



International workshop

***Access and Sustainable Fisheries:
Building Consensus and
Collaboration on ACP Fisheries***



**Report from the
European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD)**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Report	7
Annexes	
Press release	60
Agenda	63
List of participants	71



European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD)

Rue de la Science, 10
1000 Brussels
Belgium
+32.2.230.30.70

ebcd.info@ebcd.org
www.ebcd.org

Director:

Despina Symons

Staff:

Kathleen Figueiredo Laissy
kathleen.laissy@ebcd.org



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 16 and 17 July 2010, the European Bureau for Conservation and Development organised in collaboration with the ACP Working Group on Fisheries and the Seychelles Fishing Authority, and with the support of the Government of Norway and the World Bank, an international workshop on “*Access and Sustainable Fisheries: Building Consensus and Collaboration on ACP Fisheries*” at the hotel Le Meridien Barbarons in Mahé, Republic of Seychelles. This international workshop brought experts from the six ACP regions as well as experts from international organisations to deliberate on several issues pertaining to access to fisheries resources in ACP countries. It has provided the opportunity to exchange views on several controversial issues – among others, policies for determining access to a country’s fisheries resources, principles upon which these principles should be based, how ACP countries can increase benefits from access arrangements, and the empowerment of small-scale fishermen – but also to learn from one another for the betterment of the fisheries industry.

The opening session was guided by H.E Vivianne Fock Tave, Ambassador of the Republic of Seychelles to the Kingdom of Belgium, Chair of the ACP Working Group on Fisheries and co-Chair of the workshop, Mr. Serge Beslier, member of the Board of EBCD and co-Chair of the workshop and Hon. Peter Sinon, newly appointed Minister for Investment, Natural Resources and Industry in the Republic of Seychelles. They focused their attention on the **impacts on artisanal fishery** and the environment of the **Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs)** signed between the EU and some ACP countries. They stressed the importance of **information sharing between ACP countries** and comparison of different management regimes in the perspective of sustainability, taking into consideration the **growing importance of export of fishery and aquaculture products of ACP States** to regional and international markets. In the keynote address, Mr. Lidvard Grønnevet, senior advisor at the Marine Research Institute in Norway, said that it is possible to have environmental sustainability, growth and poverty reduction at the same time if the



right incentives are put in place. There are **three dimensions to successful fisheries management: the “biological”, the “economic” and the “social” dimension.** **Institutions** are essential to meet these requirements and should therefore be a priority in the reform of the fisheries sector.

The workshop addressed issues of access and sustainable fisheries under four central thematic sessions dealing with the **nature and objectives of access** and **voice and empowerment of small-scale fishermen**, the **lessons from processes of change** with the case studies of Peru and Mozambique, **efficiency and fairness in foreign fishing arrangements**, and the issue of regional **fisheries collaboration in ACP countries**.

The **European Commission** representative, Constantin Alexandrou (DG MARE), made a presentation on the **external dimension of the CFP**. Following the stakeholders consultation on the green paper that took place last year, the Commission intends to keep the MPAS and improve them. Discussions are ongoing and this external dimension will be part of the global package of the reform of the CFP.

The second half of day 2 was dedicated to **three working group sessions**. The diversity of the ACP Group of countries meant that while some issues were common to many ACP countries, approaches and solutions differed. The working groups gave an opportunity for participants to share their knowledge and experiences in a highly interactive process to advance national and regional thinking on these crucial issues and to find solutions to improve and reform their fisheries management system.

1. The first WG dealt with the **principles of access**. The group identified seven key principles and policy issues for determining access to a country's resources:

- Improve the **economic efficiency** of fisheries
- **Sustainability** and re-building of stocks



- Empowerment of **local communities** and people
- **Maximising the benefits** from access of the fishery itself
- **Responsible fishing** and **fighting IUU**
- **Transparency**
- **Social aspects** are of paramount importance

2. The second WG dealt with the **principles and pathways for reform in ACP Countries**. The group defined the necessary measures to establish sustainable fisheries management systems as:

- perform **sector reviews**
- elaborate and implement **Fisheries Management Plans**
- **control access** and relate it to **capacity**
- develop effective mechanisms to **involve stakeholders at all levels**
- **review and improve the legal framework** to make it more enabling
- enable and enhance **organisational development** for capacity-building
- **improve monitoring, information collection and reporting**
- **apply precautionary guidelines**
- **develop information sharing** and the sharing of best and worse practices.

3. The third WG dealt with the issue of **Foreign Fishing Arrangements**. The group determined ways of increasing benefits from access agreements for ACP countries as follow:

- **information on the stocks**
- **understanding the calculation of access rights** in fishing agreements and **develop capacity for monitoring the wealth** accruing to the local economies
- **transparency concerning the obligations and rights** of all involved parties
- **developing alternative approaches to fishing agreements**
- **introducing social clauses** into all type of fishing arrangements



Several conclusions on the debates held during this two-day workshop were drawn by **H.E. S.B.C. Servansing**, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Republic of Mauritius to the United Nations Office and other International Organisations in Geneva:

- **Sustainability is the key but the economic and social dimension of the activity cannot be ignored**
- **Different objectives need different instruments:** access arrangements cannot necessarily be relied upon to fulfil all the development objectives
- **Empowerment of small fishing communities: co-management** was stressed and the importance of involving fishermen and fishing communities at all stages of the decision making process
- It is important **to link access to fisheries with access to markets**
- **Individual transferable rights (ITQs)** can be successful in reducing overcapacity but they can have undesirable effects
- Need for a common understanding of what constitutes **fair, efficient, equitable and just** for all parties
- The **new FPAs** following broad reform are based on a set of comprehensive principles relating to **modernisation, rationalisation and simplification**
- **Regional agreements can reconcile economic aspirations with conservation measures** and economic benefits can be optimised at the same time as providing conservation benefits
- **Need for technical assistance and capacity building at both national and regional level**
- Success requires setting **benchmarks that measure the social, economic and sustainability objectives** of fisheries policies and development programmes.



REPORT

Opening Session

Her Excellency Vivianne Fock Tave, Ambassador of the Republic of Seychelles to the Kingdom of Belgium, Chair of the ACP Working Group on Fisheries and co-Chair of this two-day workshop drew the attention of the audience on the fact that the types of Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) generally signed between the EU and some ACP countries (the Mixed Agreements and the Tuna Agreements) have different impacts on artisanal fishery but also share some similarities: they create employment for nationals on foreign vessels and there can be value addition from foreign vessels that land their catches in national ports. However, both agreements can have negative environmental impacts and IUU fishing can occur under them.

Mrs. Fock Tave stressed the importance of information sharing between ACP countries, especially the success stories! The Ambassador highlighted the usefulness of knowing more about best practices in ACP countries – Namibia is a case in point for instance. Although most of the issues covered during the workshop were not new they remained key issues of vital importance to many ACP countries.

Mr. Serge Beslier, member of the Board of EBCD and co-Chair of the workshop, stressed the importance of bringing together various actors to present a balanced picture of the different systems of management of fisheries in different countries; this, according to him, was paramount to help elaborate new ideas on how to best manage fisheries based on various experiences. A range of key elements would contribute to this, among others, the question on how to access fisheries in the coastal waters of developing countries and the way in which the question of access would be answered could very well vary from one system to another.

Sustainability is a key condition for the development of fisheries economies given that it creates job and contributes to food security. There is no single answer to the problems discussed during the workshop – each country has its particularity –



yet, the sustainable management of fisheries has common grounds in different countries.

The **Honourable Peter Sinon**, newly appointed Minister for Investment, Natural Resources and Industry in the Republic of Seychelles, highlighted that more than 60 ACP States are engaged in the export of fish, fishery and aquaculture products to regional and international markets – particularly to the EU – a crucial sector beyond a simple economic and financial activity for many small economies, which is increasingly facing the challenges of climate change, global warming and piracy in the Indian Ocean.

Minister Sinon stated his support for regional initiatives such as the Indian Ocean Commission (IOC), which has developed an ambitious programme for fisheries management and development with EU funding, helping the countries of the region monitor the stock of the main tuna species, pave the way for the setting up of a common ‘monitoring, control and surveillance system’ and discourage illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the region. This is, he said, “very important as individually, we are less likely to be able to ensure sustainability of the fisheries resources – for all of us.” He also greeted EU commitments in tackling positively the issues of sustainability and in undertaking fundamental reforms of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) in recognition of the need to ensure the continuous future supply of fish and fish products to the European market, including an international dimension to the document covering the Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) with third countries.

Mr. Sinon highlighted two factors he believed had to be discussed and tackled during the following two days. First, the relative erosion of preferential tariffs as the playing field levels: this process will most certainly disadvantage some countries with limited capacities and drive them to loose competitiveness to continue exporting their products to the EU. Second, the Minister asked what could be implemented to progressively graduate local semi-fishermen or youths in Maritime schools to play a more active role in industrial fisheries, which to-date



remain almost exclusively foreign. The Minister stressed that lessons have been learnt from past experiences and that it will take strong will and a pro-active attitude to do what is right – to effectively protect and manage an economic activity that sustains so many and finite resources necessary for the wellbeing of all. Yet, help from the partners will be needed to get projects off the ground.

Keynote Address

The Need for Reform in the Fisheries Sector

Mr. Lidvard Grønnevet, senior advisor at the Marine Research Institute in Norway, argued that it is possible to have environmental sustainability, growth and poverty reduction all at the same time (conclusions of the *Annual Aid Effectiveness Report*) but this requires a shift in incentives. In a book entitled “*Where is the Wealth of Nations?*” the environmental economists at the World Bank looked at the characteristics of the three main sources of wealth to a society: “natural resources,” “produced resources” and “intangible resources.” Natural resources, such as fisheries, are seen as unique because they are a potential sustainable source of resource wealth that can continue for eternity if well managed. It is agreed that a common characteristic of wealthy nations such as the OECD group is that the “social capital” (or “intangible capital”) is by far the biggest share of the total wealth of a nation; as development in society evolves, natural capital is used and transformed into “invested” (or “physical/produced”) and “intangible/social” capital. It is essential to have this development path in mind when looking at how to implement reforms to achieve benefits for the whole society from the fisheries resources.

Mr. Grønnevet held that there are three dimensions to successful fisheries management: “biological” (sustainable use and protection objectives), “economic” (wealth creation and achieving efficiency objectives), and “social” (meeting equity objectives). It requires institutional capacity to be able to define the appropriate balance between these dimensions. Besides, there are three elements that determine a good fisheries management regime: Scientific knowledge for management advice (informed by the best knowledge available), updated and



proper fisheries laws and regulations, and enforcement and sanctions following the control of fishing activities.

Management of the fisheries sector is increasingly regarded as an environmental issue, as it should be. The general acceptance of the need for ecosystem-based fisheries management is part of this realization. Furthermore, in the future an increasing share of fish and protein supply from fisheries will have to come from aquaculture, which will need to include the environmental externalities.

There is great variety in how the fisheries sector is part of the development process in different countries. As an example Mr. Grønnevet used the reform path of Norway over the last three decades. The country has gone through fundamental changes in the fisheries sector. Norway suffered from resource depletion and fishing was a very unprofitable sector because it was heavily subsidised. Major changes happened through gradual advancement over time (“evolution” not “revolution”), collaboration between scientists, managers, policy-makers and stakeholders both inside the industry and in the broader society.

In the 1980s the policy objectives were stated as conservation of resources, maintaining settlement and activity along the coast, secure employment and a diversified fleet structure and ownership. There were various challenges which were the drivers of the reform process: structural problems, overcapacity and operating losses and large subsidies. The pelagic fleet was at the forefront of the initiative for a reform. A combination of environmental factors and overfishing (particularly of the Norwegian Spring Spawning Herring) acted as an eye-opener on the necessity for carrying out a true reform.

The key components of the reform were stability and predictability of fisheries management principles, long-term allocation between the segments of the fleet, limited access and individual vessel quotas, reduction/elimination of subsidies, involvement of stakeholders and the knowledge-based and gradual approach to reforms. The results are now mainly perceived as successful with a sustainable harvest, fewer vessels and fishermen, improved profitability, a diversified fleet structure but also geographical concentration. The policy objectives have now



changed to include profitability and efficiency; the economic components of a good fisheries management. The lessons learned are that fewer vessels and fishers are inevitable in a wealthy, modern society; subsidies will delay required reforms; general economic growth can smooth the reform path; and stakeholder involvement is crucial. As a humorous illustration, Mr. Grønnevet argued that instead of teaching a man how to fish -- then teach a man other skills so he can get out of the industry.

Mr. Grønnevet mentioned that in spite of recent gains in successful fisheries management, a number of reports are presenting erroneous information on the state of the fisheries resources in the NE Atlantic and globally. Examples are the UNEP LME Report, the “Rising to Depletion?” report, and the Green Economy preview report on fisheries published in May this year.

In conclusion Mr. Mr. Grønnevet emphasised that fishery policy must be country specific – it must be in coherence with the development level of the country. If the economic and institutional conditions inside and outside the fishery sector are not in place to ensure the effective ‘capture’ and redistribution of the resource rent – then a more gradual approach is preferable, where the welfare function of small-scale fisheries should be preserved until the appropriate macroeconomic conditions for rent-maximisation and distribution are fulfilled. Institutions are essential in implementing reforms and institutional change should also be a priority as part of the reform of the fisheries.

