


APFIC Regional workshop

Mainstreaming fisheries co-management



**APFIC REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON
“MAINSTREAMING FISHERIES CO-MANAGEMENT”**

Siem Reap, Cambodia, 9-12 August 2005

The designation and presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers and boundaries.

© FAO 2005

NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for sale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Senior Fishery Officer, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Maliwan Mansion, 39 Phra Athit Road, Bangkok 10200, Thailand.

For copies write to:

The Senior Fishery Officer
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Maliwan Mansion, 39 Phra Athit Road
Bangkok 10200
THAILAND
Tel: (+66) 2 697 4000
Fax: (+66) 2 697 4445
E-mail: FAO-RAP@fao.org

FOREWORD

This Workshop report is a contribution to the new role of the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC) as a regional consultative forum. This forum provides its Members a neutral platform to examine issues affecting the sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture across Member Nations. One of the major changes in modus operandi was to involve its partners and non-governmental organizations much more in the consultation and discussion processes on issues facing fisheries in the region. The Workshop was attended by 60 participants, brought together from both APFIC member countries, regional organizations and projects as well as selected non-governmental organizations that have been involved in fisheries co-management, namely the Asian Institute of Technology Aqua-Outreach Programme (AIT Outreach), the Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-governmental Organization (BOBP-IGO), the Coastal Habitats and Resources Management project (CHARM-EU), the Coastal Development Center (CDC), the Community-based Natural Resources Management Resource Center, the Fisheries Coalition Action Team (FACT), the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF), the IUCN Wetlands Programme, the Mekong River Commission (MRC), the Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC), the DANIDA Support for Brackish Water and Marine Aquaculture (DANIDA-SUMA), the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), the UNDP/FAO project on Empowerment of Coastal Fishing Communities for Livelihood Security (ECFC), the WorldFish Center (WFC), and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

The workshop's overall goal was to look into how fisheries co-management can be mainstreamed into the national system of fisheries management in the countries of the Asia-Pacific region, building on existing fisheries co-management and community-based practices that exists in many of these countries.

This workshop is a clear example of how regional organizations and FAO member countries can join their resources to deal with issues of common interest. The elaboration of the action plan from this meeting is also a strong indication of the will to move forward on tackling some of the issues facing fisheries in the region. This report is the record of the Workshop and is further supported by presentations from the participants which cover in detail national and regional issues and experiences relating to fisheries co-management in the Asia-Pacific region.



He Changchui

Assistant Director-General and
Regional Representative for Asia and the Pacific

Report of the Regional workshop on mainstreaming fisheries co-management held in Siem Reap, Cambodia from 9 to 12 August 2005. FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, RAP Publication 2005/23, 48 p.

Abstract

This is the report of the APFIC regional workshop on “Mainstreaming fisheries co-management”. The goal of the workshop was to provide a forum to learn from past experience and to promote devolved management of fisheries. Participants at the workshop had the opportunity to be exposed to a range of coastal and inland fisheries co-management interventions and the elaboration of approaches needed to make fisheries co-management a “mainstream” activity in developing countries. The objective of the workshop was to develop summary conclusions on the status of co-management in the region and provide some concrete recommendations for action towards mainstreaming fishery co-management in the Asia-Pacific region. The report contains the action plan and recommendations of the workshop.

Many agencies (both governmental and non-governmental) are striving to improve the livelihoods of poor people that are dependent on aquatic resources by including these stakeholders in the planning and implementation of fisheries management. Many states have adopted decentralization as the way to implement future fisheries management, especially in developing countries, which often involves a partnership between government and the local communities, i.e. a co-management approach. The challenge is to find a way for co-management to become a mainstream practice of both government and non-government organizations and communities.

The 63 participants at the workshop comprised representatives of a selection of APFIC member countries (Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam). Collaborating and partner organizations (AIT, BOBP-IGO, MRC, IUCN, SEAFDEC, WorldFish Center); international NGOs (WWF, ICSF); and national co-management institutions, projects and NGOs (CBCRM, FACT, EU-CHARM, CDC, SUMA) also participated and supported the participation of their representatives.

Distribution:

Participants of the Session
Members of the Commission
FAO Fisheries Department
FAO Regional Fishery Officers

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	iii
Summary and Main Conclusions of the Workshop	1
– A common understanding of fisheries co-management	1
– Key actions by stakeholders	2
Background and Rationale	4
Workshop Objectives	5
Machanism of the Workshop	5
Opening of the Workshop	6
Mainstreaming Fisheries Co-Management in Asia-Pacific	6
– Presented paper – Mainstreaming Fisheries Co-Management in Asia-Pacific	6
– Issues and constraints to mainstreaming fisheries co-management	9
– Actors and stakeholders in co-management – their roles and responsibilities	10
National Policies and Legislation Policy and Legislative Frameworks for Co-Management	12
Community Empowerment for Fisheries Co-Management	12
Enabling Environment – Linkages and Institutions	13
Human Capacity and Finances Needed for Co-Management	13
Annex 1 Workshop Agenda	16
Annex 2 List of Participants	18
Annex 3 Opening Statements to the Workshop	25
Annex 4 Presentations on Co-Management by the Participants	29
Annex 5 Description of the Elements of a Co-Management System	47

SUMMARY AND MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF THE WORKSHOP

Co-management of fisheries is widely practiced in most Asian and Pacific countries, mostly through traditional arrangements on a pilot/demonstration scale, through projects.

Pilot/demonstration schemes have shown that economic, social and environmental benefits can be achieved through fisheries co-management;

The Workshop proposed that countries in Asia and the Pacific move towards organized implementation of co-management at local, provincial and national levels, i.e. they should mainstream fisheries co-management, building on existing co-management and community-based arrangements, where available.

The Workshop further noted the need to address the following challenges to successful co-management:

- levels of poverty and marginalization amongst fishers in the region make it difficult for them to take an active role in fisheries management, and difficult for governments to regulate access;
- a lack of awareness and communication of the potential benefits of co-management;
- lack of equity and power-sharing between government and resource users, especially small-scale fishing communities;
- policy and legislative frameworks that are not conducive of fisheries co-management;
- a lack of empowerment of resource users, especially in small-scale fishing communities, that would enable them to co-manage fisheries and to benefit from shared management arrangements;
- insufficient institutional linkages and communication between relevant stakeholders;
- inadequate human capacity of many of the major stakeholders, including government and local organizations;
- establishing cost-effective and efficient support and mechanisms for financing fisheries co-management, at all levels; and
- integration of co-management with other policies, such as decentralization and poverty reduction.

A common understanding of fisheries co-management

The Workshop adopted the following common understanding of fisheries co-management:

- *Fisheries co-management can be understood as a partnership approach where government and the fishery resource users share the responsibility and authority for the management of a fishery or fisheries in an area, based on collaboration between themselves and with other stakeholders.*

In line with the overall purpose of the Workshop to have fisheries co-management mainstreamed into the national system of fisheries management in the countries of the Asia-Pacific region, building on existing fisheries co-management and community-based practices that exist in many of these countries, the Workshop developed a set of strategies (see box) and action items for the major players (see below).

Strategies to achieve the objective

Strategy 1: Demonstrate and communicate the benefits and importance of co-management, to promote the scaling up of pilot/demonstration activities at different levels of government

Strategy 2: Provide an appropriate national policy and legislative frameworks to enable effective co-management of both small- and large-scale fisheries

Strategy 3: Ensure legitimate representation of, and trust among, stakeholders

Strategy 4: Strengthen human and institutional capacity of all relevant stakeholders to enable co-management

Strategy 5: Empower fishing communities to engage in co-management arrangements

Strategy 6: Establish, enhance and increase linkages and communication between stakeholders

Strategy 7: Focus research and learning on fisheries co-management

Strategy 8: Make available and support sustainable financial arrangements for fisheries co-management

Key actions by stakeholders

All parties:

- Facilitate human and institutional capacity building at all appropriate levels, and across communities and scales, focusing on participation, communication and building partnerships.
- Assist in collecting and sharing information on fishery resources, the fishing communities and factors constraining more effective fishery management.
- Recognition of views and knowledge of local communities.
- Facilitate the creation of effective institutional arrangements and linkages among the major stakeholders at all levels, building on existing arrangements.

Actions by national governments:

- Review, develop and amend fishery policy and legislation to support fisheries co-management.
- Create and support awareness of the potential benefits of fisheries co-management.
- Ensure better cross-sectoral integration and communication where appropriate for fisheries co-management.
- Establish agreed objectives for fisheries co-management through dialogue and negotiation with fishery communities and civil society organizations/NGOs, along with the roles and responsibilities of different players involved.
- Ensure that staff at all levels are adequately skilled and experienced to facilitate the implementation of fisheries co-management.
- Assist in the empowerment of communities, and ensure equitable distribution of the benefits of co-management.
- Allocate appropriate budgets for fisheries co-management practices.
- Encourage research agencies to undertake applied research that meets high priority needs of major stakeholders (as a pre-requisite, co-management stakeholders may need to develop mechanisms to prioritize and communicate research needs).

Actions by regional and intergovernmental organizations:

In order to assist states to place co-management higher on national agendas, not as an option but as a core strategy, they will:

- Act as fora to raise awareness and exchange ideas at various levels, including at the local community level.
- Promote networking at various levels.
- Assist governments through provision of technical and policy support.
- Exchange information with policy decision-makers about field practice and experiences.
- Collaborate with other stakeholders in providing technical assistance/capacity building/training at various levels (including NGOs and facilitators at various levels).
- Coordinate the networking of institutions that have an interest in human capacity development for co-management.
- Foster participation, partnerships and trust among governments, NGOs, financial institutions etc.

In order to improve coordination of their own efforts in facilitating the adoption of fisheries co-management:

- Define and adopt common language/messages on co-management.
- Coordinate planning in how to promote the strategies and actions listed above.
- Improve communication strategies with major stakeholders (through the use of simplified reports, policy briefs, etc.) and engage the media more effectively to promote fisheries co-management.
- Develop electronic networks to increase dialog among major stakeholders.

Actions by international or regional research:

- Agencies should undertake research, and collate, synthesize and disseminate knowledge of best practices at various levels in a form easily accessible to government and non-government stakeholders.

Actions by non-governmental and civil society organizations:

- Engage with and build better partnerships with government and other stakeholders.
- Facilitate effective communication and information sharing among stakeholders, especially governments and fishing communities.
- Work closely with communities in the co-management process and the institutional development required.
- Work closely with Government agencies in the co-management process. NGOs often play an important role in capacity building within provincial and district level agencies involved in co-management.
- Facilitate local participatory research on relevant fisheries co-management issues.

Actions by aid agencies/donors (suggestions to be developed in further consultation, since the Workshop was not representative of all donors themselves):

- Encourage financial assistance to address the main challenges (listed above) in mainstreaming fisheries co-management.
- Coordinate agency support to fisheries co-management in all countries of the Asia-Pacific region.
- Streamline agency interventions with the need for mainstreaming fisheries co-management.

Actions by fishing communities (suggestions to be developed in further consultation, since the Workshop was not representative of all communities):

- Share indigenous and local knowledge and technology with other stakeholders.
- Provide fisheries related information required for co-management.
- Work for improved representation of self-organised fishing communities in decision-making bodies at all levels.
- Take efforts to increase sustainability of self-financing mechanisms.
- Take responsibility for fisheries co-management actions.

Immediate next steps/follow-up:

- Report to be distributed to participants as soon as possible for feedback and comments.
- Report to be published and circulated and posted on APFIC Website: www.apfic.org.
- Interim database to be distributed on request and established as a system for updating.
- Background papers finalized and posted on web.
- Theme of co-management to be included in the APFIC Regional Consultative Forum Meeting (August 2006).
- Action Plan adopted by APFIC at its 29th Session in August 2006.
- Partners to pursue actions in collaboration with others.
- Broader-based workshop of co-management practitioners (to be discussed by task force drawn from relevant organizations/projects (CHARM-EU, ICSF, WorldFish, FAORAP, AIT, APFIC)) that might help organize it with possible venues including Nepal, Republic of Korea.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Noting the importance of this issue for the Asia-Pacific region, the 28th Session of the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC) recommended holding a workshop to bring together the many co-management experiences in the region and to plan a way forward to “mainstream fisheries co-management”¹.

Many agencies (both governmental and non-governmental) are striving to improve the livelihoods of poor people that are dependent on aquatic resources by including these stakeholders in the planning and implementation of fisheries management. Many states have adopted decentralization as the way

¹ “Mainstreaming” in this sense refers to institutionalizing co-management within governments and local communities, rather than relying on ad-hoc projects and unsystematic interventions.

to implement future fisheries management, especially in developing countries, which often involves a partnership between government and the local communities, i.e. a co-management approach. Numerous examples of success using the approach have been documented. However, the approach is often supported by donor funding rather than from direct government funding, and as a consequence is largely confined to demonstration or pilot sites scattered throughout Asia and the Pacific. There is an inherent assumption that the practice will spread to other communities, based on good practice. In many cases this assumption does not hold and the co-management fails after the project support has been withdrawn. The challenge is to find a way that co-management becomes mainstream practice of both government and non-government organizations and communities.

