that they had raised the question about involving the fishermen in the committee but their suggestion was not accepted. Hence the alternate option of conducting a stakeholder survey was adopted. In this way, at least some viewpoints were incorporated. Though it was limited, at least for the first time, they were able to take the views of the stakeholders. These views were very important in actually removing the LOP scheme. In the policy itself, he pointed out that there was a concept of management participation by fishermen. Thus fishermen have a place. In future, the council may be the one taking decisions.

To the question regarding which gears were safe and which were destructive, Mohamed said that as an environmentalist, he would say everything was destructive while as a fisherman, he would say everything was safe. It depended on who one was and the viewpoint that one was espousing. There may be relatively safer ways of fishing and there may be relatively destructive ways of fishing.

Another question raised was regarding the decreasing fishing space because oil companies were putting reefs and platforms and the number of fishing boats was increasing. The areas occupied by oil companies were no-go areas for fishers who were now making huge losses. Mohamed pointed out that to run a boat, fuel was needed and provided by oil companies. He also pointed out that those areas probably served as fish refugia, which was possibly why they were still able to find fish nearby.

Participants broke for tea after this session and formed four groups. The topics for the group discussions were:

Group Discussion 1 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for fisheries management from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group Discussion 1 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for fisheries post-harvest and trade from the SSF Guidelines perspective.

The Group Reports are included in **Appendix 1**.

DAY 2: 20th July 2019

Session 3: Mariculture, Deep Sea Fishing and Other New Initiatives from the SSF Guidelines Perspective

Chair: V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust

This session had three speakers – Gopakumar, Marianne Manuel and CM Muralidharan

G. Gopakumar, Former Principal Scientist, CMFRI

Gopakumar began his representation by referring to the famous Chinese quote, ‘give a man a fish and you feed him for a day’. He said that he was changing it to ‘teach a man how to farm the fish sustainably, and you feed him for a lifetime’. He clarified that mariculture was not meant for another group of entrepreneurs. As small-scale mariculture farming taking place within one km of the seashore was contributing to more than 80% of the production globally, it focused largely on small-scale fishers. Pointing out that according to the last CMFRI socio-economic census, nearly 61% of the fishermen families were BPL; their main livelihood was fishing and fish were decreasing everywhere. Fish catch data indicated a gradual rise till around 2010 when it stabilised to around 3 - 3.5 million tonnes.

He said that India would need 18 million tonnes of fish by 2030 and therefore it was necessary to increase aquaculture production from about 4.9 million tonnes to 12 million tonnes as increasing fishing effort or catch or fishing vessels was not going to achieve an increase in production. Taking note of this, the NMFP2017 has mentioned that looking at the global scenario, we have to move forward and look at mariculture as a seafood production option.

He then focused on the highlights of the Draft Mariculture Policy. Its main goal was to provide additional livelihood options to coastal communities for small-scale fishermen. The other goal was to ensure food and nutritional security. The policy does not focus only on mariculture for small-scale fishers. The action plan has to be framed by the state government. He pointed out that while India was well established in inland fish culture and brackish-water aquaculture, mariculture production in India was very meagre. Current mariculture production was <0.06 million tonnes, against its potential of 8 to 16 million tonnes, according to a Nature publication. Hence, a need for a policy was felt to give guidance and direction to state governments to take up the activity.

Mariculture, said Gopakumar, is a specialised branch of aquaculture involving the cultivation of economically important marine plants and animals in the sea or any other natural waterbody having tidal influence and includes onshore facilities like hatcheries, nursery rearing and grow-out systems using seawater. Mariculture cannot be done in any location. Since the sea is being used by many stakeholders such as fishers, navigational channels etc., it is necessary to demarcate ‘mariculture zones’ based on scientific criteria and factors such as ecological, environmental, socio-cultural, logistic, etc. Protected areas are exempted; marine spatial planning can be used to identify mariculture zones.

Leasing policy: All mariculture farms in the sea would operate only in areas leased out for the purpose by the respective maritime states with licence and registration. Gopakumar said that the leasing process should not be cumbersome and if leasing was not possible, a permission system could be in place, which could exist even at the panchayat level. Discussions with fishers indicated there are no specific areas for fishing. This, he felt, may not necessarily be true. Some areas could be earmarked in consultation with small-scale fishers with their consent.

There are a number of technologies related to cold storage. Some have been worked over with fishermen and their viability has been established. Examples include broodstock cages in Mandapam, though seed availability is an issue. Till private hatcheries come into existence, Cobia fingerlings will be supplied by CMFRI, Mandapam. Showing a photograph of a lagoon in Vietnam almost filled with cages, Gopakumar said that there was no specific restriction to size or design except that the cage should be anchored properly to the seabed. He said that mussel farming was already being carried out in many locations especially in Kerala using ropes for the mussels. He said that mussel and oyster hatcheries can be established as the technology was now available. He also pointed out that while *Kappaphycus* seaweed farming in Mandapam was quite extensive there were some issues. Technology was available for all species of native seaweed.

Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA) is the practice which combines in appropriate proportions the cultivation of fin fish/shrimp with shell/ herbivorous fish and seaweed to create balanced systems for environmental and economic stability. Organic waste from the Cobia cages was taken up as manure by seaweed ensuring environmental protection. This was being carried out at Munaikadu in the Ramanathapuram district of Tamil Nadu. He said that marine ornamental fish culture was another well-established technique through which, by using limited facilities, a good price was obtained in the market. The Mandapam unit was supplying very young ones of clown fish which were being grown by entrepreneurs for sale.

He felt that while a precautionary approach was required, it did not need to be very stringent in the early stages. But it had to be kept in mind as pollution problems and sustainability issues were likely to crop up as in the case of other culture activities. Hence it had been included under the draft mariculture policy. The need of farmers was to procure seed and feed. For seed production, a private hatchery was being established in Kakinada in collaboration with CMFRI. In future, many hatcheries could come up to produce sea bass seeds, Cobia seeds etc. Likewise, since there was no demand at present, feed was not being produced. He felt seed and feed issues needed to be addressed in future.

Gopakumar pointed out that once mariculture gained momentum, other aspects such as Food Safety and Health Management would come up. For this, capacity building modules are to be developed involving the Agriculture Skill Council of India (ASCI). He said that insurance as financial support was very important for small-scale fish farmers. For initial support, there were agencies to provide finance/ subsidy. Finance and market support have both been addressed. Eventually a separate mariculture development authority of India could be established.

He said that handholding was required for sustainability and researchers had to face fish farmers with issues of relevance. Often marginal issues were taken up for research, which were of no use in the field and paper technologies should be avoided. He concluded his presentation with the observation that an integrated approach was required where all institutions collaborated with each other and fishers to make mariculture a substantial seafood production sector in the country.

Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation

Marianne Manuel began by stating that while reviewing a policy, it was important to look at the actual language of the policy. All policies are formulated by people who have good intentions but compromise on other interests by influencing from the outside. Every single existing policy is a mix of positive provisions and loopholes that allow other interests to come into an industry and create an impact on the small-scale fishing community. This needs to be looked at while examining policy.

The goal of the Draft Mariculture Policy is to increase seafood production and provide livelihood opportunities for communities. Other parts of the policy state the reasons why the mariculture policy is needed: *the seafood demand is increasing year after year and demand cannot be met through capture fisheries. To improve livelihood conditions of fisher communities, additional livelihood options are needed.* This point can be raised during group discussions – if the aim is to improve the livelihood of fishing communities, do we need additional livelihoods or do we need tenure rights and other access rights?

Pointing out that while fishing occurred largely out at sea, mariculture took place both on land and sea. Seedlings are hatched on land and then are grown at sea. A question was asked yesterday if mariculture would affect navigational channels of fishing communities. While the policy very clearly says navigational channels will be excluded and that mariculture zones will not be set up to block navigational channels, the question is what about the land-based activities? What about provisions to ensure that land-based activities do not infringe on fishing community areas and their livelihood? The policy states that they are going to notify suitable sites based on different factors including scientific criteria and in consultation with stakeholders not limited to fishers. This, Marianne said was interesting, because all policies use language addressing the main target group. A look at the NPMF reveals that it says, *'Participation of small fishing communities, fishermen groups, fishery co-operatives or government organisations will be specifically encouraged and supported'*. So it is targeting the fisher community and reassuring it that its participation will definitely be included? In the mariculture policy, the language used seems to be targeting a different group, because it is addressing a group and stating that consultations will be held not just with fishers but also with 'you'. Who the 'you' is, is unclear.

In any policy what comes first it is always important. First navigational channels and fishing grounds need to be mapped clearly in consultation with communities before taking the step of excluding them. So it is important to ensure that mapping is carried out before this policy is implemented. There are certain guiding principles that have been talked about while giving

access to waterbodies. One is to prevent conflicts among other users such as fishers and navigational users; to ensure limits to biological production based on carrying capacity; integrate principles of sustainability to mariculture by limiting impacts on the environment and society; to promote conservation of marine habitats and protection of rights of those carrying out mariculture. Again, the question of which takes precedence over the other, needs to be clearly delineated in the action point, discussed. This is because the rights of those carrying out mariculture cannot precede the right of protecting the environment and the right to ensuring that conflict between traditional users is first taken care of. The order of importance needs discussion.

The next point Marianne raised was regarding mariculture systems and species. In the section on ornamental fish trade, she said, that the policy spoke about *a mechanism that will be put in place to detect, pre-empt and regulate trade of wild-caught ornamentals*. Citing the example of the Madras Crocodile Bank, Marianne pointed out that when one cannot differentiate between cultured and captured animals in the terrestrial wildlife trade, how does one make the distinction between captured and cultured fish?

The next point she discussed was regarding the Ecosystem approach to aquaculture advocated by the policy. According to FAO, an ecosystem approach to aquaculture (EAA) is a strategy for the integration of the activity within the wider ecosystem, such that it promotes sustainable development, equity and resilience of interlinked social-ecological systems. This requires a lot of information and so the policy talks about procedures that will be put in place to assess and monitor the ecological and social impacts of water use, effluent discharge and the use of drugs and chemicals in mariculture. It is known from experience that monitoring and enforcement does not work in India. In such a situation, is it possible to implement an ecosystem approach to aquaculture? She suggested concrete action points so that monitoring and evaluation can be looked at during discussions, later in the day.

The draft policy says that right now we are limited by feed and seed in mariculture and therefore large and small hatcheries and nurseries for seed production either on PPP or private modes or by co-operatives need to be established. This then once again raises questions regarding the land-based aspects of mariculture and how it is to be regulated. To create hatcheries, the policy recommends that financial support should be given to anyone who sets up these hatcheries including farmer cooperatives. This term could be defined during the discussion session. Regarding the policy's suggestion to carry out capture-based mariculture as seeds were in short supply, she said that the policy should have actually stated that the aquaculture of a species could not be done till its seed was viable. Extracting wild stock at a time when it was well recognised that fish stocks were declining and fleets were plagued by overcapacity and overfishing, was not right.

Another issue in mariculture was that a lot more fish were required to produce feed. The NPMF talked about regulating the fish meal industry because right now it was expanding in an alarming way and leading to issues like bycatch based trawl fisheries etc. The draft mariculture policy talked about sourcing fish meals from factories that were using sustainably caught fish species. Marianne pointed out that how much of this could be certified and

regulated was questionable given that the context was one of overfishing, overcapacity and unsustainability. She also pointed out that bycatch had a lot of juvenile fish of commercially important species. While these were low value fish, in many places they were sources of nutrition for marginalised communities. A point to be considered therefore was what would be the impact on a local community if these low value fish were diverted as alternate feed for mariculture. Marianne said that the section in the policy that talked about replacing fishmeal with cheaper protein sources in order to reduce the cost of feed needed to be explored as it was an indication of the policy's priorities. It appeared to be less about ensuring that fish species were sustainably caught and more about the economics. Traceability and record-keeping were not easy to implement and hence it was necessary to discuss concrete ways of achieving this issue through a discussion on whether it was feasible or not. She said that the capacity building section had a lot of positive provisions for the community which stated that women do a lot of work in mariculture in south India and they will be supported. The insurance and financing section indicated that mariculture was a risk-based activity and therefore the government would provide insurance schemes to provide protection against losses. The small-scale fishing community might want to ask some questions about prioritised lending and financing to facilitate the emergence of the mariculture industry.

The section on post-harvest and trade in the policy also talks about improving connectivity for mariculture to markets through better market logistics, more infrastructure, cold storage, more hygienic handling facilities and also encourage sales through online portals. There are a lot of points that one can ask for in small-scale capture fishery in general as well. Marianne said that there is a possible complementarity in infrastructure that capture fishery requires that the mariculture policy would introduce for its purposes which could be used by capture fisheries as well.

The section on institutional mechanisms and governance in the draft Mariculture Policy talks about leveraging support from private financial institutions for rapid expansion of mariculture. Marianne said that talk regarding rapid expansion of anything indicated that checks and balances and a precautionary approach were not being taken into consideration.

Capture-based aquaculture (CBA) is somewhere in between capture-based fisheries and mariculture. Even as we talk about overfishing, the policy talks about capture-based aquaculture as a livelihood for local communities. Thus, once again there is a contrast between the initial introduction which says we are overfishing and that is why we need to move into mariculture, and promoting CBA as an alternate livelihood. CBA is dependent on wild stock of fish. The policy also acknowledges that unregulated aquaculture will lead to a lot of ecological and social issues, and so it talks about creating a legal framework that ensures responsible mariculture and says that the responsibility rests with the state.

The question is how feasible are some of these issues from the perspective of implementation is a point for discussion? It also acknowledges that if mariculture is to be monitored, government departments need to change the way they function. State departments, coastal marine police and the coast guard need to work together to regulate and monitor mariculture. Marianne concluded her presentations stating that when it was not feasible in capture

fisheries, the feasibility of all these departments working together to monitor mariculture was doubtful.

C.M. Muralidharan, Consultant, Fisheries Management

This presentation was made by Manas Roshan on behalf of Muralidharan. He said that the main concern in mariculture other than the environmental impact is consultation with small-scale fishing communities which could be affected in two ways. There are the navigation routes to their fishing grounds. Identification of these fishing grounds needs to be done in consultation with fishing communities. Taking up culture of mussels, pearl oysters and sea weeds could help, if done right. These could be reserved for local women SHGs. It would also be advisable to avoid GM species and go in for diversification of species. Since a lot of ground had been covered on mariculture by other speakers, he focused on the deep sea aspects alone by flagging points from the NPMF and suggesting precautions to protect the rights and resource-base of small-scale fishers.

According to the NPMF, deep sea and oceanic waters offer opportunities to increase the catch. This needs to be further reviewed based on the actual stocks available, current exploitation and economic viability. The NPFM says that the Government will consider an alternate mechanism for the development of this sector and rescind the existing LOP scheme. This should be completely in favour of Indian fishers, especially small-scale fishers and their rights. The NPMF says that while ensuring the small-scale character of marine fishery, private investments will be promoted in deep sea fishing and processing to fully harness the potential of the resource. This should not be at the cost of alienating small-scale fishers and should instead be inclusive.

The NPMF suggested that an optimum fleet size of modern fishing vessels capable of undertaking extended voyages, and wherever required, support of overseas technology will also be considered for the development of the sector. This should not pave the way for an unscientific and unviable increase in fishing capacity and should be in favour of small-scale fishers. Integrated coastal and island fisheries development plans should be implemented for which the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management should be the way forward. The most encouraging provision for SSF to be made best use of in the NPMF is that the Government will introduce new scheme(s) to enhance the skills and capabilities of traditional fishermen to undertake and popularise deep sea fishing.

Discussion

V.Vivekanandan, Chairperson for the session said that while the NPMF has just one paragraph on mariculture, a draft Mariculture Policy has been brought out. He then threw the floor open for discussion.

Palsamy from Tamil Nadu narrated a series of experiences with CMFRI, Mandapam in mariculture where most of the ventures were failures. He also pointed out that *Kappaphycus* culture was more successful in the Gulf of Mannar rather than the Palk Bay.

Many participants opined that instead of trying to artificially grow fish, it would be better to preserve natural resources for which an integrated outlook was required. Another participant said that the policy was being copied from other countries which did not have fish, unlike India where fish was still available at sea. It was more important to stop destructive fishing.

Rahiman from Andhra Pradesh narrated his experiences with CMFRI concluding that the mariculture pilots were only for people to go and see fish like in a zoo and were not viable. He said traditional fishers do not have INR 5-6 lakh (One lakh = 100,000) to invest. For fast growth of fish, chemicals need to be added and like consumers of broiler chicken who were dying of cancer; such fish eaters would also contract the disease. Pradip Chatterjee said there was no scheme for waste management and no assessment of environmental impacts in models. While one-time help could be given, it would later go to investors and not small-scale fishers.

Tajuddin from Tamil Nadu's delta said that they had not tried it in the delta areas. He pointed out that fishermen have not been taken to visit places like Vietnam. Only MPs and MLAs were taken to see such things. Arulanandam from Tamil Nadu said that when fishing was not allowed along the coast, why should mariculture be allowed in and near shore areas? A participant from Odisha said that there was no cold storage or other infrastructure even after 72 years of independence in fish landing centres. Requirements such as net mending sheds, auction halls and other such support should be addressed first before making policies.

Sheiks from Gujarat said that undersea pipelines were used to channel wastes into the sea. The downstream impact of pollutants was high. In south Gujarat, mangroves and grasslands were disappearing. Around 150 km of the coast was polluted with tar balls and intertidal areas had been encroached upon. When there were so many pressures from other projects, how could mariculture projects be taken up? With respect to deep sea fishing, it was clear that only a few possessing the right capacity could succeed and it would be more useful to identify those people and provide them with support.

Gopakumar said that there were lifestyle expectations that needed to be satisfied and reiterated that mariculture was the only way to increase fish production while conservation would not increase the catch. He said that 6 kg of trash fish wet weight/ 2kg formulated feed gets converted into 1 kg farmed fish. Economic analysis had been done only at the institute level.

Session 4: Coastal and Marine Environment, Climate Change and Blue Growth from the SSF Guidelines Perspective

Presentation: E. Vivekanandan, Former Principal Scientist, CMFRI

Chair: D. Nandakumar, Protsahan

D. Nandakumar said that the idea of the Blue Economy – blue growth as mentioned in the policy probably started from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). The SSF Guidelines could be a tool to ensure that the economies deliver inclusively and in a sustainable manner. It is also necessary to look at what is

happening along the Indian coast such as the Sagarmala project, plans for coastal Special Economic Zones (SEZs) as these have an impact on the balance of power. Things also have to be seen in the backdrop of climate change, something many political leaders do not accept. He said that the country has been emitting a lot of carbon and the changes have had an impact. Slowing down is not the solution. We need to turn around.

E. Vivekanandan stated that 'fish' is deeply embedded in the ecosystem. Healthy fish need a healthy environment. Since all organisms are interrelated, when discussions revolve around protecting, conserving and increasing fish population, what is required is not merely control, but also look at the entire ecosystem. Healthy environment and ecosystems translate into happy fish habitats, no or low pollution and Climate Change-resilient (CC) ecosystems. There is a need to protect right places and right species for which assessments of vulnerable and critical habitats and the status of vulnerable species are required. While some assessments are available, what needs to be examined is if the WLPA has provided real benefits.

Protection measures include reforestation of mangroves, replantation/transplantation of corals and seagrass, protection by community participation and an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) aimed at ecological well-being, human well-being and good governance. In EAFM, the community must be made custodians of conservation.

Vivekanandan said that there are a number of legislations such as Environmental Protection Act 1986 and WLPA, 1972 as well as multilateral treaties such as the Ramsar Convention and CITES to protect habitats. He drew attention to Goal 14 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Group (UNSDG) which specifically targets Life Below Water. Goal 14.2 aims to sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems while the target of Goal 14.5 is to conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas by 2020, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information.

Nitrogen pollution from agriculture is a major factor in marine pollution as is the growing issue of plastics and microplastics. There are a number of laws and international conventions to prevent marine pollution such as UNCLOS, MARPOL (Marine Pollution/International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships) etc; also drawing attention to SDG 14, and Goal 14.1 which aims to prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution by 2025. Prevention of marine pollution is by strict implementation of laws, enforcing standards for effluent discharge and following the polluter pays principle, among others.

Evidence of climate change in the sea include rising temperature, acidification, change in currents, anoxia, erratic rainfall, storm frequency and intensity which impact fish, and consequently, fisheries and stakeholders in the value chain. It is advisable to focus more on adaptation methods as fish should be healthy and by relieving stress on them, they will be resilient to climate change. Thus, fishery regulation is related to climate change as well and climate change needs to be mainstreamed into existing MFRA. There is also a need to look at protecting property and lives of those in coastal areas likely to be affected by the changing climate. With reference to international and national laws to promote adaptation and

mitigation, he referred to India's NAPCC (National Action Plan on Climate Change) and also to the UNSDG goal 13 which vow to 'take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts' while Goal 14.3 aims to 'minimise and address the impacts of ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels'.

Blue growth is sustainable growth and development from economic activities in the oceans, wetlands and coastal zones, as described by FAO. Blue economy focuses on five major areas which include fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, navigation and mining. India is focusing on Blue Revolution (Neel Kranti).

Vivekanandan concluded his presentation with the summation that marine capture fisheries could contribute to blue growth by:

- Restoring overexploited and depleted stocks;
- Protecting/restoring critical habitats;
- Regulating fishing capacity;
- Improving value chain;
- Reducing the impacts of habitat degradation, pollution and climate change;
- Modernising infrastructure;
- Building better institutions and
- Strengthening communities.

Discussion

A participant from Tamil Nadu pointed out that there are a lot of legal tools on one side and a lot of projects such as Sagarmala, where extraction of hydrocarbons up to 80 nm, on the other, which go against these tools. The question is how to protect small-scale fisheries, environment and sustainable marine resources.