Session 1 (part 1): Who Gets Access?

Nature and Objectives of Access

Honourable Kilus Nguvauva, Deputy Minister for fisheries and marine resources in the Republic of Namibia, gave an overview of the fisheries management system in Namibia where the fisheries sector has evolved from over fishing and over exploitation of fish stocks by distant fishing vessels before independence to a well managed sector after independence. The Government has developed and



implemented appropriate legal frameworks as well as policy and regulatory instruments to effectively guide the ministry to carry out its mandate.

Presentation 1: Fisheries Access and Wealth

Mr. Kieran Kelleher, Fisheries Team Leader at the World Bank and manager of the World Bank's Global Partnership on Fisheries (PROFISH), argued that the sustainable use of fisheries resources relies on a triple bottom line based on environmental, social and economic considerations. The economic dimension is a key dimension often missing from decision-making processes. According to Mr. Kelleher, the wealth from fisheries should be a core policy objective; not considering the wealth function in fisheries essentially increases poverty. Building wealth in the fisheries sector means investing in the fish stock or fish capital over time. This in turn requires incentives based on secure long-term rights or tenure: this is what access regime is about.

Where is the wealth of nations? Countries like Switzerland for instance that do not have immense natural resources have a huge ability to produce wealth because of their strong institutions, property rights, democracy and transparency. In contrast, countries like Mozambique have huge natural resources but have not managed to transform natural resources into wealth because of wars and political changes.

How to transform natural wealth into other forms of wealth? The level of education and the rule of Law are the two key factors explaining the ability to transform natural resource wealth into other forms of wealth. The capture and use of economic rents and surplus from fisheries require fisheries that operate at a level which maximises economic benefits. These rents are then captured by enterprises through profits, taxes and the returns to labour. This wealth is in turn transformed into private investments (modernising fleets), a mix of public and private investments (science and education), and public investments (poverty alleviation). The efficiency of these systems will determine the long-term outcomes.



Who gets access to fisheries and how well is this access used? Much of the value-added to fisheries products is captured outside ACP countries (exporters of raw materials) from processing and marketing which takes place in developed countries. Some activities add to the national wealth, others to the foreign wealth: adding to the national wealth entails moving up the value chain. Investing in increasing technology will require a reduction in the fleet if the equilibrium is to be maintained.

Fisheries can be described as a sub-prime asset because of the negative rents it generates at the global level (due to very large subsidies). Mr. Kelleher held that if the fisheries were optimally managed, US\$50 billion could be gained annually in net economic benefits. Furthermore, there is little accountability at the country level and a lack of environmental accounts on the wealth of the standing stock: these economic issues must be addressed. The economic objective has to be brought up on the list; economic incentives for generating surplus must be built under the form of strengthened rights and strengthened forms of tenure as well as improved rule of Law in a cost-effective way. Clear rules of access also need to be set: the institutions governing the access should focus on access and wealth generation on the basis of some criteria. There must be equity in the distribution and the use of licenses. Existing rights must be strengthened and codified: they need to be clear and electronically documented. Without security of tenure, this will not be possible. Subsidiarity allows for local-level solutions: this process should be facilitated for small-scale fisheries in particular.

By definition, the creation of exclusive rights means that some gain and some lose: wealth redistribution and the equity issue cannot be avoided, which delays the evolution of property rights and dilutes the strength of these rights. The crisis in fisheries has been largely treated as a fish issue rather than an economic issue. Solutions exist but reforms are politically sensitive and involve many social issues. A sustainable access regime needs clear economic objectives and rationale. Clear fisheries economic policies and principles are essential for decisions on access.

Q & A and discussion



A participant argued that the first presentation showed that in the case of Norway the objective of sustainability and environmental protection was promoted as the first priority, whereas the economic dimension was upgraded as being the priority in the second presentation. Is the market for efficiency not being carved out and forgetting sustainability? Furthermore, the role of the state has not been mentioned in the second presentation. Efficiency in itself will not save the fisheries sector: a more proactive State or policy for curbing and limiting efficiency and the level of catches is needed. That efficiency level is yet not present among fishermen of most ACP countries, which are often small and vulnerable. The participant asked if by using this factor Mr. Kelleher is not privileging the more efficient foreign access to the disadvantage of local fishermen.

Mr. Seisay, representative from Sierra Leone, asked clarifications on the wealth-based concept, especially with regards to the licensing scheme in the West African region. In Sierra Leone, for instance, a plan to increase wealth from fisheries has been developed but the licensing system does not provide for that. It is the view of the World Bank that this should be based on long-term productivity.

Ms. Erastus, fisheries Director in Namibia, asked some clarifications on the issue of the strengthening of the existing rights. Namibia believes that access to rights by fishermen is still an ownership of the Government: duration is given to fishermen to access the resources (7, 10, 15 or 20 years). If fishermen under perform, that right can be taken away. Ms. Erastus argued that there are conditions to this right and thus asked what is meant by the need to codify and strengthen these rights.

Mr. Ngoande, representative from Cameroon, asked a question which also related to fishing rights: Cameroon delivers yearly licenses and is often compared to Gabon which only delivers licenses for 6 months, renewable in the case that the conditions are fulfilled. The system used in Cameroon is often criticised, so Mr. Ngoande asked



whether Mr. Kelleher suggested longer periods to be given to fishermen in order to secure revenue and invest.

- ❖ **Mr. Kelleher** defended the primacy of different objectives: when contrasting economic objectives with biological or environmental ones, it comes down to the design of the management regime. When putting biology upfront we end up with having a set of technical measures (limits on catches, seasons): in Alaska, the fishing season has got to one day – a lot of inefficiency is then generated. It is a question of turning it around and getting people to do the right thing. Even though the advice may be biological, the decisions are almost invariably based on economics. Unless we try to consciously address this by trying to measure what is happening and get these arguments on the table in order to have clarity on the economic consequences of different management approaches, a pathway towards better sustainability will not be found. Biology should not be ignored: the triple bottom-line – environmental sustainability, equity and social responsibility – and the economic dimension have to take a prominent place.

Regarding the role of the State, efficiency should be favoured. If inefficiency is favoured, poverty issues will not be solved but rather perpetuated. Equity is unquestionably needed in the solutions but efficiency of production systems is also essential as well as the way access is organised to get efficiency.

On the question of ACP economies opening the door to private investments, it is important to distinguish between ownership and benefits. It does not really matter if the owner of a vessel is national or foreign: what matters is how much benefits are accruing to the country (employing more people, generating more foreign exchange, responsible foreign investor, benefits staying in the country, etc). We have to focus on the benefits: the ownership is essentially irrelevant.



Regarding the duration of licenses, in most West African countries licenses are given for a period of three months, which is a terrible idea for foreign fishing, according to Mr. Kelleher. Long-term investment in the country, some commitment to generating benefits, stable employment, and value-added through processing in the country is what is needed.

On the question of rights, Mr. Kelleher argued that rights go hand in hand with obligations and suggested that rather than issuing fishing licenses, fishing obligations should be issued instead.

A participant argued that wealth creation adds value to products and fisheries are a natural resource product, something sustainable if managed in a responsible manner unlike other extractive industries. He therefore asked if it is not more advisable to encourage local-value addition which will create employment and export earnings, build capacity and contribute to poverty eradication in the long-run. What is the World Bank doing to encourage this type of approach rather than pure benefits arising from access agreements?

- ❖ **Mr. Kelleher** agrees with this approach and argued that he does not advocate access agreements per se but rather to try to secure and maximise the benefits from the different access arrangements. Taking the examples of Morocco and Mauritania that have small pelagic resources, the local economies do not have the fleets to catch these sustainably; there is a good argument to license foreign vessels there. It would obviously be better to have more of these resources processed in the countries where they were caught. The value is added all the way along the value chain, not only through the harvesting but also through the processing.
- ❖ On the question on the economic and environmental dimension, **Mr. Grønnevet** illustrated in his presentation that the economic dimension was only included in the Norwegian updated sustainable management. Economics



needs to be part of a good management system; however, the environmental sustainable resource is the most fundamental dimension.

In response to a comment made by Mr. Kelleher in his presentation, Mr. Grönnevet argued that it is very difficult to uphold that ownership is irrelevant. When it comes to national control of natural resources, ownership and the national flag on ships is absolutely essential, according to him.

Mr. Nanyaro, representative from Tanzania, argued that the type of regime in place in many ACP countries does not allow for sustainable fisheries. Each country has its own regime and when countries from the EU negotiate with ACP countries they do so individually; as a result, countries of a same region do not know what conditions were offered to the others. This does not allow for transparency or subsidiarity, which are needed in order to have effective discussions based on the conditions of a country's resources. Common management regime is therefore urgently needed as well as a global approach for industrial fisheries. The overriding objective is economic benefit – food supply, social security and so on – so it is the best possible solution that is sought. In order to do this, a common understanding approach and management will be essential.

Mr. Liewes from the canning industry in Mauritius expressed his astonishment regarding the concept of adding value considering that the last development in the fisheries access agreements has seen the separation of access to the EU market with an EPA and the fisheries agreements: these are now two complete separate agreements. If the EU decides to give countries in South East Asia duty free access to the EU market, it will be impossible for ACP countries to keep competing. Would ACP countries still want to have an exclusive fishing agreement with the EU if the added value of the fish can no longer be exported to the EU under a duty free regime? The careful balance of fishing agreements, of adding value and creating wealth in the ACP nations is the basis of this cooperation. The fishing agreement and the duty access agreement are now split and no longer linked. Mr. Liewes asked whether



there should be a link between duty free access and fishing rights. He argued that ACP countries do not have enough fleet to make the industry work, thus need EU fleets. It is essential to ensure that duty free access and fisheries are carefully balanced and linked to maintain the entire value chain.

Presentation 2: The use of fisheries resources as a safety net to address poverty and livelihoods

Mr. Rondolph Payet, Regional Executive Secretary of the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries project, argued that access agreements fail to provide sustainability of natural resources and reduce poverty. Providing safety nets is not merely seen as a measure to solve temporary insecurity but also to address a long-term problem of chronic poverty. According to Mr. Payet, poverty is mainly caused by a lack of social, economic and political choices offered to people. Looking at the issue of social security, there are actions that need to be done to ensure that the population as a whole is provided with certain basic needs and to look at what the community can do for itself. It is thus important to look at both sides of the equation. The concept of sustainable livelihoods is based on the idea of building on what communities and fishermen have rather than undermining it. Understanding this helps improve the way access agreements are made and how the resources are managed to ensure sustainability.

A vast literature shows that payments made under fisheries access agreements are not based on well defined resource rent principles. It is questionable whether the rationale for these payments (100€ per tub) and for financial compensation under fisheries agreements (6% of catch in average) are adequate for wealth creation, whether it is fulfilling livelihoods or reducing poverty levels in ACP countries and whether it is being distributed equitably. There are positive outcomes from these agreements but Mr. Payet reckoned that they should be restructured in a way that provides more benefits and access to ACP countries.

There are a number of concerns regarding access agreements. First, 70-80% of EU and US access fees are paid by Governments rather than fleets and are thus



considered as subsidies. That has contributed to over-capacity in a number of fisheries. Yet, at the same time it is recognised that those access fees have helped countries in developing and sustaining local fisheries and sustaining institutions. Second, 10% of the employment and value-added resulting from fisheries agreements goes to the host developing countries, the remainder flowing to developed countries. Third, it is questionable whether access agreements aid towards poverty reduction. According to Mr. Payet, the EC needs to re-align its external policies and start looking outwards in order to help moving towards access rights that sustain livelihoods and help ACP countries to develop policies that encourage the creation of wealth from their fisheries.

Many ACP countries depend heavily on access agreements, an important source of revenue for fishing nations. Governments have a clear role to play in the way in which this revenue should be used and distributed. Too often, the money paid through access agreements is not directed towards the fishing industry or towards economic growth in the country. Furthermore, depleting stocks tend to destroy developing countries' aspirations to harvest the resources themselves; current policies tend to comfort countries in continuing to provide access to other countries. There has unfortunately not been an active engagement of partners into investing and participating in the equitable development of these countries. Mr. Payet recommended that foreign fleets should provide development space for ACP countries to invest in and implement their own development aspirations.

There are several possible actions that can be undertaken to ensure that access agreements can sustain the livelihoods of the population and ultimately reduce poverty. Authorities could interact more with the industry and engage the latter into the co-management of resources; allocation and fishing rights could be set up within different fisheries; joint ventures could be set up; countries could demonstrate more commitment in ensuring that their fisheries sector are part of the overall economic development; RFMOs could participate more actively; consensus building and regional cooperation are essential; and it should be a condition that



fisheries access payments should be invested back into the industry. Access agreements lack a development aspect and a management dimension.

Q & A and discussion

Mr. Rodrigues, representing the Spanish purse seiner fishery in the Indian Ocean, argued that tuna stocks are mainly migratory so the management of stocks should be done at the international level and there is therefore no sense in talking about management of the stocks at the national level. To manage the access of foreign fleets to the EEZs the focus should not be put solely on what the owners of fishing fleets pay but also on the contributions that the fleets can make through the creation of social and economic networks around the activity of tuna fleets (Seychelles is a very good example of this).