Many common constraints to successful implementation of co-management have been identified and some summaries in terms of “lessons learnt” are available. Ingredients for success appear to be (i) empowerment of communities, (ii) agreed roles and responsibilities of the different players (includes the whole hierarchy of players from national governments to local communities), (iii) legal and policy backing at all levels, (iv) people with skills in communication, natural resource management and problem solving, (v) use of traditional knowledge and traditional social structures (e.g. those used traditionally for decision-making and governance).

Some projects across the region have also demonstrated that co-management can not be achieved without dealing with fisheries in a more holistic livelihoods approach to break the inter-connection between overfishing and the need to survive. This involves empowering communities through improved organization to enable them to have a greater say in issues that affect their future and dealing with the issues of inadequate sanitation, lack of education, inadequate water supplies etc., while at the same time addressing the issues associated with responsible fishing.

It is probably time to take stock of the lessons learnt through government initiatives and through projects to formulate “best practice” for guidance of future activities. In particular, we need to examine what is needed to make co-management a mainstream activity. Importantly, it is clear that we need to focus on the functional (actually how stakeholders interact) rather than the structural (the theoretical relationship) aspects of co-management. A critical point to realize is that power-sharing is the result, rather than the starting point, of co-management.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the Workshop was to provide a forum to learn from past experience and to promote devolved management of fisheries. Participants at the workshop had the opportunity to be exposed to a range of coastal and inland fisheries co-management interventions and the elaboration of approaches needed to make fisheries co-management a mainstream activity in developing countries.

A specific objective of the Workshop was to develop summary conclusions on the status of co-management in the region and provide some concrete recommendations for action towards mainstreaming fishery co-management in the Asia-Pacific region.

MECHANISM OF THE WORKSHOP

The 63 participants at the Workshop comprised representatives of a selection of APFIC member countries (Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam). Collaborating and partner organizations (AIT, BOBP-IGO, MRC, IUCN, SEAFDEC, WorldFish Center); international NGOs (WWF, ICSF); and national co-management institutions, projects and NGOs (CBCRM, FACT, EU-CHARM, CDC, SUMA) also took part and supported the participation of their representatives.

The Workshop was designed to be as participatory as possible with a minimum of formal presentations. There were several technical presentations that introduced specific key themes and the rest of the activities were based around a working group format, with frequent interactions in regular plenary sessions.

The Workshop agenda is shown as Annex 1 and the list of participants as Annex 2.

OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

Mr Cheng Lim Sreang, Deputy-Governor of Siem Reap Province, welcomed the participants of the Workshop. Mr Tsukasa Kimoto, FAO Representative to Cambodia, expressed gratitude for the assistance provided by all the partner organizations. Mr Nao Thouk, Director-General, Department of Fisheries, Cambodia opened the Workshop. The opening statements are presented in Annex 3.

Mr Nao Thouk, Director General, Department of Fisheries, Cambodia was elected as the Chair of the Workshop with the APFIC Secretary, Mr Derek Staples, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific acting as Co-chair.

MAINSTREAMING FISHERIES CO-MANAGEMENT IN ASIA-PACIFIC

Presented paper – Mainstreaming Fisheries Co-Management in Asia-Pacific

The background paper presented by the APFIC Secretariat noted that there is a long tradition of fisheries management in the Asia-Pacific region. Traditional (or customary) fishery management systems have evolved over centuries in response to increasing population pressures and the need to resolve disputes over access and exploitation of fishery resources. The control of access to what were initially “common property” resources was originally the responsibility of local communities and customary fishery organisations.

These systems have been breaking down in recent decades in the face of increased mechanization of fishing vessels (or fleets) and the adoption of new gears and technologies. The process has been accompanied by a shift to government-driven scientific/economic management of the resource (through legislation) and the removal or marginalisation of traditional management mechanisms. The logic for the transfer of management responsibility to government has been partly reinforced by the theory of the “tragedy of the commons”, which assumes that management of common property resources by individual “users” inevitably leads to their over-exploitation.

Unfortunately, government-managed models of management have proved to be largely unsuccessful in managing fishery resources in the Asia-Pacific region. Over the last 20 years it has become increasingly apparent that management initiatives will not be effective if those that exploit the resource (communities and fishers) are not fully involved in the management process. The focus has therefore shifted from scientific/economic management models to those of co-management. Co-management systems are those that involve both governments and communities/resource users (both small and large scale) in sharing decision-making and planning to varying degrees. This is in contrast to “full community-based management” or “full government management” approaches wherein one or more of these stakeholders is excluded from formal involvement.

Recent experience with piloting co-management in many countries in the region has shown that it can be successful and that those exploiting the resources are capable of managing the fishery for specific purposes – including conflict reduction, use of more responsible fishing gear etc.

Four pillars are considered essential for successful co-management. These are:

- (a) an enabling policy and legislative environment;
- (b) empowerment of communities;
- (c) effective linkages and institutions; and
- (d) adequate resources (i.e. a fishery asset considered worth managing, and the people) and finances to implement the system.

An important feature of this is a robust enforcement mechanism and the existence of implementable sanctions to ensure compliance with the locally agreed rules. A critical step in the evolution of co-management is government's (either local or national level) demonstration of willingness to change policy, involve communities in the preparation of policy/laws, define roles and responsibilities of organisations and devolve power to local agencies. Community "ownership" improves compliance with locally agreed rules as well as with national legislation.

Communities involved in co-management of small-scale fisheries must also be mobilized in order to participate effectively and in a sustained manner. There must be genuine sharing of power in decision-making. Often, other (non fisheries) users of the resource such as farmers and the tourism industry will need to be involved in some stages or aspects of the process. Governments and other agencies must recognise the competence of fisher organisations and allow them to make their own local rules regarding the management of the fishery.

Effective co-management requires good linkages between participating stakeholders. The networks of stakeholders must be understood and encouraged to share information. It must also be recognised that in a co-management system success criteria may differ between stakeholders and that there may be differing priorities and emphasis on management objectives. Ecological well-being (or "state of the resource") must be balanced with human well-being (i.e. the need for food or income) and this inevitably requires management trade-offs. Communication and dialogue between stakeholders, government fishery agencies, fishers and researchers must take place effectively and be part of a participatory process.

Lastly, it must be recognised that effective co-management requires the existence of an asset that is considered worth managing since it requires the input of resources (time, effort, finance) by those involved. The transaction costs for participation in meetings, monitoring, enforcement and management can be considerable and are often underestimated at the commencement of a co-management initiative. Governments and communities must recognise and commit to providing these realities if initiatives are to be sustained.

Our current state of knowledge shows that there are no simple formulae to ensure success in fisheries co-management initiatives. What works in one area may be inappropriate or fail in another for many different reasons.

The Workshop agreed on the general concept and definition of co-management proposed in the presentation, i.e. involving a wide partnership between stakeholders. The definition was further refined in the plenary session at the end of the Workshop. Other points noted were that: co-management should focus more on local institutions than on local communities; it is very important to think about who facilitates the process and about the scale of the process (i.e. what and how much should be under co-management); and problems associated with industrial fisheries and with small-scale fisheries are different.

Working Group discussions on co-management in the context of fisheries management in Asia-Pacific.

Following the Secretariat’s introduction to this topic, participants were divided into four working groups. Groups I and II addressed the theme “Issues and constraints in mainstreaming fisheries co-management” and Groups III and IV, the themes of “Roles and responsibilities of major players in fisheries co-management” and “What works and what doesn’t”. After the presentation of each working group’s report back in plenary, participants discussed various related issues.

The importance of an appropriate legal framework for successful fisheries co-management was unanimously recognized, as well as the need to move from open access to a regulated fishing access regime. It was also emphasized that the constraints to fisheries co-management were not limited only to the sectoral legal framework; the overall national legal system has an impact on the sector in various ways.

The role of government was discussed by the participants. In this regard, its facilitation role in the co-management process was questioned since the state in some instances may provide the essential regulatory framework while at the same time function as a key user of the resource. It was therefore recommended that these two activities be clearly distinguished during the formulation and implementation of the fisheries co-management regime. Governments’ facilitation role can also represent a bottleneck for mainstreaming fisheries co-management if the appropriate human capacities are not existing or properly developed.

The challenge of delegating responsibilities for fisheries management when the sector generates important

WHAT WORKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community driven/sense of ownership (resources and process) • Supportive policy & legislative framework • High-level commitment • Building on existing initiatives/systems • Government role as “facilitator” • Supported by awareness and capacity building • Detailed/clear guidelines on regulation and enforcement • Proper mechanism/system for conflicts/disputes settlement/appeal mechanism • Linkages/dialogues/coordination and cooperation mechanism • Personal relationship and trusts • Community is organized with proper capability and resources • Empirical/research-based management with community involvement • Stakeholder participation involvement in formulating policy and legislation • A principle of subsidiarity (giving allowing fishers the right of self-determination and political participation) • Build on local knowledge and traditions • Inter-government agency coordination/cohesion in policy and legislative development (to avoid duplication, conflict) • Decentralization/delegation must be comprehensive (adequate powers and rights over resources complemented by the means to manage the resources) • Creating alternative livelihood opportunities

WHAT DOES NOT WORK FOR CO-MANAGEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much dependence on government inputs • Overly prescriptive system • Insufficient incentives/rewards (i.e. low salary of civil servants) • Benefits/incentives derived not shared/accessible • Centralized enforcement • Top-down policy formulation • Top-down consultation or passive participation • Inadequate legislative framework and weak enforcement • Lack of awareness (at the local level on the policy; at the central level for local systems/needs) • Absence of national co-management plan

revenues for the state was therefore fully recognized by the Workshop. The participants also considered that a successful management scheme should address both the large-scale and small-scale fisheries sub-sectors since they interact in various ways.

Fisheries resources in the region are generally fully or over-exploited, meaning that the need for promoting alternative livelihoods opportunities is critical. It was, however, emphasized that these alternative options should be identified and promoted outside the fisheries sector (including aquaculture) to avoid further pressure on these resources and the ecosystem on which they depend. It was also noted that a possible strategy was to provide incentives for the large-scale operators to leave the sector, which is also likely to have a follow on benefit to the small-scale sector.

Issues and constraints to mainstreaming fisheries co-management

Poverty

It was noted that poverty in a community can be a major constraint to co-management arrangements. Long-term rational decision-making is difficult for those it affects, because short-term needs are so urgent. The importance of fishing as a “last resort” also means that it can be especially difficult to restrict people’s access to managed resources. It was further observed that in co-management it can be very difficult to engage with the poor and ensure equity of both participation and benefits.

Legal and policy frameworks

Legal and policy frameworks may not be supportive of co-management and/or may not be adequately enforced. Some issues that should be clarified are user property rights, rights to manage resources, and rights to equitable sharing of benefits from resources. However, it can be risky for leaders and officials to limit access to resources, and this may explain some of the lack of political will. It was noted that current examples of co-management are mainly local pilot projects; larger frameworks for co-management of the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) are not available.

Legitimacy

Identification of legitimate representation from both government and community institutions can be problematic, as can be ensuring the involvement of all the relevant stakeholders (e.g. women may not be seen as important in co-management, the importance of local governments as a stakeholder

Levels and areas for co-management knowledge and skill building
<p>National advisory committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic concepts of co-management – national workshop (one off activity); documentation, especially on success stories • Legal review and legal aspects of co-management • Needs of the grassroots level; awareness of local issues <p>Provincial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts on co-management • Legal aspects of management • Planning & monitoring • Local issues • Conflict resolution • Training of trainers <p>District and community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts of co-management • Awareness of local issues • Conflict resolution • Organization and training of users • Training of local district committees • PRA, institutional strengthening, formulation of management plans, group mobilization/dynamics, social savings, alternative livelihoods <p>Note: Should be approached as a learning by doing exercise, through exchange visits etc.</p>

may not be recognized, etc.). Co-management itself may lack legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders due to a lack of understanding of the roles the different actors must play for it to be successful, and also due to lack of trust between parties owing to poor communication.

Institutional capacity to manage resource

Many institutional structures do not provide for co-management, and there is often a lack of organizational capacity to accommodate it – both within governments and local non-government institutions. It was observed that a lack of institutional capacity applies to both small- and large-scale fisher groups. It was further noted that capacity development of government staff can be problematic owing to changes in political representation that lead to changes in staff.

Knowledge

Co-management needs to incorporate different systems of knowledge (i.e. scientific/economic and local/traditional) in a two-way learning process. Co-management efforts are often constrained by a poor understanding of the ecology of fish resources, and the inter-connectedness of aquatic and land-based ecosystems. It can also be difficult to establish ways to integrate stakeholders, rather than polarize them.

Co-management as a process

It was noted that co-management should be adaptive and not too ambitious, and that it takes considerable time and resources. Experience shows that there is often a lack of appropriate mechanisms to link resource users and higher level managers, and to resolve the many different management priorities amongst stakeholders.

Lack of holistic/ecosystem approach

Co-management has to-date often been implemented on a pilot scale. As a result, it often ignores the “bigger picture” in terms of other sectors, ecosystems, etc.