Vivekanandan said that protecting and conserving resources were talked about as part offisheries management. It was incorrect to say that the policy is against SSF. He said that there is a need for strict and fair implementation of policies and tools e.g. pollution control. It would also be useful to see what types of investments from these funds (such as Sagarmala) should go into fisheries.

A participant from Goa said the emphasis was on fleet reduction. He said that CRZ (coastal regulation zone) was meant to protect coastal areas. Under CRZ 2011, only treated sewage was to be let into the waterways but CRZ 2019 was not strict about it and therefore there were dilution of norms. He said that the fisheries department was not working towards marine restoration; the intertidal zone especially remained unprotected.

In Kerala, pointed out a participant, there were a lot of regulations but no proper implementation. There was no clarity on who will do what and how. Another participant pointed out that the implementation plan for the policy had not yet been released. In Karnataka, a participant rued that while fishers did not get permission for rebuilding homes, the government gave approval for big projects.

To a question regarding who would control pollution control, Vivekanandan responded that pollution control was to be carried by the State Pollution Control Board (PCB) which would be implementing standards if available. It was the responsibility of the state government to control pollution.

From Maharashtra, Ujjwala Patil said that in spite of CRZ notification, there were many high rise buildings coming up flouting rules. There was also conversion of salt flats to real estate. Debasis pointed out that in many places existing mangroves had been cut down, the area had been replanted was described as restoration. Vivekanandan agreed that protecting in situ was more important. Cutting in one place and planting in another was not a solution.

Arjili Dasu said that under the Forest Act, a lot of land had been taken away. Companies such as ITC take away naturally grown bamboo. Afforestation does not provide natural growth forest; innumerable policies can be brought forth but where is the biodiversity? He asked. Nandakumar intervened to say that these points should go into the implementation document. He referred to an Australian document on Blue Economy 2025 and said that while brown is for profit only, green is for environmentally conscious. There is no document yet on blue growth.

Pollution of coastal waters was mentioned by many who also said that while CMFRI and CIFT provide technologies, the water is not fit for growing fish. Arulanandam said that when he was small, they could easily collect 10kg crab from the seashore. Now there is no fish for many miles into the sea mainly due to pollution caused by plastics and solid wastes. He asked why fishing communities could not be used to clean up beaches and why fishing villages could not have toilets.

A participant from Tamil Nadu felt that many fishing villages were not aware of rules and hence awareness for fishermen must be promoted. Another participant from the same state who carries out mariculture near Thoothukudi said that due to the spill-off of feeds and wastes, there appeared to be an increase in the number of species. As harbour extension led to erosion, they had built a seawall and fishers were now finding lobster juveniles deposited in the cracks in the rock. Some participants pointed out that Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) reports should be unbiased and complete. Also, testing laboratories gave clean chits to places known to be polluted.

After a break for lunch, the second set of group discussions followed.

Group Discussion 2 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for mariculture, deep sea fishing and other new initiatives, from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group Discussion 2 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for coastal and marine environment, climate change and blue growth from the SSF Guidelines perspective.

The reports of the Group Discussions are given in **Appendix 2**.

Session 5: Social Development of Fishing Communities from the SSF Guidelines Perspective

Presentation: V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust

Chair: John Kurien, Managing Trustee, ICSF Trust

V. Vivekanandan began his presentation stating that social development in SSF guidelines situates the fishery sector in the context of larger social development. This is a unique document that is based on the human rights approach and includes right to education, cultural freedom etc. which are central to social development.

The NFPM does not actually have “social development” as an agenda. It only talks of a more limited agenda: ‘Fisher welfare, Social Security Nets and Institutional Credits’. In effect, this is a limited ‘welfare and institutional’ agenda. However, since they can be considered as part of a social development agenda, an analysis can be attempted from the perspective of the SSF Guidelines. The section on Fisher Welfare, etc., contains 6 points: 42.0 to 46.0. It says that current welfare measures will continue and the direct benefit transfer will be the main methodology used. A new point added is that when there are natural or man-made calamities, there will be some support for restoration of livelihood and more importantly procedures for death compensation for fishers will be made easier. Ban period compensation is to be strengthened and the ban period may be increased.

In case of fisheries cooperatives, Vivekanandan said there is a case for strengthening them by helping to adopt good business models in harvest and post-harvest and providing skill development, technical and financial support and adopting a scientific approach to address “fisheries and climate-related issues”. With reference to welfare measures, there is only a statement about strengthening the measures but no analysis or attempt has been made to discuss the type of strengthening that is required: higher funding, new schemes or better targeting. However, the generic proposal includes the term “community welfare”, which has potential for expansion. Current benefits and failures of welfare measures need to be better understood such as who is benefitting. There is no clear information on distribution of benefits; in fact, in the case of some of the schemes, 50% seems to be in Tamil Nadu and is very low in other states. BPL classification is a revenue department activity that is based on norms that do not take into account the absence of landholding, annual variation in income, characteristics of fisheries etc. There is a need to see if fisheries schemes can ignore conventional BPL classification and consider small-scale fishermen (non- motorised and motorised), fish vending women and crew on mechanised sector as eligible for welfare schemes as the BPL category excludes the deserving and includes those who do not really need it.

Subsidies for fishing equipment and fuel subsidies are often considered part of the “welfare” measures at the state level. The actual budget for this (including revenue foregone) is highest for these items. The Policy is silent regarding this and fails to give guidelines. Housing for fishers, mostly implemented in southern states, is facing a crisis as post-tsunami expectations on size and cost of houses have made existing schemes unattractive.

Vivekanandan referred to the section in the policy on compensation for disasters and said that a sound policy was needed. States need guidelines to give fair compensation. While saying that the compensation for losses due to oil spills and man-made disasters was welcome, he asked why “displacement of fishers” due to infrastructure projects, mariculture and other “development” projects on the coast and sea could not be included in this component.

In the case of ban period compensation, he said there were many anomalies. Those who fish get compensation while those who do not are denied the same, whereas sometimes when owners are not part of the BPL category, they too do not get compensation during the ban period. He once again reiterated that BPL classification is meaningless in fisheries due to various unique factors affecting the sector. He said that it was not a healthy trend to see over-use and misuse of the instrument of fishing ban as it reflected a failure of fisheries management in India.

The policy, he said, has failed to grasp the nature of fisheries ‘coops’ which do not satisfy any of the principles formulated by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA). Fisheries cooperatives are largely used for channeling government benefits. There is a need to evaluate fishery cooperatives and their functioning. The effective bodies are the genuine people’s organisations, effective for doing business.

Institutional credit for fishermen is important to resolve but is an extremely difficult area of intervention. There needs to be innovation on both the supply and demand side. Supply side interventions require that big loans at small interest rates without collateral can be provided. Demand side requires that there are organisations that can ensure proper beneficiary identification, manage loan dissemination and recovery in a flexible manner and still achieve near 100% recovery. He said that NABARD’s (National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development) current schemes are unfavorable to fishermen as the terms of NABFINS and NABKISAN are not suitable for fishermen. Unless the Government of India provides a large endowment to NABARD for fisheries, this will not succeed, he concluded.

Training fishermen to catch fish is not required whereas training the community in resource management is required. Training tends to be stereotyped but needs to be customised. Other areas for training include sea-safety and there is need for field-based training rather than classroom-based training and all training should be in line with fisheries management policies.

The major gaps in the policy vis-à-vis SSF Guidelines is that it is mainly aimed at fishermen and has only a limited concern with the community as a whole. The SSF guidelines have a broad approach to social development: education, health, civic services, etc., but since the NPMF does not address this, one wonders which instrument will. It is also not clear if the fisheries departments have a role in facilitating the implementation of the SSF guidelines with the help of other departments. There should be provisions in the policy or its implementation plan to say that the fisheries department plays an anchoring/ facilitating role.

Discussion

Sebastian from Goa said that Article 54 in the NPMF provides a doorway to implement SSF guidelines in India. A participant from Odisha said that savings schemes do not refer to women. During cyclones, for 3-4 days fishing is not allowed. Compensation should be provided during that period. From Maharashtra, a participant said that the term 'BPL' should be changed to 'small-scale'. Compensation should be given to flood-affected fishers as well.

A participant from Goa said that there was damage of nets by ships and tourist boats and demanded that whoever was responsible for the damage, should compensate. Similarly, in the case of oil spills, compensation needs to be provided. Where there is rapid sea erosion, immediate rehabilitation package needs to be provided.

In the case of Puducherry, there is a separate department for fisheries; Fisheries and Fishermen Welfare department and hence the welfare schemes are routed. Changing the fisheries department name in other states to include welfare as part of their work may help. A participant from Tamil Nadu wanted to know how scientific the ban period was. What are the norms in other countries? The other issue was that in case of natural calamities, the norm was to give alerts and ban fishing over a larger area resulting in loss of income to fishers in non-affected areas. The fact that fishermen were not defined was once again emphasised by a participant who asked if fish farmers were going to be brought into the fishermen category which was not acceptable to the fishing community.

Vivekanandan responded that the exclusion of women for some benefits was because fisherwomen were considered ancillary workers. There was potential to ask for compensation for not going out fishing due to weather warning as the warnings were erratic and over a wider area. This was indeed becoming a serious issue. With regard to fishing boat collisions with ships, practical measures should be implemented to avoid such occurrences. He also felt that methods should be created to demand compensation.

How was a fisherman to be defined? The fisheries department deals with both marine and inland fisheries. Marine fisheries has capture fisheries and mariculture sub-sectors, whereas inland fisheries has four sectors. There are anomalies regarding marine and inland capture fishermen. In the social system, it is a label applied to caste. Each instrument, each law requires a clear definition, concluded Vivekanandan referring to the term fish worker coined by John Kurien.

Session 6: Gender Equity in Fisheries from the SSF Guidelines Perspective

Presentation: Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust

Chair: Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation

Nalini Nayak opened her presentation with a reference to issues raised by Nikita Gopal regarding trade, post-harvest fisheries etc. in the NPMF and said that she would look at the difference between the NPMF and the SSF guidelines in this session. She said the policy speaks about gender equality. She felt men and women have equal rights and responsibilities and should participate equally in decision-making. Men and women should share family labour equally. Women's voices should be heard in society and they should receive equal

fruit for their labour. In the SSF guidelines, everywhere fishing communities are mentioned. There are few places where men alone are referred to. The reason is that fishing is seen as complementary work. These two put together is small-scale fisheries. So if small-scale fisheries are to be protected, women's rights to safety and livelihood security needs to be protected. Therefore, women's work in fisheries should receive similar inputs. Small-scale fisheries will be supported and strengthened only if there is equality in subsidies and support.

The SSF guidelines include two points that NPMF does not talk about. One is the marginalised and vulnerable groups. They need to be defined to include fish-basket handlers in port areas, fish cleaners, headload carriers and those people who cannot capture fish, along with widows, single women and handicapped women who form large numbers in the small-scale fisheries sector.

The ecosystem approach was very important, according to her, because the discussion was about sustaining life – the food chain and the chain of life of which humans are also a part; this was also why the relationship between men and women is important. If importance is not given to equity between males and females and ecosystem is not respected, fish and small-scale fisheries will not survive.

One of the participants pointed out that women started work much earlier than men, right from waking them up and preparing for them to go to sea, to receiving them back when they return, while doing all the housework, going to the market and taking care of the children in-between. She felt that if men were given INR 4500 during the ban period, women needed to be given INR 9000. Nayak said the alternative to this was that the work should be shared. If it was shared, society would change and children would be reared differently; men would not be so aggressive and an understanding of women's work would help in attaining an understanding of the ecosystem approach.

Regarding gender equality, Nayak said the SSF guidelines clearly say that the state should ensure that the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) is put into practice. There are many aspects in the convention including: No violence in the home; no violence in the workplace; no discrimination regarding mobility; no discrimination regarding education. Thus it highlights every aspect of discrimination. Based on this Convention, some good laws were passed in India such as the Domestic Violence Act and the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act. It is well known that fisherwomen face a lot of harassment and discrimination in the market, while travelling by bus and so on. But no mention of these has been made in the NPMF policy.

Nalini Nayak concluded that if equity between males and females was given importance and the ecosystem and life within it was respected, fish and small-scale fisheries would thrive.

Discussion

When asked if in this conference, was there equal representation, the answer was no; women were represented in lesser numbers than men.

Ujjwala Patil talked about the Cooperatives Act which required changes. Since 2013, they had been pushing for change. While the NPMF talks about forming women's cooperatives, there are practical difficulties in forming them because of the rule regarding ten mechanised boats. Every state has an Act regarding the formation of cooperatives. Under the current provision whoever catches fish can form a cooperative. Provisions for making cooperatives for those in post-harvest fisheries are required. NPMF talks only about women in post-harvest fisheries, but many of them also participate in harvesting and should be included. In Maharashtra, mostly men are members of the fisheries cooperative societies. There are very few women members and therefore when schemes are brought in, those who are not members do not get benefits.

In Karnataka, men's and women's cooperatives are different. When men die at sea, women get compensation. But when women die at their workplace, their families are not compensated. Seeta Dasan pointed out that even in markets, men control the facilities used by women. Sebastian from Goa said that leadership does not evolve. When men go for meetings, women do not. Men are active on the ground. There is a need to share knowledge with women. Their group is now working towards leadership development among 200 men and 200 women. Rohit from Andhra Pradesh said that we use the word patriarchy so much because of belief. We have been told: the boy is preferred etc. Men resort to violence both at home and at sea.

Nayak said that the question of cooperatives differs from one state to another. When SEWA wanted to register as a trade union in Kerala, it was a seven year struggle. It was only after a central legislation came through that it was accepted by the state. With regard to compensation, where ever women's unions fought for an issue, they got what they wanted. Hence, there is need to raise one's voice and ask for change. Only then will it happen.

Marianne Manuel thanked all the participants for a lively and informative session.

DAY 3: 21st July 2019

The day began with the third set of group discussions as follows:

Group Discussion 3 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for social development of fishing communities from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group Discussion 3 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for gender equity in fisheries from the SSF Guidelines perspective

The Group Reports are included in **Appendix 3**.

After a break for coffee, the participants assembled for the open forum.

Open Forum

Chair: V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust

V. Vivekanandan opened the session stating that it was an opportunity for one representative from each state to share some of their thoughts about something that may not have been discussed within the group or something that they wanted to stress upon.

Tamil Nadu (Meenakshi)

Meenakshi from Rameshwaram in Tamil Nadu is a seaweed harvester. She said there were 21 islands between Rameshwaram and Thoothukudi and about 1000 fisherwomen collected seaweed in this stretch. Forest officials have prevented them from collecting seaweed from there on many occasions and she averred that the right over the sea in the stretch belonged to the fishing community. Their requests for the issuance of identity cards had been in vain and she sought urgent help in obtaining them. She pointed out that the women seaweed harvesters had been given awards by the United States, but their own state had failed to provide them with identity cards. She reiterated that they would not give up their rights as the sea belonged to the fisherfolk and it was they rather than the government, who protected the sea.

Kerala (Jackson)

Jackson from Kerala reflected on the discussions on the NMF Policy. According to him a major issue was that since fishing rights had still not been fixed and it was unclear who could fish since no decision had been taken. It was also not very clear who was going to benefit from the policy. The second point he made was regarding welfare measures. There was a lot of diversity among the states. In Kerala there were around 26 welfare schemes, some states also had their own welfare schemes. It was not very clear to what extent fishermen were properly covered under welfare measures. The third point was regarding mariculture, which was now being pushed on the grounds that marine fish resources were dwindling and production needed to be increased and only mariculture offered a future. He expressed worry regarding the environmental impacts and how it would displace capture fishermen from their livelihood.

West Bengal (Debasis Shyamal)

Debasis Shyamal raised three issues. The first was regarding rivers. The relationship between the rivers and sea was crucial for the health of fisheries, even marine fisheries. If this was not properly recognised and if the health of the riverine system was not maintained, it would affect the entire fisheries sector. Special mention was made about Hilsa which lived both in sea and in freshwater and its management involved management of both freshwater and marine sources. The second point was regarding the Sunderbans which was a conserved area that came under the Marine Protected Area and this was affecting the livelihood of people who had been fishing there traditionally. So in the MPA, small-scale traditional fishing livelihood protection was completely denied by the Forest Department. People who had boat registrations, identity cards and licences were denied permission to fish. This was a matter of serious concern. The third point was regarding health insurance facilities. He felt fishermen have common problems in all the states and for each state to run its own independent programme may not be a good idea. Like one nation, one policy, there should be a common system for all fishermen.

Andhra Pradesh (Arjili Dasu)

The entire Andhra Pradesh coast was highly exploited. Dasu said that there were many issues affecting the coast. For example, the public hearing on CZMP (Coastal Zone Management Plan) did not accept it but CZMP was passed by the government. At the same time, in different districts, CRZ violations were taking place. In the West Godavari district alone, 70 people were slapped with criminal cases under CRZ. These issues have not been raised, if they were, it would provide clarity regarding mariculture. Mariculture was totally connected with land and water. When there was no basic right to land, or on the shore surface, there was no question of entering into water. Andhra Pradesh had the second longest coast after Gujarat. The coastal waters were polluted either by factories or by municipalities. Neither the community nor the municipalities had been consulted regarding pollution control of the sea or riverine areas. The permission for all the factories while carrying out public hearing was obtained from the pollution control board. They should get an opinion from the fisheries board as well, in consultation with the community. Unless treatment was carried out to reduce pollution, there was no way of saving either the rivers or the seashore. The basic requirement of the fish larva to survive near the coast was not taking place. Vast stretches of mangroves were getting destroyed along the shore and their usage was being converted for shrimp culture. Until these issues were addressed, one could not proceed towards mariculture.

Odisha (Prasanna Behera)

Behrara said they became aware of the problems affecting fisheries in other states only after attending this workshop. He said more workshops at state and district levels were needed. He also said that more financial assistance was needed during the fishing ban especially during the turtle ban (seven months) during arrival of turtles as well as breeding ban (sixty days). They needed more support from ICSF and other NGOs to agitate for the fulfillment of their demands. He demanded the dismantling of all illegal prawn farms in coastal pockets and the regeneration of mangrove forests. Mangroves and other forests given to industry and other activities by the government should be stopped. There are already three large ports in Odisha and the government plans to build 12 more ports, which is not good. To fulfil their demands, more pressure needs to be put on the state and central governments.

Vivekanandan said that in Odisha small-scale fishermen were living under the shadow of the National Park and the marine and coastal protected areas and this was a serious issue for them.

Karnataka (Baby Saliyan)

The speaker was the president of the fresh fish sellers of Udipi district. They had established a fresh fish women's cooperative society six years ago and were controlling nearly 27 fish markets. They have been given high tech markets by the government but they were not up to expectations. The construction was faulty and a number of facilities required were lacking. They did not have proper dressing/waiting rooms and it was very difficult to maintain them properly.

They had a cooperative society which was granting loans of INR 25000 per loan at 0% interest to fisherwomen. She requested for pressure to be exerted on the government to sanction loans of an adequate amount at 0% interest to all the fisherwomen, not just in Karnataka but all over India. She said that in her district, one fishing boat with seven crew members went missing; family members were still waiting for their arrival and the government should take some measures to identify them and provide adequate compensation for them. They were not given any insurance facilities. The government must take sufficient measures to provide insurance facilities to all the fishermen. In order to encourage their children, they were giving scholarships out of fund created by their savings. It is a step created by their association to motivate their children. Every month on the first, they met in order to deliberate on various issues.

Goa (Olencio)

With respect to the national policy on marine fisheries, in the preamble, no proper definition has been given to explain who comes under the small-scale category. Nor has this been debated. With respect to fisheries management, they were concerned about the impact of private investment or PPP as they had seen how non-major ports had been taken over by private players, especially Adani and had witnessed the repercussions. There had been no debate on whether private investment would help or what the drawbacks would be. With respect to mariculture, again whether this would block traditional access, in the sea or in the river, was not clear. Rather than promoting wild culture fisheries, the focus should be on promoting the protection of capture fish. Presently there was a need to ensure that it carried on in a sustainable manner and there was no need to resort to artificial means.

In terms of marine environmental pollution, mitigation measures like controlling water pollution, beach erosion, strengthening environmental laws: like the impact of CRZ 2019 have not been discussed. The laws have to be strengthened rather than diluted. In terms of climate change, there is awareness regarding projects like Sagarmala, Bharatmala (coastal corridors), nationalisation of rivers (111 rivers) and development – what impacts will these have on climate change? The impact of the present ports has already been seen, what will be the impact if there are more expansions? It has already been seen that in coastal areas, roads led to more erosion. With respect to traditional livelihoods like mariculture and ecotourism: there is no definition of ecotourism and what its impact will be (like setting up marinas) on traditional fishers. At present a critique on all environmental laws is required so that those that are useful are strengthened and those that are deleterious are removed.

Maharashtra (Kiran Koli)

The focus should not be on individual states; what fishers want and do not from the policy must be discussed. Many points are mentioned in this policy, but if there are no fish in the sea, then what will we do with the policy? Destructive fishing is completely banned. However, destructive fishing itself has not been defined in the policy; it must be clarified. In fact a list of destructive fishing methods are available. We request a clarification regarding destructive fishing.

Gujarat

Gujarat's coastal fisheries are based on small-scale fisheries. Highest fisheries production here is at over 8 lakh tonnes per annum. For fisheries resources that were available within 4 nautical miles (nm), one decade ago, fishermen now have to go 7-8 nm. The boats have to venture deep into the sea. In the last three decades, there is very little fishing within the 3 nm area. Only Gujarat fishers fish in the *pagadia* (intertidal zone) as there is a large intertidal zone ranging between 100m and 5 km. Stocks are decreasing but CMFRI stock data shows high values. How do they conduct their survey and what is the mechanism they use is not known. Is the data authentic or reliable? There are suspicions regarding its authenticity. Gujarat and Western India's biggest river is the Narmada which flows only in the monsoon to meet the sea. The Sardar Sarovar dam has stopped the flow of water for eight months and freshwater never mixes with the seawater and breeding never takes place. Narmada is now non-perennial except during the monsoon. In the last monsoon there was very little water because the height of the dam had been raised. So the small fishers based out of the Narmada estuary are in very bad condition. Tapi is also in the same situation.