Mr. Paredes, Peruvian economist had the impression that it might be a mistake to be looking at too many policy objectives while only very few instruments are available. According to him, the issue of access to fisheries has more to do with sustainability and wealth creation than other important issues such as equity, food security and poverty alleviation: other instruments than accessibility should be looked at when trying to deal with those problems. His view was that the focus is not being put on the right instruments. Regarding the issue of co-management, based on his experience in Peru, the owners of the fleet processing plants have much more resources than the public sector and have sometimes conflicting short-term interests. It can be thus risky to involve the private sector into the management of fisheries.

Mr. Phillips, from the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism Secretariat supported the view that the EC should start looking more outward and suggested that ACP countries should, on the contrary, start looking more inward – looking at the fisheries development process as an integral part of the overall internal sustainable development strategies.



- ❖ **Mr. Payet** responded that it is important to look at the entire mechanism in order to accrue more benefits that will allow ACP countries to use better the revenues or the benefits of employment and social networks. Regarding co-management, he held that it is important to find the balance when allowing the private sector to enter the management of fisheries. This depends on the country: there are various levels of co-management. Yet, according to Mr. Payet, the industry should be part of the management process as much as possible.

Ms. Erastus reiterated the importance of the question posed on the instruments. On the argument made by Mr. Payet about the fact that access agreements lack a developmental aspect, she asked whether it was in terms of capacity building, training or something else.

Mr Quatey from Ghana argued that knowing the problems faced with access agreements, it could be useful to look more into joint ventures and see what it can do in terms of wealth creation and poverty reduction.

- ❖ **Mr. Payet** suggested that access agreements should help increase the value of what stays in a country and that policy instruments which ensure accrued benefits to ACP countries should be defined. He held that access agreements can contain joint venture arrangements.

Mr. Kelleher proposed to look at the relationship between joint ventures and access agreements: if a foreign fleet has a continued rolling series of access agreements, there may be fewer incentives to engage in joint ventures as they have access to the raw materials that will then be processed in their countries of origin. On the other hand, if there is a statement principle that access agreements can open the doors to



investments, this could be a way to encourage investments and structure a dialogue with foreign fleets on how to structure transfer of benefits to ACP countries.

Mr. Goujon, representing the French tuna boat owners, asked the audience to think about the benefits accrued to entire economies by the presence of EU fishermen. He suggested that benefits must be shared but that risks must be shared too.

Session 1 (part 2): Who Gets Access? Voice and Empowerment of Small-Scale Fishermen

Ms. Beverly Wade held that the social component in fisheries management and development is one that is mostly underdeveloped or missing and rarely is the focus of the major challenge which is to ensure that the small-scale fisher folk and coastal communities are not marginalised.

Presentation 1: Voice and empowerment of small-scale fishermen

Mr. Alhaji Jallow, Senior Fisheries Officer at the FAO Regional Office for Africa argued that it is difficult to expect socially ignored people to generate revenue and wealth for a nation. In many ACP countries, the voices of millions of small-scale fishermen are not heard and they are therefore excluded from most activities. Small-scale fisheries in ACP countries contribute up to 80% of the inland and marine fish catch: in some countries, the 20% expected from industrial fisheries are not ensured because the landings are done offshore. Small-scale fisheries are yet to attain their potential to contribute to sustainable development and attaining the MDGs. Several factors have been identified as contributing to this situation: insecure rights to land and fisheries resources; inadequate or absent health and educational services and



social safety nets; vulnerability to natural disasters and climate change; and exclusion from wider development processes due to fragile organisational structures and weak representation and participation in decision-making processes.

Strategies have been developed to counter these problems through the active involvement and organisation of fisher folk at the community level in conceptualising and designing policies and programmes as well as their implementation. These strategies use “voice”, “participation” and “empowerment” processes. Voice means the capacity and confidence of fisher folk to realise that their views, ideas and experiences are important and to express them to the agencies that should be supporting them. In some cases, the voices are heard but not taken into account, which is the basis of the participation and empowerment process. Participation and empowerment is a multi-dimensional social and location specific process that helps people gain control over their own lives.

Involving small-scale fisher folk in fisheries processes is essential for enforcing regulations and for keeping policies and programmes running as they are the ones dealing directly with the resources. However, before giving voice to fishermen and empowering them, a closer look will have to be given to governance structures in fisheries. Decision-making processes and institutional frameworks have to be designed so as to facilitate these processes. There is a broad consensus that improving governance should be a priority in all ACP countries.

It is important for local resource users and community members to make their own choices. Giving voice therefore entails building confidence and self-esteem by training and encouraging them to put their voices across and make sure that these voices will be taken up and used. Creating and improving linkages between fishermen and enablers and service providers is also crucial: forums of consultation have to be developed, representative bodies built up and the capacity of fishermen to contribute increased. Regarding empowerment processes and mechanisms, helping fisher folk recognise and mobilise their own strengths – such as adaptability, resilience, skills and knowledge – must underlie a system of participation and partnership. Participation entails the creation of an atmosphere of negotiation,



collaboration and partnership. When trying to create an enabling environment, co-management will have to be facilitated by Government officials who are sometimes reluctant to give power. They will have to formulate and adopt supportive small-scale fisheries policy and legal frameworks.

The lessons learnt are that capacity needs to be enhanced in order to facilitate processes at the decentralised levels. Secondly, a change of attitude is required from central authority to service providers for fishermen and other stakeholders. Thirdly, once partners are comfortable with their respective roles and once they have acquired trust and mutual understanding to collaborate in the management and development of small-scale fisheries, powers can then be delegated.

Presentation 2: Fisheries co-management: an attempt to address the communities' needs and development expectations

Mr. Simeão Lopes, Director of the National Directorate for Fisheries Administration in the Ministry of Fisheries of Mozambique presented the challenges affecting coastal fishing communities in Mozambique. These communities live under poverty and in vulnerable environments because of a lack of alternatives to address their social, economic and political needs. Top-down governance arrangements pursued by the Government until 1992 have excluded poor communities from decision-making processes. Fisheries policy and management objectives in Mozambique, inherited from old colonial systems, gave much emphasis to industrial fishing interests and left aside artisanal fishing because they were not recognised as an important source of welfare. Poor capacity and poor social organisation at the community level aggravated this situation.

Two kinds of policy responses were given. A national-wide vision of development, which was translated by a political will to focus on poverty alleviation, became the core development objective. Democracy, human empowerment through education and health, gender empowerment and decentralisation of the public administration system provided a new environment for communities to voice out their needs and access services. Policy and administrative reforms have been



pursued by the Government with an emphasis on institutional and legal enforcement in rural remote areas to ensure that community rights on access to natural, social and economic assets were secured. Social and economic networks were promoted to ensure that communities were able to participate in governance and market systems and funds were provided to support community livelihoods initiatives. The second policy response entailed specific reforms in the fisheries sector: in 1990 artisanal fishing became formally recognised as a legal activity with specific rights of access to fishing endowments. Regulations were put into force to secure the right of access to fishing resources to communities as well as their involvement in decision-making processes. Institutional capacity was strengthened and livelihoods development strategies were developed.

The fisheries co-management programme is an example of a programme that contributed to the empowerment and voicing of poor communities through inclusion mechanisms in governance. At the community-level, different layers of people are part of community councils, which discuss the needs of their community and especially those of fishermen. At the district and provincial level, the government authorities and provincial governors are part of co-management councils. However, since all decisions cannot be taken at this level, the Minister has set up a consultative forum that meets quarterly since 1998 and which is made up of fishermen who bring directly their problems and ideas to the Minister. Co-management has proven to bring various benefits: it gives an opportunity to fishing communities to voice out their needs at different levels, improving the proficiency of management regimes, it has increased adherence and compliance to regulations, and participatory and joint decision-making processes have improved.

The implementation of any fisheries management regime implies changes on the patterns of resource exploration, which may have direct impacts on the local users in different ways. Linkages between co-management and alternative development programs are inevitable. A common vision on resource management regime is required to address the different social and economic interests between the industry and communities but also amongst communities. The decentralisation



policy has proved to be one window for the inclusion of poor communities in governance and decision-making processes through fisheries co-management arrangements. However, there are concerns regarding the fisheries agreements with the EU as the small-scale sector was not involved in the process and the communities claim that there are no direct benefits accruing to them. Mr. Lopes wondered how these agreements could help the process of empowering communities.

Q & A and discussion

Mr. Seisay argued that when fishermen are not involved in the arrangements that lead to the agreements there is always some form of confrontation. He asked whether some sort of guarantee was considered in the arrangement or in the legal framework in order to minimise conflicts between small-scale fishermen and industrial fishermen.

Mr. Phillips reiterated that the lesson learnt is that policy environment that is conducive to the involvement of fishermen in decision-making processes at various levels is required but also partners that are committed to the long-term capacity development of fishermen organisations and good partnerships between stakeholders, technical agencies and research agencies. According to Mr. Phillips, there should be a research process that constantly reviews what is being done to improve on it. It is crucial to capture and share the experiences in the various countries that have small-scale fisheries.

Mr. Ngoande expressed his concern regarding the diversity of fisher folks, a big challenge experienced by many fishing nations. It is a real problem to address the issue because nationals perceive migrant fishermen as people who explore national resources but who do not invest the benefits back in the country. Mr. Ngoande recommended including migrant fishermen into national policies.



- ❖ **Mr. Jallow** responded that fisheries agreements are concluded mainly between national authorities and partners for industrial fisheries. The conflict arises from the fact that artisanal fishermen now have to operate on distant waters because the areas close to the shore are depleted: they now have to operate in zones operated by industrial fisheries. Mr. Jallow argued that if fishermen are better engaged and if representatives are put in place small-scale fishermen will have more opportunities to participate in negotiating the agreements (on conditions of access to ensure that their own operations are guaranteed and their livelihoods sustained). It is the role of Governments to ensure that fishermen have partners they can talk to.

Regarding the question of immigrant fishermen, this is a perennial issue according to Mr. Jallow. It is important to ensure their livelihoods in the country and to provide them with a guarantee that they can stay in the country of immigration. This is an issue that has to be addressed by Governments.

- ❖ **Mr. Lopes** argued that the question on immigrants is an institutional problem rather than a social one: it is mainly a problem created by existing administrative boundaries. He believes that it is crucial to involve migrant fishermen in the process and to include them in discussions rather than pushing them away.

Session 2: Principles and Pathways for Fisheries Reform in ACP Countries

Lessons from processes of change

Presentation 1: Case study of Mozambique



Mr. Joaquim Tenreiro, former Secretary of State for Fisheries in the Government of Mozambique and now independent fisheries consultant, presented the case of the fisheries sector in Mozambique in a context of economic change. At the time of independence in 1975 the fisheries sector was dominated by offshore foreign industrial fleets dedicated to exports. Semi-industrial fleets were partly abandoned and artisanal fisheries were in crisis because of the weak link between consumers and supply markets. Rural marketing networks were abandoned by foreign owners causing a shortage of essential goods and fishing gears. Public administration dedicated to fisheries as well as national technical staff was severely missing mainly due to the departure of foreign technicians from the country. It was only in the late 1970s that the first public administration institution dedicated to fisheries was created and the first assessment of fishing resources potential was carried.

The 1980s saw the emergence of a centrally-planned economy. Fisheries development policies were defined and political and administration functions were concentrated in one single state body. The fisheries sector was divided into an industrial fisheries sub-sector oriented towards the export of crustaceans and the supply of fish to larger cities; a private semi-industrial sub-sector primarily focused on the supply of fish; and an artisanal fisheries sub-sector providing increased economic and social conditions for local communities assisted by a network of Government companies. Appropriate port infrastructures were created to support the fishing fleets, industrial units of production of fishing equipment and gear were established, national technical staff were intensively trained and scientific knowledge on marine and continental resources was developed.

During the following decade, a readjustment programme was initiated. The industrial fisheries sub-sector prepared for a greater involvement of private enterprising; Government companies supporting small-scale fisheries were privatised. The separation between political and fisheries administration functions were carried out gradually. A Fisheries Master Plan for the period 1995-2005 was designed to give greater importance to small-scale fisheries (artisanal and semi-industrial). However, the consequence of structural adjustment was that the



industrial fisheries sub-sector was taken by the foreign partners in joint ventures. The privatisation of services and production of fishing equipments and gear diverted companies to other activities.

Today, many challenges remain to be addressed. The major challenge in the future will be to support the construction of new local fisheries administration integrating co-management committees in the system. The second challenge will consist in adding more value to fishing produce in industrial and small-scale fisheries. A third challenge will be to improve fisheries planning and management systems. Lastly, regional cooperation remains a condition for the development of new fisheries: this will require greater integration and joint efforts in fisheries management and surveillance.