Actors and stakeholders in co-management – their roles and responsibilities

As a general point, it was noted that there is often a lack of facilitation or of sufficiently skilled facilitators, and that this may act as a potential bottleneck in any up-scaling of co-management initiatives. The identification of facilitators is therefore important.

Communication needs
<p>Communication is a <i>process</i> that should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target the appropriate people • Flow is vertical and horizontal • Create a common understanding of management objectives and process (e.g. this could be done through working on a joint management plan). <p><i>Note: Good communication is essential for success.</i></p>

Information needs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory of <i>all</i> resources (not just fish!) – and their dynamics • Information on rights – legal requirements • Law and order situation and relevance of laws • Weather forecasts/warning systems • Wealth of information in communities themselves – should be a two-way flow • Many demands from government for information e.g. number of fishers, gear, catch etc. • Alternative livelihoods • Functions of other organizations • Monitoring is expensive • Monitoring of organizations <p>Lack of information about many co-management initiatives operating in a non-project environment.</p>

Table 1. Co-management actors and stakeholders in co-management: roles and responsibilities

Actors	Role and responsibilities
<p>GOVERNMENT AND ITS INSTITUTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central/national/federal ● Provincial/regional/state/local govt.) 	<p><i>At the national level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide an enabling environment through the specification of policy and legislation ● Technical support/advice/human resource development ● Empowerment, incentives, equity ● Facilitate a participatory process/partnership ● Ensure linkages ● Standard-setting ● Quality control, trade and market support <p><i>At the local level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Execute policy; implement management plan and measures; issue local administrative rules, regulations and ordinances; coordinate with other sectors; local project planning
<p>FISHER INSTITUTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Communities ● Groups ● Organizations etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Local planning and implementation ● Custodian/stewardship over resources ● Sustainable exploitation of resources ● Formulation/observance of local rules and regulations ● Conservation and resource enhancement ● Participation in objective-setting and planning ● Facilitate participatory process/partnership ● Involvement in national/regional processes
<p>INDIVIDUAL FISHERS not included above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individuals ● Groups outside formal systems ● Migrants ● Etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Stakeholders in that they use the resources and are expected to follow management interventions ● Maybe “outside” formal arrangements but still need to be considered/involved
<p>PRIVATE SECTOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Small-scale entrepreneurs ● Larger-scale/industrial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Involvement in terms of upstream and downstream linkages
<p>FACILITATORS AND SUPPORT GROUPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGOs and international agencies ● NGOs – international, local ● Trade unions ● Advocacy groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Financial support and pilot implementation of projects ● Capacity building ● Advocacy ● Linkages ● Extension and pilots ● Standard setting
<p>MEDIA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Means of awareness, information flows/exchange
<p>ACADEMIC/RESEARCH/TRAINING INSTITUTES (Government and non-government)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support and implement research and development activities and capacity building

NATIONAL POLICIES AND LEGISLATION POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORKS FOR CO-MANAGEMENT

The Workshop background paper on *Policy and legislative frameworks for co-management* examined the policy and legislative frameworks for co-management in 13 countries in Asia and the Pacific, and the extent to which these frameworks hinder or support co-management practices.

Co-management in the wide sense of government partnerships with other stakeholders for the purpose of natural resource management, rather than just the narrower concept of community-based management, is an emerging trend. The trend is driven by, amongst other things, an awareness of resource depletion, conflicts both within the sector and between fisheries and other sectors, and the perceived benefits of co-management as an approach. In the face of increasing pressure on fisheries resources, the need to formally codify existing community management practices through greater government involvement and legislative support has also been important. Furthermore, implementation of co-management is now being encouraged, or at least enabled, by decentralisation policies in almost all of the case study countries.

Political will is the prerequisite to the establishment of co-management mechanisms. It must be reflected in policy, legislation and action specific to the fisheries sector, as well as more generally in government policy and legislative support.

However, many of the current co-management initiatives remain pilot projects only, and are strongly driven and supported by donors. The nature of policy and legislative frameworks is varied, as is commitment by governments; in some cases support is more rhetoric than real, with insufficient transfer of powers and financial resources to local levels.

The background paper presented on “lessons learned” gave an analysis of the different case studies, and a number of conclusions were drawn about the key characteristics of a supportive policy and legislative framework based on ideas of “best practice”. The adoption of these characteristics by governments would demonstrate their commitment to co-management, and increase the likelihood of co-management success.

Some participants stressed the fact that elaboration and enacting new legislation was a relatively long process especially if based on a consultative approach and that it required strong political will.

Some participants expressed concern about the emphasis given to enabling conditions and prerequisite “success factors”. The consequence may be counter productive in terms of developing a management approach that should in essence remain adaptive.

It was also mentioned that many experiences in co-management appear to be donor driven. Such experiences are often the best documented. However, there are co-management elements that have been spontaneously introduced in small-scale communities.

Various short presentations made by Workshop participants on co-management experiences are included as Annex 4 of this report.

COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT FOR FISHERIES CO-MANAGEMENT

An overview presentation on *Community empowerment for fisheries co-management* dealt with a generic model of community empowerment from a practitioners’ point of view as well as a review of experiences gained from level interventions. Empowerment of fishing communities means enabling resource poor, marginalised, isolated and unexposed groups to enhance their capacities in order to

cope with changes, undertake economic and social development, ensure greater community cohesion, perceive mutual interests in sustaining fisheries resources and regulate fishing.

Since empowerment is a process, and grows over time and in different but mutually reinforcing dimensions, it needs to be fostered through holistic approach. Community issues and action areas such as gender inclusiveness, additional and alternative income generation, primary health care and sanitation, nutrition, elementary education, disaster preparedness, legal literacy, confidence building and visioning all need to be addressed in addition to those of conservation and fisheries resources sustainability.

Community empowerment is encouraged through networking of local organizations at village, district, provincial, regional and national levels. The empowerment process needs to draw energy both from “outside” and “inside” sources. Outside agencies may serve a catalytic role, promoting an enabling environment by facilitating policy, legal and institutional reforms, for example. But empowerment depends essentially on energies generated from within the community, through self-help projects and other stakeholder initiatives that both reflect and reinforce a sense of unity and common purpose.

ENABLING ENVIRONMENT – LINKAGES AND INSTITUTIONS

Participants were divided into four working groups comprised of (i) country representatives, (ii) regional organization representatives, and (iii and iv) representatives of NGOs and projects. Tasks were allocated as follows:

- (a) Country groups were asked to construct an inventory of the minimum institutional and capacity requirements for a workable co-management system.
- (b) Regional organizations were asked to elaborate the actions they could take to support the mainstreaming of co-management.
- (c) Those representing projects and NGOs were asked to describe the arrangements and activities necessary to support co-management at the local level.

Outcomes of the working group deliberations are tabulated in Annex 5 and are also reflected in the summary conclusions section at the beginning of this report.

HUMAN CAPACITY AND FINANCES NEEDED FOR CO-MANAGEMENT

A panel of experts was formed to discuss issues and considerations relating to human capacity and financing needs for co-management. The members of the panel each made a short presentation, followed by a plenary discussion.

The panel drew attention to a number of important questions for consideration by the Workshop. These included the following:

- (a) What is the cheapest way to mainstream co-management?
- (b) What is the best way to finance i) policy changes for mainstreaming, and ii) start up and capacity building?
- (c) How should recurrent costs and benefits be shared?
- (d) If co-management is newly applied, what are the new costs and what costs can be reduced?
- (e) What are the side effects of co-management in terms of positive and negative costs?

- (f) What are the costs involved in informing the government about the benefits of co-management?
- (g) What is the best approach and what are the costs of building confidence and enthusiasm for co-management?
- (h) How should informal ways of working be described and analyzed?
- (i) How should capacity be built with communities more effectively?

In addressing these questions the panel made a number of short presentations:

In Japan, in the Kanagawa prefecture the total value of the catch is \$84 million, and the annual government fisheries budget is \$16.2million with about half of the total being for research. Fishers also pay 8 percent of the value of catch to the 24 Fisheries Cooperative Associations (FCAs) in the prefecture. FCAs make local regulations, keep catch records, etc., and are an integral part of the management. Management costs as a percentage of the value of production are 27 percent, and high compared to the typical situation in Japan.

In Bang Saphan Bay in Thailand, where a co-management project has operated since 1999, resources have recovered as a result of trawlers and push net fishers being kept out of the demarcation area. This has attracted outsiders to come seasonally to fish in the Bay without making contributions to management costs of the fishery, but against which the members of the co-management group are unable to take action. Also, the boundaries and management rules are different in this area and a neighbouring bay, resulting in conflicts between local fishers. Agreeing boundaries of co-management areas is important in reducing conflict and therefore management costs and government can play a critical role in assisting groups to prevent the intrusion of non-members to designated areas. There is a need to document the effects of this project and spread the results more widely.

Human capacity building involves costs. For many resource users activities are made on a volunteer basis and low government salaries can also provide a disincentive. Conflicts are often generated by projects through payment of different levels of rewards. Better incentives must be considered to ensure the participation of stakeholders in co-management. Building on both formal and informal activities that are already being conducted can reduce costs. Rumour can be an effective way of reducing information costs. Costs can also be reduced through learning, rather than teaching, by using existing systems, and by delegating responsibility and creating ownership.

The different characteristics of conventional management and co-management imply different costs, especially in terms of human capacity development. For example, the multiple dimensional nature of co-management capacity building includes organizational and institutional development and the need to work across communities and scales, and to be more communicative.

Conflicts are often generated by projects through payment of different levels of rewards. Better incentives must be considered to ensure the participation of stakeholders in co-management. In the long-term, self-financing by communities must be considered given that it is unrealistic to expect governments to contribute additional funds. Self-financing can be increased through credit and savings schemes, alternative/supplementary activities as part of management, and self-taxation.

In response to the presentation of the panel, it was noted that costs of management can be changed by switching the type of fisheries management regulations being used and by giving fishers ownership of resources. They can also be reduced if management models and tools move from costly efforts to estimate stock maximum sustainable yields (MSYs) to more practical and relevant management tools based on local management of fisheries. It was observed that effecting policy change itself may not be costly, and that legislation must enable local management units (if possible constitutionally) to tax and re-invest in co-management at the local level.

Agreeing on who should pay for management costs and how management benefits should be allocated is very important, but can be complicated when there are multiple stakeholders involved in the catching of fish, e.g. absentee boat owners, those that lease vessels, vessel crew, etc. Capacity should be built at the grassroots level so that benefits and rights will not be captured by a few.

It was pointed out that the cost of management should be within the context of management space, i.e. what is the management unit, how is this decided and by whom? The question of how to optimize the space in order that cost may also be optimized was also raised. Participants observed that it is difficult to estimate changes to costs and benefits because most activities to date have only been of a pilot nature.

With reference to the existence of two types of fisheries in most Asian countries, i.e. small-scale and large scale, it was emphasized that there is a need to look at these two sectors simultaneously as they use the same resources. Moreover, small-scale fishers may bear some of the cost of managing their own fisheries but not major activities such as keeping the trawlers out of the coastal areas.

On who should take the initiative in mainstreaming co-management, one opinion says that it is the responsibility of the government who should take other stakeholders on board. The theory is that the financial cost of co-management will be gradually reduced as it becomes more systematic. The other costs (transaction costs) can also be seen to be a more acceptable "expense" as the stakeholders in a co-management system start to see positive results from their participation. In summary, the session agreed that examining the costs and cost effectiveness of co-management are essential.