Plenary: FWO-CSO Perspectives on the Implementation of the National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Chair: John Kurien, Managing Trustee, ICSF Trust

The Chairperson gave each person five minutes to talk about any specific aspect of the implementation which may have been left out of the discussion. He went on to explain a bit about the whole process that ICSF has been involved with regard to the national plan and the SSF guidelines. He said that this is part of a larger series of initiatives that they had been taking to make the SSF guidelines known more widely in order to link it up with the national policy and the governance process. This is one of those initiatives. There will be another session in which there will be more government participation at the state level and so on. Another initiative is the discussion at the panchayat level. They were getting people such as panchayat presidents etc. from different parts of India to have discussions about both the guidelines and the policy.

Speakers:

Peter T., General Secretary, National Fishworkers' Forum (NFF)

Members of the National Fishworkers (NFF) members sat together recently and discussed the agenda which was on mariculture and fisheries management. Following a difference of opinion they took a decision to sit together once again and send a report to ICSF as soon as possible. Several things have been added in the policy, many in favour of the small-scale fisherfolk in the policy. At the same time, the Government of India and the Prime Minister (PM) are taking serious interest in the Blue Economy but all the facilities are going to big trawlers and not the small fisherfolk. This is a major point of concern. If fishers allow

mariculture, all small-scale fishers will gradually be evicted and will lose their rights. PPP cannot be allowed. If it is allowed, all land belonging to fishers will be taken over by corporates. In the present situation, CRZ is not in favour of fisherfolk, it allows tourism, industries and real estate sectors. This needs to be changed. In climate change, the first people to be affected are the fishing community. Nationally or internationally, nobody is considering fishing communities. John Kurien has the space in the international forum and so does the ICSF which needs to take this forward. NFF has decided to meet as soon as possible to discuss these two agenda points and forward its views. This workshop has been very useful in promoting awareness regarding several issues.

Kurien observed that India was a big country with different social and ecological situations. It was only natural that there would be differences. But that did not mean that some common agenda cannot be arrived at especially when discussions are held over the impact of these issues on the fisherfolk. Whether they relate to management or mariculture, it is possible to have consensus.

Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation

Introducing Marianne Manuel, Kurien said she is the Assistant Director at the Dakshin Foundation, an NGO based out of Bangalore which is working very closely with coastal communities, NFF and other organisations and helping them to understand the laws and is also taking up various issues. Dakshin is also involved in concrete initiatives such as fisheries co-management, in Lakshadweep and also helps people's organisations.

The NMFP, talks about co-management of fisheries. There is a need to extend co-management to ocean and land based spaces, and a lot of issues that were discussed in the workshop can be incorporated. Whether the discussions are about the paucity of infrastructure or lack of equal representation for men and women, or the fact that new industries are entering into the coastal and marine areas and spaces for fishers are shrinking, there is a need to ensure that there is an effective co-management structure in place, where MPAs are designed and set up with the consent of fishermen. The issue is not about the language of consultation which can always be twisted, but about **consent**. With the participation and consent of fishing communities, whether while designing conservation measures, fisheries management, or ideas regarding the arrival of marine spatial planning. The planning is going to be done on their behalf by an outside agency. The fishing communities need to take lead in designing what beaches and coastal spaces should look like, how coastal commons should be used and how marine resources and the environment should be protected. Communities are in the frontline of all issues dealing with pollution and erosion. Given that communities bear the brunt of these issues, it is important that the concept of co-management is taken and lobbied for so that the idea can be extended to all spaces and not fisheries management alone. For example, in terms of decisions, the Niti Ayog wants to open up tourism in Lakshadweep. Fishers are empowered to work with the government on fisheries management. They also have the relationships and empowerment to have these conversations about whether tourism should be allowed in these spaces or not;

whether other types of industry should be allowed; in terms of their access to electricity and freshwater, what are the limitations that they are facing. Many women have talked in this meeting with regard to how markets are designed. If markets are designed in a co-creative fashion, in cooperation and planning with the communities, both men and women, then markets would be designed to cater to the needs of the community that is going to use it. The idea of co-managed institutions, co-managed spaces is that it is the only way to open up the conversation regarding many other things; it is an umbrella concept that embodies all the issues that have been under discussion over the last three days.

Kurien agreed with Marianne's observations on consultation and informed consent and felt it was important that she had highlighted this. He also thought that the points she had raised about co-management, not just regarding the sea, but also land, were also significant.

Arjilli Dasu, Executive Director, District Fishermen's Youth Welfare Association, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh

In Andhra Pradesh, officials of the fisheries department and politicians are unaware about the SSF Guidelines. Representations and booklets have been given several times eliciting no response. The SSF guidelines should be included in the marine fisheries policy. In Andhra Pradesh most fishing comprises bottom trawling fishing. There is an immediate need to ban bottom trawling nets and illegal nets. The Andhra Pradesh government is not bothered about central policies. Only state government policies are followed. Climate change is a big problem for the traditional fishing community and the cost of fishing operations has gone up significantly over time because of climate change. Fish was available within 5-6 km earlier and fishermen would spend 3-4 hours in the sea. Today they spend 5-7 days. Nets also are changing. Earlier all fish would be caught using 3-4 nets, today there is a different net for each fish such as the mackerel net, seerfish net, pomfret net etc. The Cage culture was introduced by CMFRI in the sea off Visakhapatnam, five years ago. Tourists enjoy the cage culture just as they do museums. Recently, at Danavaipeta in the Kakina area, the fisher community installed a cage culture in the sea. But there were no profits. Out of an expenditure and investment of INR 53 lakh, they only received INR 1,76,000. Local fishermen also raised objections. In the sea, the ONGC, Navy, mechanised boats and others have occupied many areas. Where is the place for traditional fishermen if the cage culture is introduced as well? Insurance is required for boats and fishers. Post-harvest and value addition are also needed. Most fisherwomen in this sector are above 45 years. Fisherwomen, below 45 years are not interested in this job. We have informed the Government of Andhra Pradesh regarding the current state of affairs and requested it to encourage value addition such as packed dry fish and; we have also asked it to encourage young educated women in this sector as about 85% are opting for domestic work. These women should be brought into the value chain. When fish are caught, they are of excellent quality, but by the time the fish reaches the consumer, there is a 50-60% loss in quality but the price increases. Sagarmala is a big problem. By making big harbours, there will be space only for big boats. Where will the small boats go? With coastal land being either occupied or lost due to erosion, there is no space even for drying fish, so there is an urgent need to protect

coastal land.

John Kurien flagged the first point Arjilli Das mentioned regarding many people in the government being unaware of the SSF guidelines. It was important to ascertain this as these guidelines have been endorsed by the Government of India. They were not a legal document but carried moral obligations which were often more powerful than legal obligations and pressure had to be put on the bureaucrats to implement them.

Jesu Rethinam, Member, Executive Committee, National Fishworkers' Forum

Jesu Rethinam said that he was not only speaking on behalf of the NFF but also other organisations, especially the Coastal Action Network and other member organisations. He agreed that SSF guidelines were voluntary. Today the government had placed an amendment of RTI Act regarding the provisions in the RTI. Whatever legal measures or rights that were there in the Act had been totally taken away by all amendments. So in this context implementing voluntary guidelines purely on their moral ethic raised questions on how it was going to happen and was a major issue. He cited the example of a particular project wherein coastal communities had expressed their views stating that they did not want it, and had enough evidence to prove that it was already causing pollution but no effort has been made either by the company or the government to have a comprehensive vision in this regard; even after the community had given a written presentation to the Collector stating that they did not want the project there. The Ministry has very clearly questioned the right of the community to voice its opinion. So where is the question of getting consent? And how do we get that consent? How do we ensure that consent? There should be some radical legal measure passed by the parliament to have that consent and unless the consent is there, we cannot move forward. We had a few things like SEZ where unless you had the consent of the farmers, their land could not be taken away. But now even that has been taken away. In this political scenario, I just wanted to look into the implementation of the NPMF. The NPMF without incorporating the SSF Guidelines has started extending support for the deep sea fishing policy by giving subsidised loans to the deep sea vessels. The fisheries department clearly pushes for deep sea vessel loans. In this context, I am not sure what we should do. The government has started implementing what it thinks it can implement. From what I understand, there were two draft policies and the final policy has come. In the beginning itself there were many groups that worked on it and submitted their suggestions. But most of these suggestions were not considered or were changed. Why can questions not be asked under the RTI, regarding the suggestions that were made and the objections that were raised and how these were used by the Ministry to frame this policy? Because in the CRZ case, the Centre for Policy Research (CPR) – Namati programme, obtained information through RTI and took legal measures. The suggestion is that we should look into it, get the information and then thrash it out. Make the state accountable to what the people have already said in their suggestions. Especially ICSF has given a detailed note for the draft policy. SSF clearly says tenure rights should be given priority. But how do we take it forward?

John Kurien: said he thought Jesu had raised an interesting point about the RTI for the draft

in relation to the changes that had taken place. He was however unsure whether answers could be accessed as several people in the last couple of days mentioned that purposive changes were made to cater to some lobbies.

Purnima Meher, Maharashtra Machhimar Kruti Samiti (MMKS)

The policy while mentioning gender equity and gender justice does not mention the role of women in pre-harvesting. Rights of women, markets, tenure rights are also not mentioned. Kurien did talk about the role of the Panchayati Raj institutions. It is called gram panchayat (GP) in Maharashtra and the 74th amendment opened the doors for women. What is the role of women in panchayats, especially fisherwomen in areas such as fish markets? There is no voice for fisherwomen in the GP. There is so much happening with regard to globalisation that even in villages there are no spaces and women sit in streets. There are records in the village panchayat and fishermen get registered in the port but for fisherwomen who go from street to street there are no records of spaces. There have been discussions regarding how to bring this up in the GP. Discussions regarding widows in the fisher community are required. The SSF guidelines bring back memories of Chandrika Sharma. The SSF guidelines and the NPMF should be connected and there was a need to come up with long term and short term plans.

John Kurien summed up that Meher had touched on government functioning at the lowest levels and the role of panchayats in recognition of the rights of fisherwomen. The SSF guideline is the only UN document dedicated to one individual, Chandrika Sharma.

Pradip Chatterjee, President, Dakshinbanga Matsyajibi Forum (DMF)

Pradeep Chatterjee felt that they were reacting to the policy after a delay of two years and that they should have presented the government with an action plan within six months after the policy came out, following intense discussions and consultations amongst themselves. He said, 'The government presented us with three consecutive drafts on this policy and I remember three times the NFF came out with recommendations and through those recommendations some changes were made after seeing that justice had not been done in the first draft.' Suggestions should have been made when it was at the draft stage. After it was finalised, no time should have been lost in suggesting action plans.

A very important weakness of the policy was that the fishery sector is not a stand-alone sector. It was being continuously impacted by many other sectors. Shipping, construction, roadways, thermal power plants, nuclear power plants – everything. Where does the fishery policy stand among the many interventions from these other sectors? That has to be decided. It is well known that when a thermal power plant or a port comes, there are no discussions or consultations with the fisher people because they have no value. They have no right over water, so it is taken from them at the will of several other people. This has to be contested. The fisher people must have right over water. In the sector, small and traditional fishers should have preferential access. The principle of scale subsidiarity needs to be applied. There

should be a moratorium for the larger players and none for small fishers. Yes, there is overcapacity. First reduce the capacity of the larger players, mechanised boats, and trawlers. There should be a ban on all kinds of destructive fishing like bottom trawling, purse seining, LED light fishing, fish finders etc. In the ban period too scale subsidiarity should be applied. If a month's ban is proposed for small-scale fishers, there should be four month bans for larger vessels. All these aspects should be considered. Regarding MPAs, there is a very good direction that fishers' right to livelihood will be protected. But nothing has been done as yet. We are languishing in the Sunderbans, Gahirmatha, Bhitarkanika, Malvan etc. The Government has a policy, but no implementation, no direction and no action plan. So the government should be asked immediately how it plans to protect the livelihood of the fishers in protected areas. The fisher community does not agree with mariculture as it is capital intensive. Small-scale fishers cannot engage in it and yet it is being planned. The main argument is that fish are dwindling in the ocean. So without going into the process of reduction and trying to address issues related to it, prescribing mariculture will only add to the pollution. It will not increase natural resources of the ocean waters in any way. It is capital intensive and will ultimately go into the hands of investors, or some group of entrepreneurs as is happening in the prawn aquaculture and inland sectors.

Regarding climate change, the strength of small-scale fishers has been reduced due to pollution, overfishing, encroachments etc. How can they resist the impact of climate change? When erosion is taking place due to construction on the coastline, it is also contributing to climate change. As far as women are concerned, they should have equal rights, equity etc. In practical terms, the government needs to come out with a comprehensive scheme for women fishworkers from which they can draw their requirements such as finance, transport, platforms for fish drying, marketplaces, value additions etc. In general schemes for fishworkers and women should be given priority and preferential access. The primacy of small and traditional fishworkers should be maintained. Unless this is ensured and discussions are limited to stakeholders who comprise anyone on the coast and equal rights are given to them all, fishers will be in minority. So the primacy of small and traditional fishers and fish workers in fisheries management is needed. For this, suitable mechanisms should be developed. Knowledge, information can be supplied from outside but the decision should be in the hands of the small and traditional fishers.

John Kurien took up Chatterjee's first point regarding delay and pointed out that it was due to collective failure. 'So within this context let me have the last word as the person responsible for ICSF here – the role of ICSF can only be that of a facilitator. We cannot take a leading role in opposing or proposing government policy in the way the fishworker organisations can.' He proposed that if a vision document was prepared in alignment with the kind of fisheries that fishers wanted for the country, it could be taken up at all levels and the powers could be confronted with it.

Discussion Highlights

T. Peter from Kerala said that at least 10 HP engines should be allowed in the Marine Protected Areas in Tamil Nadu. Chinese high-propulsion engines should not be permitted.

LED light fishing should be avoided. Basic facilities for fishworkers in fishing harbours and landing centres are essential as they are travelling up to 200 km to catch fish.

The participants from Andhra Pradesh said there should be a completely ban on mariculture; it should not have been allowed in the first place. They were of the view that routing welfare schemes through gram panchayats was completely inefficient and felt that it would be better if the state fisheries department undertook the task as the gram panchayats were completely political and took their cut.

Participants from Goa pointed out that a discussion on ecotourism was completely missing in the policy. Catch-picture-release for tourists coming in boats needed further discussion.

A participant said that they had proposed 80:20 ratio for co-management, biodiversity committee heads and all other committees for community participation with 80% of the members being drawn from the community and a maximum of 20% from the other side/government. He also suggested that there should be an increase in the ban period along with an increase in compensation and the BPL criteria should be removed; the last two for the ban and lean period. Enforcement of specifications for engine and net sizes should not be limited to fishermen alone, but should also cover importers and manufacturers for effective implementation. Another participant said the capacity should be restricted to a maximum of 250 HP in trawlers. Participants from Maharashtra felt that the city and village development plans should include reserved spaces for fish markets.

Rules must be made to control fishing and ensure biodiversity conservation of fish stocks, said some participants from Karnataka. There should be control over fishing in the 12-100 nm area by restricting fishing vessels and fishing gears. Catching of juvenile fish must be stopped. Advocacy on SSF should percolate down to the last person in the village. On the west coast, the monsoon fishing ban is in place for a period of 90 days (15th May to 15th August); the compensation for this period should be hiked for fishers. Blue economy, especially Sagarmala, needs to be discussed and there is a need to reach out to the stakeholders in this regard. They also called for a state-level workshop for stakeholders.

Debasis Shyamal speaking on behalf of West Bengal said that the ban period along the east coast should vary because when trawlers go out to sea, small-scale fishers do not get any fish. He proposed a 120 days ban for mechanised boats with four cylinders and more and 90 days for motorised boats. Manual boats should be kept out of the ban. There should be a ten year moratorium for the registration of new mechanised boats. The message given by placing a moratorium on small boats is not right as they need to be supported. There should not be any new boats and even if a boat is destroyed/damaged there should be no replacement. He felt that this would enable fish to come close the coast in 20-40 years.

Alleya from Odisha explained that there were three types of bans in Odisha. There was a full year ban on the Kendrapara district marine sanctuary along a 60 km coast. The marine sanctuary had core and buffer areas. Fishers have identity cards from the fisheries department but foresters shot at them. There was a no-fishing zone in place along 100 km for 7 months. He suggested that the ban should only be in place in places where turtles come to breed

instead of the entire area. Based on traditional knowledge, small-scale fishers do not fish in such locations, he said.

Nalini Nayak requested NFF to define what was small-scale in different parts of the coast. With this the session came to a close.

Plenary: Short-term and Long-term Action Points for the Implementation of the National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

The presentation was made by Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust along with E. Vivekanandan, Principal Scientist (Retd.), CMFRI.

Chair: Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust

Sebastian Mathew read out the draft recommendations and requested feedback so that they could be finalised. The text of recommendations read out at the workshop is given below.

(See Appendix 4)

The Workshop came to an end with the Vote of Thanks proposed by N. Venugopalan, Programme Manager, ICSF Trust.

.APPENDIX – 1

GROUP DISCUSSION 1

Group Discussion 1 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for fisheries management from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group a: Fisheries Management (Coordinator: K. Sunil Mohamed; Rapporteur: Ahana Lakshmi). The group had sixteen members.

While most of the fisheries management measures proposed are relevant and important in the Indian context, they will not be fruitful without addressing the fundamental issue of tenure of fishermen and the historical rights of the fishing communities involved in fisheries for generations. This was the pre-condition put by the group for a sound fisheries management in India

For fleet-size control and capacity reduction (a key to effort reduction and resource sustainability), it is necessary to acknowledge that members of the historical fishing

community, especially active fishermen and those who have been active in fishing for a reasonable period of time, have first right to own fishing boats. Consensus over boat ownership must be developed with historical fishing communities on ways to ration the access to resources given that there is very little scope for further expansion and considerable overcapacity at present. A resource allocation policy on the basis of 'scale subsidiarity' must be developed. This works on two axes: size or fishing capacity of the unit and fishing method (passive/active). The group felt that the fishing fleet must be restructured on the basis of scale subsidiarity ensuring smaller scale units have preference, i.e., the larger units are allowed only to the extent that there is a surplus available after resource allocation to smaller units. Such a fleet restructuring will actually lead to capacity reduction without loss of employment and create conditions for custodianship of the resource and greater chances of success for community management and co-management. It may be easier to adopt apparently difficult management measures for effort control and enable substantial localisation.

6.0 To develop strategies to reduce overcapacity: There is need to reduce capacity of fleet to reduce pressure on fish stock. This can be done by fleet reduction by implementing a moratorium on new boats for ten years, allowing only replacements with a review after 10 years. Non-licenced boats should be banned from fishing and those caught indulging in illegal fishing should have their licences cancelled. For example, during the ban period in Kerala, even carrying a net of less than the legal mesh size attracts penalty. However, it must be highlighted that there needs to be a mechanism for law enforcement as lack of political will is a problem. Simultaneously, other causes of fish stock reduction such as development of ports and pollution of coastal waters should also be identified and controlled.

7.0 Precautionary approach for maintaining MSY could be done using traditional knowledge of fishers.

8.0 Fleetsize optimisation would be possible by declaring the prescribed fleet size at the national level as overcapacity is a problem that cannot be addressed at the state level, considering that while the catch is not going down totally, the state share is changing with aggressive fishing and states reporting higher catches. For example, social criteria on ownership of boats could be developed using the FRA as an example.

8.0 Fishing effort management: To prioritise access to resource, principles of scale subsidiarity should be applied, thus promoting smaller boats and passive gears where possible and ensuring rotational access. Illegal fishing by trawlers/ purse-seiners could be curtailed by the enforcement of zones in the short term while educational initiatives to convince the masses regarding the undesirable outcomes of overcapacity and illegal fishing could be the way to go in the long term.

8.0 Area specific management plans could be prepared based on CMFRI's zonation. Fishers should be licensed to fish only in those zones. Currently, the group noted, stock assessment is all messed up because fishing is all over the place.

8.0 Protection of iconic species requires a new instrument other than the WLPA which has its origin in terrestrial areas. The group felt this was essential as fishing is a legitimate livelihood and foresters do not understand fisheries.

8.0 Creation of fish refugia through consultation and based on traditional knowledge, if available has to be done.

8.0 Evaluation of existing MPA needs to be done by ensuring that management plans (prepared already) are implemented without hampering traditional/ SSF livelihoods.

9.0 The conflict resolution mechanism between traditional and mechanised sectors must recognise the primacy of traditional and small-scale fishers. A level-playing field is required in the council as disparity in power is the fundamental problem; and there should be proper punishment for breaking rules. 10.0 Information services to fishers could be disseminated through a provision of disaggregated data of catch and landing centres in the public domain. Information should be disseminated through community radios. Information that will help in restoration and protection of coastal ecosystems must be provided to fishers.

12.0 Input and output controls for fleet size etc.: For this, a menu of options is essential and there should be preferential access for SSF.

13. Demarcation of distance from Shore for motorised and non-motorised. The group pointed out that India is one of the earliest to have demarcated this and preferential access to SSF with implementation of scale subsidiarity principle should be done. Ensuring share of resources for SSF could be done through input controls.

14. Promotion of co-management or participatory management should be via self-organised community organisations and not through administrative orders. It was necessary to provide due recognition to community organisations.

15. Promotion of private investments in deep sea fishing in states. The group felt that deep sea should be considered beyond continental shelf. While no corporate investment should be permitted, fishermen can invest on their own, or eligible investors from fishing communities should be given permit. There should not be large subsidies as this will result in government becoming the owner.

15. Capacity building for deep sea fishing should be by encouraging traditional fishermen, training them for deep sea fishing and guiding and control existing deep sea fishing. There should be also proper buy back methodologies.