Presentation 2: Case study of Peru

Mr. Carlos Paredes, Peruvian economist, presented on the recent reform of the Peruvian anchoveta fishery, the largest single-stock fishery in the world accounting for approximately 10% of the global marine catch. In the early 1990s, Peru went through a major economic reform and returned to a market-based economy. A fishing law exclusively prohibited any increase in plants and in the number and size of fishing vessels. The TAC system gave regulated limited access to the anchoveta fishery to protect the specie from over-fishing. However, the lack of individual property rights fostered a race for fish among vessel owners and led to over investment in the sector. Furthermore, incentives were created for private actors back into the industry, which coupled with prevailing corruption, led to a significant expansion in the number of vessels and processing plants operating in the sector. The average cost structure reflected the sector's overcapitalisation and was characterised by a high share of fixed costs. Paredes and Gutierrez (2008) concluded in a study that cutting the fleet's hold capacity and the plant's processing capacity by half would have led to doubling the sector's aggregate profits. The TAC system secured the sustainability of the biomass: fishing was not possible during the long fishing ban periods, there were limited incentives for under reporting and because



the wages of fishermen were paid as a percentage of the value of landings, they behaved as inspectors. Although the sustainability of the fishery was built the economic results were very poor: the race for fish led to over capitalisation, reduced profits, created large inefficiencies and displaced workers.

A legislative decree passed in 2008 introduced individual property rights in the fishery by assigning a Maximum Catch Limit to each Vessel (MCLV) defined as a percentage of the TAC. The Peruvian adaptation of the ITQ system tackled the fleet's overcapitalisation problem but left untouched the number and size of processing plants, which constitutes the direct source of demand for anchoveta. As vessels were granted resource ownership, the balance of power between fleet and plants dramatically shifted, the power being given to ship owners. These changes entailed a reduction in the number of jobs. The reform's initial outcomes were that it virtually eliminated the race for fish. The fishing effort was reduced and the number of active vessels dropped, leading to an increase in profits for the sector – in the first year, a 24% reduction in the number of vessels led to a 50% increase in profits for the sector. However, this new regime opened the space for perverse incentives: it fostered an increase in under reporting of landings, which had a clear effect on the sustainability of the biomass.

Mr. Paredes argued that the structure of incentives and rewards that condition the behaviour of actors in the sector needs to be changed: what is needed is not necessarily stronger sanctions but to restructure the system of penalties so that it will produce the desired results. Besides, institutional arrangements and framework are weak, with jurisdictional problems between the central and regional authorities. Corruption is endemic and it is a practice that is hard to abandon. Once again, the structure of incentives and rewards need to be changed in order to produce the desired outcomes.

The anchoveta sector should not be viewed as destined to exclusively produce fishmeal and fish oil. It is desirable that the share of fishing for direct human consumption (DHC) will increase with time although the new legal framework does not include clear incentives for its development. Mr. Paredes held that the reform



has brought in some equity considerations: the dramatic shift in the balance of power between fleet and plants was not a market outcome but the result of a specific Government intervention that modified the sector's regulatory framework. Equity issues should therefore be openly discussed as they involve the fleet and the processing plants both in the indirect human consumption sub-sector and in the DHC industry.

Mr. Paredes focused his policy recommendations on three key problems:

- *The excessive number of plants should be reduced:* authorities should tackle excessive demand coming from an excessive number of plants. Two non-excluding policy options are:
 - Developing a sectoral structural adjustment programme consisting of a voluntary tender scheme aimed at acquiring and dismantling the excess number of processing plants in the industry;
 - Establishing a total production quota (TPQ) of fishmeal for the industry as a whole and then assigning individual and transferable production quotas.
- *The monitoring and control system should be reformed:* the structure of incentives and rewards should be overhauled, reducing to a minimum the discretionary power of public and private individuals, trying to eliminate the administrative sources of corruption. Introducing state of the art technology should be part of the short-term agenda.
- *The Government should undertake institutional reform:* it is essential to separate the regulation function from the supervisory-control function. The Government should consider creating an independent Superintendence of Fishing and Aquaculture in charge of the latter and the Vice Ministry of Fishing would retain its regulatory and coordination functions. Interference of the regional Governments and the Judiciary with sector policy should be reduced.



Q & A and discussion

Mr. Payet asked Mr. Paredes what the costs of the reform in the fisheries sector are. He asked how much it cost for the Government to come up with a social programme to compensate the losers from the reform compared to the value of the resource that has been exploited.

Mr. Grønnevet asked Mr. Paredes to develop his argument that stated that the increase in fishing days created perverse incentives and increased the cases of illegal reporting.

- ❖ **Mr. Paredes** responded that the costs of social compensation are very small: during the first year, ca. US\$2 million were allocated to the social compensation fund from duties levied on fish landings. Regarding the figures and the percentage presented, there clearly was a big influence of those most powerful that were behind the reform in setting low figures. Yet, this is one of the few reforms that have been implemented in Peru that takes into explicit account the transition costs and their alleviation.

On the second question, Mr. Paredes argued that there is a total quota and individual quotas are attributed to fishermen to allow them to better plan their activities. This has had two effects: the first is that the fishing season is very large so it is difficult to see when one is fishing illegally above its quota and the second is that there has been a large concentration of the industry with 7 big companies controlling about 70% of the fleet and plants. Mr. Paredes argued that under reporting does not come from the fishing fleet owned by small independent owners but rather occurs within the integrated enterprises that own both fleets and plants.

Mr. Amilhat asked how individual quotas have been allocated, how they are traded and how science interferes to rectify those quotas. He argued that the picture needs



to adjust to the availability of resources, which may at one point come against the existence of fishing rights. He asked how this is captured in the Peruvian legislation.

- ❖ **Mr. Paredes** argued that the quotas were fixed as a percentage of the TAC: what changes each year depending on the characteristic of the biomass is the TAC. The percentage allocated to each vessel remains the same. Each percentage was distributed in the beginning based on the weighted average of the whole capacity and historic fishing. This created a lot of problems as most small independent fishing vessel owners were against this new regime. The large corporations that saw the benefits of this were of course supportive of the new system.

Ms. Erastus asked which solutions Mr. Paredes envisaged to solve the problem of corruption.

- ❖ For **Mr. Paredes**, corruption has to do with incentives and sanctions. The problem is that the person working in a plant earns 20 times less in a month than what he can get through bribing in a single landing! The problem has little to do with surveillance being carried by the public or the private sector. This is an administrative source of corruption because there is a lot of power given to a single person. It is important to change the agents that have been in charge of it until now and to create an independent superintendence of fisheries.

Ms. Wade asked how ITQs have been traded since their introduction and what the dynamic is with regards to individual owners versus integrated companies.

- ❖ **Mr. Paredes** held that the Law says that ITQs are not tradable; however, in reality they are tradable but are tight to the vessels. Therefore, if one wants to trade the quota, one will have to trade the vessel. Before, quotas could be



transferred from one boat to another only if both boats were owned by the same company: this situation clearly benefited large corporations owning a lot of vessels, which were those behind the new law. Now, a lot of independent vessel owners transfer the quotas by leasing their quotas to big companies (this can be done for up to two years). This leads to a large concentration of the industry.

Session 3: Foreign Fishing Arrangements

What makes foreign fishing arrangements efficient and fair?

Presentation 1: Equitable foreign fishing access agreements

In his presentation, **Mr. Lidvard Grønnevet** sought to answer the question of what makes foreign fishing access agreements efficient, fair and equitable for all interested parties in public, private, coastal and distant waters. He also tried to define what is meant by the 'surplus' targeted by foreign fleets, how it is defined and how it is measured. Mr. Grønnevet presented the argument that "50% of the problems in the world results from people using the same words with different meaning... the other 50% come from people using different words with the same meaning" and defended that greater common understanding is absolutely essential.

Equitable is synonymous with the concept of fairness and is defined by the notion of having or exhibiting equity dealing fairly and equally with all concerned parties. *Efficient* means being or involving the immediate agent in producing an effect, something that is productive of desired effects without waste. *Fair* is a concept marked by impartiality and honesty, something that is free from self-interest, prejudice or favouritism; achieving a proper balance of conflicting interests. This concept is what is really coming closest to what we are searching for. *Just* is defined by having a basis in or conforming to a fact or reason, an act in conformity with what is morally upright or good.

Equitable and fair agreements are agreements that achieve a proper balance of conflicting interests; that is what is understood by the interested parties to be a



fair balance. A very important question in negotiations is what influences this understanding. These elements are the very essence here, according to Mr. Grønnevet: for instance, there are different *information* levels between the parties during negotiations. Information trustworthiness is also important, whether both parties trust the information on equal terms. Dealing with access agreements and fisheries and biological resources, it is absolutely essential to know how big the resource is (the fishable, spawning and recruitable stocks) and what the trend is (going up or down). This influences what is understood to be a fair and balanced agreement between the parties.

The same goes for *value systems*: the traditional difference between a value and an interest is that a value cannot be partially fulfilled or compromised – we either fulfil it or we don't. In foreign fishing agreements, there can be particular groups such as coastal communities or indigenous groups vulnerable to certain deals: these could be elements in an agreement that do not really have to do with economic calculations. *Interests* on the other hand represent a balance of different calculations.

Another very important notion to consider during negotiations is the one of *enforcement*: we could have the finest agreement possible but if it is not possible to enforce, what is then the effect of it? Besides, the notion of enforcement has another dimension pertaining to the notion of *power*: if there is a disagreement between parties, what is then the situation? Is it possible for one party to force the other party into accepting the deal anyway? Lastly, it is essential to have as much *transparency* as possible in these dealings – both relating to the process and the results. In the case of the agreements signed with ACP countries, access to quotas of resources is often given in exchange of payments. That will raise the question of how to calculate the value of the fish resources in monetary terms. However, regardless of any such specific problems; in any type of agreement the basic issue remains the same: what is the proper “equitable balance” in the trade-off?

Whether there is a major interest in a stock or not by any party will influence the priority given to that stock in a certain agreement. In conclusion, Mr. Grønnevet



argued that a proper balance of conflicting interests is what really makes an equitable agreement.

Presentation 2: Lessons from the reform of the external dimension of the CFP and New Thinking on the Fisheries Partnership Agreements

Mr. Constantin Alexandrou, head of unit at DG MARE, European Commission, held that since the last fisheries reform that took place in 2002 the EU has tried to gradually develop the concept of the Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) when negotiating fisheries agreements with third countries. Now, before entering a new reform process, the EC is in the process of assessing what has been achieved. The EU currently has 21 fisheries agreements out of which 14 are in force with ongoing protocols. 10 agreements are exclusively tuna agreements and 4 are mixed agreements (which represent 92% of the FPA budget). Current FPAs give access rights to EU vessels in third countries fishing in their exclusive economic zones (EEZ). The EU gives financial compensation to third countries in exchange for access rights: the 14 FPAs represent 160€ million per year. This financial counterpart represents a large part of the national fish revenues in third countries.

Among the positive elements that came out of the assessment, the partnership element that was gradually developed has helped improve fisheries policies in third countries, especially in the fields of science, monitoring, control and surveillance and infrastructure. The system was also changed in 2004 from one of targeted actions to one of sectoral support. Currently, the FPAs allowed a huge reduction in fishing opportunities for demersal and coastal fleets in order to encourage small scale and industrial local fisheries. Yet, despite these qualitative improvements, there are also negative elements: EU fleet is still accused to “fish, pay and go” and EU operators are accused of being subsidised.

The EU started an internal process in 2009 to launch the new reform for which a Green Paper has been prepared: no decision has yet been taken regarding the content of the external dimension of the reform of the FPAs. The main principles are that the FPAs should be *modernised* (including human rights and investment clauses, bringing a qualitative value to the FPAs), *rationalised* (to define the



respective role and interest of the fleet, the industry and Member States) and *simplified* (the texts of protocols and agreements must be simplified).

- The FPAs should ensure a better coherence between fisheries agreements and other EU policies and instruments such as environment policy, trade policy, development policy and external relations policy.

- They shall be in line with the Global Fishery Governance, referring to what is decided and adopted at the level of the UN, FAO and RFMOs and to secure closer relations between FPAs and what is done at the level of the RFMOs.

- A governance framework should be set up in which the activity of the EU fleet would take place. Human rights and democratic principles clauses would enable suspension of the agreement in case of violation of these principles. Other clauses will include anti-corruption, auditing, exclusivity and transparency.

- More funds should be channelled to develop a sustainable fishery policy in third countries and promote responsible management of fishing efforts. Activities of monitoring, control and surveillance should be strengthened. More fisheries infrastructures should be developed in third countries, local economy development increased and the investment framework improved for more and better transfer of technology.

- Clearer separation should be made between the support for fisheries policy and the governance framework and the cost of access to resources. The financial element should be linked to the support for fisheries policy. More financial contribution should be given to third countries in order to focus on their real needs towards the development of their fisheries sector.

- Finally, the EU will seek to develop the regional approach through Regional Cooperation Programmes (RCPs) which could provide additional assistance to partner countries at regional level. The EU should also seek to provide support for specific countries that need to improve their administrative capacity and increase subsidiarity.

Q & A and discussion



Ms. Erastus asked Mr. Alexandrou to clarify who is determining the surplus, which is generally determined on the basis of an impact assessment. Her view is that it would be fair and transparent for such information to be shared with the country in negotiation.

Mr. Kelleher argued that both speakers assumed that the surplus is determined in terms of tons of fish. According to him, having an economic dimension of the surplus affects the entire calculations in terms of generating wealth: he held that just because there is surplus fish in the sea does not mean that it is economically viable to catch it. Mr. Kelleher asked the speakers to define surplus and to offer alternatives or new dimensions to this question of surplus.