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Time	Activity
Day 1	
08.30 – 09.00	Registration
09.00 – 09.30	Welcome remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.E. Governor of Siem Reap • FAOR Cambodia • DG Fisheries Cambodia
09.30 – 09.35	Election of Chairperson
09.35 – 09.45	Group photo
09.45 – 10.15	Coffee/Tea
10.15 – 10.25	Introduction to workshop – objectives and mode of operation (Derek Staples – FAO)
SESSION I – Co-management in context of fisheries management in Asia-Pacific	
10.30 - 11.00	<i>Co-management model</i> (APFIC Secretariat)
11.00 – 11.10	Introduction to Working Group activities Facilitator
11.10 – 12.30	Working Groups Co-management model – roles and responsibilities
12.30 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.00	Working Group Reports
SESSION II – Enabling environment – national policies and legislation	
15.00 – 15.30	<i>Policy and legal issues</i> (LEGN, FAO)
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee/Tea
16.00 – 17.30	Short presentations – Country/project experiences Discussion
17.30 – 18.00	Meeting of “Friends of the Chair”
Day 2	
SESSION III – Enabling environment – empowering communities	
09.00 – 09.30	<i>Overview presentation</i> (Dilip Kumar – FAO, Bangladesh)
09.30 – 10.30	Short presentations – Country/project experiences Discussion
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee/Tea
11.00 – 12.30	Short presentations – Country/project experiences Discussion
12.30 – 14.00	Lunch

Time	Activity
Day 2 (continued)	
SESSION IV – Enabling environment – Linkages and institutions	
14.00 – 14.10	Introduction to Working Group activities Facilitator
14.10 – 16.30	Working Groups (Tea/Coffee provided) Linking national to local
16.30 – 17.30	Reports of Working Groups
17.30 – 18.00	Meeting of “Friends of the Chair”
Day 3	
All day	Field Trip
Day 4	
SESSION V – Human capacity and finances needed for co-management	
09.00 – 10.30	Panel discussion
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee/Tea
SESSION VI – Mainstreaming fisheries co-management	
11.00 – 12.30	Workshop Conclusions
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 16.00	Recommendations & actions
	Meeting close

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BANGLADESH**Husne Ara (Ms)**

Senior Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock
Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka 1000
Bangladesh
Tel: 7170052

CAMBODIA**Nao Thouk**

Director-General
Department of Fisheries
186, Norodom Blvd., P.O. Box 582
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel: +855-23-215796
Fax: +855-23-215470
E-mail: naothouk@mobitel.com.
khcatfish@camnet.com.kh

Srun Lim Song

Director, Inland Fisheries Research and
Development Institute (IFReDI)
Department of Fisheries
186, Norodom Blvd., P.O. Box 582
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Fax: +855-23-220417
Mobile: +855-12-997-005
E-mail: limsong@online.com.kh

Ly Vuthy

Chief of Community Fisheries Development
Office
Department of Fisheries
186, Norodom Blvd., P.O. Box 582
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel: +855-11660840
E-mail: lyvuthy@online.com.kh

Prin Savin

Chief of Provincial Fisheries Office
Siem Reap, Cambodia
Tel: +855-12821584

INDONESIA**Tri Aris Wibowo**

Head of Sub-division of Monitoring and
Evaluation
Directorate-General of Capture Fisheries
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Medan Merdeka Timur
No. 16, 12th Floor, Jakarta
Indonesia
Tel: +62-21-3519113
Fax: +62-21-3519113
E-mail: triaris_wibowo@yahoo.com

INDIA**Amarjit Banga**

Director (Fisheries Economics & Coordination)
Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and
Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture, Room No. 346A
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi 110001
India
Tel: +91-11-23097012
Fax: +91-11-23070279
E-mail: dirfy@hub.nic.in;
Aj_banga@hotmail.com

JAPAN**Mitsutaku Makino**

National Research Institute of Fisheries Science
Fisheries Research Agency
2-12-4 Hukuura, Kanagawa,
Yokohama 236-8648
Japan
Tel/Fax: +81-45788-7655
E-mail: mmakino@affrc.go.jp

Tadashi Yamamoto

Honorary President
Japan International Fisheries Economics Society
Shinjuku 1-23-6-401
Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-0022
Japan
Tel/Fax: +81-3-3350-1867
E-mail: yamachu@tkb.att.ne.jp

MALAYSIA

Hj. A. Rahman bin Muhammad

Director, Licensing and Resource Management
Department of Fisheries Malaysia
1st Floor, Tower Block, 4G2, Wisma Tani
62628 Putrajaya
Tel: +603-88884407
Fax: +603-88891233
E-mail: amra52@yahoo.com

MYANMAR

U Hla Tun

Fishery Officer
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries
Sinmin Road, Ahlone Township
Yangon, Myanmar
Tel: +095-01-228621
Fax: +095-01-221404
E-mail: DOF@mptmail.net.mm

NEPAL

D.B. Swar

Deputy Director-General
Department of Agriculture
Harihar Bhawan, Pulchowk
Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel: +977-15521127
E-mail: deep_bahadurswar@hotmail.com

PAKISTAN

Mohammad Hayat

Fisheries Development Commissioner
Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
38 Shaheed-e-Miliat Secretariat, Jinnah Avenue
Blue Area, Islamabad, Pakistan
Tel: +92-51-9208267
Fax: +92-51-9212630
E-mail: drmuhammadhayat@yahoo.com

PHILIPPINES

Jessica Munoz

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
860 Quezon Avenue, Arcadia Bldg.
Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel/Fax: +632-4109990
E-mail: jmunoz@frmp.org

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Hyun-Jong Kim

Deputy Director, International Cooperation Office
Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
140-2 Gye-Dong, Jongno-gu
Seoul 110-793
Republic of Korea
Tel/Fax: +82-2-3674-6992/+82-2-3674-6996
E-mail: harrykim@momaf.go.kr

Tai-Gi Kim

Deputy Director, Fishery Resources
Management Division
Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
140-2 Gye-Dong, Jongno-gu
Seoul 110-793
Republic of Korea
Tel: +82-2-3674-6931
Fax: +82-2-3674-6935
E-mail: pico567@momaf.go.kr

Kwang Nam Lee

Economic Analysis Research Fellow
Samho Center BD "A", 509
275-1, Yangjae-Dong
Seocho-Gu, Seoul
Republic of Korea
Tel: +82-2-589-0627
Fax: +82-2-589-1700
E-mail: lkn6530@chol.net

SRI LANKA

G. Piyasena

Director-General
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Development
Maligawatta Secretariat, Colombo 10
Sri Lanka
Tel: +94-11-2472187
Fax: +94-11-2449170
E-mail: depfish@diamond.lanka.net

THAILAND

Suchat Sangchan

Fishery Biologist
Andaman Sea Fisheries Research and
Development Center
Phang-nga, Thailand
Tel: +66-07-6412788
Fax: +66-07-6412788
E-mail: bodan_fishery@yahoo.com

VIET NAM

Nguyen Van Chiem

Expert, National Directorate for Aquatic
Resources
Exploitation and Protection
Ministry of Fisheries
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan Street
Ba Dinh District, Hanoi
Vietnam
Tel: +84-04-7716213
Fax: +84-04-8353363
E-mail: nvchiem@yahoo.co.uk

Tuong Phi Lai

Institute of Fishery Economic and Planning
Ministry of Fisheries
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan Street
Ba Dinh District, Hanoi
Vietnam
Tel: +84-4-7718887
E-mail: tuongphilai@yahoo.com

Regional Fishery Organization Partners:

AIT Aqua Outreach Programme

Nick Innes-Taylor

Coordinator
Aqua Outreach Programme
Asian Institute of Technology
Pathum Thani, Thailand
Tel: +66 (0)1873-1920
Fax: +66- 42-304494
E-mail: nickIT@ait.ac.th;
nick@udon.loxinfo.co.th

Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-Governmental Organization

Y.S. Yadava

Director
BOBP-IGO
91, St. Mary's Road, Abhiramapuram
Chennai 600 018
Tamil Nadu, India
Tel: +91-44-24936294
Fax: +91-44-24936102
E-mail: bobysy@md2.vsnl.net

S.S. Tabrez Nasar

Senior Programme Advisor
BOBP-IGO
91, St. Mary's Road, Abhiramapuram
Chennai 600 018,
Tamil Nadu, India
Tel: +91-44-24936294
Fax: +91-44-24936102
E-mail: Tabrez.Nasar@bobbpigo.org

CHARM-EU Project

Yves Henocque

CHARM-EU Co-Director
Coastal Habitats and Resources Management
Project (CHARM)
Plodprasop Bldg., 4th Floor
Department of Fisheries
Kasetsart University Campus
Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Tel/Fax: +66-2-5613132
E-mail: henoc@ifremer.fr

Kamonpan Awaiwanont

CHARM Training Coordinator
Coastal Habitats and Resources Management
Project (CHARM)
Plodprasop Bldg., 4th Floor
Department of Fisheries
Kasetsart University Campus
Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel/Fax: +66-2-5798200
E-mail: kawaiwanont@yahoo.com

Coastal Development Center

Kungwan Juntarashote

Director
Coastal Development Center
Faculty of Fisheries
Kasetsart University Campus
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +66-9-4558541
Fax: +66-2-9825815
E-mail: ffiskwj@ku.ac.th

Sangtien Ajjimangkul

Assistant Professor
Department of Fishery Management
Faculty of Fisheries
Kasetsart University Campus
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +66-2-5797642
Fax: +66-2-5797642
E-mail: ffissaa@ku.ac.th

Sansanee Wangvoralak

Instructor
Department of Fishery Management
Faculty of Fisheries
Kasetsart University Campus
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +66-9-5797642
Fax: +66-2-5797642
E-mail: ffissnw@ku.ac.th

Jantra Srisomwong

Instructor
Department of Fishery Management
Faculty of Fisheries
Kasetsart University Campus
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +66-9-5797642
Fax: +66-2-5797642
E-mail: ffisjts@ku.ac.th

***Community-Based Natural Resources
Management Resource Center*****Fermin Manalo, Jr.**

Community-based Natural Resources –
Management Resource Center
13-A Maaralin St.
Diliman, Quezon City
Philippines
Tel: +63-2-9203368
Fax: +63-2-9203368
E-mail: welldev@yahoo.com

Fisheries Coalition Action Team**Carl Middleton**

Acting Director
FACT
#71, Street 592, Sangkat Boeung Kak II
Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel/Fax: +855-23992044
E-mail: carl_middleton@hotmail.com

***International Collective Support of
Fishworkers*****Chandrika Sharma**

International Collective in Support of
Fishworkers (ICSF)
27 College Road
Chennai 600 006
India
Tel: +91-44-28275303
Fax: +91-44-28254457
E-mail: icsf@vsnl.com

IUCN Wetlands Programme**Richard Friend**

IUCN Programme Manager
MWBP Office, 16 Fa Ngum Road
POB 4340
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +855-1285-2904
Fax: +855-232-11944
E-mail: Richard.mwbp@iucnlao.org

Sok Vong

National Programme Coordinator
The World Conservation Union
Cambodian Liaison Office
#48, Preah Sihanouk Blvd. Tonle Bassac
POB 1504, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel: +855-23-222311/2 ext. 114
Fax: +855-23-211944
E-mail: sokvong.mwbp@online.com.kh

Sommano Phounsavath

Technical Officer
Living Aquatic Resources Research Center
(LARReC)
Ban Khunta, Sikhottabong District
POB 9108, Vientiane
Lao PDR
Tel: +856-21-263479
Fax: +856-21-214855
E-mail: larrec.capture@laopdr.com

Mekong River Commission

Wolf Hartmann

Component Coordinator
Management of River and Reservoir Fisheries
Component
P.O. Box 7035
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +856-21-223436
Fax: +856-21-223610
E-mail: merops@laopdr.com

Khamtanh Vatthanatham

Programme Officer
Mekong River Commission
184 FaNgum Road
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +856-21-263263
E-mail: khamtanh@mrcmekong.org

Somphanh Chanpengxay

Department of Livestock and Fishery
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +856-21-416932
Fax: 856-21-415674
E-mail: somphana2003@yahoo.com

Ubolratana Suntornratana

Udon Thani Inland Fisheries Research and
Development Centre
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture
100 Supakitjunja Road
Amphur Muang, Udon Thani
Tel: +66-42-221167
Fax: +66-42-249689

Nguyen Van Hao

National Programme Coordinator
Research Institute for Aquaculture No. 2
116 Nguyen Dinh Chein Street – Dist. 1
Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam
Tel: +84-8-82-30676
Fax: 84-8-82226807
E-mail: haovra2@hcm.vnn.vn

Regional Community Forestry Training Center For Asia and the Pacific

Peter Stephen

Capacity Building Coordinator
Regional Community Forestry Training Center
for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC)
Kasetsart University Campus
P.O. Box 1111, Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Tel: +66-2-9405700 ext. 1230
Fax: +66-2-5614880
E-mail: opjs@ku.ac.th

Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center – Secretariat

Suriyan Vichitlekarn

Policy and Programme Coordinator
SEAFDEC Secretariat
P.O. Box 1046, Kasetsart Post Office
Bangkok 10903, Thailand
Tel: +66-2-940-6326 to 29
Fax: +66-2-940-6336
E-mail: suriyan@seafdec.org

Supaporn Anuchiracheeva

E-mail: supaporn@seafdec.org

Yasuhisa Kato

Special Advisor
E-mail: kato@seafdec.org

Magnus Torell

Senior Advisor
E-mail: magnus@seafdec.org

Worawit Wanchana

Programme Manager
E-mail: woravit@seafdec.org

Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center – Training department

Bundit Chokesanguan

SEAFDEC Training Department
P.O. Box 97 Phrasamutchedi
Samut Prakan 10290, Thailand
Phone: +66-2-425-6100
Fax: +66-2-425-6110 to 11
E-mail: bundit@seafdec.org

Kongpathai Saraphaivanich

E-mail: kongpathai@seafdec.org

**Support for Brackish Water and Marine
Aquaculture**

Davide Fezzardi

Socio-Economic Adviser
Support to Brackish Water and Marine
Aquaculture
Ministry of Fisheries – DANIDA
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan St.
Ba Dinh District, Hanoi, Vietnam
Tel: +84-4-7716-516 ext. 335
Fax: +84-4-7716-517
E-mail: dfezzardi.suma@fsps.com.vn

WorldFish Center

Blake D. Ratner

Regional Director, Greater Mekong Sub-region
WorldFish Center
Mekong Regional Office
Department of Fisheries
P.O. Box 582, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel: +855-12-777-527
Fax: +855-23-220417
E-mail: b.ratner@cgiar.org