16. Development of Infrastructure. The group felt that fishing harbours and fishing jetties in some locations (e.g. AP) are urgently required. Spaces for fish drying are also needed. It was pointed out that in some states, there are enough landing sites but no storage facilities and hence fish agents buy up stock at lower prices. There was also the issue of use of formalin in fish preservation. The group suggested market-mechanism facilitated infrastructure storage,

managed by cooperatives that come from community as in Maharashtra. They also suggested setting up demand-based fish markets with hygienic facilities.

17. Preparation of coastal fisheries development plans. The group said that CZMP do not have information on fisheries and this must be rectified.

Group b: Fisheries Management (Coordinator: E. Vivekanandan; Rapporteurs Divya Karnad and N. Venugopalan, ICSF Trust). The group had twelve members.

6.0 To develop strategies to reduce overcapacity: The group had divergent opinions. One opinion called for defining destructive fishing like bull trawling and bottom trawling. The group said that the NPMF should define traditional fishing following which destructive fishing techniques could be banned and overcapacity reduced. For this, a suggestion was to work on 'one family - one boat' principle. Overcapacity is also due to certain forms of adaptation in technology and only 'traditional' should be encouraged. Another opinion was that there should be no more building of new vessels and that boat building could not be done without registration. They said that the MFRA needs to be amended with powers to check boat building yards as was done by the Kerala Government through the amendment of the KMFRA.

7.0 Precautionary approach for maintaining MSY: To support the precautionary approach, one should stop all types of boat manufacturing except manual and motorised, and the 'one boat - one family' should apply only to the mechanised sector. Doubts were raised about whether this could actually be implemented on the ground.

8.0 Fishing effort management: For this, there should be financial transfers to do things right and it may be better to implement this through a co-management framework at the Taluk, district and state level.

8.0 Biodiversity conservation in production process: The group said that the state and national biodiversity boards should have consultations with the fishing community to know how marine environment is getting impacted, e.g. loss of mangroves. Fishing community should be part of the decision-making process and permit process in critical habitats of coastal and marine environment.

8.0 Species-specific and area-specific management plans: The group felt that fishing areas should not be privatised in the name of conservation. There was general scepticism about usefulness of MPAs. It was unclear how mariculture would support fishing communities. The idea of 'no-take' zones was not acceptable to the group which felt that the fishing community protects charismatic species. The group said that oil companies are coming into Kerala and the creation of MPAs are being brought in to disguise ventures like mariculture and other forms of privatisation. Fishing has to be sustainable throughout the marine space. Beyond 100 nm, species-specific management plans can be implemented.

8.0 Conservation of EBSAs: would be possible only after they are identified.

8.0 Evaluation of Existing MPAs: should be carried out through studies.

8.0 Legislative support to ensure rights to traditional fishermen: is required, especially user rights for the traditional fishing community in landing centres.

9. 0 Creation of fish refugia:through consultation is fine as an idea but problematic in implementation, felt the group. If fishing activity is to be restricted in such refugia, then no activity should be permitted; and such closures should be temporary.

10.0 Information services to fishermen: With regard to this, there was a difference of opinion about use of information services. The group felt that provision of real-time information regarding resources had increased over-exploitation at sea. Information services support few fishermen and the group felt that PFZ information also supports growth of Fish meal industries and reduction in prices at fish landing centres. However, information services regarding cyclones and weather forecast are useful to fishermen.

11. 0 To conduct periodical reviews of temporal and spatial closures: The group said that seasonal ban should be continued and there was no need to review this. They felt that the seasonal ban period has to be increased with suggestions varying from 90 days to 120 days. Review is needed only for spatial closures. They said that manually operated boats should be allowed inside MPAs and the protection of MPAs should be given to fisheries cooperatives or community-based organisations. Another suggestion made by the group was that boats with upto 30 Hp engines should be allowed to fish during seasonal ban. They called for removal of the BPL card-based support system and said that compensation has to be given for the seasonal ban.

12.0 Input and output controls, Fleet size etc: For this, mesh size regulation is important and use of Indonesian or Chinese engines should be prohibited. The square mesh size is compulsory for trawl net and the use of diamond mesh size should be banned. They also called for a ban on curly dol or bag nets.

13. Demarcation of distance from Shore for motorised and non-motorised: The group said that the 12 nm limit should be an artisanal fishing zone. They felt that the State's jurisdiction over EEZ can be increased. They called for the use of the automatic vessel identification system by law enforcement agencies to monitor, patrol etc. and said that depth demarcation should be closely monitored.

14. Promotion of co-management or participatory management: The group supported co-management with some members feeling that better financial allocation is needed with a clearer participation of the fishing community.

15. Promotion of private investments in deep sea fishing in states: The group were emphatically against LOP. The majority said that there was no need to promote deep sea fishing while a few in the group supported community-based deep sea fishing.

Group Discussion 1 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for fisheries post-harvest and trade from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group c: Fisheries Post-harvest and Trade (Coordinator: Nalini Nayak; Rapporteur: Tara Verghis and Manas Roshan). The group had nineteen members. Translation support was provided by Samyuktha PC, S. Gunakar, Gutta Rohith and Ashis Senapati.

The participants first discussed some of the terminologies used. These are given below:

Subsidiarity Principle: When the community cannot do, the government can do (but the community should be included).

Tenure rights: A participant thought it was the same as the right to have a job. It is the right over a resource that people have enjoyed for a long time. The right has not been given to the fishing communities by the government

Co-management: Working with the government and working outside the government. Traditional communities may be included in management, but when that happens, political appointees seize control and this does not align with the community's needs. Another view point was that co-management had government on one side and the community on the other. It was necessary to include all stakeholders along the value chain, irrespective of gender. When all stakeholders have some say in management, it is defined as co-management.

Ecosystem Approach: Some of the participants thought that this referred to the environment while others interpreted this as a reference to fish hygiene and safety. It means all different species living together.

How can these terms be applied to post-harvest and trade?

Tamil Nadu: Participants from this state wanted to know why it was necessary for women fish vendors to get a certificate for the fish they sell. It was agreed that often, they don't know how the fish have been handled before they acquire them. They agreed that there were lots of problems from the fishing to the landing site to the market area. Participants pointed out that women fish vendors have to pay a tax to use the markets. Fish vendors are not allowed to transport their fish in (public) buses and hence are forced to rely on private modes of transport. They said that markets do not have any restrooms or safety facilities for women. They said that while fishermen have ID cards, these are not issued to the women in the community.

Women seaweed collectors from Ramnad said that tenure rights are a major problem in the biosphere reserve. Women stay in the islands during seaweed collection, but forest officials harassed them and have banned all activity. Women do not have ID cards and there is no union or cooperative of women seaweed harvesters; there is only a fisher cooperative.

The group said that there were big catches at the end of the ban period. However, traders suppress prices and say they don't want the fish. This continues for about 10 to 12 days. They sell the excess fish to chicken feed companies. Regarding cooperatives, the group opined that they need to work in favour of the community and middlemen should not get in the way.

Karnataka: The ecosystem approach was considered difficult to implement for the women who deal in salted fish in Malpe markets. They individually buy fish from fish yards and there is a demand for all kinds of fresh fish. The women buy the fish individually; the cooperative only supplies the salt. The group said that the land provided by the port authorities should be exclusively for fishery activities and these lands should be under the control of the community. Women should not be restricted from using these lands for fish drying. At the same time, fish vendors should not use the harbour to sell fish. Transport is the main issue for fisherwomen: the landing centre is far away from the markets. Only a few women are allowed at a time to transport their fish in shared taxis / auto rickshaws.

Cooperatives need support as societies are still functioning from rented buildings. The group felt that the government can provide them land. They wanted interest-free loans, just like farmers who are considered eligible for them from public sector banks. It was also pointed out that women find it difficult to compete with male vendors who sell fish in the street markets.

Odisha: Exploitation by middlemen is rampant in cooperative societies. Members are local politicians. Instead these societies must have regular elections within the community. Transport facilities from landing centres to markets are absent. Middlemen have vehicles and they purchase fish at low prices from auctions/landing centres. Small fish vendors need cold storage facilities at landing sites and markets. Fishermen are compelled to rear poultry as a part of the Integrated Coastal Zone Management project. But the community needs fishery-related alternatives. There is a lot of outward migration from the state, especially men from coastal villages. When the men are away, the women purchase fish from other villages far away and sell dried fish for a living. Poor infrastructure as exemplified by the solar-powered dry fish plant set up by the government at a cost of INR 2 crore. It was managed by SHGs for three years but now is defunct. It is not properly covered, has no boundary wall and was also damaged by cyclones. Ecotourism in protected areas is not an option because the fishing communities have no rights and the government does not permit them to carry out any activity in these areas.

Group d: Fisheries Post-harvest and Trade (Coordinator: Nikita Gopal; Rapporteur: Marianne Manuel). The group had 11 members.

Nikita Gopal said that the post-harvesting policy was being prepared and inland fishery was included in it. She said this was an opportunity to address the limitations in the NPMF. She suggested that once a draft is in place, there would be consultations and hence it would be useful for the community to attend those consultations. She said that in the meetings that had taken place, the following points had been made: basic facilities are absent for women in markets and during creation of new markets, neither women (the sellers), nor buyers are

being asked how these spaces should be or where they should be and what facilities are required. She asked when basic infrastructure such as landing centres, markets or roads is missing, how is trade to be carried out. She also pointed out that rights to traditional selling areas are being reduced and women are losing ground. She suggested the following action point: Each state needs to create a scheme and budget allocation for these basic facilities or else they will remain as mere words in the policy.

Nandini said that metropolitan Mumbai has many facilities but women are still selling fish on the roads. Basic amenities like dressing rooms, toilets and water supply are missing in landing centres. Malavani and Malad have space allocated for fish markets but even here, goondas are preventing people from using it. There is no dispensary. Ujjwala said that landing centres in Maharashtra need to be reserved and cannot be changed. She said if residential areas are growing, those areas which are informal markets without registrations should be mapped and included in the development plan of Mumbai. Markets also need space to grow and this space should be included in the plan. A crèche for children was also a big requirement, she said. The action point derived is that 'areas which are informal markets without registrations etc. should be mapped and included in the development plan.' Nandini suggested that shops run by fisher cooperatives should be created in neighbourhoods similar to vegetable shops run by cooperatives. Bharat Patel suggested the action point: Demarcation of fish landing centres; and post-harvest infrastructure needs to be included in the city development plan.

Poornima said women who go to Sassoon dock for auction need to be protected and given rights to this area for purchase and sales. Women from Palghar and Gujarat also come here, but there's nothing for them. Basic amenities need to be installed and since these women stay overnight; night shelters are needed. Sheik said that when cities create development plans, they need to ensure a fisheries market along with vegetable markets. The places where women traditionally sell need to be reserved and they should not be allocated new markets at far away locations. Nikita Gopal said women from Andhra Pradesh too go all the way to West Bengal to buy fish. Thus, women around India travel. Therefore a general action point could be a call for 'landing centres with facilities for auction, toilets, changing rooms etc'.

Sheik said that INR 40 crore had been spent on a fishing harbour. But there was no income because the government had selected land inside the estuary and no boat could enter it as dredging had not been done. From 2005-2019, no money has been earned. Hence, 4000 boats have now migrated to Maharashtra due to poor site selection. Ujjwala said that big projects for tourists were coming up in Sassoon and Kasara and therefore work at landing centres had been stopped in favour of beautification projects. Sheik said PPP projects should be introduced in fisheries infrastructure because then management would be good but Usman said that this would allow corporates to enter the scene. Nikita said that investments in Kochi airport have been made by regular folk and similarly, could fisher unions, boat owners' cooperatives rather than corporations (in case of PPP) become partners? Sheik said that government- private investment is 90:10; that 10% could come from the community. Subsequently, management could be by the associations or investors which could include collection of fees etc and be used for maintenance and management. Usman emphasised that

it must be made clear that in these PPPs no corporations are allowed. However, Milan from West Bengal said that in this PPP model, small fisher families would get excluded and become marginalised further.

Usman said land for drying sheds needs to be allocated since land next to fisher villages are given to various industries. And when infrastructure is built, the management needs to be given immediately to a management committee and fishermen have to be part of it. The action point from here was ‘when infrastructure is built the management needs to be given immediately to a management committee and fishermen have to be part of it’.

Bharat Patel said that many fishing communities migrate to catch fish. Migrating families need to have facilities in their areas of migration and also need better connectivity between these places. Milan said women cooperatives are needed so that funds for women’s activities actually get to them. Ujjwala said it was necessary to amend the 1961 Cooperative Act: they had been trying since 2013 but women have not been able to start a cooperative because the rule lays down a requirement of 10 mechanised boats to start a cooperative. The action point here was to ‘introduce a scheme for setting up women fish vendor cooperatives’.

Ujjwala said that SHGs should not be mentioned as the implementing vehicles in policies as political parties set up SHGs and capture the space; excluding fisher SHGs. Fisher cooperatives ensure that it is only fishers.

Sheik proposed the following action point: ‘Landing centres should be identified and mapped and all spaces used for post-harvest’. Ujjwala said it should be ensured that the CZMP includes the local village development maps. The revenue department must be approached to get these maps created.

Mr Sheik said financial management is important and suggested an action point: all fishers need a credit card-like the Kisan card which provides credit worth INR 2 lakh with 2-3% interest. There needs to be a clear criterion regarding who is eligible. In the discussion that followed, suggestions were made that anyone with a biometric fisher card could be eligible. The problem was that in many places, non-fishers also have these cards.

Milan suggested that each state needs a grievance redressal committee at the state, district, block and panchayat levels comprising fisheries department officials and fisher leaders. Ujjwala suggested that fisher leaders also need to be in the District Planning and Development Committees.

Milan said cooperatives should manage cold storage facilities with the help of subsidies from the government as this would help to offset the maintenance and electricity charges. To cut out the middle men, alternate credit sources are needed. If these cold storages extend a line of credit, they can keep the fish catch till the sales are done and the loan paid back, cutting out the middleman. The government should also offer an interest subsidy on the loan, so that only 4% increment is finally spent by the fisher since the balance is paid back to the fisher’s account.

Bharat Patel said that proper drying and storage yards for Bombay duck were needed so they could fetch better prices. Currently there is too much sand in the dried product. Ujjwala affirmed that there was a loss of INR 2 lakhs in Bombay duck because of quality issues and the batch went to the fishmeal factory in the end.

APPENDIX 2

GROUP DISCUSSION 2

Group Discussion 2 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for mariculture, deep sea fishing and other new initiatives, from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group Discussion 2 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for coastal and marine environment, climate change and blue growth from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group a: Gujarat and Maharashtra (Coordinator: V. Vivekanandan; Rapporteur: MSH Sheikh). The group had ten members.

The group held a discussion on the location of mariculture and its hindrance to fishermen and the displacement of fishermen due to other kinds of development. They pointed out that creeks are polluted and hence mariculture here is risky. They felt that if they did not take up mariculture activities, others would grab it. There were many varieties of mariculture which could give employment to SSF and the possibility of clam and oyster culture could also be explored. Sindhudurg's mariculture project and crab hatchery with positive results in backwaters was cited and the success with seabass in Uran in Raigarh district was also mentioned. The group felt that these examples were useful as possible modes of alternative employment especially during ban period, as people based near creeks could turn to these kinds of projects for their livelihood. However, hatchery was required. Mariculture also calls for heavy investment and hence was not affordable for the community. Therefore, finance should be made available. However, large-scale heavy investment-based mariculture should be avoided and only community-based mariculture should be permitted.

Rights of sea and fishing should be defined and space management should be formulated before going in for mariculture. There should be scientific data-based inputs before implementing the policy. Investments, risk and profits are high. In this situation small fishermen cannot survive or develop.

Small-scale fishermen cannot go for deep sea fishing, said the participants in the discussion. Hence, they cannot make investment. Those already involved in deep sea fishing should be given aid and other support. There should be no big investment. Actually, the continental shelf has regular fishing and there is no clear definition regarding deep sea fishing. The group therefore demanded that deep sea fishing should be defined as any fishing area that was beyond the continental shelf.

Group b: Goa and Karnataka (Coordinator: E. Vivekanandan; Rapporteur: Marianne Manuel). The group had six members.

In their discussion about the environment, with special reference to Section 37 of the NPMF, Baby, who was the leader of fish markets vendors for the district Udipi taluk, said that recently high-tech markets had been constructed by the NFDB. Women maintain the markets and did not use plastic bags to carry fish; waste from fish cleaning etc was given to the fish meal factory and so the fish market remains clean. For waste management, they spend INR 15000 every month from their own funds. They said that government should give assistance to improve cleanliness. They use ice to keep the fish fresh in iceboxes which they had designed. But the box size is now insufficient. She said that even though the market is high-tech, the construction quality is poor with slippery floors where women have fallen. Since the municipality is not maintaining the market, they are preventing the municipality from auctioning it. There are no toilets, dressing rooms or other facilities. They said that large boxes in which 2-3 bags of fish can be stored were needed. The action point that emerged

was: 'Hand over market management to the women's group. Give them funds to support them in keeping the market clean.'

Vasudev Boloor said that the Mangalore fish market needs renovation. He revealed that they have been protesting for more than 25 years as more than 500 people sell here. The related action point was: 'Markets should be designed in consultation with the fisherwomen so that proper facilities can be incorporated. All basic facilities like water supply, sanitation etc can then be provided.'

Gunakar called for an effective implementation of the Acts. Olencio said that point 38 of the NPMF says that EIA should be compulsory and strengthened in CRZ areas. He disclosed that the EIA, for example, was not involved in maintenance and dredging in these areas even though the level of desiltation here was high. He said that beaches were getting eroded and intertidal areas were getting destroyed. It was therefore necessary, he felt, to have a policy to decide whether the mud removed through maintenance dredging could be put back on the coast in place of sea walls. His second point was that NGT needed to be strengthened; for example, the Pune branch had no judge. He felt that every state needed an NGT so that environmental cases could be heard and disposed off faster.

Vasudev said that wastewater should be discharged after treatment and this was not being monitored even by the Pollution Control Board (PCB). PCB Goa had agreed to put the pipeline into the deep sea because they had launched an agitation. He said that the MRPL agitation was related to the non-treatment of water before release and said that PCB was not taking up this issue. He said tar balls are now seen on the beaches. The action point suggested was: 'Waste water treatment plant should be set up outside the 500 m CRZ zone (and not inside)'. Olencio said that the 2019 CRZ does not restrict people from dumping untreated sewage into the sea. It was necessary to protect rivers upstream. He said that CRZ 2019 violates the EPA and we should take a stand against it. He called for the following action point: 'Strengthen the CRZ and turn it into a law'.

Gunakar said that net manufacturers should be compelled to stop making small mesh nets. There should be a halt in manufacturing single-use plastic bags. He said that pollution testing was being handed over to the Fisheries College but the college did not know where the water was coming from. He said that pollution testing committees should have fishermen. The action point suggested was: 'The EIA body should have fishermen in it to ensure that pollution checks are done in the right area. Another suggestion was that the carrying capacity of the area needs to be calculated to assess how many industries can come up in an area. Without this assessment the carrying capacity of the industry might get exceeded.

Olencio said most plastics are dumped by water sports and hence there should be complete ban on the use of plastics, including cans, on beaches, shacks and shops. The suggested action point was: Regulation of plastics in tourist areas – beaches, water sports operators, shacks, beachside shops (all tourism operators). Gunakar said people needed to stop dumping in the sea and called for a survey. Sebastio said that section 5.5 of the SSF guidelines should be read with NPMF and that people should manage their environment. Coastline threats need

to be assessed as a whole and should not be limited by state boundaries as these areas are connected resulting in impacts spreading over larger areas. E.g. water sports and oil spills affecting fish breeding grounds. Inland water sports should be completely banned. Olencio said that a comprehensive plan to tackle oil spillage and removal of oil was required with penalties on ships that are dumping it. Manas said that IMO has guidelines on oil spill waste management. Mr Sebastio called for an action plan to clean rivers of plastics.

Mr Olencio referring to NPMF 39 said that the Inland Waterways Authority Act 1985 was draconian under which 111 rivers had been nationalised. He felt that rivers were going to be privatised and river bank areas would be developed. He said that the law says river waters can be diverted when abundant. The group felt that this provision needs to be deleted and called to put an end to river nationalisation. They also said that leasing and acquiring of river bed should be banned. Sebastio said there should be an action to denotify rivers from being referred to as national waterways. He cited the New Zealand government's apology to the Maori for using their river as a highway.

Baby said that in the Mangalore Port and Udipi Harbour, the Fisheries department is located in the Port area, but it does not take any action on issues affecting fishermen. For example, the fishing yard is for landing centre and auctioning but the department does not stop retail sales. Vasudev Bloor demanded that the fisheries and fisheries harbour portfolio should be placed with one ministry. Olencio said the fisheries department has limited powers for marine violations and should be given more control and power so it can take action against violations and work for the restoration of marine areas. Prakash said that the harbour was shrinking because space was being taken over by non-fishing activities

Olencio asked if capesize vessels could be restricted from entering harbours as they disturb nursery grounds and currents. He said that CZMP needs to mark ESAs like corals; etc but no demarcation has been done; ground truthing was required to mark these areas. Vivekanandan said training programmes could be held to rehabilitate and release marine mammals and other species accidentally caught in nets. Gunakar said sunken ships were not being removed and were polluting the area; fishermen were not being able to fish but nothing was being done. Olencio said that certain fertilisers used in agriculture should be phased out and more organic sources should be used. Incentivising this transition would help. Gunakar said that any committee on climate change needs fishermen in it since they alone know these issues well.

Group c: Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Puducherry (Coordinator: John Kurien; Rapporteur: Ahana Lakshmi). There were seven members from Kerala and fourteen from Tamil Nadu in this group.