Mr. Goujon argued that the fishing agreements signed with the EU are always criticised although it represents the only fisheries agreements with distant fleets that are publicly published and thus transparent and that allow each party to know the terms under which the agreements were signed. Through them, the EU can place fishing responsibility in the hands of third countries that can in turn benefit from the expertise from the EU in this field.

H.E. Gunessee argued that the principles of equity, balance and fairness could be better approached when it comes to having ACP type agreements. Yet, there are two different systems reflecting EU balance of power and negotiation. According to him, the problem is that ACP countries do not have the capacity to make assessments of the stocks: thus, the EC should have information on stocks transparently shared with third countries to allow the latter to have full information when negotiating. Only this would bring the principles equity, balance and fairness into the system.

Most ACP countries have common interest in regional cooperation, especially to fight IUU, but most lack capacity for MCS. The Indian Ocean is an example on this: Mr. Gunessee asked how it is possible to further enhance the capacity to go beyond the Indian Ocean and cover the whole of West Africa.



❖ **Mr. Grønnevet** argued that today there is an enormous problem of over-capacity and catching capacity in most countries. So to find out what is purely meant by surplus stocks in the original framing of the Law of the Sea dating from the 1982 is not very easy. It is based on some considerations that were foreseen at that time and that are not relevant anymore. According to Mr. Grønnevet, the concept of surplus has to be understood in political terms and considerations.

❖ **Mr. Alexandrou** deplored the fact that there is no clear definition of what is meant by surplus. However, he believes that there are two aspects linked to this concept: biological surplus of the resources and economical surplus. In the first situation, it is important to have a full knowledge of the real situation of the stocks. In the second, fish resources in the water belong to the coastal state and the first priority is to give these resources to be exploited by the local fleet. What is not exploited could then be granted to others. Throughout the years, the fishing possibilities the EU got from third countries in the fisheries agreements have substantially been reduced because of the belief that the first possibilities should be granted to the coastal state to develop its own fisheries policy and avoid do enter in conflict with local fleets. The fisheries agreements signed with the EU are not the panacea but nonetheless the only publicly available fisheries agreements that can be easily criticised. Its protocols offer clear provisions on the obligations of all parties offering a legal framework which has to be respected; this does not exist in private or semi-private deals which are on the increase in some regions.

Regarding the question on balance of power, Mr. Alexandrou responded that the EU always tries to strike a balance when entering a deal. The symbolic value of 100 euros per ton comes out a calculation made by the EC concerning the tuna agreements; it represents a calculation for the access



rights. Today, the split between the ship-owners contribution and the Community contribution is 35-65. It is not excluded that this figure can improve in the future.

A participant from Ghana argued that there are serious problems concerning the evaluation of resources in ACP regions. The participant asked the Commission whether there are plans in the current reform to improve the information base on evaluation of resources in those countries.

Regional bodies have expressed their interest in having block negotiations: will the reform encourage the existing RFMOs on block negotiations, i.e. negotiating agreements with the EU on behalf of countries.

Mr. Ngoande asked whether the assessment that is guiding the way forward for the FPAs was also conducted in EU countries.

- ❖ **Mr. Pierre Amilhat**, Director in DG MARE, argued that the issue of regionalisation is a very complex one. In order to create regionalism, partners are essential so it is important to discuss questions such as defining where the regions are. There is no one model that can be applied in every part of the world and regional differences need to be factored in any form of cooperation. It is a promising area yet a lot of work still needs to be done. The issue of surplus is fundamental: as far as biology is concerned, the stock assessment cannot be a bilateral agreement – it is about looking at the stock as a whole and this work is done by the RFMOs. It is within the context therefore of the RFMOs that science needs to be pushed forward on migratory species. Surplus is also an economic formula. The issue of surplus has to be looked at as a global relation: with surplus, there is investment, and with investment there is investment production. The value of fish is not only the number of tons that are available.



Session 4 (part 1): ACP Collaboration Examples of regional fisheries cooperation in ACP countries

Presentation 1: Lessons from the Nauru Agreement

Mr. Kieran Kelleher argued that the Nauru Agreement illustrates well how developing coastal states have managed to increase the control over their shared fisheries, increase the benefits from sustainable use of resources, agree on sharing the harvest and agree on rules of access. Yet, this kind of effective regional collaboration takes time, trust, political will and a clear common cause among the participants. Undoubtedly, untied development aid was important in helping structure these efforts.

There are eight parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) located in the Pacific region. The agreement concerned three species: skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye. 25 years of collaboration have led to the current state of affairs. In the late 1970s, the South Pacific countries declared their EEZs and formed the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). In 1982, eight Pacific Island countries concluded the NA with the objective to maximise the economic gains from the region's tuna. A first arrangement was put together setting out the minimum terms and conditions for foreign vessel access to the EEZs – a black list was created listing the vessels that were not allowed to fish. The economic aspirations of the PNA began to meet the conservation measures: closure of the high seas pockets created protected areas where purse seine fishing is not allowed and where it is brought under PNA control. Preferential access for generating benefits was set up based on equity, vessel flag, number of nationals employed, local purchases made and onshore investment. The engagement is not restricted to PNA members but is part of a broader World Bank, Pacific Island fisheries engagement and includes links to the global environment facility; a lot of work for climate change on the Pacific Islands is ongoing.

Mr. Kelleher stated that the success of such agreement was due in part to the high level political commitment by the Presidents of those states; the political framework of the South Pacific Community has been vital to ensuring this kind of



collaboration. He held that the common interest must outweigh the individual interest for effective collaboration. Where possible, the economic and conservation objectives and measures must be blended.

Presentation 2: The architecture of the World Bank's West Africa Regional Fisheries Project (WARFP)

Mr. Xavier Vincent, official at the World Bank in the Environment & Natural Resources Management for the Africa Region unit, argued that fisheries in Africa are of utmost economic importance: the fish caught in Africa's waters provide employment, trade possibilities, foreign exchange and food security. Fisheries also play an important role in poverty prevention or reduction, as well as wealth distribution. However, marine fish resources are generally fully or over-exploited and a large portion of the value added from exploitation is captured abroad.

Based on this analysis, the global objectives set for investments in Africa's marine fisheries are of environmental, economic and social order. The *environmental objective* is to recover over-exploited fish stocks or at least to maintain the status quo for fully-exploited fish stocks. It entails the conservation or the rehabilitation of the ecosystems that support marine fish stocks. In term of *economic objectives*, the challenge is to increase the annual net economic benefits to the region from targeted fisheries, which will then fulfil the social objectives of having a clear distribution of these benefits. In order to achieve the *objectives of sustainability and greater economic contribution*, key constraints need to be addressed. The first is the need for regional collaboration as neither fish nor fishermen know frontiers. The second is the need to improve governance in the fisheries sector in order to avoid degradation of the natural resource base and the need to fight against inappropriate behaviour. The third challenge is to address the lack of capacity and conditions needed to capture more of the value of these resources locally in term of economic benefits: the investment climate and security of investment are very important for foreign operators to invest in infrastructures.



The WARFP uses an adaptive and coordinated approach: the programme span is of 15 years and countries enter the programme at their own pace and participate in those components that interest them in order to develop their own approach. A regional fisheries body provided a common platform for dialogue and coordination. The commonly agreed components of the project are: good governance and management of the fisheries resources; reduction of illegal fishing; and increasing the contribution of the marine fish resources to the local economies.

Mr. Vincent stressed that solutions in the fisheries sector are rarely national and therefore a regional approach should be promoted, although it tends to be more complex. Besides, collaboration and coordination among donors should be strengthened – it has been noted that there are too many initiatives on the field, often overlapping or lacking coherence. The WARFP could be used as the framework to develop and enhance coordination. Furthermore, the approach and instruments adopted in the programme can generate synergies and more coherence for the future.

Presentation 3: ACP Fish II Programme: regional fisheries cooperation in ACP countries

Mr. Philippe Cacaud, fisheries lawyer at ACP Fish II programme, presented this EU-funded project which covers most ACP countries with around €30 million for a period of 4-5 years. The programme aims to provide technical assistance and training to ACP countries, as well as organising workshops and carrying studies on marine and inland fisheries and aquaculture. The project provides support at both regional and national levels to RFBs/RFMOs and ACP states. The overall objective of the programme is to contribute to the sustainable and equitable management of fisheries in ACP countries for poverty alleviation and to ensure food security. The specific objective is to strengthen fisheries sectoral policy development and implementation in ACP countries.

The programme is divided into five components. The first consists in *improving fisheries policies and management plans* at regional and national levels: it



encompasses not only policy instruments but also legislative and legal framework. The second consist in *reinforcing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS)* as well as enforcement capacities. The third component is the *reinforcement of national and regional research strategies and initiatives*. The fourth component consists in *developing business supportive regulatory frameworks* and private sector investment. The fifth consists in *developing the Knowledge Exchange System (KES)* to increase knowledge-sharing on fisheries management and trade at regional level.

The main challenge of the programme was to ensure global coherence with other donors' activities and interventions and avoid overlapping with ongoing and pipeline projects through regular exchange of information with regional managers of other projects and various donors. This implied the need to build synergies with other donors and projects, working together to create coherence in terms of developing regional policy to stop IUU fishing and complement activities undertaken by other donors. The Knowledge Exchange System was originally designed and tailor-made for ACP countries to create a new information system. However, there has been difficulty in the concept itself and in the way of ensuring the sustainability of this tool. Today, the project has shifted from creating a new system to supporting existing regional information systems through RFBs and RFMOs. Presently, Regional Action Plans are being finalised for the 6 ACP regions. Projects will start on the ground by the end of 2010.

Q & A and discussion

Mr. Payet asked Mr. Kelleher how effective the vessels days have proved to be in ensuring the sustainability of the stocks or in limiting the capacity from evolving. He asked how effective this method has proved to be and if there were public constraints.

Mr. Darri argued that most of the problems faced by the West Africa region in the fishing industry are due to poor infrastructures, thus the reason for the lack of landing of fishing fleets in some ACP ports. Access to EU market is the main problem



for West African countries as they do not meet EU standards. He asked about the possibility of accessing aid from the World Bank to address these issues and enhance ACP exports.

Mr. Phillips expressed his concern over the fact that many donors act as consultants and provide technical assistance and training although much needed provision of equipment is still missing on the ground. This critical component is being left out: he argued that policies can be reviewed, legislations can be put in place, and human resource capacities can be built but unless there is equipment provided to ACP countries, there will always be a fail in terms of real implementation. Mr. Phillips asked whether some action will be taken in this direction by donors.

Mr. Nanyaro argued that ACP countries fail to see tangible benefits from the qualitative support provided by the types of programmes presented above. He held that most countries now have good and enabling legislation in place; therefore what is needed the most now is equipment and facilities.

- ❖ **Mr. Kelleher** responded that the vessel day's scheme shows considerable problems; however, there are a number of other considerations. The capacity has not changed in principle but it has in practice. A capacity limit may need to be reintroduced. A vessel day's scheme may not be sufficient by itself to ensure sustainability.
- ❖ **Mr. Vincent** responded that the World Bank would provide support to help ACP countries entering EU market but the rationale for doing this should be demonstrated first of all. Indeed, a "bank" provides loans, which have to be repaid. ACP countries will have to improve the management of resources in a responsible manner for operators to exploit them rationally and produce benefits for the country. ACP countries will also have to create an enabling environment for investors by ensuring security of investment.



- ❖ **Mr. Cacaud** recognised that it is a limitation of the programme not to be able to provide any equipment and investment in terms of infrastructure.

A participant asked Mr. Cacaud how ACP Fish II interventions are going to improve existing MCS regimes within the FFA region.

A participant asked Mr. Kelleher to clarify how countries that are located in the high seas areas can proceed to close high seas for fishing.

Mr. Alexandrou argued that Mr. Vincent mentioned in his presentation that one of the objectives of the World Bank's project was to contribute to the local economies of ACP countries; however, there was no focus attached to the development of this segment in his presentation. He argued that fisheries is not only a matter of export revenues; it is a matter of feeding the local population and it is linked directly to human consumption.

- ❖ **Mr. Kelleher** said that he used the term "closures" in inverted commas. They are effective because PNA countries refuse to license any purse seiners that fish in high seas areas. They require the VMS information to ensure that the vessels don't fish in high seas areas.

On the food and nutrition question, he mentioned that the World Bank is aware of the difficult situation in West Africa with relation to fish and nutrition. More than 1 million tons of low value fish are imported in this region to feed the poor people. The WB is undertaking a major study on global supply and demand for fish on the intra-Africa trade in fish, associated with the fish nutrition of the poor.

- ❖ **Mr. Vincent** argued that it is agreed that the future is not in the marine fishery: the production is up to the maximum and there is little room for



improvements in production. Good management will permit to stabilise the production but there is a huge potential in fresh water and particularly in aquaculture, which is perceived as the next revolution for providing proteins to the population. Investments into this sector will have to be made.

To Mr. Alexandrou's question, he answered that export is one of the targets of the last component. The other activities like R&D are not targeting exports but production of fish in general, marketing, and improvements of post-harvest losses and so on. If there is an improvement in the resource base and a reduction in fishing it will also benefit the entire value chain. However, ACP countries' priority still is to get hard currency.