Edmund Oh

Research Analyst
WorldFish Center
P.O. Box 500, GPO 10670
Penang, Malaysia
Tel: +60-4-6202124
Fax: +60-4-6265530
E-mail: e.oh@cgiar.org

Fisheries Department

*(Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome,
Italy)*

Dominique Greboval

Senior Fishery Officer
E-mail: dominique.greboval@fao.org

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)

Eric Meusch

WWF Lao Programme Office
53 Ban Saylom – Vientiane
P.O. Box 787
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +856-21-216080
Fax: +856-21-251883
E-mail: eric.meusch@wwflaos.org

**Empowerment of Coastal Fishing Communities
For Livelihood Security**

Dilip Kumar

Fishing Community Development Advisor
Empowerment of Coastal Fishing Communities
for Livelihood Security (BGD/97/017)
ADB Hatchery Campus
Charpara, Cox's Bazar
Bangladesh
Tel: +880-34162721
Fax: +880-31464543
E-mail: dilipk@agni.com

Zafar Ahmad

National Project Director
ECFC Project, Department of Fisheries
ADB Hatchery Campus
Charpara, Cox's Bazar
Bangladesh
Tel: +01730-11772

Observer

Ulrich Schmidt

c/o FAO Cambodia
No. 5, Street No. 370
P.O. Box 53
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel: +855 (0) 11658045
E-mail: ulrich.schmidt@virgilio.it

FAO

Hans Bage

Fishery Industry Officer
E-mail: hans.bage@fao.org

Benoit Horemans

Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme
Coordinator
E-mail: benoit.horemans@fao.org

Susana Siar

Fishery Industry Officer

E-mail: susana.siar@fao.org

Legal Office**Blaise Kuemlangan**

Legal Officer

E-mail: blaise.kuemlangan@fao.org

Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific*(Phra Athit Road, Bangkok 10200, Thailand)***Derek J. Staples**

Senior Fishery Officer

E-mail: derek.staples@fao.org

Simon Funge-smith

Aquaculture Officer

E-mail: simon.fungesmith@fao.org

Graeme Macfadyen

FAO Consultant

E-mail: graeme@consult-poseidon.com

Secretariat**Pornsuda David**

Technical Assistant

E-mail: pornsuda.david@fao.org

Thong Samphors

Department of Fisheries

Phnom Penh, Cambodia

OPENING STATEMENTS TO THE WORKSHOP**Welcome address by H.E. Governor of Siem Reap Province, Cambodia**

Today I am very proud to have the honour to participate in the Regional Workshop here on “Mainstreaming Fisheries Co-management” from 9–12 August 2005, which is jointly organized by Department of Fisheries, Cambodia and the Asia-Pacific Fisheries Commission (APFIC).

On behalf of Siem Reap provincial authority, I warmly welcome all distinguished delegates from the Asia-Pacific region representatives to be here for this special occasion. I would also like to thank the Department of Fisheries and APFIC in selecting this province to hold such Regional Workshop.

Fisheries form a very important part of the lives of many people in this region. As you know the Government of Cambodia is actively encouraging better management of the natural resource base that supports their livelihoods. This is very apparent in the Tonle Sap, a large lake near here that I believe you will be visiting on your field trip. At this site, government is working closely with the people of the region to improve fisheries management – so called co-management arrangement. The choice to have this workshop so close to the Tonle Sap should give you the opportunity to observe, first hand, fisheries co-management in action.

While you are in the Siem Reap region, I also hope that you will take the opportunity to learn more about our history and culture and find time to visit our famous Angkor Wat Temple. This important site reminds us of the history of the ancient Khmer civilization that reached in its peak during the Angkor period during the 8th to 13th century. If you examine the sculptures at the temples you will see evidence of the important of fish to the people of the region even in those ancient times.

I trust that the work that you will be doing here over the next few days will help ensure that the same abundance and variety of fish for which this region is famous will also be there for our children and all future generations.

We hope that the result of this Regional Workshop will lay a basis for better approaches of successful implementation of the co-management regionally. It will also provide, especially, a knowledge base and tools for decision-makers in the world-wide for mainstreaming fisheries co-management.

Again, I would like to take this opportunity to be grateful to Department of Fisheries and FAO through APFIC for their generous support for this Workshop. I wish you all a nice stay in Siem Reap and hope you enjoy the famous Angkor Wat Temple and the Tonle Sap Great Lake and hope you will have a successful meeting in Siem Reap.

Statement by Tsukasa Kimoto, FAO Representative in Cambodia

I am very pleased to be able to welcome you to Siem Reap and to this Regional Workshop on “Mainstreaming Fisheries Co-management”, which is jointly organized by Department of Fisheries, Cambodia and the Asia-Pacific Fisheries Commission (APFIC). On behalf of FAO, I warmly welcome all the distinguished delegates from APFIC, partner organizations, and all involved in fisheries across the region. The Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission is the oldest fishery commission in the world. It has served its members well for over 50 years and FAO through APFIC has supported the development and management of fisheries in the region throughout this long period.

However, as newer sub-regional fishery bodies have formed, for example SEAFDEC, the Mekong River Commission and the Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-governmental Organization who are all represented here today, APFIC has moved to being the overarching consultative forum to address, and find solutions for, trans-boundary fisheries and aquaculture issue affecting the whole of the Asia-Pacific region. For the biennium 2005/06, the Commission elected two major topics for its consideration. The first was the issue of trash fish, and some of you may have attended the recent workshop in Hanoi, Viet Nam where several important actions to address the issue were agreed to. The second topic is the one being addressed here today – how to “mainstream” fisheries co-management.

So what do we mean by “mainstreaming”. The concept of co-management, where governments and users of the fishery resources join forces to promote more responsible and efficient fisheries, is not new. However, with some notable exceptions such as Japan, co-management has been carried out across the region only in isolated project demonstration/pilot sites and has been largely donor driven. However with decentralization policies increasingly finding their way into country agendas, the time is right to make this much more than a collection of pilot sites but to “mainstream” the initiative into everyday fisheries management.

This Workshop will endeavour to build on lessons learnt and best practice across the region in an attempt to define more clearly the processes required to make co-management a mainstream activity. It will deal with policy and legislation issues, it will examine how to empower communities and will also look at the institutional linkages need to bring it about. Lastly it will consider what resources will be required to facilitate this.

These APFIC Workshops, however, are not isolated events. AS with the previous Workshop, this Workshop should come up with a concrete action plan on what needs to be done. These recommendations will be further embellished at the next APFIC Consultative Forum Meeting and presented to full Commission Session in August next year. In this way it hoped that your collective efforts will translate into action for the benefit of the whole region. We hope that in this way FAO and APFIC, in collaboration with its partners, can assist in laying the foundations for the successful implementation of the co-management across the region. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Department of Fisheries and APFIC for their generous support for this Workshop and trust that you all have a very constructive and useful Workshop.

I would like to leave you with one last thought. The reason that so much work has been put into organizing this Workshop is to bring you all together so that you can share your ideas and experiences. Please put all your energies into making what, I am sure will be, a very successful event.

Opening Speech by Mr Nao Thouk, Director General of the Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Kingdom of Cambodia

On behalf of the Fisheries Department and on my own behalf, first of all, I wish to extend my warmest welcome to everyone attending this regional Workshop on mainstreaming fisheries co-management. It is our great honour and pleasure to host this important Workshop with the collaboration and participation of your Excellencies, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, representing the Governments, International and National Organizations.

Allow me to take this opportunity to express my gratitude for the presence of H.E. Provincial Governor and for taking his valuable time to participate in the opening ceremony of this Workshop. Also, for his cooperation and warm hospitality to the Distinguished Guests and Delegates in the Workshop, while staying in the beautiful province of Siem Reap. I would like also express my deepest thanks and appreciation to the Asia-Pacific Fisheries Commission and other Organizations for their support and cooperation in jointly organizing this Workshop.

As all of you know, Cambodia is rich in fisheries resources as there are plenty of rivers, tributaries, lakes and large floodplain covering 2.7 percent of the total land area. The total annual inland capture fisheries production is estimated to be about 290 000 to 430 000 tons with a value of US\$200-250 million. Cambodia's inland fisheries are most productive in the region and perhaps are ranked number 4 in the world behind China, India and Bangladesh. Fisheries contribute 8.4 to 11 percent to the country's Gross Domestic Product. In terms of employment and income generation, Cambodia's aquatic habitat provides an important and major source of employment and income generation for rural people, who fish, collect aquatic plants and animals, and rely on it for other related activities.

Freshwater fisheries also contribute to food security and nutrition for Cambodian people. Rice and fish are the basic diet and more than 75 percent of the animal protein intake is derived from fish, especially among the rural population. Average fish consumption of people living in fishing-dependent communes particularly in the Great Lake areas is about 75.6 kg/person/annum, compared with the national average that ranges between 30-40 kg/person/year. These consumption figures indicate that the inland fisheries of Cambodia contribute more to the national food balance than any other inland fisheries in the world.

Bearing in mind that the fisheries sector is crucial to people's livelihoods and the national economy, the Royal Government, during its second mandate, achieved significant reforms in many areas, especially in the fisheries sector. In the third mandate, the Royal Government will continue to promote fisheries reforms by designating fisheries as one side of the Rectangular Strategy. Let me brief your Excellencies, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen about fisheries reform in Cambodia. In October 2000, the Prime Minister of the Royal Government of Cambodia initiated historical change in the fisheries sector by releasing more than 56 percent (536 302 hectares) of fishing lot concession areas for local people to organize community fisheries. The purpose of this reform is to promote broad local participation in fisheries management and the efficient, sustainable, and equitable use of living aquatic resources. This reform was received enthusiastically by many people, especially those who live inside or near fishing lots.

Subsequently, a sub-decree on community fisheries management was prepared and put out for broad public consultation. After more than 4 years of consultation, the sub-decree was signed by the Prime Minister on 10 June 2005. The community fisheries sub-decree provides direction to set rules and establish legal procedures for co-management of community fisheries throughout the Kingdom of Cambodia. Roles and responsibilities of community fisheries, the Ministry and Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, and the Department of Fisheries are clearly established in the sub-decree, in which MAFF has general jurisdiction over community fisheries management.

To support implantation of the sub-decree on Community Fisheries Management, the Department of Fisheries has prepared draft guidelines on community fisheries, and samples of by-laws, management plans, and community fisheries agreements. The Department of Fisheries plans to put these documents out for public review and consultation in order to solicit ideas from key players and to promote community participation in the preparation of these legal instruments before sending them to MAFF for the official approval.

The finding from the fisheries policy reform impact assessment conducted by the Department of Fisheries and supported by the Department of International Development, provides basic information on how fisheries policy reform impacts poverty, fisheries resources, food security, gender and aquatic ecology. Generally, fisheries policy reform has a positive impact on those aspects, even though there are some concerns. However, it is difficult to generalize the impact of fisheries reform in a short period of time because it is diverse and highly dependent on the situation and local conditions. Therefore, additional studies and investigations will need to be conducted as time passes and reforms are more firmly established.

So far, almost 400 community fisheries have been established in Cambodia with cooperation and support from the national and international organizations and agencies. However, we have faced many constraints and challenges in the process of the fisheries reform, including the limited community fisheries experience and financial support for community fisheries activities. Under its 2005 priority action plan, the Department of Fisheries, in collaboration with national and international organizations and agencies, intends to strengthen the capacity of the community fisheries by building the capacity of fisheries officials, local authorities, and community fisheries organizations through training, workshops, and study tours and share learning of experiences from community fisheries around the world.

For existing community fisheries, DOF will support the development of by-laws, CF management plans and CF area agreements and try to finalizing draft fisheries legislation. We will also strengthen community fisheries by building capacity of the CF committees, increasing public awareness of the national resource management and protection issues, and by disseminating the sub-decree on community fisheries management and fisheries law. DOF will also promote the establishment of additional community fisheries organizations in fishing grounds that have been segregated from fishing lots, protected areas, reservoirs, and community fisheries refuge ponds.

This Workshop is very important for all of us in the region to share knowledge, experiences, and lessons learnt and I hope that this Workshop will promote active discussions and have a positive outcome that will be benefit all of us for the sake of community fisheries co-management. Cambodia has much less experience with fisheries co-management than other countries, which have had community-based management systems in place for many years. We hope Cambodia will learn from the experience of others at this Workshop.

Once again, I would like to express my deep appreciation for the presence of Excellencies, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen to the meeting today as well as the next two days of meetings. The presence of Excellencies, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen shows a strong commitment and regional cooperation in fisheries co-management.

In conclusion, I would like to wish Excellencies, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen great success, prosperity, happiness and a good stay in the Kingdom of Cambodia, the land of Angkor Wat. Without further delay, let me declare this Regional Workshop on Mainstreaming Fisheries Co-management open. Thank you very much for your attention and have a successful Workshop.