15. Deep Sea Fishing: The group demanded the removal of paragraph 15 from the NMFP 2017 and asked for its replacement with the original statement from the earlier draft. They said that there is not much fish in the deep sea and whatever there is can be caught by enhancing SSF capacity. They felt that proper surveys should be carried out before promoting deep sea fishing for resources and capacity. They said that LOP should be cancelled and

private investments, overseas technology etc should be removed and fishers should not be forced into deep sea fishing

27. Mariculture: Members in the team wondered if there was an international agenda to convert fishers into mariculture practitioners and end small-scale fisheries. They also said that unprocessed fresh fish has the highest value. This was a special feature of small-scale fishing. Mariculture, however, is restricted only to a few species. It not only causes reduction in diversity but also creates a whole cycle and chain of issues. It cannot be done everywhere or by everyone or all the time. It restricts fisher movement and controls freedom of fishermen.

27.0 Setting up of mariculture farms/ parks: To go ahead with this, areas suitable for mariculture should first be identified. Areas such as open rough seas where mariculture is not possible should be excluded even in areas considered suitable for mariculture. Primacy should be given to small boats such as vallams that require fishing access. Fish breeding sites and fishing grounds have not yet been mapped. This is a primary activity and the group said that such areas need to be excluded from mariculture zones. They said that participative resource mapping at the village level is necessary and communities should be able to take decisions on locations for mariculture. They raised concerns about exclusions of areas accessed by SSF such as lagoons by placing solar panels which would prevent fishers from fishing in those locations.

27.0 Husbandry, Seed, Feed and Health Management: The group said that it was highly doubtful that mariculture would increase fish production considering its high input requirements such as 6kg small/trash fish wet weight and 2 kg fish feed to produce 1kg of cultured fish and said that the energetics does not make sense. It was merely conversion of protein consumed by masses to produce small quantity of high value fish.

27.0 Mariculture and Environmental Impact: Raising concerns about the adverse environmental impact of *Kappaphycus* growing on live coral, they said that the culture of native species such as *Gracilaria* should be ensured. They said that the extensive use of chemicals in extensive mariculture was a problem to the environment and preferred sea ranching to aquaculture. Moreover the economic viability of mariculture has to be assessed.

27.0 Mariculture and Social Impact: Raising questions of equity, the group said that referring to mariculture practitioners as fish farmers would result in the exclusion of SSF as subsidies would go to the farmers. They felt that mariculture could only serve as an additional source of livelihood along with fishing and could not be an alternative; they also said that it should be totally under the control of fishers.

41. Climate Change and Marine Environment: Group members said that sentences in the draft version that were protective of SSF and set controls on port development have been removed from the NFMP resulting in dilution of terms. They felt that coastal communities must be consulted for approvals for port location and suggested 'port pay principle' for those affected by port development (like the 'polluter pay' principle). Sea level rise due to climate change had the highest impact on fishing villages as they were closest to shore and hence

required special compensation. It was necessary to develop a long term housing plan for such communities.

Group d: Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and West Bengal (Coordinator: Nalini Nayak; Rapporteur: Divya Karnad).

Mariculture: The members from West Bengal said that as there was no need for mariculture and there was no need to discuss any details. They said that fish was available only in certain areas in the sea and not everywhere. People would want to introduce mariculture in areas that were abundant in fish and comprised was spots where they fished. They therefore asked why they should be forced to give up their fishing grounds for mariculture.

Participants from Odisha said that the government was pushing for mariculture and by engaging with it they would actually have an opportunity to influence the policy. The government might take inputs but would not accept direct opposition. As the government has already taken up this agenda, they felt that they should make space for it. They did not want the government to declare SEZ in the sea. They strongly felt that regulations such as requirement for community permission before a company could start mariculture in an area must be included in the policy.

Nalini said that this required recognition of tenure rights and hence, the demand should be that first fishing rights should be given preference before mariculture. In Odisha, spatial zonation of exclusive artisanal zones means that the government recognises the rights of fishers and therefore it has to consult them before allowing other activities. In fact, in some places in Ganjam, fishing rights were actually bought from the government, which meant that the rights were recognised.

Members from Andhra Pradesh felt that government policies always go against the locals as exemplified by their experience with various schemes in their state. They felt that there was no way to influence the policy and it should be rejected outright. Women participants said that there was no way to guarantee that once mariculture was introduced in some place, it would not be gradually moved into areas where they fished. They felt that if they gave way even an inch, the government would take a yard. They pointed out that a large part of their fishing grounds were already occupied by mechanised fishing, oil, navy, coast guards etc., therefore, how could more space be given up now for mariculture? They said that the sea was very rough in the Bay of Bengal and hence it is not possible to carry out mariculture properly. They cited a village in Kakinada that had been given the technology and materials free by CMFRI. They invested INR 3 lakhs but at the end when they got the product, they only earned INR 1.7 lakhs. They wanted to know how this was useful. Further, they asked how fishermen could invest if CMFRI did not give subsidies. The total cost of the project would be around INR 50-60 lakhs, which was not affordable for fishermen. They concluded that firstly, mariculture did not benefit them and secondly, it would hinder their access to their traditional fishing grounds resulting in spending more on diesel. Since panchayats were

being diluted, there was no point in giving them decision-making powers and hence they felt that mariculture should be opposed completely.

The group from West Bengal said that while assessing locations for mariculture, there were no EIA covers in areas outside the proposed project site. They said that the EIA process for mariculture should be changed to look at external, social and cumulative impacts. They wanted to know how pollution would be assessed given the levels at which it would be diffusing from the project. They pointed out the dangers of pollutants from land-based aquaculture being dumped in the sea, and said that if mariculture was carried out directly in the sea, pollution levels would be far greater. Mariculture was a technological 'solution' to a problem created by pollution and overfishing and therefore it would be better to focus on restoration and sustainable fishing rather than on an activity that carried potential hazards. The management plans should focus on support to traditional fishing and reduce overcapacity in mechanised fishing so that there was no need for mariculture. In other places, like E. Midnapore district, the government gave a tourist company the right to use the coastal area by buying the panchayat heads, so they felt that local institutions could not be trusted to oppose issues on a case-by-case basis and felt that outright opposition was the only way.

The group said that CMFRI was not talking about ill-effects of mariculture; it was not even able to say how much of the fish would go to feed mariculture. These were their commons, said the group members, and not the government's space to give away. The law of the country upholds the public trust doctrine – so how could water be privatised? Livelihoods could not be leased out to someone else; the group said that they opposed mariculture as a matter of philosophical.

Andhra Pradesh members said that the sea belongs to fishermen and there was no question of the government leasing the sea without asking fishermen. Considering that people call nearshore fish as low value because they were exposed to most of the pollution, what was the point of nearshore mariculture? How much employment would actually be generated as compared to SSF, they asked. Furthermore, they felt that fish were meant to be caught, not cultured, and asked how someone who cultivates fish could call himself a fisherman.

Climate Change: Members from West Bengal said that there were positives and negatives. On the positive side, they were getting sardines now, but the negative outcome was that they were experiencing a number of storms. As a result, the disaster management program of the government was on overdrive. They were getting storm warnings almost every day because of which people had stopped paying heed. The result was that when there were real storms, people were unheeding, went out and get killed. They called for proper storm warnings and better communication technology for warning boats. They said it was necessary to distinguish between the impact of development and climate change and to reduce the hazards of development so that the effect of climate change impacts would not be so bad. At the moment the two were on collision course, making the situation worse. They also suggested the adoption of green initiatives to reduce fuel consumption, emissions etc. Most of the development was taking place along the coast and was creating a negative impact and the government and industry were now blaming it on climate change; there needs to be a clear

understanding of the impacts created by climate change, said the participants from Odisha. The group said that there used to be jungles near the beaches in Odisha but these were cut down for industries and needed to be restored. They also called for the restoration and protection of beach vegetation and sand dunes which offered protection from storms.

APPENDIX 3

GROUP DISCUSSION 3

REPORTS

Group Discussion 3 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for social development of fishing communities from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group Discussion 3 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for gender equity in fisheries from the SSF Guidelines perspective

Group a: Gujarat and Maharashtra (Coordinator: Kiran Maha Deo Koli, Secretary, Maharashtra Machhimar Kruti Samiti; Rapporteur: MSH Sheikh). There were ten participants in this group

Welfare and Gender: Gender Justice does not reflect the actual justice to be given to women, said the participants. Only post-harvest related issues are discussed in the NPMF. The role of women cooperatives and the nature of the organisations are not defined. Subsidy and financial assistance which are not mentioned should be emphasised. They felt that health and sanitation facilities should be provided in working places and said night shelters were required for fisherwomen who were selling and purchasing fish from big markets. For migrant fishermen (e.g. Gujarat – Kutch) they wanted basic facilities like schools, roads, fish jetties and allied infrastructure.

They called for an increase in women-friendly financial schemes and said that post-harvest and trade should have less private investment and women's organisations and cooperatives should be encouraged. They demanded the restarting of special fisherwomen identity cards. Pre-harvesting activities should be carried out by fisherwomen and women-centric schemes should be introduced. BPL category should be removed and there should be social security benefits for fishers. For e.g. fishers who are orange card-holders should be entitled to some schemes.

Fish farmers and traditional fisherwomen should be identified separately. The participants said that there should be a scheme like LARR for fishermen displaced due to development projects. Their rehabilitation should be done. Non-traditional fish farmers should not be given aid and schemes under fisheries. Right to livelihood should be linked with fishers for social security. Losses to fish workers due to bad weather and prohibitory government orders should

be compensated (during/after cyclone and when the government orders a prohibition on sea venture and fishermen have to face loss of fishing days). They said that the ban period should be 90 days on the west coast (15 May to 15 August) and that there should be subsidy for fishermen during the ban period/ lean period. Savings-cum-relief schemes should not be linked to the BPL limit (category), the insurance limit should be more than INR 5 Lakh, and there should be an increase in fuel subsidy.

Group b: Goa and Karnataka (Coordinator: C.M. Muralidharan;Rapporteur: Sebastiao Rodrigues, Bharat Mukti Morcha).

42.0. There should be rehabilitation of fishing communities with regard to housing due to beach erosion within 500 meters from HTL (High Tide Line. Beach nourishment/ restoration should be given priority. There should be no age restriction on financial assistance under welfare schemes and less formalities and filing of forms should exist for subsidies so that there is one card (single window) clearance. Fishermen card should be basis of all welfare schemes. Fisheries must be considered on par with agriculture. New housing schemes for construction of houses for fishing communities should be started in CRZ areas with special provisions. Houses of genuine fishers in CRZ areas must be legalised. Fishers availing welfare schemes should be members of co-operatives/CSOs.

43.0. There needs to be sea surge insurance as nets are washed away and there is toppling of boats and loss of life. These require immediate compensation. The procedure for claiming adequate compensation for loss of life and property must be made easier and compensation must be released within 15 days. Those fishermen and fisherwomen who are not insured must also be compensated by any welfare fund of the government. Known sources of oil spills must be stopped and those responsible for them must be criminally charged and prosecuted. Compensation must be awarded to affected fishing communities. Effective (technology and institutional security) search measures in case of fishing crew gone missing at sea should be deployed and compensation should be paid to families of missing fishermen within three months. The effects of dredging, spillage of other material, impacts of ship breaking/ repairs/ construction should also be considered man-made disasters. Spillage of materials at the time of loading and unloading at Port area and sea should also be considered man-made disasters and must be compensated. Soil erosion and spillage of mining rejects into rivers from run-offs and unloading barges, abandoning of sunken ships must be classified as man-made disasters. Those responsible must be prosecuted. Steps/measures should be taken to remove abandoned/sunken ships in rivers and seas.

44.0. Compensation during ban period: does not exist in Karnataka and Goa; hence adequate compensation should be paid to men and women during the ban period; there should be provision of rations for families during the fishing ban period.

45.0. Co-operative society should be provided with cold storage, and given control of auction areas as well market areas: to eliminate middle-men at fishing yards. Government

should provide financial assistance to cooperatives through interest-free loans and linkages to national and international exporters.

46.0. Financial assistance through zero interest loans for operational costs, nets and repair works of canoes and motors: needs to be provided and fishing harvesting and post-harvest inputs should be provided through cooperatives.

47.0. Encouragement to traditional technologies: Instead of up-gradation of fishing technologies that promote over exploitation, traditional technologies should be encouraged. Training in capacity building should be field based rather than class room based.

48.0. Schemes to promote dignity of fishing activities for younger generation: With respect to gender equity, there should be schemes to promote dignity of fishing activities for the younger generation. There should be schemes to provide clean hygienic markets and storage facilities along with toilet facilities. Fisher women should be given access to decision-making bodies and institutions and allowed adequate representation. Pension schemes for fisher women including ILO provisions on Pension to Fish workers must be initiated and implemented. Health schemes for treatment of fishermen and fisherwomen should be initiated and implemented. Gender-specific health attention to women should be provided. Children from fisher communities must be given reservation in fisheries colleges and research institutions. Dry fish vendors/seasonal fish vendors must be provided temporary shelters at required places and markets. Dedicated sites should be established on beach areas, land and markets for drying of fish. Basic facilities for hygienic handling, processing and marketing of fish to get better quality and price should be made available. Abandoned boats near harbours should be removed to make harbour spaces for fishing communities.

Group c: Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Puducherry (Coordinator: John Kurien; Facilitator: Sura Vengadesaperumal, Puducherry; Rapporteur: Ahana Lakshmi). Seven from Kerala, fourteen from Tamil Nadu and one from Puducherry were part of this group.

The group said that DBTS is effective and should be continued for all schemes as money reaches those who are registered in the schemes, unlike earlier times when it used to be siphoned off on the way. The downside is that money reaches non-fishers as well if they are members of the cooperatives.

After natural calamities, there is no clear compensation policy; the existing compensation is insufficient and does not reach the affected in Tamil Nadu whereas in Kerala, the compensation policy and procedures are clear. In Puducherry, funds against non-plan expenditure is accumulated and used in the years when there is a disaster. Surveys carried out by the fisheries department need clarity. Compensation is needed for days when fishers were not permitted to go fishing due to warning from IMD said the members from Tamil Nadu. Participants from Kerala said that they received INR 1000 per day. The Tamil Nadu group felt that a similar compensation must be given as soon as possible in their state as well and it must cover every person denied access to the sea. Members agreed that fishers also have

Comment [N1]: Full form

responsibility to not go to sea when the government issues such a warning. Contribution from government is needed for insurance premium. There is no scheme for women in harvesting (using small boats in backwaters and lagoons). It is necessary to enumerate such fishworkers and issue ID cards as available in Kerala. The State Disaster Response Fund has guidelines that define categories for giving compensation but these guidelines are outdated and provide higher compensation to farmers and must be revised and updated.

With respect to education, health and other facilities, it is necessary for the gram panchayats to be properly funded. Decentralised governance is crucial for ensuring welfare schemes. In terms of credit facilities, new schemes tailored to the needs and requirements for the fishing community are needed, and a fisher cooperative bank could be considered. However, in Kerala, Mastyafed loans have led to overcapacity and indebtedness, said the members from Kerala. They also pointed that there is a moratorium on loans where assets are declared lost at sea. They called for proper the functioning of fisheries cooperatives.

The group said that many of the points had been discussed under different topics especially post-harvest and trade. Under gender equity, they said that the definition of a fishworker should not be diluted and fisherwomen must be considered as equals and not as ancillary workers. Tamil Nadu said that women in the culture and processing sector do not come into the count. They said that it would be good to form groups and take market control as had been done in Karnataka. In Kerala, for long distance fish transport (>60km), special assistance (loan INR 50000) is available; now that autos are available their dependency on buses has decreased. Loans are taken to buy bikes / vehicles but after a while they are sold. The group called for dedicated transport vehicles for women. Driving them requires additional skills and hence is not preferred. Also, there are safety issues and early morning requirements. Women collecting seaweeds from islands in Tamil Nadu still do not have identity cards and demanded that they should be issued to them, soon. During the ban period (self-conservation/ ban - when they do not collect seaweed), they should be given credit support which will help in paying school fees for their children

Group d: Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and West Bengal (Coordinator: Nalini Nayak; Rapporteur: Manas Roshan). There were sixteen members.

Gender Equity and Social Development

Introduction: Social development /welfare were often understood as only meant for men. Women are not included in most welfare schemes. Many fishworker representatives do not know enough about the NPMF 2017 and the SSF Guidelines. Women's voices are largely absent because organisations and unions do not encourage women to take up leadership roles.

Gender: Sexual harassment at the workplace is as much a problem in the fisheries value chain as it is in a corporate office. Systems to address this are required through either women's cooperatives or by raising awareness about their rights. There is low awareness on sexual health, menstrual hygiene and HIV. Adult education or community health centres are essential. Women must also play an active role in gear and craft decisions, input and output control measures, etc.

Social Development: Members said that while every coastal village has a government and private school and subsidised fees, they need support / scholarships for higher education. There should be no APL and BPL cards for savings and relief schemes because the real vulnerable communities did not have access to them. Instead, they should make it universal for all fisherfolk. Amenities for women in markets such as water, sanitation, health clinics and rest rooms at fish markets are necessary. As in Kerala and Tamil Nadu, all vendors including men, should be provided a separate amount under the scheme during the ban period.

Housing: In Andhra Pradesh, houses are constructed too far from the beach. The CRZ (500 m) should be completely under the control of fishing communities. Boats and gear need protection during storms, but if jetties are constructed, then they are dominated by the trawlers (e.g. Kakinada). In West Bengal, central and state schemes are implemented through panchayats and in many places they are captured by local power brokers. In Odisha, there should be land pattas and pucca housing for all coastal villages. Cyclone shelters are not adequate in crowded coastal areas. Road connectivity between villages, landing centres and markets is a concern in all three states that participated in the discussion.

Health: In Andhra Pradesh, health schemes are available, especially for primary and maternal health. But many remote coastal villages do not have access to these. Many communities need to travel far away for specialised health services. In Odisha, ASHA workers deliver maternal health services. Fishing villages also need primary health centres and midwives.

Youth: In Odisha, a large number of youth are educated but are unable to get jobs. Very few are engaged in the fishery businesses. Job opportunities and additional livelihoods should be connected to their traditional livelihoods. In Andhra Pradesh, youth are increasingly interested in leaving fisheries to try new professions.

APPENDIX 4

ACTION POINTS

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
FISHERIES MANAGEMENT					
6.0	To develop strategies to reduce overcapacity	Build consensus to rotate access of fishing vessels to fishing grounds and resources to reduce overcapacity	1. Define destructive fishing and traditional fishing 2. Adopt one family- one vessel policy 3. Raise awareness of fishers, fishworkers and fishing communities on issues like overcapacity and illegal fishing	5.20 States should avoid policies and financial measures that may contribute to fishing overcapacity and, hence, overexploitation of resources	
7.0	Precautionary approach to maintain MSY			3.1 Guiding Principle 10: Economic, social and environmental sustainability: applying the precautionary approach and risk management to guard	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				against undesirable outcomes	
8.0	Fishing effort management	Recognise that active fishers from traditional fishing communities, especially fishing for a reasonable period of time, have the first right to own fishing vessels	Address tenure of fishers and the customary rights of the fishing communities involved in fisheries for generation	5.15 States should endeavour to improve registration of the fishing activity.	
8.0	Fleet size optimisation	1. Develop a resource allocation policy based on “scale-subsidiarity”, which means larger units are considered only if there are surplus fish stocks after allocations to smaller units-- and restructure fishing fleet	1. <i>(Repeated)</i> Adopt one family one vessel policy 2. Regulate boat building centres 3. Develop social criteria for determining ownership of fishing vessels (Forest Rights Act can be a model	5b. Sustainable resource management	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		according to this policy 2. Implement moratorium on new fishing vessels for ten years, only replacement allowed, review after 10 years 3. Ban non-registered fishing vessels from fishing 4. Declare optimum fleet size at the state level 5. Cancel/suspend licences/registration of fishing vessels caught in illegal fishing	to be consulted)		
8.0	Biodiversity conservation in production processes		<i>(Repeated)</i> Define destructive fishing and traditional fishing	5.1 These Guidelines recognise the need for responsible and sustainable use of aquatic biodiversity and natural resources to meet the developmental	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				and environmental requirements of present and future generations.	
8.0	Species specific management plans			5b. Sustainable resource management 11.1 Establish systems of collecting fisheries data, including bio-ecological data relevant for decision-making on sustainable management of small-scale fisheries with a view to ensuring sustainability of ecosystems, including fish stocks, in a transparent manner.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
8.0	Area specific management plans	1. Implement area-based management zones as developed by CMFRI 2. Fishing vessels to be licensed to fish only in designated zones 3. Ban illegal fishing by trawlers/purse seiners by defining and strictly enforcing fishing zones for different gears		5.15 Accordingly, States should involve small-scale fishing communities in the design, planning and, as appropriate, implementation of management measures, including protected areas, affecting their livelihood options. 10.2 Develop and use spatial planning approaches, including inland and marine spatial planning, which take due account of the small-scale fisheries interests and role in integrated coastal zone management.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
8.0	Conservation of EBSAs and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems	Identify EBSAs to assist proposing an action plan			
8.0	Protection of iconic, endangered and threatened species	Develop a new fisheries legal instrument to conserve and protect iconic/charismatic marine species that takes into consideration specificities of marine waters and fishing by traditional fishing communities	<i>(Repeated)</i> Define destructive fishing and traditional fishing	5.16 States should deter, prevent and eliminate all forms of illegal and/or destructive fishing practices. 11.5 States should ensure information for responsible SSF and sustainable development is available, including for IUU fishing.	
8.0	Sustainable utilisation of resources	Undertake stock assessment		3. Guiding Principles 5b. Sustainable resource management: "long-term conservation and sustainable use"	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
8.0	Creation of Fish refugia through consultation	Create fish refugia based on traditional knowledge, if available		5.15 States should involve small-scale fishing communities in the design, planning and, appropriate, implementation of management measures, including protected areas, affecting their livelihood options.	
8.0	Evaluation of existing MPAs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the needs of traditional fishermen in relation to MPAs 2. Allow manually operated boats within MPA 3. Implement management plan without hampering traditional/SSF livelihoods 4. Include fishing community in decision-making process including 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote consultations with fishing community members by state and national biodiversity board to assess how marine environment is impacted, including loss of mangroves. 2. Permit fisheries coops to manage MPAs 		