- ❖ **Mr. Cacaud** argued that support for MCS has already been done in the Pacific region so ACP Fish II interventions are more specific now.

Session 4 (part 2): ACP Collaboration How to measure fisheries success?

Presentation 1

Mr. Alhaji Jallow argued that in earlier times, emphasis was put on available fisheries technology, resources and economic factors (demand for new products). With time it was understood that not only development considerations had to be taken into account but that management aspects also had to be considered. It has been observed that the social structure of fisheries communities, the partner institutions, the patterns of decision-making among resource-users or the historical and cultural background of fisheries communities can all have a profound influence on the way innovations in fisheries are perceived or how management initiatives are accepted, regardless of how appropriate those innovations or initiatives might seem to analysts and decision-makers. Well managed fisheries can generate high resource rents that can be used to finance investments within or outside the sector. There is also multiplier effects of well-managed fisheries on economic development in terms



of intra-sectoral and inter-sectoral interactions and in terms of the infrastructures developed for the sector. The employment aspect is the biggest part of the impact of fisheries.

A sustainable fishery produces consistent output over an indefinite period without otherwise damaging the enveloping environment. Therefore, sustainability in fisheries combines theoretical disciplines with practical strategies through appropriate policies, regulations and management techniques. There are three aspects to success in fisheries. The *social aspect* relates to fisheries resources that contribute to social welfare in a manner considered to be equitable. The *economic aspect* is to be found in fisheries that are operated efficiently and that avoid overcapacity by maintaining the fishing effort at Maximum Economic Yield (MEY) level: rent is either capitalised into the price of a right or extracted as a royalty. The *biological aspect* of success deals with the stocks and the exploitation: even stocks that are overexploited can be rebuilt and turned into sustainable catches in the long run. In fisheries, success is to be found in the ability to produce outcomes that come close to meeting the stated objectives; it can also be found in a context where things have improved or working well compared to previous situations. Yet, success requires a benchmark on which the improvement can be measured and a metric to gauge the improvements that seeks to be demonstrated: this requires criteria that enable success to be measured against something else.

In 1996, the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) provided an ecosystem based criteria that not only measure biological status of the fishery, but included measuring success in social and economic terms too. These criteria also involve some problems. Associating success with biological and technical factors gives little credit to success derived from and characterised by institutional, social or economic factors. Furthermore, quantitative measurement is more successful in developed countries because of more reliable data: in developing countries, this can create problems in measuring success in fisheries. Once success is measured, it is important to maintain it.



In conclusion, Mr. Jallow warned that success can also be a cause of failure: once there is money to be made, people flock into the sector making the catch per unit go down and creating a struggle in investment. Therefore, to prevent success to subsequently turn into failure, it has to be carefully managed and the consequences of improved conditions have to be well mapped out and catered for in advance. With appropriate and well devised fisheries management plans in place, success should be the inevitable outcome for the fishery; the management plan will provide the adequate support to ensure that success is sustained.

Presentation 2

Mr. Kieran Kelleher argued that the fisheries sector is making a pretty poor contribution and although the potential is big the global net benefits are negative. He held that the '*rents*' that are generated by the sector are a good indicator of success. The potential gains that can be made and the status of economic losses in the sector are powerful arguments in moving towards reform. This of course requires gathering reliable data (see *The Sunken Billion*). A lot of GDP contributions from fisheries are post-harvest, which are not usually in the national accounts. On the *social side*, employment is a key factor in the distribution of rents and benefits generated by the sector: poverty in coastal communities is an important indicator. Studies have shown that subsistence fisheries contribute greatly to livelihoods; besides, gender in fisheries and the role and empowerment of women in fisheries is an important indicator (50% of the workforce is female). The value of fishing in nutrition is another important social indicator: the actual value is twice of the value revealed by standard statistics. A lot of the conventional information and indicators used are very deficient in the fisheries sector. The state of stocks is generally the prime indicator of the *environmental dimension*. The study *Rising to Depletion* shows the state of the fisheries in several countries and what it may have been in the past if it was at a better state of exploitation. By overlaying rent estimates with rising to depletion situation of the fisheries, it is possible to estimate the foregone economic



value of fisheries. Environmental accounts are usually outside the conventional indicators and statistics.

Regarding overarching indicators, the World Bank produces annually governance indicators. It also works in the field of Corporate Social Responsibility in fisheries in partnership with the industry (“Alliance for sustainable fisheries”). This work focuses on sustainable value chains and on developing codes of conduct for the industry. It is crucial to involve the industry if they are to act in a responsible way. In terms of aid performance, the World Bank has reviewed fisheries aid programmes worldwide and national evaluations: the outcomes were unclear and the results inconclusive. Mr. Kelleher therefore suggested looking for other indicators; for instance, the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) is now expanding into forestry and fisheries by transposing its indicators into other sectors. Tracking the economic performance of the companies involved in fisheries is quite important: tracking the profitability of the companies can give fore-warning of the management measures that may be required.

In conclusion, Mr. Kelleher suggested looking outside the sector and trying to mainstream some of the indicators and integrate them with the broader national indicators. It is necessary to improve the project evaluation and monitoring indicators to make them more focused. Also, major gaps in fisheries statistical systems must be repaired. Success depends on a triple bottom line: economic productivity, social and distribution issues, and environmental considerations. It is important to focus on all three and improve indicators in all areas by working within and outside the sector.

Q & A and discussion

Ms. Erastus held that Namibia invests heavily in MCS measures. At times, it was noticed that the costs exceeded the revenues collected among the users and the perception created in the government was that the private sector was being subsidised. When foreigners enter and use Namibian EEZ and given that so much



money is being put into MCS, it makes it difficult to measure the successes in the fisheries, especially as it is linked to the sustainability aspect.

Mr. Ngoande asked whether any of the projects presented during the workshop address these challenges for which ACP countries lack the capacity. In order to link and incorporate economic objectives into fisheries, progress must be measured in detail.

Mr. Nanyaro argued that fisheries can contribute to the economies of developing countries and equity can be established only if there is a global approach to MCS, which is the biggest problem according to him. It is only once the problem of IUU will be resolved that fisheries will start contributing to ACP countries' economies. He asked why European nations do not put all their resources during a period of time to deal with IUU fishing first. Only enforcement will resolve this problem.

- ❖ **Mr. Jallow** argued that successful fisheries is the responsibility of governments that should do more policing and ensure more security to attract investments. In the case of Namibia, they are trying to keep foreigners out because employment is at risk but it is a national catastrophe as they are keeping investments out at the same time. Resources are the responsibility of the Government: investments must be therefore made in this area out of taxes and licenses, which should not be seen as subsidies.
- ❖ **Mr. Kelleher** recommended looking at countries that show good practices such as New Zealand: they have internalised the costs of management and have outsourced some of the management to tenders (monitoring is done by the private sector for instance). The industry is aware of these costs and of the fact that it is contributing to these costs. It is therefore essential to have the industry on board with the MCS regime – it will be more costly if the industry



tries to avoid it. The industry itself has to provide and meet some standards towards sustainability: those not complying should be put out.

Linking monitoring efforts to decision-making processes can help enormously: the principle of subsidiarity is essential. All data can be collected at the village level and decisions could be based at the local level with advice from the central authorities. Improvement in the management regime can generate huge additional economic, social and environmental benefits.

Mr. Alexandrou argued that artisanal and coastal fisheries, which are essential for local economies, should be framed within the jurisdiction of each coastal state. Without such a frame, the right management of coastal states could be undermined.

Mr. Paredes suggested developing more output-based projects, which would focus more on the outputs of the process. This has not yet been done in fisheries: which outputs are desired should be more clearly defined. A balance score card showing the pursued goals could be useful here: it is important to be able to quantify and monitor the success.

Mr. Goujon expressed the European concern for IUU fishing as well and argued that European private operators generally comply with MCS. He also stated his hope that the reform of the CFP will improve things and bring more ACP countries to integrate the FPA-EU network, a certain and transparent way to reach success in managing fisheries.

Session 5: Working Groups

Working Group 1: Access Principles

The questions to the working group were:

- a. What are the key policy issues for determining access to a country's fish resources?***



b. What are the principles upon which the access should be based?

The group addressed the two questions together as they considered those to be linked. They identified a number of key policy issues for determining access.

The first policy issue concerns the question of how to **improve the economic efficiency of fisheries** in general and the economic efficiency of access agreements? It is imperative to look at the problem of overcapacity in fisheries, at the issue of rent (license fees), and at the issue of surplus (economic or political), which needs to be addressed and defined in the terms of overall policy goals. Furthermore, ensuring that investments are done in good faith by the investors and not done through bogus companies is another principle that needs to be looked at when determining economic efficiency.

The second policy issue concerns **sustainability and re-building of stocks**. The guiding principle is that there should be a proper stock assessment in fisheries; if not, then there should be one of the primary issues to be looked at, and that includes the entire spectrum of stock assessment (management goals, reference points). The issue of access rights (allocation and licensing) is important: the difference between open access and restricted access in terms of allocation of rights is very important. Also, the issue of and Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) and how control is provided to ensure accessibility is central; when rebuilding stocks, it is essential to have enforcement and MCS operations in place.

The third policy issue discussed by the group is **empowerment of local communities and people**: as a guiding principle, there is the need to look at equity participation to ensure that local people can participate in either access or in the fishery that has been developed. The issue of technology and transfer of skills are of equal importance: it was found that this is paramount in ensuring the environment of either the business community or the community level. The issue of co-management is also of great from an artisanal fishery point of view. Access rights are essential for empowering communities in terms of ensuring stewardship and ability to participate actively and share ownership.



The fourth policy issue concerned **maximising the benefits from access** of the fishery itself. Rather than having joint venture arrangements, the issue of partnership should be looked at more closely. Some principles can be adapted to make sure that when the access is given it maximises the benefits to the country based on their overall policy goals such as capacity and technology transfer. Employment creation is another principle that needs to be looked at as well to ensure that employment is maximised. Trade-offs between those principles would ensure that those benefits are maximised. Capturing the maximum resource rent and the value addition to the resource to improve the retention of the wealth in a country are also central.

The fifth policy issue that came up concerns **responsible fishing and fighting IUU** by denying access to vessels involved in IUU fishing operations. The mechanisms that ensure compliance should be put in place.

The sixth policy issue concerns **transparency**: decision-making processes should be transparent and equitable in granting access rights (license fees) as well as more participatory in practice.

Lastly, **social aspects** were seen as of paramount importance when discussing policy issues: employment creation, equity and social and cultural considerations should be taken into account.

Working Group 2: Principles and Pathways for Fisheries Reform in ACP Countries

The questions to the working group were:

a. Which elements and measures are necessary to establish a sustainable fisheries management system that takes into account ACP countries' specificities?

The group firstly defined the common specificities of coastal countries in the ACP regions, that is:

- They possess Exclusive Economic Zones (**EEZs**) and fisheries resources in them



- **small-scale fisheries** with particular interest in livelihoods: the coastal communities of these countries depend almost entirely on fisheries for their livelihoods
- **semi-industrial and local industrial fleets**
- they suffer from **over fishing and environmental degradation** in coastal shallow fishing zones
- interactions with industrial fleets
- **weak governance** in terms of central Government and legislation and poor organisation of stakeholders
- **limited inputs in landing and fishing facilities** due to poor financial support in ACP countries, they share resources but severely lack of coordination between coastal countries
- **the way access is organised is a common problem** to these countries: there is open access, especially for small-scale fisheries, in some countries through registration and permit schemes. In other countries, there is a limited issue of licenses with closed seasons or delimitation of areas for some specific resources - there is co-management in some fisheries
- for semi-industrial fleets there is **annual registration** for safety purposes, permits, license schemes, territorial limits, or closed seasons
- for industrial fleets there are **proper licensing schemes** but no limitation of access with poor determination of carrying capacity
- There is **preferential access for artisanal actors**.

The necessary measures that were defined by the group to address and overcome these problems are:

- to perform **sector reviews** before engaging in **reviewing fisheries policies** to reflect sustainability criteria
- to elaborate and implement Fisheries Management Plans (**FMPs**)
- to **control access** and **relate it to capacity**



- to develop effective mechanisms to **involve stakeholders at all levels** (sectoral reviews and legislations reviews). At a later stage, public hearings should be organised as well given that national resources also concern the public
- to **review and improve the legal framework** to make it more enabling
- to enable and enhance **organisational development** for **capacity-building**, including Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (**MCS**)
- to **improve monitoring, information collection and reporting**: this needs applied research in order to get science-based and reliable information
- to **apply precautionary guidelines** and other relevant principles, especially where reliable scientific information is lacking
- And finally to **develop information sharing** and the sharing of best and worse practices.

b. Which steps should be followed in the context of the reform and how should the participative process be organised?