PRESENTATIONS ON CO-MANAGEMENT BY THE PARTICIPANTS

The Fisheries Resource Management Project: Philippine Experience

Jessica Munoz, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Philippines

The Fisheries Resource Management Project (FRMP) being implemented by the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of the Philippines aims to address the issues of fisheries resource depletion and poverty among municipal fishers. The Project is composed of three components, namely: fisheries management, income diversification and capacity building. Eighteen bays which were assessed as heavily exploited were chosen as project sites. The implementation of the Project is being done by existing organizational structure at the national, regional and local levels. This is to ensure that no additional layer is placed in the bureaucracy. Furthermore, existing organization and manpower can readily assume the implementation of project activities when the Project phases out. The FRMP adheres to the concept of community-based fisheries management. However, by the nature of its institutional arrangement and major activities, it is largely a co-management in nature, with the national government playing an active role in project implementation.

The Project had undertaken various activities that involved the fishers, local government units and the community as a whole. Fishers and local government units are involved in fisheries management planning and implementation. The community-based law enforcement involved volunteers are deputized as fish wardens to establish the Fisheries Law Enforcement Team. Fishers participated in the information, education and communication campaigns. The promotion of income diversification was achieved through the organization of self-reliant groups in the coastal community. Prospective beneficiaries of livelihood projects were trained and given financial support. NGOs were engaged to undertake community organizing with the aim to assist in the social mobilization of fishers. At present, people's organizations composed of fishers have availed of the livelihood projects offered by the Project. The Project has also invested a considerable resource for capacity building. Fishers and local government unit staff were trained in various aspects of fisheries management.

The implementation of FRMP showed the national government's desire to veer away from the traditional fisheries management where the national government formulates policies and implement projects and activities, to a regime that promotes the empowerment of the fishers and the community. Fisheries management involves processes that may seem unending and repetitive. However, fisheries management practitioners should bear in mind that fisheries co-management is not achieved overnight and that the success or failure of fisheries co-management will depend on how the various players did their roles and responsibilities in relation to the overall management framework.

A Historical and Institutional Overview of Fisheries Management in Japan

Mitsutaku Makino, Fisheries Research Agency, Japan

Until the Early Feudal Era (about 1700) Coastal waters were considered to be extensions of the land, and villages were responsible for establishing rules governing local resource use (i.e. autonomous management body). Offshore areas were basically open access. Later Feudal Era (about 1700-1868) labor-intensive and capitalized fisheries developed (beach seine fisheries, large set-net fisheries). A few fishermen monopolized coastal fishery. In the Offshore area, large-scale fisheries operators established their own guilds and made rules, protected by feudal lords.

Modernization Period (1868-1900) – In 1854, Japan abolished the national seclusion policy of 200 years, and Feudal Era ended in 1868. New government carried out dramatic modernization of

institutional framework. As for Fishery, introduction of the Top-Down, centralized license system in 1875, and dissolved into chaos. Meiji Fishery Law 1901-1945 First law that put fishing rights and licenses in a statutory form. Rights were granted to local fishermen's organizations and individuals. The nature of rights was property rights. Especially after the amendment in 1910, these were exclusive rights concentrated to a few big right holders.

Fishery reform after the WWII (1945-1949). Under the Allied Occupation, sweeping changes in national institutional framework (e.g., current constitution). Allied Power requested democratization of the fishery. To cope with domestic food shortages, and to improve the economic status of the fishermen actually engaged in fishery operations.

The current fishery law (1949-). The fundamental concept (Section 1 of the law) is "the holistic utilization of sea areas". To arrange and coordinate various fishing operations within a certain area from an overall point of view, not from the viewpoint of each economic unit. Various levels and scales of coordinating organizations have been instituted. Fishing rights are not exclusive real rights, but limited real rights (subject to limitations set out by coordinating organizations).

Coordinating Organizations

Level	Organization	Function
National Level	Fishery Policy Council	The advisory body to the government for national level fishery coordination, design of national fishery policy, etc.
Multi-jurisdictional Level	Wide-Area Fisheries Coordinating Committees (WFCCs)	Coordination of resource use and management of highly migratory species. Also addresses Resource Restoration Plans.
Prefectural Level	Area Fishery Coordinating Committees (AFCCs)	Mainly composed of democratically elected fishermen. Coordination through the Fishery Ground Plan, Prefectural Fishery Coordinating Regulations, and Committee Directions.
Local Level	Local Fisheries Cooperative Associations (local FCAs)	Composed of local fishermen. They establish operational regulations (FCA regulations) that stipulate gear restrictions, seasonal/area closures, etc., according to local environment.
More Specialized Purpose	Fishery Management Organizations (FMOs)	Autonomous body of fishermen. FMO rules are more detailed and stricter than the FCA regulations.

Recent legislation and amendments

In 1990, Resource Management Agreement System (i.e. official support system for resource management by FMOs). Total Allowable Catch (TAC) since 1997 for 7 species and Total Allowable Effort (TAE) (since 2001). In 2001, Basic Law on Fisheries Policy: new policy framework for the 21st century (Resource rehabilitation plan. The target self-sufficiency: 53 to 66 percent in 2012).

The role of local government

Responsible for the administrative procedure, and give scientific and legal advice. 130-150 staff in Prefectural fisheries division (about 80-90 of them are for research), only one policing boat (34 t, 5 crews). Annual budget: \$58 100 000 (including personnel expenses. About 0.4 percent of the prefecture total budget.)

Some emerging issues

- entry barrier and non-competitiveness
- governance of the coastal use (other user involvement)
- environmental stewardship
- coastal ecosystem management

A review of Various Tools for Fisheries Management and their Applicability to Asian Countries

Tadashi Yamamoto, Honorary President of Japan International Fisheries Research Society

This was a review of various tools for fisheries management and their applicability to Asian countries. The presentation highlighted the dual nature of small-scale and industrial fisheries in Asian countries, and the different objectives and characteristics in terms of fishing labour. It was also noted the different management tools and different principles of policy for management. In small-scale fisheries should be managed on a decentralized process, using fishing rights and licences only to some extent. In industrial fisheries management should be more centralized and use fishing licences only.

A number of different management tools were outlined, such as TACs, Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs), group user rights, etc., and for each one their main characteristics in terms of whether such tools are top-down or bottom-up management measures, the extent to which central or local government (or a mix) should be responsible for them, and some issues relating to costs incurred by the government.

Fisheries Co-management in Cambodia

Ly Vuthy, Community Fishery Development Office, Department of Fisheries (DOF), Cambodia

Fisheries resources management in Cambodia is governed by the 1987 FIAT Fisheries Law (a new law is in the process of approval). The law specifies limited access fisheries (fishing lots, which are temporary spatial concession) and open system and open access fisheries (middle-scale and family fisheries defined by type of gear). Co-management, in the Cambodian context, is understood as a cooperative arrangement between the government and local communities and called community fisheries (CF). The establishment of CF is considered a process of learning by doing which may vary from one place and according to the actors involved. First experiences include:

- 1994: Community pond fisheries were supported by AIT in Svay Rieng Province.
- 1995: FAO Participatory Natural Resource Management Project includes in Siem Reap includes community-based fisheries management (CBFM).
- 1998: CFs were established in Kratie and Strung Treng Province.

When, after the initiation of the Fisheries Reform in 2000, 56 percent of the fishing lots were cancelled, to be managed by CF, a legal base and institutional framework needed to be provided. To facilitate this, a Royal Decree on CF establishment was signed by the King. The Royal Decree provided the legal basic for the Royal Government to issue the Sub-decree on CF Management, which defined roles and responsibilities of communities and state, given DOF/MAFF general jurisdiction over CF management. On the institutional side, the Community Fisheries Development Office was established in DOF to deal with the overall administration and facilitation of CF and Community Fisheries Development Units were instituted at provincial level.

As a result, CFs grew from 165 in 2001 to 386 now. However, the process is only in its initial phase, as 65 percent of the CFs have no by-laws and internal regulations, 75 percent lack clear delineation

of their community fishing grounds and 85 percent have no management plan, all of which are needed for approval of their legal status as CF.

Management of fisheries resources: Some experiences through involvement of communities in the Bay of Bengal region

Yugraj S. Yadava, Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-governmental Organization (BOBP-IGO), India

Phang-nga Bay, presents a good example of Government, BOBP, NGO and Community partnership in the management of resources. Governors and community leaders from three provinces signed an agreement to ban push nets and trawlers within the 3-km zone reserved for small-scale fisheries. Community members later adopted this as a bay-wide policy.

Eventually, a mangrove reforestation programme in 35 villages of Phang-nga Bay was initiated, a cadre of volunteers for surveillance was set up, revolving funds created and training of fisher folk in data collection and public hearings organized. These became regular features of the activities in Phang-nga Bay.

The format for discussions (community-government dialogues) actually influences the type and content and outcomes of the dialogues.

Conclusions and lessons learnt

The fisherfolk requested the Department of Fisheries Thailand (DOF Thailand) to consider the entire Bay to be included in the Department of Fisheries/Bay of Bengal Programm/Community-based Fisheries Management project (DOF/BOBP CBFM) so that the communities could better decide on planning the fishing rights within the Bay and allocation of areas to certain uses, fishing gear and perhaps zoning schemes.

Consensus was reached on including setting objectives for multiple uses of the Bay's resources and finding sustainable activities and income that are environment friendly. The initiative was seen as a major step towards changing the old course of the top-down approach to bottom-up approach and shared responsibility.

Kanniyakumari, India

Implemented in a tripartite arrangement with BOBP as the 'think tank' and resource manager, Government of India (GOI) as facilitator and State Governments as implementor with the communities at the core of the programme.

Fisherfolk appreciated use of participatory tools and approaches that helped them comprehend the realities about fishing pressures.

Series of stakeholder meetings eased tension in relationships between the three major groups of boat owners – *kattamarams*, *vallams* and motorised boats.

Participatory Research Approach (PRA) tools were quickly picked up by community members.

Grassroots level government staff appreciated and used the CBFM as it brought them 'closer' to communities.

Conclusions and lessons learnt

- because of the larger size of the participating states (larger than many small countries), logistics, funding and time frame are constraints.

- conflicts were not eliminated but there was better understanding of each other's situations.
- panchayats (local self-governing bodies) were not fully involved in decision-making.
- bureaucracy sometimes made the process cumbersome.
- participatory processes, though very efficient, at times may be time consuming and more costly.

Pulao Payar, Malaysia

There were 2 projects – (i) Special area management plan for Pulao Payar Marine Park, a local level activity and (ii) Coastal fisheries management at national level:

- training of stakeholders in management of marine parks.
- local coastal zone management workshops.
- collection of data in the marine park and establishing committees.
- marine park council established.

Conclusions and lessons learnt

- Consultations with ALL stakeholders are vital.
- More in-depth discussions at planning stages to ensure consensus and ownership of the process itself.
- The level of awareness increased significantly.

Points to Ponder

What differentiates between co-management, community-based management and participatory approaches to management? Basically they are interchangeable expressions defined as:

“A situation in which two or more social actors negotiate, define and guarantee among themselves a fair sharing of the management functions, entitlements and responsibilities for a given territory, area or set of natural resources” (Feyerabend et. al., 2000)

Are there parallels that can be drawn between the two CBFMs (Fisheries and Forestry)? Is CBFM (Fisheries) trying to “reinvent the wheel” at times and not making the most by learning from other sectors particularly forestry where co-management successes are ahead of fisheries.

Unlike in the forestry sector, where “ownership” of forests have been given to communities (communal property), fisheries lags behind. “Social communication” is a major instrument in the success of CBFM, how much of this has been practiced is still to be determined.

“Learning by doing” also involves a lot of trial and error. Who pays for it? CBFM may help with tools and guiding principles and may not concretise “models” because of the vast differences in culture and traditions – countries like India could be an example.

The Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC)

Peter Stephen, Capacity Building Coordinator, RECOFTC, Thailand

RECOFTC was established in 1982 amidst growing calls for a training and capacity building institution to support community forests – this is a similar situation we are facing in fisheries today....

Mission statement:

“To enhance capacities at all levels to assist people of the Asia-Pacific region to develop community forestry and manage forest resources for optimum social, economic and environmental benefits”

RECOFTC structure

- capacity building services
- regional analysis and representation
- country program support
- program planning and delivery

Our (enabling) environment

- 80 percent of the world’s poorest (living on less than US\$1 per day) depend on forest resources for their livelihood.
- 377 million ha or 22 percent of all forests in developing countries are owned by communities. This figure may reach 540 million ha or 45 percent by 2015.
- forest-owning communities invest between US\$1.3 billion and US\$2.6 billion in sustainable forest management per year.
- decentralisation, governance, partnerships, poverty and equity.

Our (challenging) environment – key findings from Community Forests (CF) status analysis:

- with regional economic growth.
- significant proportion of forestland is under some degree of community management.
- many countries **do have** supportive policies, but they are plagued with problems.
- many national institutions have been developed, but capacity is still inadequate.
- more forests are being placed under protected area status and **communities are losing access.**
- participatory approaches are used in fire management, community-private partnerships, production forest management. **There is no single model.**
- documentation and dissemination of sound science and traditional systems is still missing (and written in English).
- increasing trend to cross-sectoral linkages.