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		granting the issue of permits in critical habitats of coastal and marine environment 5. Prevent fishing areas from being privatised in the name of conservation 6. Identify EBSAs to assist proposing an action plan			
8.0	Legislative support to ensure tenure rights to traditional fishermen	<i>(Repeated)</i> Recognise that active fishers from traditional fishing communities, especially fishing for a reasonable period of time, have the first right to own fishing vessels	<i>(Repeated)</i> Address tenure of fishers and the customary rights of the fishing communities involved in fisheries for generation	5.4 When necessary, in order to protect various forms of legitimate tenure rights, legislation to this effect should be provided.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
9.0	Conflict resolution mechanism between traditional and mechanised sectors	1. Recognise the primacy of traditional and small scale fishers 2. Introduce effective rules to deal with conflicts including punishment for breach of rules	<i>(Repeated)</i> Define traditional fishing	5.9 States should recognise that small-scale fishing communities are often the weaker party in conflicts with other sectors and may require special support. 5.11 Access to impartial and competent judicial and administrative bodies to timely, affordable and effective means of resolving disputes over tenure rights.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
9.0	Fisheries Management with traditional knowledge, science and business principles and effective engagement of primary stakeholders	1. <i>(Repeated)</i> Undertake stock assessment 2. Identify causes of fish stocks' depletion other than fishing pressure, such as development of ports and pollution of coastal and inshore waters. 3. <i>(Repeated)</i> Create fish refugia based on traditional knowledge, if available		11. Information, research and communication 11.6 States should document traditional fisheries knowledge and technologies in order to assess their application to sustainable fisheries conservation, management and development. 11.7 Provide technical and financial assistance to organise, maintain, exchange and improve traditional knowledge of aquatic living resources and fishing techniques, and upgrade knowledge on aquatic ecosystems.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
9.0	Better collaboration between Government agencies and stakeholders			3. Guiding Principle 6: Consultation and Participation, and 12: Social Responsibility 10. Policy coherence, institutional coordination and collaboration	
10.0	Information services to fishers: Distribution of resources and availability	Disaggregated data of catch and landing centres be made available in public domain	Disseminate information through community radios, especially that would help in restoration and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems	5b. Sustainable resource management and 11. Information, research and communication 11.1 Establish systems of collecting fisheries data, including bio-ecological data with a view to ensuring sustainability of ecosystems, including fish stocks, in a transparent manner. 11.4 All parties should	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				recognise small-scale fishing communities as holders, providers and receivers of knowledge.	
10.0	Information services to fishers: Real time resource maps			5b. Sustainable resource management and 11. Information, research and communication	
10.0	Information services to fishers: Productivity assessments and PFZ advisories	Ensure that PFZ do not support growth of fish meal industry and reduction in price of fish at fish landing centres		5b. Sustainable resource management and 11. Information, research and communication	
10.0	Information services to fishers: Weather forecast			6.16 and 6.17 Sea safety: States should promote access to information and to emergency location systems for rescue at sea for small-scale vessels.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
11.0	To conduct periodical reviews of Spatial closures(MPAs)	<p><i>(Repeated)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include fishing community in decision-making process including granting the issue of permits in critical habitats of coastal and marine environment 2. Prevent fishing areas from being privatised in the name of conservation 3. Identify EBSAs to assist proposing an action plan 		<p>10.2 Develop and use spatial planning approaches, including inland and marine spatial planning, which take due account of the small-scale fisheries interests and role in integrated coastal zone management.</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
11.0	To conduct periodical reviews of temporal closures	1. Continue seasonal ban and enhance the ban period ranging from 90 days to 120 days, subject to exemptions for vessels with fishing power up to 30hp 2. Provide financial support during seasonal bans 3. Remove BPL card-based support system 4. Provide financial support to women during their self-imposed ban period to support children's education		5b. Sustainable resource management	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPME Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
12.0	Input and Output Controls: Fleet size, fishing days, area of operation, engine horsepower, gear size, MSY, Minimum mesh size, minimum legal size, diversion of fishing effort, development of fleet plans, creating fisheries management areas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibit the use of Indonesian and Chinese (over XX hp) engines 2. Implement mesh size regulations, especially square mesh for trawl gear 3. Recognise preferential access for SSF 4. Implement the menu of options as proposed in the Policy 		5b. Sustainable resource management	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
13.0	Demarcation of depth for mechanised, motorised and non-motorised implemented	1. Proscribe bull trawling, bottom trawling, purse seining, and other forms of destructive fishing techniques 2. Make mandatory the use of Automatic Identification System <i>(Repeated)</i> 3. Ensure preferential access for SSF 4. Implement area-based management zones as developed by CMFRI 5. Fishing vessels to be licensed to fish only in designated zones 6. Strictly enforce fishing zones for different gears	1. Ensure implementation of the scale subsidiarity principle 2. Designate a share of resources for SSF	5.7 States should give appropriate grant preferential access to small-scale fisheries ... Where appropriate, specific measures, inter alia, the creation and enforcement of exclusive zones for small-scale fisheries, should be considered.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
13.0	Demarcation of distance from shore for mechanised, motorised and non-motorised implemented	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proscribe bull trawling, bottom trawling, purse seining, and other forms of destructive fishing techniques 2. Make mandatory the use of Automatic Identification System <i>(Repeated)</i> 3. Ensure preferential access for SSF 4. Implement area-based management zones as developed by CMFRI 5. Fishing vessels to be licensed to fish only in designated zones 6. Strictly enforce fishing zones for different gears 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure implementation of the scale subsidiarity principle 2. Designate a share of resources for SSF 	<p>5.7 States should give appropriate grant preferential access to small-scale fisheries ... Where appropriate, specific measures, inter alia, the creation and enforcement of exclusive zones for small-scale fisheries, should be considered.</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
14.0	Promotion of co-management or participatory management through regional, interstate and national fisheries councils	1. Promote co-management through self-organised community organisations 2. Recognise the role of community-based structures in co-management	1. Ensure access to decision-making bodies and institutions, and adequate representation for women in fishing communities 2. Implement co-management framework at Taluk level- district level- and state level	5.15 Participatory management systems, such as co-management, should be promoted. Also 5.15, 5.17 and 12.4 Develop knowledge and skills to support successful co-management arrangements	
15.0	Government of India Guidelines for 12-200 nm zone			5.7 Taking due account of Art. 6.18 of the Code, States where appropriate grant preferential access of small-scale fisheries to fish in waters under national jurisdiction.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
15.0	Promotion of private investments in deep sea fishing in States	1. Do not permit corporate investment in deep sea fishing 2. Issue permits for deep sea fishing only to fishermen from fishing communities.			
15.0	Promotion of private investments in fish processing in states				
15.0	Capacity building for deep sea fishing	No subsidies should be granted to promote such investment. Subsidies should be restricted only to smaller vessels			
15.0	Training in Entrepreneurship development				
15.0	Development of public				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	/private partnership				
15.0	Availability of credit from Institutions				
15.0	Integration of deep sea fishing industry and seafood processing				
16.0	Schemes for enhancing skills in deep sea fishing	1. Encourage traditional fishers, provide them training for deep sea fishing (only community-based deep sea fishing) 2. Guide and regulate existing deep sea fishing			
16.0	Schemes for modernisation of existing fleet for deep sea fishing	Introduce fishing vessel buy back schemes			
16.0	Schemes for new deep sea fishing fleet to				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	cooperatives, self-help groups				
16.0	Schemes for training on board fishing vessels for better linkage to markets				
16.0	Schemes for linkages for export of fish				
16.0	Awareness of international regulations relating to fishing in EEZ				
16.0	Awareness of international regulations relating to fishing in high seas				
16.0	Development of infrastructure	Develop fishing harbours in areas that do not currently have access to			

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		fishing harbours and fishing jetties (e.g. Andhra Pradesh)			
16.0	Certification of vessel construction capabilities for deep sea fishing				
16.0	Development of human capacity for deep sea fishing				
16.0	Awareness about rules and regulations for deep sea fishing				
16.0	Development of scientific, technical information on deep sea fisheries resources				
16.0	Development of best fishing methods to				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPME Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	target deep sea fisheries resources				
17.0	Preparation of coastal fisheries development plans				
17.0	Preparation of islands' fisheries development plans				
17.0	Framework for coastal tourism			6.8 Small-scale fishing communities should equitably benefit from developments such as community-based tourism	
17.0	Framework for island tourism			6.8 Small-scale fishing communities should equitably benefit from developments such as community-based	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				tourism	
17.0	Development of floating refuelling barges				
17.0	Introduction of mother carrier vessels				
17.0	Introduction of mobile marine ambulances				
18.0	Development of harvesting of fishery resources in ABNJ				
MCS					
19.0	Registration of fishing vessels in ReAL Craft			5.15 States should endeavour to improve registration of the fishing activity. 5.16 States should	

Comment [N2]: ??

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	<u>NPMF Recommendations</u>	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	<u>SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)</u>	Comments
				ensure the establishment of MCS systems or promote the application of existing ones applicable to and suitable for small-scale fisheries.	
19.0	Introduction of chip-based registration cards with information on registration, number of license, base harbour/port, fishing trips, introduction of log books, movement tokens, colour coding of fishing vessels, introduction of bio-metric cards to fishers			5.16 MCS, 6.17 Sea Safety, and 11.5 IUU Fishing	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
19.0	Role of community in MCS			5b. Sustainable resource management, specifically 5.16 and 5.18	
20.0	Development of legislation to comply with international standards and norms by FAO, IMO and ILO			6.12 Occupational Health and Safety, and 6.16 Sea Safety: States should ensure the development, enactment and implementation of appropriate national laws and regulations consistent with international guidelines of FAO, the ILO and IMO for work in fishing and sea safety. Also 3.1 (7), 4.1, 8.2 and 10.1	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPME Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
21.0	Amendment of MFRA to have registration of fishing vessel building yards	<i>(Repeated)</i> Regulate boat building centres		5.20 States should avoid policies that may contribute to fishing overcapacity and, hence, overexploitation of resources. Also 6.16 (footnote 3)	
21.0	Annual survey of fishing vessels for seaworthiness			6.16 (footnote 3)	
21.0	Inspection of communication and safety equipments			6.16 and 6.17 Sea safety, specifically: States should promote access to information and to emergency location systems for rescue at sea for small-scale vessels.	
21.0	Standard design specification for			6.16 (footnote 3)	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	fishing vessels				
21.0	Standard specification for construction material of fishing vessels			6.16 (footnote 3)	
21.0	Standard specification for continuous MCS procedures			5.16 States should ensure the establishment of MCS systems or promote the application of existing ones applicable to and suitable for small-scale fisheries.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
22.0	Introduction of measures to prevent IUU in EEZ			<p>5.16 States should ensure effective monitoring and enforcement mechanisms to deter, prevent and eliminate all forms of illegal and/or destructive fishing practices.</p> <p>5.20 States should avoid policies and financial measures that may contribute to fishing overcapacity and, hence, overexploitation</p> <p>11.5 States should ensure that the information necessary for responsible small-scale fisheries and sustainable development is available, including</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				IUU fishing.	
22.0	Introduction of measures to prevent IUU in high seas				
22.0	Introduction of measures to prevent IUU in other EEZs				
23.0	To provide necessary awareness and training to fishermen to avoid maritime boundary crossing				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
23.0	Incorporation of provisions of Work in Fishing Convention 2007		Ensure social security benefits to all men and women along the fisheries value chain consistent with ILO standards, with a particular focus on women	6. Social development, employment and decent work. Specifically: 6.12 and 6.16 Appropriate national laws and regulations consistent with ILO guidelines for work in fishing and sea safety. Also 6.3 Social Security, 6.9 Violence, 6.11 Migrant Workers, 6.13 Forced labour, 6.15 Child Labour, and 6.16 Sea safety	
23.0	Timeline for ratification of WFC 2007				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
24.0	Improvement of working conditions of fishers on fishing vessels	Deploy effective search measures for fishers missing at sea (better technology, institutional arrangements)		6. Social development, employment and decent work. Specifically: 6.12 and 6.16 Appropriate national laws and regulations consistent with ILO guidelines for work in fishing and sea safety. Also 6.3 Social Security, 6.9 Violence, 6.11 Migrant Workers, 6.13 Forced labour, 6.15 Child Labour, and 6.16 Sea safety	
24.0	Improvement of working conditions of migrant fishers on fishing vessels			6. Social development, employment and decent work. Specifically: 6.10 and 6.11 Migrant Workers	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
24.0	Timeline for updating Indian legislation related to fisheries			10. Policy coherence, institutional coordination and collaboration	
24.0	Development for hygienic and sanitary norms for fishing harbours			6. Social development, employment and decent work, and 7. Value chains, post-harvest and trade	
25.0	Distress alerting transmitter on fishing vessels			6.17 States should promote access to emergency location systems for rescue at sea for small-scale vessels.	
25.0	Automatic vessel identification system	<i>(Repeated)</i> Make mandatory the use of Automatic Identification System		6.17 States should promote access to emergency location systems for rescue at sea for small-scale vessels.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
25.0	Communication equipment on the fishing vessel			6.16 and 6.17 Sea Safety, increasing compliance	
25.0	Training	<p>1. Provide reservation for children of fishers and fishworkers in fisheries colleges and research institutions</p> <p>2. <i>(Repeated)</i> Raise awareness of fishers, fishworkers and fishing communities on issues like overcapacity and illegal fishing</p>	<i>(Repeated)</i> Disseminate information through community radios, especially that would help in restoration and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems	6.17 Sea Safety training and awareness	
FISHERIES DATA AND RESEARCH					
26.0	Implementation of National Marine Fisheries Data Acquisition Plan	Undertake stock assessment		11.1 Establish systems of collecting fisheries data, including bio-ecological data with a view to ensuring	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				sustainability of ecosystems, including fish stocks, in a transparent manner.	
MARICULTURE					
27.0	Setting up of mariculture farms/parks	1. Identify areas that are suitable for mariculture 2. Exclude areas that are not suitable		6.8 Small-scale fishing communities should equitably benefit from small-scale responsible aquaculture.	
27.0	Setting up of hatcheries				
27.0	Lease rights policies				
27.0	Marine Spatial Planning	1. Protect access to fishing grounds in areas where small-scale fishers need access 2. Ensure that mariculture areas do not overlap with			

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		fish breeding areas			
27.0	Husbandry, seed, feed, health management				
27.0	Mariculture and environmental impacts	Change EIA process for mariculture to look at all impacts, including social impacts			
27.0	Mariculture and social impacts	Secure tenure rights of traditional fishing communities to the maritime space before the development of a mariculture is considered			
27.0	Capacity development of local markets for mariculture				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
27.0	Capacity development of value chains for mariculture				
27.0	Development of local markets for mariculture				
27.0	Development of value chains for mariculture				
27.0	Support to fishermen groups				
27.0	Support to Fishery cooperatives				
ISLAND FISHERIES					
28.0	Development of Islands fisheries for Tuna harvesting				
28.0	Development of Island				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPME Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	fisheries in mariculture				
28.0	Support to post harvest fisheries development				
28.0	Development of capacity of fishers				
POST HARVEST PROCESSING					
29.0	Capacity building in post-harvest fisheries	<p>1. Invest in hygienic fish storage and marketing facilities, inter alia, to reduce exploitation by middlemen</p> <p>2. Recognise the rights or women to traditional selling areas</p> <p>3. Promote consultation and participation of women in market infrastructure development and</p>	Develop a scheme and provide budget allocation for basic facilities in markets	<p>7. Value chains, post-harvest, trade and</p> <p>12. Capacity development,</p> <p>7.3 States should foster, provide and enable investments in appropriate infrastructure, organisational structures and capacity development to support the small-scale fisheries post-harvest subsector</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		management		12.2 Provide capacity building, for example through development programmes, to allow small-scale fisheries to benefit from market opportunities.	
30.0	Develop cooperatives and infrastructure	1. Invest in spaces for fish drying 2. Create storage infrastructure that are managed by community-based coops 3. Create basic facilities for women, including night shelters, crèches in markets including migrant women traders under local bodies	1. Provide infrastructure facilities such as landing centre, market places and, roads, etc. to facilitate fish trade 2. Promote cooperatives and women’s organisations in post-harvest and trade and discourage private investment	7.3 and 7.4 States and development partners should recognise the traditional forms of associations of fishers and fish workers and promote their adequate organisational and capacity development in all stages of the value chain ... support for the setting up and the development of cooperatives	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
31.0	Development of on board fish handling			7.5 Environmentally sustainable practices within an ecosystem approach should be promoted, deterring, for example, waste of inputs (water, fuelwood, etc.) in small-scale fish handling and processing.	
31.0	Development of measures to reduce bycatch			5.20 States should avoid policies and financial measures that may contribute to fishing overcapacity and, hence, overexploitation of resources	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
32.0	Measures to control and regulate proliferation of fishmeal plants			7.7 States should ensure that promotion of international fish trade and export production do not adversely affect the nutritional needs of people for whom fish is critical to a nutritious diet,	
32.0	Measures to regulate low value fish species in fish feed industry			5.20 States should avoid policies and financial measures that may contribute to fishing overcapacity and, hence, overexploitation of resources	
TRADE					

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
33.0	To improve value addition of seafood		Undertake market surveys to evaluate value addition	7.5 All parties should seek ways to create value addition, building on existing traditional and local cost-efficient technologies, local innovations and culturally appropriate technology transfers.	
33.0	Better product branding			7.3 Appropriate infrastructure, organisational structures and capacity development to support the small-scale fisheries post-harvest subsector in producing good quality and safe fish and fishery products, for both export and domestic markets, in a responsible and	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				sustainable manner.	
33.0	To Promote quality fish to domestic consumer	Map informal markets and include them in development plans		7.3 Appropriate infrastructure, organisational structures and capacity development to support the small-scale fisheries post-harvest subsector in producing good quality and safe fish and fishery products, for both export and domestic markets, in a responsible and sustainable manner.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
34.0	Development of traceability and chain custody in seafood trade			<p>7.3 and 11.11 Recognising the role of small-scale fisheries in seafood production, states and other parties should promote the consumption of fish and fishery products within consumer education programmes in order to increase awareness of the nutritional benefits of eating fish and impart knowledge on how to assess fish and fishery product quality.</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
34.0	Development of Food Safety Standards Authority of India benchmarks			7.3 Appropriate infrastructure, organisational structures and capacity development to support the small-scale fisheries post-harvest subsector in producing good quality and safe fish and fishery products, for both export and domestic markets, in a responsible and sustainable manner.	
34.0	Harmonisation of FSSAI benchmarks with Export Inspection Council s standards				
35.0	To create an enabling environment for the promotion of eco-				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPME Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	labelling				
36.0	To implement measures to provide adequate credit facilities to reduce credit bondage				
MARINE ENVIRONMENT AND POLLUTION					
37.0	To improve effluent treatment standards and development of regulation	<i>(Repeated)</i> Identify causes of fish stocks' depletion other than fishing pressure, such as development of ports and pollution of coastal and inshore waters.	Broaden man-made disasters to include those caused by dredging, disposal of mine tailings, oil spillage, effects of ship breaking/repairs/constructions, etc.	9.3 Address issues such as pollution, coastal erosion and destruction of coastal habitats due to human-induced non-fisheries-related factors. 9.5 In case of disasters caused by humans, impacting small-scale fisheries, the responsible party should be held accountable.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
37.0	To reduce plastics in the sea and development of regulation				
37.0	To minimise ghost fishing and development of regulation				
37.0	To reduce marine pollution through better design and construction of fishing vessels				
38.0	Development of adequate mechanisms to address erosion and accretion of the coastal infrastructure development	1. Rehabilitate fishing communities who have lost their houses due to beach erosion 2. <i>(Repeated)</i> Identify causes of fish stocks' depletion other than	Implement beach nourishment/restoration in affected areas		

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		fishing pressure, such as development of ports and pollution of coastal and inshore waters.			
39.0	To implement measures to improve the quality of freshwater inflow				
40.0	To implement measures to protect endangered, threatened marine species			<p>5.16 States should ... deter, prevent and eliminate all forms of illegal and/or destructive fishing practices.</p> <p>11.5 States should ensure information for responsible SSF and that sustainable development is available, including for IUU fishing.</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
40.0	To implement measures to protect mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reefs	<i>(Repeated)</i> Promote consultations with fishing community members by state and national biodiversity board to assess how marine environment is impacted, including loss of mangroves.		5a and b. Sustainable resource management and 9.3 Integrated and holistic approaches, including cross-sectoral collaboration for climate change adaptation	
CLIMATE CHANGE					
41.0	To initiate focused studies on climate change impacts on fish stocks and fishing communities			9. Disaster risks and climate change	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
41.0	To implement climate change adaption options			<p>9, specifically 9.4: States should consider assisting and supporting small-scale fishing communities affected by climate change or natural and human-induced disasters, including through adaptation, mitigation and aid plans.</p> <p>Also 10. 1 Policy coherence with regard to climate change and disaster risk management.</p>	
FISHERS WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY NETS AND INSTITUTIONAL CREDIT					