- political will is essential but it can only be effective if there is sufficient awareness
- sectoral review and evaluation of resources and fishing capacity have to be carried
- policy review must be done in consultation with stakeholders and the public
- harmonisation of policies among countries at the regional level is essential: one country can not go it alone. It is imperative to work together and this can be done by harmonising policies, regulations and guidelines
- reviewing national legal frameworks
- elaboration and review of Fisheries Management Plans with reference to Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) and the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF)
- improve data collection and reporting



- identify the representatives of fisher folk groups, facilitate the establishment of fisher folk organisations, strengthen them and formalise their participation in all the processes and mechanisms
- the participation of the fisher folk can be best implemented by the devolution of fisheries management authority to local administrations, which should be given the power to manage fisheries resources under the sponsorship of the central authorities (“eyes on, hands off”)
- encouraging participatory Monitoring, Control and Surveillance: where MCS has been applied centrally, it has not worked. If the communities that benefit from these resources are given the opportunity to participate, fisheries will be more sustainable. National MCS plans should be developed and established and the capacity of communities should be improved.
- and information sharing should be encouraged and facilitated at local, national and regional levels: collaboration is essential, thus joint activities at regional level should be further encouraged (science, statistics, MCS and so forth).

Working Group 3: Foreign Fishing Arrangements

The questions to the working group were:

- a. How can ACP countries increase benefits from access arrangements, including joint ventures and direct foreign investment (FDI)?***

The discussion focused on the Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) though it was acknowledged that other less transparent forms of arrangements exist.

The main conclusions drawn pointed to the importance of:

- information on the stocks to assess the surplus and information on the economy of the sector to better estimate the value of the resources
- Understanding the calculation of access rights in fishing agreements and develop capacity for monitoring the wealth accruing to the local economies from the various types of arrangements



- transparency concerning the obligations and rights of all involved parties in the different types of arrangements
- developing alternative approaches to fishing agreements such as joint ventures and Foreign Direct Investment. Such arrangements should not be limited to the harvesting sector but extended to the entire value chain (servicing and processing were mentioned as an alternative to joint ventures and direct investments)
- and introducing social clauses, such as the ILO's minimum wages guarantee included in the FPA, into all type of fishing arrangements

It should be mentioned that ACP participants expressed concerns about the progressive erosion of the preferences for accessing the EU market but no conclusions were reached on this.

b. How to ensure efficiency and equity of those arrangements for ACP countries?

The discussion was less conclusive: it pointed out to the need to get a definition of efficiency and equity and concluded on the necessity to develop benchmarks, re-emphasising the relevance of transparency in the fishing arrangements.

In both discussions, the participants stressed their interest in exploring the potential benefits of regional agreements versus national agreements. This may become a field of research in the future.



Session 6: Conclusions to the Workshop and Key Recommendations

Ambassador S.B.C. Servansing drew several conclusions following a fruitful discussion during this two-day workshop. It came out of the debate that **sustainability is the key but that the economic and social dimension of the activity cannot be ignored**. The wealth creation effect of fisheries is a core objective in the development of the sector, therefore greater sophistication of that wealth creation effect is necessary through **proper investment, enhanced security of access and added value along the whole supply chain** – from harvest to post harvest activities.

Discussions have also drawn the attention on the fact that the status of global fisheries is suffering from declining productivity, inefficiency and over capacity. It was agreed that **the economic dimension is very important when it comes to the right to access**. On the issue of access arrangements, the question remained open on what would be the best way of providing adequate compensation (in terms of payment received) for the resources captured. However, it was stressed that it is important to view the **multiplier effect of access arrangements** in access granting countries. It was also agreed that **different objectives need different instruments**: access arrangements are only one instrument that meet certain objectives and cannot necessarily be relied upon to fulfil all the development objectives. Other instruments need therefore to be added to access arrangements in order to fulfil development objectives.

Discussions also touched upon the issue of the **empowerment of small fishing communities** and the need for fisheries reform. **Co-management** was stressed and the importance of involving fishermen and fishing communities at all stages of the decision making process.



It was argued that it is important **to link access to fisheries with access to markets**: Ambassador Servansing stated that the changing international trade landscape and international negotiations should not be overlooked here.

Individual transferable rights (ITQs) can be successful in reducing overcapacity but they can have undesirable effects especially if they are not accompanied by special measures for monitoring, control and surveillance.

Regarding foreign fishing arrangements, the participants to the workshop concurred on the **need for a common understanding of what constitutes fair, efficient, equitable and just for all parties**. The concept of fairness refers to the proper balance of conflicting interests, which in turn is informed by a number of elements, namely: every party should have the same level of information and trust the available information; there should be a shared value system which may not always be guided by rational economic objectives but may be guided by political objectives as well; there are different interests that should be satisfied; there is the necessity for enforceability, otherwise the outcome will be a function of an underlying power equation, which does not necessarily do justice to equity; and there is the need to have wide transparency.

The **new Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) following broad reform are based on a set of comprehensive principles relating to modernisation, rationalisation and simplification**. Greater coherence between FPAs and other EU policies was sought in the context of global fisheries governance. Enhanced assistance for sustainable fisheries in 3rd countries was given a central importance. The important conceptual separation was made between support for fisheries policy and governance and the cost of access to resources. Other elements were integrated in the reform such as the development of an overall governance framework (human rights) and consolidation of regional cooperation.



On the discussion on **ACP cooperation**, it was seen in the case of the Nauru Agreements for instance how **regional agreements can reconcile economic aspirations with conservation measures and how economic benefits can be optimised at the same time as providing conservation benefits** through closure of high seas or bringing purse seiners under control. It also highlighted through the West Africa Programme the **need for a shared vision to address key constraints and move to an adaptive and coordinated approach based on good governance in management, reduction of illegal fishing, and increasing contribution of the marine fisheries resources to the communities**. Furthermore, the need for donor collaboration and coordination was emphasised and the need for leadership among the various actors to avoid duplication of roles – it is important that one group assumes leadership while respecting ownership and participation by national countries.

Discussion also led to the **need for technical assistance and capacity building at both national and regional level**: for instance, one of the lessons of the ACP Fish II programme is that most of the technical assistance and capacity building programmes are focusing on the soft infrastructure and there are not enough resources directed towards hard infrastructure in terms of equipment.

Finally, on the discussion about measuring success in fisheries, it was agreed that success is usually measured against defined objectives which require to set **benchmarks that measure the social, economic and sustainability objectives** of fisheries policies and fisheries development programmes. It was concluded that **success needs to be well-managed otherwise it will lead to failures** – success can also be an incentive for increased fishing.



ANNEXES

Annex 1: Press Release

On July 16th and 17th 2010 the European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD) organised in collaboration with the ACP Working Group on Fisheries and the Seychelles Fishing Authority an international workshop on “*Access and Sustainable Fisheries: Building Consensus and Collaboration on ACP Fisheries*” in Mahé, Republic of Seychelles with the support of the Government of Norway and the World Bank

This workshop brought fisheries experts from the six ACP regions as well as experts from several relevant international organisations to deliberate on several issues pertaining to access to fisheries resources in ACP countries. The workshop provided the opportunity to exchange views on many issues that may be controversial – among others, policies for determining access to a country’s fisheries resources, principles upon which these policies should be based, how ACP countries can increase benefits from access arrangements, and the empowerment of small-scale fishermen – but also to learn from one another for the betterment of the fishing industry through collaboration and knowledge sharing and to make fisheries operations the most efficient, successful and publicly beneficial as possible.

H.E. Vivianne Fock Tave, Ambassador of the Republic of Seychelles to the Kingdom of Belgium, Chair of the ACP Working Group on Fisheries, and co-Chair of the workshop stressed the importance of information sharing between ACP countries, especially the success stories: she deplored the fact that failures are far more often recounted than successes. The Ambassador highlighted the usefulness of knowing more about best practices in ACP countries such as the case of Namibia for instance.

Mr. Serge Beslier, member of the Board of EBCD and co-Chair of the workshop argued that sustainability is a key element for the development of fisheries economies as it creates jobs and contributes to food security. He warned that there is no single answer to these problems as each country has its particularity: yet, the sustainable management of fisheries has common grounds in different countries.

The Honourable Peter Sinon, newly appointed Minister for Investment, Natural Resources and Industry in the Republic of Seychelles, highlighted that more than 60 ACP States are engaged in the export of fish, fishery and aquaculture products, a crucial sector beyond a simple economic and financial activity for many small economies, which is increasingly facing the challenges of climate change, global warming and piracy in the Indian Ocean. He greeted EU commitments in undertaking fundamental reforms of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), such as to include an international dimension to the document covering the Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) with third countries. Minister Sinon stressed that lessons have been learnt from past experiences and that it will take strong will and a pro-active attitude to do what is right; yet, help from partners will be needed to get the various



projects off the ground although it is ACP States' role to take concrete steps towards showing real commitment for a fair, robust and exemplary partnership.

In the keynote presentation, Mr. Lidvard Grønnevet, senior advisor at the Institute of Marine Research in Norway, underlined that environmental sustainability can be achieved in parallel to growth and poverty reduction. He pointed to scientific knowledge, laws and regulations, and control enforcement and sanctions as the required elements for good fisheries management. There is general acceptance that successful fisheries management has a least three dimensions: biological, economic and social. Yet, successful fisheries management also requires institutional capacity to define an appropriate balance between these parameters within management objectives and to implement and adapt these responsively over time. In conclusion Mr. Grønnevet stressed that fishery policy and reforms must be country specific and in coherence with the development level of the country. The welfare function of small-scale fisheries should be preserved in most developing countries until the appropriate macroeconomic conditions for rent-maximization and distribution are fulfilled.

The workshop's key conclusions were that sustainability is the key to the current status of global fisheries. However, the view that the economic and social dimension of the activity cannot be ignored was widely supported throughout the two days. It was argued by several speakers that the wealth creation effect of fisheries should be a core objective of development and that it should be pushed for through proper investment and ensured security of access to fishermen. There is a need for added value along the whole supply chain and that it is crucial to link access to fisheries with access to markets.

Foreign fishing arrangements should have a common understanding of what is fair, efficient, equitable and just for all parties. The concept of fairness refers to the proper balance of conflicting interests, which in turn is informed by a number of elements, such as parties having the same level of information and trust in the available information, a shared value system which may not always be guided by rational economic objectives, satisfaction of different interests and necessity of enforceability and wide transparency.

Regarding the empowerment of small fishing communities in the context of the fisheries reform, it was commonly accepted that there is a need for co-management at all stages of the decision making process.

Following a reform, the new Fisheries Partnership Agreements are now based on a set of comprehensive principles such as modernisation, rationalisation and simplification of the rules; greater coherence between FPAs and other EU policies; the necessary grounds for global fisheries governance; greater assistance for sustainable fisheries in 3rd countries; separation between support for fisheries policy and governance and the cost of access to resources; the development of an overall governance framework; and consolidation of regional cooperation.



Regarding regional cooperation, it was agreed that there is the need for a shared vision in order to address key constraints and move to an adaptive and coordinated approach based on good governance, the reduction of illegal fishing and increasing contribution of the marine fisheries resources to the communities. It was commonly understood that a regional approach is complex but a very viable one to ensure positive results - the NAURU agreements are a good example, which shows that regional agreements can reconcile economic aspirations with conservation measures. In terms of donor collaboration and coordination, it was highlighted that there is the need for a leadership role while respecting ownership at the country level. Yet, when it comes to technical assistance and capacity building at national and regional level, there are often short comings that arise at the level of equipment assistance.

In conclusion, it was agreed that in order to measure the level of success against the objectives, it is necessary to set benchmarks for social, economic and sustainability objectives. Even success has to be well managed if not it can lead to failure



Annex 2: Agenda

Friday 16 July 2010

Plenary

Opening Session

Co-Chairs: **H.E. Mrs. Vivianne Fock Tave**, *Ambassador of the Republic of Seychelles to Belgium and Chair of the ACP Working Group on Fisheries*
Mr. Serge Beslier, *Member of the Board of EBCD*

9:00 – 9:20 Introduction

Hon. Peter Sinon, *Minister for Investment, Natural Resources and Industry, Republic of Seychelles*

The workshop will have the objective of fulfilling three tasks:

- (i) To examine the arrangements made on access to fisheries resources in ACP countries and analyse how they affect the sustainability of these resources, while also looking at the benefits produced by the sector and assessing which improvements could be made (lessons can also be drawn from non-ACP countries);
- (ii) To consider the principles and practices of foreign fishing arrangements in ACP countries; and
- (iii) To look at how ACP countries can collaborate on fisheries and in particular on arrangements intended for foreign fishing. Particular focus will be given to the Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) between the EU and ACP countries.

9:20 – 9:50 Keynote address

Lidvard Grønnevet, *Marine Research Institute, Bergen, Norway*

Well managed fisheries generate wealth and economic benefits; conversely, poorly managed fisheries survive on subsidies and are a burden on the country. Efficient management arrangements will bring more benefits for fisheries, which in turn will generate more returns for fishermen, fishing communities and the public at large. Where fisheries are in decline, “business as usual” is not an option.

The session will seek to highlight the need for reform in the fisheries sector and to identify the key challenges in the design and management of the political economy of the reform. The session will aim at:

- (a) Describing the social and economic rationale for reform; and



(b) Outlining key themes and questions to be addressed in the following sessions, i.e.:

- The nature of fisheries access rights: building clarity, security and responsibility on fishing rights and tenure;
- The process of reform: moving from conflict to consensus on access;
- Sharing of costs and benefits of access: how is it done?
- Collaboration on international fishing arrangements: how can ACP countries collaborate on these?

Session 1: Who gets access?