Co-management is founded in communication and relationships

Wolf Hartmann, Management of River and Reservoir Fisheries (MRRF) in the Mekong Basin, MRC Fisheries Programme, Lao PDR

Management is, above all, management decision-making

When talking about fisheries management, we immediately think of such things as control of effort, regulation of gear and, particularly in inland fisheries, the enhancement of habitats and stocks. This is, we are talking about the implementation of management measures. However, ‘management’ means, above all, decision-making on measures to be taken. *To manage* is to exercise “the right to regulate internal use patterns and transform the resource by making improvements”.

“It’s co-management or no management!”

While management decision-making can take place away from the resource user, his or her involvement in decision-making is essential for management implementation and compliance with measures which have been decided on. There is no successful management without user involvement, as I have written in 2000, “It’s co-management or no management!” There are no ‘managed fisheries’ on one and ‘co-managed fisheries’ on the other side. There are only ‘managed fisheries’ or ‘unmanaged fisheries’. Successful management incorporates elements of good governance (such as transparency, accountability, participation), which are characteristics of co-management. Co-management is good governance in fisheries management and development! So, again: Co-management is not an alternative to conventional management. It is something different. It is a different dimension in management. Management is the “*what* (is being done)”, co-management is the “*how* (it is being done)”.

Is co-management a permanent arrangement?

Through much of the ‘co-management year’ there is actually very little co-management. In Lao PDR for example, most of the time management is taken care of by users. Representative from the government are present, but not in a very dominant way. Co-management as a moment of joint decision-making takes place once a year, in a central meeting, with representatives from all levels (local to national) present.

Capacity-building for co-management has many dimensions

Self-organization of users is a prerequisite for them to become partners to a highly organized group of stakeholders – the government. We have seen that, even where user organizations have previously existed, they may have lost most of their earlier impetus. Developing or consolidating organizational routines and accompanying users in the implementation of such routines over a sufficiently long period is an essential part of capacity-building, where government organizations should play an important role. In the presentation on the situation of co-management in Cambodia it became very clear that organizing is not enough. Many organizations are ‘empty shells’. What is lacking are by-laws and regulations. By-laws and regulations are management institutions. Organizations are the hardware of management, they are visible. Institutions are the software; they are invisible, but essential. The most important ‘institution’ for local participation is the ‘management plan’. It is the basic concept for management planning, management monitoring, and further development of the management system (management plan adaptation).

Does co-management mean “communicative management”?

Communication between the management partners in co-management, that is, the users and the Government, is a precondition for participatory management. Joint learning and joint planning is one approach: The co-managers develop a common language. An important result of co-management planning and implementation has been that users feel content, as their opinions are heard and they are being taken serious as ‘specialists’ in their own right. However, it is also important to communicate whatever has resulted from the experiences so far obtained from participatory management to other members of the society, through radio broadcasts in Lao PDR, for example, and a booklet in local language on “How to set up Community Fisheries” in Cambodia.

Co-management capacity-building goes beyond the individual and the local

Capacity-building goes beyond the individual and specific groups. It is aimed to go across groups and communities. Not only government staff, but government staff and users! Not only men, but men

and women! Not only young adults, but children and the older people as well! Capacity-building also goes beyond the level of the individual water body. It goes from reservoirs and lakes to rivers and basins – all are interlinked! When “modeling” a river basin as part of a capacity-building exercise, we were surprised on how many such linkages exist!

Capacity-building goes beyond the local level. MRRF has developed a number of different formats of capacity-building which link communities between districts and provinces. It has developed and implemented, over a period of four years, a sequence of capacity-building on regional level on co-management in inland fisheries. These regional events are closely linked to national follow-up workshops, where participants evaluate “What is the same, and what is different?”, and “What can we use, and what not?”

Co-management: devolving management responsibilities but not funds?

It has become clear that the development of financial capacity is an important condition for the implementation of many, but not all, activities which are contained in jointly agreed management plans. This should be emphasized: Not all activities need funding, and it's usually not at the beginning that the funding question kicks in. Financial capacity means two things: 1) the user groups must be able to monitor finances and account for them; however, 2) they also must have access to funding. This is a difficult question in some of the riparian countries. Part of the co-management promise is, for Governments, to economize on management expenditure by bringing in community members to perform certain management tasks. So, as in all likelihood; funding can not always come from outside, the possibilities of “self-financing” has to be investigated. Therefore, important tasks in creating financial capacity are the identification and development of sources of funding by and for user communities. There are three major mechanisms tried out in the sites supported by us:

- 1) credit and savings schemes, through which, among other purposes, the implementation by users of management measures have been supported.
- 2) development of alternative or supplementary economic activities, promoted by management organizations, which, among other purposes, contributed to the funding of that organization.
- 3) taxation for the benefit of management organizations. This can be in the form of taxation of the fishery as such (as in a case in Vietnam), or of fish marketing. In Lao PDR the user organization and a private concession holder is authorized by the district government to charge fish traders a fee (tax) on fish marketed. This may have, potentially, four effects: a) making available sufficient funds for waterbody management; b) creating an incentive for fishers to market through their own/shared organization; c) create a group of active fishers who are all shareholders (“owners”) of catch destined for sale; d) discourage illegal fishing and marketing.

This would also be an example of creating financial capacity through institutional development.

Is co-management “no action, talking only”?

When doing the slides for this presentation, I suddenly realized that the photos showed exclusively group interaction. And I knew there would be this comment from the plenary: “So co-management is ‘no action, talking only’ (or NATO)?” Somebody said to me: “We can't only do co-management. We have to do something tangible, too...!” Most certainly! The co-management “promise” is to increase tangibility of our (conventional) management by maximising agreement and compliance by all concerned. Co-management is “conventional management ++”. It is *in addition* to what conventional management proposes. We are not suggesting substituting conventional management with a different

set of management activities. Co-management is doing conventional management in a participatory way.

Some enabling socio-political prerequisites for co-management

Ulrich Schmidt, Observer, Cambodia

The concepts of co-management of fisheries are still poorly understood by many. Taking our definition that co-management:

“can be understood as a partnership approach where government and the fishery resource users share the responsibility and authority for the management of a fishery or fisheries in an area...”

It is evident that the platform where success or failure will be determined will be the interface of collaboration between government and users. We can imagine then two ends of a wide spectrum of relationships. In the (rather idealized) scenario there are two main features:

- user organization/communities that are fully empowered, (i.e. politically allowed to manage) and in terms of capacity (ability to manage – knowledge, communication, financial means), and
- government providing, as a sovereign function of state, the legal and regulatory framework and good governance/legality to enforce it impartially.

The interface between these will consist of a political dialogue to ensure compliance and adaptability. Here, co-management would be achieved based on a contract between the main players, considering also interest and needs of secondary sector stakeholders.

In today's reality (with few exceptions), where users, their institutions and communities are weak (or kept weak), empowerment will remain, for some time to come, largely externally (Government/Donor/NGO) driven, with probable negative effect on self-help capacities, high transaction cost and less potential for self-sustained locally evolved management (i.e. less incentives for Government and users to invest). In this situation, the emergence of a functional and increasingly balanced partnership will depend:

- on successful decentralization processes and other advances in societal developments (good governance, legality), to provide the climate of change, and
- a broad process of facilitation of slowly increasing effective and responsible participation of empowered resource user organizations in co-management.

Among others, the following factors may be of critical importance here:

- being externally driven (initially at least), facilitation of co-management will generally be a top-down process.
- the process of gradually changing this to a more bottom-up effort will be slow. In many cases, it will imply a trade-off, that balances excess external inputs (with detrimental effects on self-esteem and self-help capacities of the users) with inadequate/ineffective resources (financial/capacity which result in lack of progress, frustration, and risking the arrest of the process all together)

Under the conditions of imperfect governance, which often characterize the social context of small-scale fisheries, appropriation and extraction of natural resources may involve some degree of

political-economical opportunism by influential or powerful interests. If this results in outsiders harvesting the resources managed by communities and user organizations without permission and/or compensation, it will make completely disincentivize any efforts towards sustainable resource use, by both government and users.

Many communities and user organizations are effected by poverty and inherent hierarchical/paternalistic structures, which imply the risk of elite capture within the communities, endangering legitimacy of representation and democratic decision-making. If not confronted effectively by improved communication and learning and the establishment of basic democratic processes, this may have grave effects on benefit distribution and, thus, the acceptability of co-management by the majority of the resource users.

Coastal Resources Co-Management Dimensions: Tentative definition of indicators for projects regional portfolio sharing

Yves Henocque, Co-Director and Kamonpan Awaiwanont, Training Coordinator, Coastal Habitats and Resources Management Project (CHARM-EU), Thailand

As underlined in the rationale of this regional Workshop, successes and failures of past and current coastal resources co-management efforts are often poorly or non-documented. Drawing lessons from this growing body of experiences in the region is still a slow and difficult process for lack of readily available documents that analyse how the differences in project design and implementation are influencing outcomes. There is a growing need to learn from one another's experience and develop features of coastal zone management projects that work successfully.

Although some evaluation tools have been developed for project performance, outcome, and management capacity assessments, involved communities are rarely involved in these evaluation processes. It is thus proposed to develop with concerned communities, a strategy that will link their activities in a "learning portfolio" about the conditions under which a co-management approach to habitats and coastal resources is most effective. A learning portfolio's net impact should become far greater than the sum of its parts.

To allow this added benefit of cross-learning from site experiences to happen, a common language and framework of action are needed, in other words a "social contract" or a mutually developed agreement that governs how the portfolio functions. It would include a statement of the vision of the portfolio, outlines ideas of what the members of the portfolio will do together, and describes the obligations and benefits of being a member. After presenting the general concept and some examples of a learning portfolio, it is proposed to practically start developing a common coastal resources co-management learning framework in the region.

Five key attributes

- participation
- partnerships
- integrated approaches and methods
 - *integration of science with policies*
 - *combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches to resource management;*
 - *integration between large- and small-scale management*
 - *integration among sectors and disciplines*
- learning and adaptation
- building capacity

Main issues at stake

- **institution building** – *in the sense of institutional process and property rights for conservation of natural resources.*
- **institutional integration** – *in the sense of a clear definition of roles, rights and duties within and between organizations.*
- **management capacity** – *in the sense of achievement rate of CRM projects in the community/ local government plans.*
- **representation and participation** – *in the sense of the mechanism that effectively allows a good representation and participation of the diverse groups.*
- **knowledge production** – *in the sense of the knowledge the community has about its own natural resources and habitats.*
- **behavioural incentives** – *in the sense of accountability of leaders and access to loans through saving groups.*
- **conflict resolution** – *in the sense of accommodation of groups diversity towards common objectives.*
- **operational support** – *in the sense of existence of more or less developed saving groups and other funding mechanisms.*

The Wetlands Alliance – Building local capacity for sustainable wetlands management

Nick Innes-Taylor, Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) Outreach, Thailand

Brings together strengths of four institutions (AIT, WWF, WorldFish Center, CORIN) in:

- education
- training
- conservation
- development
- research
- focusing on poverty and wetlands in and around the Mekong region
- based on existing collaboration

Focusing on **the importance of aquatic resources** which are a key element in poor people's livelihoods, but relatively little is known.

Aiming to develop and support local management capacity and mitigation. Local development agencies can begin to work more effectively for poverty alleviation, even if their resources and information are limited.

The alliance will work towards institutional policy change. Local agencies are ideal partners for adapting and applying knowledge gained by working the alliance.

Building local capacity for co-Management

- a learning approach to aquatic resources
- participatory approaches for district offices/extension workers
- working from what's known and what's been done
- building understanding and awareness of conservation
- promoting poverty-focused agenda

Thai Baan village research as a mechanism for improving stakeholder and government dialogue
Richard Friend, Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Programme (MWBP), Lao PDR

How to negotiate between stakeholders, who are often faced with conflict, lack of trust, lack of information?

Thai Baan is a research approach in which local people themselves define and carry out all research activities. It builds on local knowledge and experience for assessment, monitoring and management of natural resources.

Thai Baan in Songkhram, Thailand

Arose as a Thai NGO and controversial origins over water infrastructure projects. Thai Baan in Songkhram supports decentralized planning and management. It is working with Tambon – Subdistrict Administration Organizations (schools, academics, district and provincial government) with 240 villagers (village researchers) from 4 villages in Nakhon Phanom Province

Thai Baan research topics

- ecosystems
- fish species
- fishing gear
- flooded forest (*pa bung pa tham*) vegetation
- river bank agriculture and water management
- livestock

Thai Baan achievements

- provides information that is not otherwise easily available
- allows local people to develop a better understanding of their environment
- allows local people to represent their interests and needs for better informed planning and decision-making
- partnership with local government, different resource users
- inclusion in provincial strategic plans

Future implications

Monitoring and assessment as part of the management process. It was noted that it is important in Thai Baan research to feed back information to other communities in the river basin. In part this is happening with the results being incorporated into local curricula, and with networks being developed in the region.