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
42.0	To continue current welfare measures	1. Continue welfare measures through direct-benefit-transfer scheme to prevent corruption and enable funds effectively reaching all registered beneficiaries	<i>(Repeated)</i> Ensure social security benefits to all men and women along the fisheries value chain consistent with ILO standards, with a particular focus on women	6.2 Affordable access to adequate housing, basic sanitation that is safe and hygienic, safe drinking-water for personal and domestic uses, and sources of energy. Preferential treatment of women, indigenous peoples, and vulnerable and marginalised groups – in providing services and giving effect to non-discrimination and other human rights – should be accepted and promoted where it is required to ensure equitable benefits.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
42.0	To provide such welfare through DBTs, including housing and other amenities	1. Make fishermen card the basis for all welfare schemes 2. <i>(Repeated)</i> Rehabilitate fishing communities who have lost their houses due to beach erosion			
43.0	To provide adequate support to restore livelihoods from natural calamities like storm surges, cyclones etc	1. Develop cogent compensation policy and procedure for fishers and fishing communities affected by natural calamities to ensure adequacy and timeliness of support 2. Provide compensation for days lost to fishing due to IMD warning (Consider Kerala model in this context) 3. Provide insurance coverage to include	1. Develop guidelines for surveying national calamities at the state level. 2. Introduce schemes for women in harvesting affected by natural calamities 3. Revise and update guidelines for State Disaster Response Fund for defining categories eligible for compensation, especially to benefit affected fishers, fishworkers and fishing	9.4 States should consider assisting and supporting small-scale fishing communities affected by climate change or natural and human-induced disasters, including through adaptation, mitigation and aid plans, where appropriate.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		natural calamity with insurance premium paid by the government	communities 4. Provide insurance coverage for fishing activities that are impacted by sea surges 5. <i>(Repeated)</i> Broaden manmade disasters to include those caused by dredging, disposal of mine tailings, oil spillage, effects of ship breaking/repairs/constructions, etc.		
43.0	To provide adequate support to restore livelihoods from the impact of oil spills	Stop all known sources of oil spills and prosecute those responsible for oil spills		9.4 and 9.5 In case of disasters caused by humans, impacting small-scale fisheries, the responsible party should be held accountable.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
44.0	To strengthen the existing compensatory package for closed season and to increase the ban period of 61 days	<i>(Repeated)</i> Remove BPL card-based support system		5.15 States should facilitate, train and support small-scale fishing communities to participate in and take responsibility for, taking into consideration their legitimate tenure rights and systems, the management of the resources on which they depend for their well-being and that are traditionally used for their livelihoods.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
45.0	To strengthen fisheries cooperatives with skill development, technical and financial support	Provide co-operative societies with cold storage facilities, and control over auction and market areas to eliminate middlemen	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance funding for gram panchayats to improve education and health facilities 2. Strengthen decentralised governance to ensure welfare schemes for fishers 	<p>7.4 There should be support for the setting up and development of cooperatives and other organisational structures, as well as marketing mechanisms</p> <p>10.6 Promote collaboration among professional associations, including fisheries cooperatives and CSOs. They should establish networks and platforms for the exchange of experiences and information and to facilitate their involvement in policy- and decision-making processes.</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
45.0	To strengthen fisheries cooperatives to look at issues from a science-based approach			7.4 and 10.6	
46.0	To support fishermen with public finance through NABARD	1. Develop credit facilities that are designed to the needs and requirements of fishing communities 2. Provide interest-free loans to cover operational costs related to net and vessel repair works of fishing vessels, and engines	Improve efficiency of providing financial support to affected communities through single-window clearance	6.4 States should support the development of and access to other services that are appropriate for small-scale fishing communities with regard to, for example, savings, credit and insurance schemes, with special emphasis on ensuring the access of women to such services.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
47.0	To make fishermen with new skills for efficient means of fishing			<p>6.2 Promote investment in human resource development such as health, education, literacy, digital inclusion and other skills of a technical nature that generate added value to the fisheries resources as well as awareness raising.</p> <p>12.4 Government agencies should work to develop knowledge and skills to support sustainable small-scale fisheries development</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
47.0	To make fishermen more skilful to move away from artisanal fishing	Provide reservation for children of fishers and fishworkers in fisheries colleges and research institutions	Introduce schemes to promote dignity of fishing activities for the younger generation	<p>6.8 Support complementary and alternative income generating opportunities – in addition to earnings from fisheries-related activities – in support of sustainable resource utilisation and livelihood diversification.</p> <p>6.14 States should facilitate gainful and decent employment of youth, respecting their career choices and providing equal opportunities.</p>	
GENDER EQUITY					

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
48.0	To support 66% workforce of women in post-harvest sector	1. Introduce pension schemes for fisherwomen 2. <i>(Repeated)</i> Recognise the rights or women to traditional selling areas 3. <i>(Repeated)</i> Promote consultation and participation of women in market infrastructure development and management	1. Promote cooperatives and women’s organisations in post-harvest and trade and discourage private investment 2. Ensure that fisherwomen are treated on par with fishworkers, and not considered as ancillary workers	3.1 Guiding Principle 5: Equity and equality: "using preferential treatment where required to achieve equitable outcomes" 6.2 Preferential treatment of women, indigenous peoples, and vulnerable and marginalised groups should be accepted and promoted where it is required to ensure equitable benefits. 8.3 States should establish policies and legislation to realise gender equality taking into account social, economic and cultural aspects.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
48.0	To support women self-help groups			8.2 Women should be encouraged to participate in fisheries organisations, and relevant organisational development support should be provided.	
48.0	To initiate women-friendly financial support schemes	1. Provide subsidies to women in relation to their post-harvest activities 2. Enhance women-friendly financing schemes	<i>(Repeated)</i> Introduce schemes for women in harvesting affected by natural calamities	6.4 Support access to services that are appropriate for small-scale fishing communities with regard to, for example, savings, credit and insurance schemes, with special emphasis on ensuring the access of women to such services.	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
48.0	To develop good working conditions for safety, security and hygiene	<i>(Repeated)</i> Create basic facilities for women, including night shelters, crèches, in markets including for migrant women traders under local bodies	Map informal markets and include them in development plans	7.2 All parties should recognise the role women often play in the post-harvest subsector and support improvements to facilitate women's participation in such work. States should ensure that amenities and services appropriate for women are available as required in order to enable women to retain and enhance their livelihoods in the postharvest subsector.	
48.0	To develop transport facilities for retail marketing	Develop schemes to provide dedicated transport arrangements for women engaged in post-		7 Value chains, post-harvest and trade, specifically 7.2 and 7.4 enhancing livelihoods	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		harvest activities			
48.0	To encourage women to take up small-scale fishing	Provide identity cards for women collecting seaweeds			
48.0	To encourage women to take up value addition activities		Undertake market surveys to evaluate value addition	8.4 All parties should encourage the development of better technologies of importance and appropriate to women's work in small-scale fisheries.	
48.0	To make women participate in fisheries management	1. Ensure adequate representation for women from fishing communities in decision making bodies 2. <i>(Repeated)</i> Provide financial support to women during their self-imposed ban period to		5.15 Sustainable resource management: "States should involve small-scale fishing communities – with special attention to equitable participation of women, vulnerable	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		support children's education		and marginalised groups – in the design, planning and, as appropriate, implementation of management measures"	
ADDITIONAL LIVELIHOODS					
49.0	To develop alternate sources of livelihood like mariculture and ecotourism			6.8 Support complementary and alternative income generating opportunities – in addition to earnings from fisheries-related activities – in support of sustainable resource utilisation and livelihood diversification ... Small-scale fishing communities should equitably benefit from	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				developments such as community-based tourism	
49.0	To support concrete tourism plans like catch, photograph and release(CPR)				
BLUE GROWTH INITIATIVE					

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
50-51.0	<p>To focus on Neel Kranti (Blue Revolution)</p> <p>To integrate elements of Blue Growth Initiative in Blue Revolution</p> <p>To focus on Sustainable Development Goals</p> <p>To use Marine Spatial Planning(MSP) to support all economic activities like mineral exploration, oil exploration, maritime traffic, space for defence installations</p> <p>To avoid conflicts of fisheries sector with other sectors</p>		138	<p>5a. Responsible Governance of tenure, specifically,</p> <p>5.9 States should ensure that small-scale fishing communities are not arbitrarily evicted and that their legitimate tenure rights are not otherwise extinguished or infringed. Small-scale fishing communities, in particular vulnerable and marginalised groups, are often the weaker party in conflicts with other sectors and may require special support if their livelihoods are threatened by the development and activities of others sectors.</p> <p>5.10 States and other parties should, prior to the implementation of large-scale development projects that might impact small-scale fishing communities, consider the social,</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS					
52.0	To ensure compliance of International binding and non-binding instruments			<p>10.1 States should recognise the need for and work towards policy coherence with regard to, inter alia: national legislation; international human rights law; other international instruments</p> <p>Also, 3.1 Guiding Principles, 4. Relationship with other instruments, 5.13 Sustainable resource management 6.12 OHS, 8.2 Gender, 9.1 Climate change</p>	
53.0	To integrate provisions of binding and non-binding instruments				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	into fisheries policy				
54.0	To implement provisions of SSF Guidelines taking into consideration complexities and divisions in SSF	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement the SSF Guidelines guiding principles 3 and 4 (Non-discrimination, gender equality and equity) 2. Implement the SSF Guidelines chapter 8 on Gender equality 3. Implement para 7.10 SSF Guidelines regarding access to market, trade information with specific reference to vulnerable sections including women to be respected and honoured 4. Implement SSF Guidelines para 7.2 to provide special emphasis be proved with regard to enhancing facilities for 			

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
		women in post-harvest fisheries sector			
55.0	To consider provisions of international instruments holistically				
REGIONAL COOPERATION					
56.0	To promote strong regional cooperation in management and sustainable utilisation			<p>10.5 States should establish and promote the institutional structures and linkages – including local–national–regional–global linkages and networks – necessary for achieving policy coherence, cross-sectoral collaboration</p> <p>10.8 States should promote enhanced</p>	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				international, regional and subregional cooperation in securing sustainable small-scale fisheries.	
57.0	To develop measures to safeguard human rights of fishermen			SSFG humanrights-based approach	
57.0	To participate in regional fisheries and environment bodies				
57.0	To harmonise policies and programmes for harvesting of transboundary resources			11.8 All parties should promote the availability, flow and exchange of information, including on aquatic transboundary resources, through the establishment or use of appropriate existing	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				platforms and networks at community, national, subregional and regional level, including both horizontal and vertical two-way information flows.	
58.0	To develop skills for fishermen who are migrating to other neighbouring countries			6.10. 6.11, 6.13 Decent work and migrant workers. Also 11.10 Promote research on the conditions of work, including those of migrant fishers and fish workers, and inter alia health, education, decision-making, in the context of gender relations, in order to form strategies for ensuring equitable benefits for men and	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				women in fisheries.	
58.0	To develop formal Government approval for fishermen migrating to other countries				
GOVERNANCE					
59.0	To develop a coordinating mechanism between line agencies and coastal state			10.5 States should establish and promote the institutional structures and linkages necessary for achieving	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
	governments			policy coherence, cross-sectoral collaboration and the implementation of holistic and inclusive ecosystem approaches in the fisheries sector. At the same time, there is a need for clear responsibilities and there should be well-defined points of contact in government authorities and agencies for small-scale fishing communities.	
60.0	To prepare a model MFRA bill incorporating new developments post 1980s				

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
61.0	To develop a legislation for sustainable development and fisheries management in EEZ				
62.0	To develop an implementation plan with action points, time series, to identify agency responsible for the work, funds for implementation plan			12.4 Government authorities and agencies at all levels should work to develop knowledge and skills to support sustainable small-scale fisheries development and successful co-management arrangements, as appropriate. Particular attention should be given to decentralised and local government structures directly involved in governance	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017

Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				and development processes together with small-scale fishing communities, including the area of research.	
62.0	To develop monitoring and evaluation for timeliness and efficacy			13.4 States should recognise the importance of monitoring systems that allow their institutions to assess progress towards implementation of the objectives and recommendations in	

Draft Action Points - National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017					
Section	NPMF Recommendations	Action Points (Short-term)	Action Points Long-term)	SSF Guidelines (chapter and paragraph)	Comments
				these Guidelines.	



International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)

**NATIONAL WORKSHOP:
2017 NATIONAL POLICY ON MARINE FISHERIES, INDIA
AND THE SSF GUIDELINES**

Asha Nivas Social Service Centre, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

19th to 21st July 2019

PROGRAMME

Friday, 19 July 2019: Day 1	
9:00 – 09:30	REGISTRATION
9:30 – 11:00	<p>Inaugural Session</p> <p><i>Welcome:</i> Shri. Manas Roshan, Programme Officer, ICSF Trust</p> <p><i>Opening Remarks:</i> Shri. Narendra Ramachandra Patil, Chairperson, National Fishworkers' Forum</p> <p>Integrating the SSF Guidelines into the National Policy on Marine Fisheries</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> Shri. Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Shri. V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p>
11:00 – 11:30	GROUP PHOTO
	TEA-COFFEE BREAK
11:30 – 13:00	<p>Session 1: Fisheries Management from the SSF Guidelines Perspective</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> Shri. K. Sunil Mohamed, Principal Scientist & Head-in-Charge, Molluscan Fisheries Division, Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Indian Council of Agricultural Research</p> <p>Discussion</p>

	<i>Chair:</i> Shri. Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK
14:00 – 15:30	<p>Session 2: Fisheries Post-Harvest and Trade from the SSF Guidelines Perspective</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> Smt. Nikita Gopal, Principal Scientist, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Indian Council of Agricultural Research</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Smt. Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p>
15:30 – 16:00	TEA-COFFEE BREAK
16:00 – 18:00	<p>Group Discussion 1 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for fisheries management from the SSF Guidelines perspective</p> <p>Group Discussion 1 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for fisheries post-harvest and trade from the SSF Guidelines perspective</p> <p>Group a: Fisheries Management (<i>Coordinator: Shri. K. Sunil Mohamed; Rapporteur: Smt. Ahana Lakshmi, Consultant, ICSF Trust</i>)</p> <p>Group b: Fisheries Management (<i>Coordinator: Shri E. Vivekanandan, Principal Scientist (Retd.), CMFRI; Smt. Divya Karnad, Independent Researcher and N. Venugopalan, Programme Manager, ICSF Trust</i>)</p> <p>Group c: Fisheries Post-harvest and Trade (<i>Coordinator: Smt. Nalini Nayak; Rapporteur: Smt. Tara Verghis, Consultant, ICSF Trust and Shri. Manas Roshan</i>)</p> <p>Group d: Fisheries Post-harvest and Trade (<i>Coordinator: Smt. Nikita Gopal; Rapporteur: Smt. Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation</i>)</p>
Saturday, 20 July 2019: Day 2	
09:00 – 10:30	<p>Session 3: Mariculture, Deep Sea Fishing and Other New Initiatives from the SSF Guidelines Perspective</p> <p><i>Presentations:</i> Shri. G. Gopakumar, Former Principal Scientist, CMFRI Smt. Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin</p>

	<p>Foundation Shri. C.M. Muralidharan, Consultant, Fisheries Management</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Shri. V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p>
10:30 – 11:00	TEA-COFFEE BREAK
11:00 – 13:00	<p>Session 4: Coastal and Marine Environment, Climate Change and Blue Growth from the SSF Guidelines Perspective</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> Shri. E. Vivekanandan, Former Principal Scientist, CMFRI</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Shri. D. Nandakumar, Protsahan</p>
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK
14:00 – 15:00	<p>Group Discussion 2 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for mariculture, deep sea fishing and other new initiatives, from the SSF Guidelines perspective</p> <p>Group Discussion2 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for coastal and marine environment, climate change and blue growth from the SSF Guidelines perspective</p> <p>Group a: Gujarat and Maharashtra (<i>Coordinator:</i> V. Vivekanandan;<i>Rapporteur:</i> Shri. MSH Sheikh, Brackish Water Research Centre)</p> <p>Group b: Goa and Karnataka (<i>Coordinator:</i> E. Vivekanandan;<i>Rapporteur:</i> Smt. Marianne Manuel)</p> <p>Group c: Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Puducherry (<i>Coordinator:</i> John Kurien, Managing Trustee, ICSF Trust; <i>Rapporteur:</i> Smt. Ahana Lakshmi)</p> <p>Group d: Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and West Bengal (<i>Coordinator:</i> Smt. Nalini Nayak; <i>Rapporteur:</i> Smt. Divya Karnad)</p>
15:00 – 15:30	TEA-COFFEE BREAK

15:30 – 16:30	<p>Session 5: Social Development of Fishing Communities from the SSF Guidelines Perspective</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> Shri. V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Shri. John Kurien, Managing Trustee, ICSF Trust</p>
16:30 – 17:30	<p>Session 6: Gender Equity in Fisheries from the SSF Guidelines Perspective</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> Smt. Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Smt. Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation</p>
19:00 – 20:30	<p>CULTURAL PROGRAMME</p> <p>DINNER</p>
Sunday, 21 July 2019: Day 3	
09:00 – 10:30	<p>Group Discussion 3 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for social development of fishing communities from the SSF Guidelines perspective</p> <p>Group Discussion 3 (Concurrent): To develop short-term and long-term action points for gender equity in fisheries from the SSF Guidelines perspective</p> <p>Group a: Gujarat and Maharashtra (<i>Coordinator: Kiran Maha Deo Koli, Secretary, Maharashtra Machhimar Kruti Samiti; Rapporteur: Shri. MSH Sheikh</i>)</p> <p>Group b: Goa and Karnataka (<i>Coordinator: Shri. C.M. Muralidharan; Rapporteur: Shri. Sebastiao Rodrigues, Bharat Mukti Morcha</i>)</p> <p>Group c: Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Puducherry (<i>Coordinator: John Kurien; Rapporteur: Smt. Ahana Lakshmi</i>)</p> <p>Group d: Andhra Pradesh, Odisha and West Bengal (<i>Coordinator: Smt. Nalini Nayak; Rapporteur: Shri. Manas Roshan</i>)</p>
10:30 – 11:00	TEA-COFFEE BREAK

11:00 – 12:00	<p>Open Forum</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Shri. V. Vivekanandan, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p>
12:00 – 13:00	<p>Plenary: Presentation of Group Reports</p>
13:00 – 14:00	<p>LUNCH BREAK</p>
14:00 – 15:00	<p>Plenary: FWO-CSO Perspectives on the Implementation of the National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Shri. John Kurien, Managing Trustee, ICSF Trust</p> <p><i>Speakers:</i></p> <p>Shri. Peter T., General Secretary, National Fishworkers' Forum Smt. Marianne Manuel, Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation Shri. Arjilli Dasu, Executive Director, District Fishermen's Youth Welfare Association, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh Smt. Jesu Rethinam, Member, Executive Committee, National Fishworkers' Forum Smt. Purnima Meher, Maharashtra Machhimar Kruti Samiti (MMKS) Shri. Pradip Chatterjee, President, Dakshinbanga Matsyajibi Forum (DMF)</p> <p>Discussion</p>
15:00 – 16:00	<p>Plenary: Short-term and Long-term Action Points for the Implementation of the National Policy on Marine Fisheries 2017</p> <p><i>Presentations:</i> By Facilitators Shri E. Vivekanandan, Principal Scientist (Retd.), CMFRI and Sebastian Mathew, Executive Trustee, ICSF Trust</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Smt. Nalini Nayak, Trustee, ICSF Trust</p>
16:00 – 16:15	<p>Vote of Thanks</p> <p>Shri. N. Venugopalan, Programme Manager, ICSF Trust</p>
16:15 – 16:30	<p>TEA-COFFEE</p>

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

National Workshop on the 2017 National Policy on Marine Fisheries and the SSF Guidelines

Asha Nivas Social Service Centre, Chennai, 19-21 July 2019

List of Participants

FISHWORKER ORGANIZATIONS

Andhra Pradesh

1. Mr. Arjilli Dasu

Executive Secretary, District Fishermen's Welfare Association

14-8-27/1A, Bhanojithota, B.C.Road, Gajuwaka, Visakhapatnam- 530 026, Andhra Pradesh.

Tel : 0891 2701 228

Cell : 098498 07388

Email: arjillidas@rediffmail.com

2. Mr. Debashish Pal

D.T.F.W.F

Dr. 2-60-66, Sai Krishna Nagar, Near Sambhunagar flyover, Rajahmundry East,

Godavari District – 533101, Andhra Pradesh

Cell: 8555809779

Email: deamra3108@gmail.com

3. Ms.G.Ratna

W/o Raju.

Mangamaripeta Village, Chepalupada-post, Bheemunipatnam-Mandal, Visakhapatnam -

Dist.- 531162, Andhra Pradesh.

Cell: 9550785102

4. Mr. K Rahaman Thotungal

Andhra Pradesh Traditional Fishermen Union

2-5-229, Fishermen Colony, Sector-9, Appugar, Visakhapatnam (Urban) - 530017, Andhra Pradesh

Cell: 8919427877

Email:tfwufishworkers@gmail.com

5. Ms. Kovvada Varalaxmi

Traditional Fishworkers Union

17-45, Kamala Veedhi, Old Gopalapatnam, Navara, Visakhapatnam - 530027, Andhra Pradesh.