09:50 – 11:00 Nature and objectives of access

Moderator: Namibia – Hon. H.E. Kilus Nguvauva

Presentations will look at the definition of access and what is meant by it; they will examine the legal, social and economic issues associated with different types of fishing rights. The advantages and shortcomings of different approaches relating to the issue of access and use of fisheries resources will be illustrated with the help of two contrasting cases.

Presentations and speakers:

- A 'wealth-based' approach focused on generating economic surplus and profits from fisheries, and contributing to economic, social and environmental positive outcomes.
 - **World Bank** (20 min.)
- The use of fisheries resources as a social safety net with the objective of directly addressing poverty and livelihoods in fishing communities.
 - **Rondolph Payet, SWIOFP, Kenya** (20 min.)

Q&A and Discussion (30 min.):

The central question will focus on how to balance fisheries objectives, drawing particular attention on the political, social and economic trade-offs. The WB could prepare an interactive quiz on these issues in order to foster a debate.

11:00 – 11:20 Coffee

11:20 – 12:30 Voice and empowerment of small-scale fishermen

Moderator: Belize – Ms. Beverly Wade

The voice of coastal fishing communities, indigenous people and marginalized stakeholders often goes unheard. The case is presented for preferential



access to fisheries resources to be granted to these communities. Alternative arrangements are explored, including direct participation in harvesting and mechanisms to share royalties from fishing. This session will make use of the material from the FAO Bangkok's workshop on Small-scale fisheries.

Presentations and speakers:

- **Alhaji Jallow**, *FAORAF, Ghana (20 min.)*
- **Simeao Lopes**, *Ministry of Fisheries, Mozambique (20 min.)*

Q&A and Discussion (30 min.):

What constitutes best practices in local or community management?

12:30 – 14:00 **Lunch**

Session 2: Principles and Pathways for fisheries reform in ACP Countries

14:00 – 15:15 **Lessons from processes of change**

Moderator: Tanzania – Geoffrey Nanyaro

This session will highlight the fact that there are many issues lying outside the narrowly defined 'fisheries sector,' which must be resolved beforehand if the aim is to build sustainable fisheries. These topics include:

- Fiscal issues; legislative incoherence; preparing the political case for reform, including the consultation process; financing reform; and measures to compensate the losers from the reform process; but also
- The importance of timing, sequencing and tracking the reform process; the role of development assistance; integrating economic and fiscal principles, as well as legal foundations; and addressing decentralization in the case of co-management.

Three case studies will expose different pathways of change in fisheries, the redistribution of benefits and the lessons learned from these changes. The focus will be put on the objectives, as well as on the process of change itself, how it was managed, its successes and the difficulties encountered.

Presentations and speakers:

- The case study on Mozambique will illustrate the transition from a centrally-planned economy to a market-based economy and the creation



of a system of preferential access to inshore resources for fishermen in coastal zones.

- **Joaquim Tenreiro**, Mozambique (20 min.);
- The case study on Peru will examine the introduction of individual quotas in the world's largest anchoveta fishery and will look at the issues arising from the changes brought.
 - **Carlos Paredes**, Peru (20 min.);

Q&A and Discussion (35 min.):

15:15 – 15:35 Coffee

Session 3: Foreign fishing arrangements

15:35 – 16:35 What makes foreign fishing arrangements efficient and fair?

Moderator: Fiji – H.E. Mr. Pecea Vocea

The different types of foreign fishing arrangements will be examined in order to identify the terms and conditions that make these agreements fair and efficient to all parties. A diversity of arrangements will be considered, from simple access agreements to more complex joint ventures, leasing and charter arrangements.

Presentations and discussion will focus on three sets of questions:

- What makes a foreign fishing access regime efficient and equitable for all the interested parties in public, private, coastal and distant waters?
- What is meant by the 'surplus' targeted by foreign fleets, how is it defined and how is it measured? [To be prepared with the help of some material readily available];
- What makes a joint venture agreement fair and equitable?

Particular focus will be given to the Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) signed between the EU and ACP countries, which are among the most developed and comprehensive type of access agreements. The role of FPAs in promoting good governance in third countries will also be addressed here.

Presentations and speakers:

- Equitable foreign fishing access agreements.
 - **Lidvard Grønnevet**, Marine Research Institute, Norway (15 min.)
- Lessons from the reform of the external dimension of the CFP and New thinking on the Fisheries Partnership Agreements.
 - **Konstantin Alexandrou**, DG MARE, EC (15 min.).



Q&A and Discussion (30 min.):

16:35 – 16:55 **Coffee and snack**

Concluding Session: Summary and arrangements for Working Groups

16:55 – 17:30 **Summary of lessons learned and Conclusions of Day 1**

Chair: Mauritius – H.E. SBC Servansing

This session will deal with the organisation of the Working Groups and with the distribution of tasks for Day 2: the aims will be to have 3-4 working groups made up of 10 participants each (this can be better defined following confirmation of the exact number of participants to the Conference).

Suggested themes and questions to be tackled and answered by the Working Groups:

1. Access Principles WG.

- (a) What are the key policy issues for determining access to a country's fish resources?; and
- (b) What are the principles upon which the access should be based?
 - Chair: ACP
 - Rapporteur: EU

2. Principles and Pathways for fisheries Reform in ACP countries

- (a) Which elements and measures are necessary to establish a sustainable fisheries management system that takes into account ACP countries' specificities?
- (b) Which steps should be followed in the context of the reform and how should the participative process be organised?
 - Chair: FAO
 - Rapporteur: NGO

3. Foreign Fishing Arrangements WG.

- (a) How can ACP countries increase benefits from access arrangements, including joint ventures and direct foreign investment?
- (b) How to ensure efficiency and equity of these arrangements for ACP countries?
 - Chair: EU
 - Rapporteur: WB

4. ACP Collaboration WG.

- (a) How best can ACP countries collaborate on fisheries and in particular on arrangements for foreign fishing?



EBCD
EUROPEAN BUREAU FOR
CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT



(b) How can existing arrangements and development assistance be improved?

- Chair: WB
- Rapporteur: ACP

Saturday 17 July 2010

Plenary

Session 4: ACP collaboration

9:00 – 10:05 **Examples of regional fisheries cooperation in ACP countries**

Moderator: EC (DG MARE) – Mr. Pierre Amilhat

Introduction on the issue of partnership and regional cooperation by Pierre Amilhat.

Presentations and speakers:

- Lessons from the Nauru Agreement.
 - **Kieran Kelleher**, *World Bank* (15 min.);
- The architecture of the World Bank's West Africa Regional Fisheries Project.
 - **Xavier Vincent**, *World Bank* (15 min.);
- Presentation of ACP Fish II.
 - **Philippe Cacaud**, *ACP FISH II* (15 min.)

Q&A and Discussion (20 min.):

10:05 – 10:55 **How to measure fisheries success?**

Moderator: Sierra Leone – Dr. Mohamed Seisay

Presentations and speakers:

- The presentation will show how environmental, social and economic indicators can be used to measure fisheries performance by comparing fisheries performance in selected ACP countries using these indicators.
 - **Alhaji Jallow**, *FAORAF, Ghana* (15 min.)
- Using fisheries performance indicators.



- **World Bank** (15 min.)

Q&A and Discussion (20 min.):

10:55 – 11:15 *Coffee*

Working Groups

Session 5: Working Groups

11:15 – 12:30	Working Groups
----------------------	-----------------------

12:30 – 13:45 *Lunch*

13:45 – 15:00	Working Groups
----------------------	-----------------------

15:00 – 15:30 *Coffee and snack*

Meeting among the Rapporteurs of the WGs

15:30 – 16:00	Reporting of the Working Groups
----------------------	--

Chair: World Bank – Dr. Kieran Kelleher

Plenary

Session 6: Discussion and Conclusion

16:00 – 16:45	Discussion in Plenary: Summary and Next steps
----------------------	--

Chair: Norway – Dr. Lidvard Grønnevet

16:45 – 17:30	Closure: Concluding remarks by a High Representative from the Government of Seychelles and the Co-Chairs.
----------------------	--



Note:

The Workshop will be held in English and there will be NO translation.

Co-Chairs:

Vivianne Fock Tave (Emb. Seychelles, Brussels)

Serge Beslier (EBCD)

Speakers:

Hon. Peter Sinon (Ministry of Environment, Seychelles)

Lidvard Gronnevet (Norway)

Rondolph Payet (SWIOFP)

Alhaji Jallow (FAO)

Joaquim Tenreiro (Mozambique)

Carlos Paredes (Peru)

Constantin Alexandrou (DG MARE)

Kieran Kelleher (WB)

Xavier Vincent (WB)

Philippe Cacaud (ACP Fish II)

Moderators:

Hon. Kilus Nguvauva

H.E. Peceli Vocea (Emb. Fiji, Brussels)

H.E. SBC Servansing (Emb. Mauritius, Geneva)

Pierre Amilhat (DG MARE)

Dr. Mohamed Seisay

Beverly Wade

Geofrey Nanyaro

Regional Representatives:

Pacific:

- Vanuatu: **Robert Jimmy**
- Solomon Islands: **Ferral Iasi**

Caribbean:

- Bahamas: **Michael Braynen**
- Belize: **Beverly Wade**

Southern Africa:

- Namibia: **Hon. Kilus Nguvauva**
- Mozambique: **Simeao Lopes**

West Africa:

- Sierra Leone: **Dr. Mohamed Seisay**
- The Gambia: **Kawsu Darry**

East Africa:

- Tanzania: **Geofrey Nanyaro**
- Madagascar: **Njaka Ratsamanarisoa**

Central Africa:

- Cameroon: **Salvator Ngoande**
- Gabon: **Guy Rerambyath**

Republic of Seychelles Officials:

Barry Faure

Veronique Herminie

Terry Romain

ACP Secretariat Representative:

Olusola Ojo



Annex 3: List of participants

Adolfo Valsecchi	adolfo.valsecchi@mwbrands.com
Juan Pablo Rodrigues-Sahagun	anabac@anabac.org
Samuel Quaatey	samquaatey@yahoo.com
Michel Goujon	orthongel@orthongel.fr
Philippe St Pern	philippe.saintpern@mwbrands.com
Veronique Garrioch	vero.garrioch@gmail.com
Patrice Robert	probert@iblgroup.com
Ephraim Wairangu	emwairangu@yahoo.com
Barry Faure	bfaure@statehouse.sc
Francis Marsac	francis.marsac@ird.fr
Clifford Toussaint	ctoussaint@sfa.sc
Elisa Socrate	esocrate@sfa.sc
Michel Marguerite	mmarguerite@sfa.sc
Albert Napier	albertnapier@yahoo.com
Joe Dingwall	7boa.labelproject@sfa.sc
Nicholas Prea	nick@seychelles.net
Mario Yanga	marioy@hotmail.com
Karl Seraphine	ikaseraphine@yahoo.com
Anthony Savy de St Maurice	aqua@seychelles.net
Jamshed Pardiwalla	alliedag@seychelles.net
Shunji Fwiwara	sf@iotc.org
Olusola Ojo	ojo@acp.int
Peceli Vocea	pvocea@fijiembassy.be
Helene Fiagan	fiagan@acp.int
Alejandro Anganuzzi	aa@iotc.org
Terrence Phillips	terrencephillips@vincysurf.com
Kawsu Darri	kawsu@gambiaembassy.be
Simeao Lopes	slopes@mozpesca.gov.mz
Mohamed Seisay	mohamedseisay@yahoo.co.uk
Shree Baboo Servansing	sservansing@mail.gov.mu
Njaka Ratsimanarisoa	njakka@gmail.com
Ferral Lasi	flasi@fisheries.gov.sb
Salvador Ngoande	sango_cam@yahoo.fr
Beverly Wade	bawade@yahoo.com
Geofrey Nanyaro	gfnanyaro@yahoo.com
Lidvard Gronnevet	lidvard.gronnevet@int.no
Xavier Vincent	xvincent@worldbank.org
Joaquim Tenreiro	joaquim.tenreiro@gmail.com
Carlos Paredes	cparedes@intelfin.com.pe
Kieran Kelleher	kkelleher@worldbank.org
Raj Mohabeer	raj.mohabeer@coi-ioc.org
Harijhonse Razaka	harijhons.razaka@coi-ioc.org
Nicolas Xavier	xavier.nicolas@coi-ioc.org
Ina Henriette	ihenriette@sfa.sc
Roy Clarisse	rclarisse@sfa.sc
Jude Talma	jtalma@sfa.sc
Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi	hoseagonza@yahoo.com
Georges Mba-Asseko	gmbasseko@yahoo.com
Anna Erastus	anerastus@mfmr.gov.na



Kilus Nguvauva
Sutiawan Gunnessee
Evert Liewes
Tiana Randriambola
Philippe Cacaud
Mreedola Din
Alhaji Jallow
Pierre Amilhat
Constantin Alexandrou
Serge Beslier
Vivianne Fock Tave
Peter Sinon
Alberto Galban

nrukambe@mfmr.gov.na
ambmaur@skynet.be
ewliewes@princesmauriti.us.com
scp-soc@blueline.mg
pcacaud@aol.com
mbeeharry@mail.gov.mu
Alhaji.Jallow@fao.org
Pierre.Amilhat@ec.europa.eu
constantin.alexandrou@ec.europa.eu
serge.beslier@yahoo.fr
vfocktave@seychellesgov.com