Cell: 9398049433

Email: tfwufishworkers@gmail.com; education.vsp@gmail.com

6. Ms.S. Radhakumari
W/o Prasad.
Mangamaripeta Village, Chepaluppada-post, Bheemunipatnam-Mandal, Visakhapatnam
Dist.- 531162, Andhra Pradesh
Cell: 8341772075

7. Mr.V.Jaggarao
S/o Sattiyya
DFYWA
Jalaripalem Village, Pudimadaka Post, Atchuthapuram Mandal, Visakhapatnam Dist.-
531011, Andhra Pradesh
Cell: 9951972462

Goa

8. Mr. Olencio Simoes
Joint General Secretary, Goenchea Raponkarancho Ekvott
H.No.58, Opposite Health Center, Baga, Cansaulim - 403712, Goa.
Cell : 091588 75851
Email: olencio365@yahoo.co.in

9. Mr. Sebastiao Rodrigues
BITS Goa
48/2, Vanxim, Diwar, Ilhas, P.O. Piedade - 403 403, Goa.
Cell: 9923336347
Email: sebydesiolim@gmail.com

Gujarat

10. Mr. Bharat Patel
Machimar Adhikar Sangarsh Sangathan
P.O. Bhadreswar, Taluk Mundra, District Kutch- 370 411, Gujarat.
Tel: 91 2838 282445
Cell: 91 9601071983 / 94264 69803
Email: bharatp1977@gmail.com

11. Mr. Kantilal Nanabha Tandel
President, Shree Dholai Machhimar Society, Dist. Navsari.
9 Patel Faliya, Bilimora, Near Custom House, Bilimora , Bilimora (m), Navsari - 396321,
Gujarat.
Cell: 9029179179
Email: aakanxa.enterprise@gmail.com

12. Shakar Amadbhai Bloch
Gandhinagari, Okha- Tal. Okhamandal, Near Datar Pir, Dist. Devbhoomi Dwarka, – 361350,
Gujarat
Cell: 9737660171
Email: sakaramadbhaibloch@gmail.com

13. Mr. Usmangani Sherasiya

Secretary, National Fishworkers Forum (NFF).
Kankot, Tal. Wankaner, District Morbi - 363641, Gujarat.
Cell: +91 9427443976
Email: usmantabu@gmail.com

Karnataka

14. Baby H. Salian
W/o. Hemagiri Salian
Udupi Taluk Mahila Hasimeenu Maratagarara Sangha (R.), Shri Raksha, Salmara, Kodavoor,
Malpe, Udupi District - 576106, Karnataka
Cell: 9945712733
Email: prakashsuvarnavk@gmail.com

15. Mr. Jayavithal C Kubal
Akhila Karnataka Meenugara Parishat
Alvedande Kumta, N K District - 581343, Karnataka.
Cell: 9242881743
Fax: 9483484481
Email: jayavithal68@gmail.com

16. Mr. Vasudev Bloor
General Secretary, Akhila Karnataka Fishermen Parishad.
Thingalaya's Compound, Bloor, Mangalore - 575 003, Karnataka.
Tel : 0824 2457 810 (R)
Cell : 094492 07805
Email: vasudevbloor@yahoo.com

Kerala

17. Amala Shaji
SEWA
KRAD-51, Kuthiravattom rd, Kunnumpuram, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 001, Kerala.
Cell: 9207935611
Tel: 0471-2470167 / 0471 2465007
Email: sewakerala@gmail.com

18. Mr. Jackson Pollayil
Kerala Swatantra Matsya Thozhilali Federation (K.S.M.T.F)
Pollayil House, Arthungkal.P.O., Alappuzha - 688 530, Kerala.
Cell : 093494 47166
Tel: 7025831585
Email: jacksonpollayil@gmail.com

19. Ms. Jenet Cleetus
Kerala Swatantra Matsyathozhilali Federation (K.S.M.T.F)
Thyvilakam House, Veliyaveli P.O, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 021, Kerala.
Cell: 9645381503

20. Ms. Mable Raymond

Kerala Swatantra Matsyathozhilali Federation (K.S.M.T.F)
TC : 81/805, Shobha House, Valiaveli PO, Thiruvananthapuram - 695021, Kerala.
Cell : +918138866468, +91 8547714049

21. Ms. Seeta Dasan
SEWA
KRAD-51, Kuthiravattom road, Kunnumpuram, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 001, Kerala.
Tel: 0471-2470167 / 0471 2465007
Cell : 97449 84639
Email: sewakerala@gmail.com

22. Mr. T. Peter
General Secretary, National Fishworkers Forum (NFF).
'Udayam', Valiaveli - P.O, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 021, Kerala.
Cell: 08289905239
Email: peter.ksmtf@gmail.com

23. Mr. V D Majeendran
Kerala Swatantra Matsya Thozhilali Federation (K.S.M.T.F)
Veliparambil, Mundamveli - PO, Kochi - 682507, Kerala.
Cell: 9846727648

Maharashtra

24. Mr. Kiran Maha Deo Koli
Mumbai Dist. President
Maharashtra Machimar Kruti Samitee (MMKS)
Addr 1 : 1st Floor, Madhala Pada, Nava Nagar Road, Near Mutton Shop, Madh Koliwada, Malad (West), Maharashtra.
Addr 2 : Natke House, Darya Galli, Madh Koliwada, Varsova, Malad (W), Mumbai -400 061, Maharashtra
Cell: 097022 65813
Email: kiran.koli13@yahoo.in

25. Mr. Moreshwar V. Vaity
At Post Arnala, Koliwada, Ganpati Road, Tal Vasai, Dist. Palghar, Virar (w) - 401 302, Maharashtra.
Cell: 099233 70950
Email: vaitymoreshwar@gmail.com

26. Mr. Narendra Ramachandra Patil
Chairperson, National Fishworkers Forum (NFF)
At & Post - Satpati, (Kharibav), Tal. – Palghar, Thane - 401 405, Maharashtra.
Tel: 02525 224028
Cell: 099232 41641 / 087889 15886
Email: rpatilnarendra@gmail.com

27. Mr. Philip B. Mastan
Maharashtra Macchimar Kruti Samitee

6885, Mastan House, Pachubandar Road, Near Hotel Kinara, Koliwada, Vasai, Bassein,
Thane, Vasai - 401201, Maharashtra.
Cell: +91 9823495537

28. Ms. Purnima Meher
Vice President, Maharashtra Macchimar Kruti Samitee.
Addr 1: At Wadarai Village, Post- K. Mahim, Palaghar, Dt. Palaghar - 401 404,
Maharashtra.
Addr 2 : Wadrai, Palghar, Thane- 401 403, Maharashtra.
Cell : 098928 38203
Email: purnima.meher@yahoo.com

29. Mr. Ravi Kiran Toraskar
NFF (Malvan Taluka Shramik Macchimar Sangh)
2381, Chandikamand, Revatle, A/P-Malvan, Taluka Malvan, Dist-Sindhudurg - 416606,
Maharashtra.
Cell: 9225900303
Tel (R): 02365-251299
Email: shramik.machhimar@yahoo.com

30. Ujwala Jaykisan Patil
C/o Jayprakash Narayan Dandekar
Maharashtra Macchimar Kruti Samit & N.F.F.
A/401, Sagar Samrat, Mahim causeway, Mahim West, Mumbai - 400 016, Maharashtra.
At - Post Palghar, Dist. Palghar
Cell: 9867111543
Email: ujjwalajpatil@gmail.com
Email: ujwala.j.patil@gmail.com

Odisha

31. Ms. Arid Parbati
Odisha Traditional Fishworkers' Union (OTFWU)
At: Sana Arjapali, P O:Bada Arjapali (via -matikhalo), Ganjam Dist. - 761 045, Odisha.
Cell: 097766 56783
Email: otfwuorissa@gmail.com

32. Mr. K. Aleya / Alleya K.
Secretary, Orissa Traditional Fishworkers' Union (OTFWU).
Addr 1 : At: Sana Arjapali, P O:Bada Arjapali (via -matikhalo), Ganjam Dist. - 761 045,
Odisha.
Addr 2: Arjapalli, Via – Chatrapur, Ganjam - 761 020, Odisha.
Tel : 06811 262 286 / 06811 254 314
Cell : 094370-69286 / 089086 05912
Email: otfwuorissa@gmail.com / otfwu@hotmail.com /
alleyya.fishermen.kanda9@gmail.com

33. Mr. Prasanna Kumar Behera
Orissa Traditional Fishworkers' Union (OTFWU)
Village /Post Nagar, P.S. Astrang, District Puri- 752 109, Orissa.

Cell: 99373 95771 / 9437536924
Tel: 0675 8213861
Email: prasan.behera73@gmail.com

Puducherry

34. Sura. Vengadessaperoumal
Founder – President, Viduthalai Vengaikal (in), Puducherry State Fishworkers Forum.
No.1, South Street, Ganapathichettikulam, Puducherry – 605014.
Cell: 9442118904
Email: advocatevperoumal@gmail.com

Tamil Nadu

35. Ms. A. Gandimathi
Law Trust
11/1A, Ramakrishna Paramahamsar Street, Velipalayam, Nagapattinam- 611001, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 04365-248674
Email: lawtrust1986@gmail.com

36. Mr. A Ibrahim
S/o Abdulhasan
Tamil Nadu Meenavar Peravai
Address: Umarpulavar Street, Mallipattinam, Thanjavur District - 614723, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9994146935
Email: ib1980@gmail.com

37. Mr. A Palsamy
Ramnad District Fishworkers Trade Union
Address 1 : No 7, North Street, SVM, Petrol Bunk, Velipattnam, Ramanathapuram - 623 504, Tamil Nadu.
Address 2 : Bharathi Nagar, Mayakulam P.O. Ramanathapuram, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 094423 22393 / 097870 50998 / 91 83440 68119
Email: rfturamnad@yahoo.co.in

38. Mr. A Thajudeen
Tamil Nadu Meenavar Peravai
Address: 1/65, A.K. Hajiar Street, Mallipattinam - 614723, Thanjavur District, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9965575177 ; 9944704042
Email: fisherthaju@gmail.com

39. Ms. Jesu Rethinam
Secretary-cum-Director, SNEHA (Social Need Education and Human Awareness).
30, KariangudiChetty Street, Velippalayam, Nagapattinam - 611 001, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 04365 248622
Cell: 94433 16738
Email: snehangt@gmail.com

40. Ms. M. Meenakshi

Addr 1: 7/56 Mayakulam, Bharathi Nagar, Ramanathapuram - 623503, Tamil Nadu.
Addr 2: No.7, North Street, S.V.M. Petrol Bunk (back side), Vellipatinam - 623504,
Ramanathapuram District, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9787050998

41. Mr. P. Rajesh
Ramnad District Fishworkers Trade Union
Address 1 : No 7, North Street, SVM, Petrol Bunk, Velipattnam, Ramanathapuram - 623
504, Tamil Nadu.
Address 2 : Bharathi Nagar, Mayakulam P.O. Ramanathapuram, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 094423 22393 / 097870 50998 / 91 83440 68119
Cell: 9443646732
Email: rfturamnad@yahoo.co.in

42. Mr. R.V. Kumaravelu
General Secretary, Vangakadal Meen Thozilalar
Vice President, NFF
Sangam 27, Kariyankudi Chetti Street, Velipalayam, Nagapattam - 611 001, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 94428 67035
Email: vangakadalunion@rediffmail.com

43. Ms. S. Jansi Rani
D/o Soosai.
Ramnad Traditional Fishworkers Trade Union (RFTU).
1/1119, Omsakthinagar. 5th Street, Vaigainagar, Ramnad - 623504, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 7904465344
Email:jansirani.4669@gmail.com

44. Mr. U. Arulanandam
Arif Trust Pamban
Chandragiri Street, Pamban - 623 521, Rameshwaram Tk., Ramanathapuram Dist., Tamil
Nadu.
Cell: 9994629474
Tel: 04573231733
Email: arifarul@gmail.com

West Bengal

45. Mr. Debasis Shyamal
Vice President, Dakshinbanga Matsyajibi Forum (DMF).
Addr 1: Jalal khan barh, Contai, East midnapore - 721 401, West Bengal.
Addr 2 : Village - Baguranjalpai, P.O. - Deshduttabar, Thana - Junput Coastal, Dist. - Purba
Medinipur - 721 450, West Bengal.
Cell : 099336 02808 / 77972 37669
Email: debasis.shyamal@gmail.com / Dmfwestbengal@gmail.com/ kmkmu@rediffmail.com

46. Ms. Jharna Acharya
DMF
Post – Binandapur, Pa. – Keshiary, Dist – Paschim Medinipur, Pin – 721135, West Bengal.
Cell: 9732780878

Email: jharnaacharyya@gmail.com

47. Mr. Milan Das

Dakshinbanga Matsyajibi Forum

Vill. Ramrampur, PO-Diamond Harbour, Dist. South 24 Parganas - 743331, West Bengal.

Cell: 7872407611

Email: mdas1640@gmail.com

48. Mr. Pradip Chatterjee

Dakshinbanga Matsyajibi Forum (DMF)

20/4 SIL Lane, Kolkata - 700 015, West Bengal.

Tel: 91 33 23283989 (O) / 91 33 23297662 / 91 33 23297202 (R)

Fax: 91 33 23283989

Cell: 91 9874432773

Email: pradipdisha@gmail.com

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

49. Dr Yugraj Singh Yadava,

Director, Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-Governmental Organisation & Project Manager,
World Bank Ocean Partnership for Sustainable Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation - Bay
of Bengal Project.

91, St. Mary's Road, Abhirampuram, Chennai - 600 018, Tamil Nadu.

Tel: (0091) 44 2493 6188

Fax: 44 2493 6102

Cell: 9841042235

Email: yugraj.yadava@bobpigo.org

CSOs

50. Mr. D. Nandakumar

PROTSAHAN

KRA E-32, Divakaramandiram, Ayurveda College West Lane, Thiruvananthapuram –
695001, Kerala.

Cell: 09287394818

Email: nandan4@gmail.com

51. Mr. Jones Thomas Spartegus

B.E Research Team - SNEHA (Social Need Education and Human Awareness).

30, KariangudiChetty Street, Velippalayam, Nagapattinam - 611 001, Tamil Nadu.

Tel: 04365 248622

Cell: 90477 24159

Email: rjts1987@gmail.com

52. Ms. Marianne Manuel

Assistant Director, Dakshin Foundation.

1818, 5th Main, 9th Cross, Sahakarnagar C Block, Bangalore - 560092, Karnataka.

Cell: 91 80 42113509 / 91 8861297597

Email: marianne.manuel88@gmail.com

53. Mr. Mohammed Siddique
MSH Sheikh
Kasba Mohalla, Mougul Street , At & Po OLPAD- 394540, Dist. Surat, Gujarat State.
Cell: 09825546017
Email: mshsheikh@gmail.com

54. Mr.R.Sridhar
SNEHA (Social Need Education and Human Awareness) Research Team.
30, KariangudiChetty Street, Velippalayam, Nagapattinam - 611 001, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 04365 248622
Cell: 7406638772
Email: sridhar.rao@apu.edu.in

55. Mr. Saravanan
C/o Ms. Pooja Kumar
Coastal Resource Center
92, 3rd Cross Street, Thiruvalluvar Nagar, Besant Nagar, Chennai – 600 090, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 24465401
Cell: 9176331717
Email: saravanan1950@gmail.com

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

56. Dr. G. Gopakumar
Former Principal Scientist & Head, Mariculture Division,CMFRI.
'Suryakanthi', Chanthumoola, Malayinkeezhu.P.O., Thiruvananthapuram District - 695571 ,
Kerala.
Cell: +919447587283
Email: drggopakumar@gmail.com

57. Dr. K. Sunil Mohamed
Principal Scientist & Head, Molluscan Fisheries Division, Central Marine Fisheries Research
Institute.
Post Box No. 1603, Ernakulam North P.O., Kochi - 682 018, Kerala.
Tel: 0484 2394 794
Cell: 94470 56559
Email: ksmohamed@gmail.com

58. Ms. Nikita Gopal
Principal Scientist, ICAR-CIFT.
Matsyapuri PO, Kochi - 682029, Kerala.
Cell: 9447091328
Email: nikiajith@gmail.com

INDEPENDENT RESEARCHERS

59. Mr. C.M.Muralidharan
Flat 13, Plot 26 Asian Bharati Apts, Bharati Avenue, Kottur, Chennai-600085, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9840859888
Email: cmmuralidharan@gmail.com

60. Divya Karnad
Ashoka University
2 Tarapore avenue, Harrington Road, Chetpet, Chennai - 600031, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9677046054
Email: divya.karnad@rutgers.edu

61. Dr. E. Vivekanandan
Emeritus Scientist, CMFRI.
75, Santhome High Road, R.A. Puram (Near MRC Nagar), Chennai - 600 028, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 2461 7310
Cell: 94442 38648
Email: evivekanandan@hotmail.com

FISH FARMER

62. Mr. R. Rexon
Sippikulam, Vilathikulam Thaluk, Thoothukudi District - 628903, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9786488292
Email: sippiaquafarms@gmail.com

FISHERMEN COOPERATIVES

63. Mr. K Prakash Suvarna
S/o. Late. Vedavyasa Kotian.
Udupi Taluk Mahila Hasimeenu Maratagarara Sangha (R.).
Yashas Near Kote Beedu, Kote Village, Katapadi Post, Udupi Dist – 574105, Karnataka.
Cell: 9964019229
Email: prakashsuvarnavk@gmail.com

64. Mr. Xavier Joseph
Chief Executive , SIFFS (South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies).
Karamana, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 002, Kerala.
Tel: 04712343711
Cell: 7561815625
Email: admin@siffs.org / joseph.siffs@gmail.com

INTERPRETERS

65. Mr. A. J. Vijayan
Program Coordinator, PRO TSAHAN Coastal Watch
Maithri, 41 Asha Nagar, Trivandrum - 695008, Kerala.
Tel: 04712460081
Cell: 9847250043
Email: vijayanaj@hotmail.com

66. Mr. Ashis Senapati
Project Swarajya

Short stay home, Near Collectorate.At - Khadianga, Badahat Street, Kendrapara - 754 211, Odisha.

Tel: 06727 233569 / 06717 233327

Cell: 98612 62342 / 99389 85161

Email: ashissenapati3@gmail.com / senapatiashis@rediffmail.com

67. Dr. Gunakar S.

Mansagurikara House, Sadashiva Nagar II cross, P.O Surathkal-575014, Mangalore, Karnataka.

Cell: 9449935442

Email: gunakarsurathkal72@gmail.com

68. Mr. Gutta Rohith

C/o Akkineni Srimanarayana, Pothureddypally.

Nuzvid (Mandal), Krishna (District) - 521201, Andhra Pradesh.

Cell: 9985250777

Email: gutta.rohitbunny@gmail.com

69. Ms.Nandini Chavan

Giriraj Society, B-69, Room No: 12, NNP Zone – 2, General A.K. Vaidya Marg, Goregaon East, Mumbai – 401065, Maharashtra.

Cell: 8850408034

Email: nandini.jai@gmail.com

70. Samyuktha PC

No. 150, First Floor, Fifth Cross Street, Second Avenue, Kuthubi Complex, Vettuvankeni, Chennai - 600115, Tamil Nadu.

Cell: 9884876951

Email: sam.pc.work@gmail.com

71. Ms. Shilpa Nandy

C/o. Subhjit Ghosh.

Khudiram Bose Central College & DMF.

104 Rastraguru Avenue, Nagerbazar, Kolkata - 700 028, West Bengal.

Cell: 9674186887 / 9007299124

Email: shilpanandy@yahoo.co.in

WORKSHOP DOCUMENTATION

72. Dr. Ahana Lakshmi

2B, Y226, 6th Main Road, Anna Nagar, Chennai - 600 040, Tamil Nadu.

Cell: 9840740404

Email: ahanalakshmi@gmail.com

73. Ms. Janani R.

No. 5/808, 8th Cross Street, Thiruvalluvar Nagar, Palavakkam, Perungudi Post, Chennai- 600 041, Tamil Nadu.

Cell: +91 93609 84157

Email: jana.ravi92@gmail.com

74. Mr. M. Sathish Kumar
No. 4/567B 12th Street, J.J. Nagar, Thirusulam, Chennai - 600 043, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9940557507
Email: tnhgsathish@gmail.com

75. Mr. P. Santhosh Kumar
No. 143 & 144, FF4, NSC Bose Road, Kumaran Nagar, Padi, Chennai - 600 050, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 9884855015
Email: santhoshsports2009@gmail.com

76. Ms. Tara Verghis
"Kandathil", New No. 4/18, 4th North Cross Street, Off Sunrise Avenue, Neelankarai, Chennai - 600 041, Tamil Nadu.
Cell: 91 77081 08557
Email: tara.verghis@gmail.com

OTHERS F

77. Mr. Mohamed Abuthahir
VR Maritime Services Pvt. Ltd.
Unit 405, 4th Floor, 'Challa Mall', 11, Sir Thyagaraya Road, Pandy Bazaar, T. Nagar, Chennai - 600 017, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: + 91 44 48610492 (O)
Cell: +91 98849 20492
Email: ops@vrmaritime.net / chennai@vrmaritime.net / mohamed.abuthahira@gmail.com

ICSF TRUST MEMBERS

78. Mr. John Kurien
BN-284, Thanal, Mahila Samajam Lane, Bapujinagar, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 011, Kerala.
Tel: 0471 2446 989
Cell: 81292 98407
Email: kurien.john@gmail.com

79. Ms. Nalini Nayak
SEWA
Sadanand, ANRA 62, Choola Lane, Anayara P.O., Thiruvananthapuram - 695 029, Kerala.
Tel: 0471 2741 675
Cell: 98950 77961
Email: nalini.nayak@gmail.com

80. Mr. V. Vivekanandan
Secretary, Fisheries Management Resource Centre.
T.C.24/1911, N.C.Hospital Road, Thycaud, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 014, Kerala.
Cell: 98470 84840 / 9677034670
Email: vivek@siffs.org

ICSF SECRETARIAT

81. Ms. Ganga Devi
International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF).
No: 22, First Floor Venkatrathinam Nagar, Adyar, Chennai - 600 020, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 91-44-24451216
Fax: 91-44-24450216
E-mail: icsf@icsf.net

82. Mr. Manas Roshan
International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF).
No: 22, First Floor Venkatrathinam Nagar, Adyar, Chennai - 600 020, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 91-44-24451216
Fax: 91-44-24450216
E-mail: icsf@icsf.net

83. Ms. Manjula
International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF).
No: 22, First Floor Venkatrathinam Nagar, Adyar, Chennai - 600 020, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 91-44-24451216
Fax: 91-44-24450216
E-mail: icsf@icsf.net

84. Mr. Sebastian Mathew
International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF).
No: 22, First Floor Venkatrathinam Nagar, Adyar, Chennai - 600 020, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 91-44-24451216
Fax: 91-44-24450216
E-mail: icsf@icsf.net

85. Mr. Venugopalan
International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)
No: 22, First Floor Venkatrathinam Nagar, Adyar, Chennai - 600 020, Tamil Nadu.
Tel: 91-44-24451216
Fax: 91-44-24450216
E-mail: icsf@icsf.net