Promoting Fisheries Co-Management in Southeast Asia: SEAFDEC Approach and Directions
Suriyan Vichitlekarn, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) Secretariat, Thailand

Background

- 2001 Resolution and Plan of Action on Sustainable Fisheries for Food Security
- Regionalization of CCRF and Regional Guidelines

- ASEAN-SEAFDEC projects
 - decentralization and rights-based fisheries
 - human resource development for fisheries management
 - fishery statistics and information
 - resource enhancement

Co-management – perspective

- co-management and regulatory fisheries (rights-based fisheries)
- licensing system → large-scale fisheries
- group user rights → small-scale fisheries

Co-management – ways forward

- national consultation as a process to review systems and practices
- dialogue with and support from policy-makers
- regional guidelines on co-management for small-scale fisheries using group user rights
- develop initiatives/tools to support national mainstreaming of co-management for small-scale fisheries (2006-2010)

Co-management and issues related to access: the case of “outsiders”

Eric Meusch, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Lao Programme Office, Lao PDR

Local people, when identifying emerging problems related to aquatic resources management, often associate many of the problems identified with “Outsiders”. The term outsider can include a wide range of people depending on the context, but it generally means those people from outside the administrative or decision-making sphere of the implementing group. Whether outsiders are people from the next village or from a foreign fishing vessel, they can pose a significant threat to local resource management regimes. The basic issue is that decisions made by one group of stakeholders may not influence the behavior of the other groups of stakeholders that are also using the resource.

Given this fact, institutionalizing local management through a co-management arrangement can be an important tool in providing local communities recourse against intrusion from outside groups who have less interest in resource management. Although local people may agree among themselves concerning various access restrictions (area-based, gear-based, seasonal, etc.), they have little influence over outside groups without support of government at various levels. By getting communities and local governments to work together in a co-management arrangement, local people are less likely to conflict directly with outsiders because of the role that government can play in supporting locally initiated rules and mediating conflicts.

In other cases, however, a co-management arrangement can benefit outside groups that have a legitimate stake in resource use and management. Groups with traditional, seasonal, migrant access patterns can potentially be excluded by local villages in attempts to limit fishing pressure. This can unintentionally place biases against certain, often marginalized, groups who are unfairly impacted by management decisions. Government can play an important role in insuring that traditional access rights of outside groups are respected in co-management arrangements.

Outsiders are often considered threats to community-based natural resource management initiatives, a problem that co-management arrangements can help resolve by including government agencies at the appropriate level of authority. This can help support community management activities where

outside threats come from outside the community's sphere of decision making and influence. It can also assist in securing the rights of legitimate outside stakeholders who have been excluded by local-based management bodies.

Co-management, poverty alleviation and controlling access

Susana Siar, FAO Fisheries Department, Rome, Italy

Small-scale fisheries maybe full-time, part-time or seasonal. In particular open access may be perceived to guarantee the “right to survive” of everyone, particularly the poor. Whilst open access may seem to benefit everybody, a result is that with nobody actually responsible for sustaining the resource, there is a tendency towards overfishing and over capacity. The FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries offers the following general guidance to States:

- prevent overfishing and excess fishing capacity
- preferential access to traditional fishing grounds and resources
- not to allow any vessel to fish unless so authorized
- institutional and legal frameworks to determine possible uses and govern access

The FAO “Increasing the Contribution of Small-Scale Fisheries to Poverty Alleviation and Food Security” (Technical Guidelines) also encourage States to end free and open access through input or output controls. The challenge is how co-management can lead to control of access and at the same time guarantee the “right to survive” of the poor? Co-management may not directly lead to poverty alleviation and does not automatically result in access control.

What can be done?

<p>Stakeholders Through stakeholder analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● targeting the poor and organizing them into a stakeholder group ● building confidence and capacity 	<p>Assigning user rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● maybe individual or community rights ● identification, registration, and licensing of fishers ● regulating the number of boats, gear, licenses, fishing effort, or the amount of catch
<p>Livelihoods Livelihoods diversification and micro-enterprise development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● microfinance to support livelihoods diversification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● human resource development
<p>Legislative Framework Policy statement and legislation supporting co-management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● devolution of authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● collection of data for sound decision-making: socioeconomic, demographic, bio-physical, local knowledge, production ● monitoring and impact assessment

Empowerment of Coastal Fishing Communities for Livelihood Security (GOB/UNDP/FAO Project: BGD/97/017)

Zafar Ahmad, National Project Director, Empowerment of Coastal Fishery Communities (ECFC), Bangladesh

The primary target group are coastal fishers both men and women who are poor and disadvantaged section of the society and most prone to recurring natural disasters and sea borne accidents.

The immediate objectives of the project are: to assist the communities organize themselves into village level organizations, that are self managed and self directed; to introduce various economic and community welfare activities which are operated and managed by their organizations; and to facilitate sustainable conservation and management of coastal, marine and estuarine fisheries resources and habitats by the communities thus empowered.

Outcomes/Impacts

Organization of fishing communities

Fishing communities of 117 coastal villages are organized into 248 village level organizations (123 men and 125 women covering about 20 000 households). Village organizations connected and linked through the network of Upazilla and District level federations. Realizing the benefit of organization, 8 new villages have come forward to join the project.

Self reliance and self sustaining organizations

Savings as initial activity of organization: US\$156 816 (as on May 2005), being used as credit to members for meeting emergencies/income generating activities. Fund for operation of Community Organizations (COs): US\$2 780 (as on May 2005). Welfare fund to support victim families: US\$13 722. US\$800 per family already given to 2 families for loss of lives by sea borne accident. US\$400 per family given to a family for death of mother during delivery. All these are contributing to confidence building and development of self reliance.

A bottom up election procedure is followed to induct honest, dedicated and efficient worker in the executive committees of COs. The concept of "VO Leadership" has been changed to "Shebok" – a designation that implies sacrifice, not position. Inducting District Fishery Officers (DFO) and Upazilla Nirbahi Officers (UNO) in District Federation of Fishers (DFF) and Upazilla Federation of Officers (UFF)-Empowerment committees respectively as non voting members.

Mobilization and capacity building of District and Upazilla level GO partners

First ever in Bangladesh, the capacity of DOF officials has been built up on community empowerment. Moreover, several Upazilla level DOF officials have been trained with special technical training and study tour abroad.

Promoting income generation

Income generating activities (IGA) are aimed at reducing fishing pressure in the coastal and offshore waters. IGA supports are provided only after the required capacity is built up among the members. Till May 2005, a total of 4 773 families have been operating different small business. A total of 80 demonstrations on various village based business activities with successful operators done.

Micro Capital Grant (MCG)

Out of 117 villages 95 villages already constructed Village Development Committee (VDC), 95 percent of the MCG businesses operating well with only 12 MCG businesses have been fall in sick in terms of irregular pay back. About 5 000 beneficiaries got gainful employment through 421 business and resource re-generation related activities. Beneficiaries have earned a modest profit of more than US\$225 000 from MCG supported business. Beneficiaries have returned an amount of US\$60 220 to their respective Village Organizations or VDC accounts.

Promoting other welfare activities

46 primary schools are operating by communities in the project area. Class III in all schools and 6 new schools are running by exclusive VO supports. Awareness built up on PHC and WATSAN. More than 20 villages have achieved 100 percent sanitation, in other villages sanitation coverage within 60-80 percent range.

Fishers built up capacity to cope with natural disaster. Most significant preparedness for disaster is their US\$173 318 savings deposited in the bank. They have developed and introduced low-cost sea-safety device, demonstrated unprecedented preparedness in actual cyclone situation, also made others alert at midnight on getting tsunami signal.

Adequate awareness built up on legal aspects including Fish Acts and regulations, family laws and human rights. Public hearings have helped in bringing the communities, local government authorities, lawyers, Government Organization (GO) agencies including administrators and police officers at one platform for giving instant solutions to many lingering problems.

Community participated fisheries management or fisheries co-management introduced. Fishers now involved in planning, implementation and monitoring of fisheries related activities. All other stakeholders are also made partners in the process.


Coastal community radio programme introduced for the community and by the community aired.

Some considerations on empowerment

Blake Ratner, Regional Director, Greater Mekong Sub-region WorldFish Center, Cambodia

Empowerment is often conceived as something we (government, outside agencies, etc.) do to communities. This gives the impression of local (poor) communities as the receivers and outside agents as the providers. In my experience, however, the truest examples of community empowerment begin with local initiatives.

Nevertheless, there is much government and external agents can do to promote community empowerment. Much depends on the legal and governance framework in place, including aspects like devolution of appropriate authority and mechanisms for conflict resolution that have been discussed. Other aspects of the legal and governance framework that we have not mentioned but are equally important include protections for basic rights such as the freedom for a group to organize and to express its views publicly, and fair legal recourse (a functioning judicial system). At the local level, the capacities of community organizations, their linkages to other organizations, and the knowledge and awareness of community members contribute as well to empowerment, and are factors that outside groups can influence.



On the one hand, empowerment is an outcome of factors including these. On the other hand, empowerment is a process. As communities become more empowered, they are better equipped to advocate for improvements in the legal and governance framework, to create and sustain linkages, to improve their capacities further, etc. To promote community empowerment, governments need to think not just about what services they provide, but also how they respond when communities mobilize and seek change.

Enabling environment – empowering communities

Fermin Manolo, Community-based Coastal Resource Management (CBCRM) Center, Philippines

The case of the Community-based Coastal Resource Management (CBCRM) approach in the Philippines and the work of the CBCRM-Resource Center is based on a long history of social movement which has an environmental activism, from the 70's and the Environmental Movement which gained momentum since the 80's.

Legal/policy framework

Post Martial Law Constitution, 1987	Local Government Code of 1991	Fisheries Code of 1998
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • natural resources as state owned (Regalian Doctrine) • recognizing role of NGOs/Pos and community organizations in State decision making • preferential rights to small/artisanal fisherfolks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decentralization • participation of NGOs/Pos in decision making structures and processes of local government units including decision to allow national government project in any locality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-orientation of fishery management philosophy from maximization to sustainable management • allotting the 15 km municipal fishing ground to municipal or small fisherfolks • creation of Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council which provides for participation of fisherfolk organizations and NGOs as a recommendatory body to any local policy making pertaining to fishery

The creation of the above legal and policy framework and environment resulted from the intense effort of NGOs, social movement organizations and their allies inside government.

Community-based coastal resource management (CBCRM)

Based on the assumptions of the failure of State-led model of natural resource management and risks of purely market-led natural resource management, CBCRM adopts a User Manager Principle (i.e. community as resource manager). The guiding principles of the approach are: equity; community control; democratization of access and sustainable management.

The approach used is people centered and ecosystem-based management and has the following components:

- social preparation and community building/organizing
- education and capacity building
- resource management planning
- support for livelihood and capital resources mobilization
- research and knowledge building
- networking
- policy advocacy
- gender and development

The **Co-management value of CBCRM approach** is that it seeks to enable communities to effectively negotiate with other stakeholders and wrestle with antagonistic interest groups and; influence national and local government legislative and executive actions in:

- policy making and enforcement
- negotiation on with international bodies such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) (along with other civil society organizations)
- devolution of some authorities to fisherfolk organizations

The **CBCRM (now CBNRM) Resource Center** is an NGO that aims to distil and propagate knowledge generated from the practice of CBCRM in the Philippines. It contributes to theory building in coastal resource management, including community-based and co-management. The center also provides capacity building support to community fishery efforts in Asia through training, research, publication, community to community exchange, post tsunami rehabilitation.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ELEMENTS OF A CO-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Level	Description	Functions	Other agencies/groups (indirectly) involved	Skills/capacity development required
National Agency Responsible Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishery Department • National advisory committee on co-management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and amend legislation if necessary • Review and amend policy if necessary • Link with RFOs/donors/(I)NGOS • Links with other Gov Department • Direct co-management research activities required • Budget allocation • MOU/Agreements between related agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National fishers federation • Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment • Ministry of Investment and Planning • Ministry of Finance • National Rural Development Agency • National Law and Enforcement Agency • Bureau of local government • Coordinate on financial support • Fishery Research institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National level advisory committee • Basic concepts of co-management – national workshop (once off activity); literature esp. on success stories • Needs of the grassroots level; awareness of local issues
Provincial/State Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial fisheries department • Provincial co-management unit/committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of mgt plans coming up • Guidance on developing mgt plans going down • Monitoring and evaluation of co-mgt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Provincial departments (part of Provincial co-management committee) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts on co-management • Legal aspects of management • Planning & monitoring • Local issues • Conflict resolution • Training of trainers
Middle-level interface	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-district/district level; • possibly multi-sectoral; “co-management organization”! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of district mgt plans • Implementation of District mgt plans • Request specific advice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement staff • Local Gov administration • NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts of co-management • Awareness of local issues • Conflict resolution • Organization & Training of users • Training of local district committees

Level	Description	Functions	Other agencies/groups (indirectly) involved	Skills/capacity development required
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRA, institutional strengthening, formulation of management plans, group mobilization/dynamics, social savings, livelihoods <p>Note: Approach as LEARNING (learning by doing, exchange visits etc.)</p>
Aggregations/ Federations of villages/ communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federations of village groups (e.g. waterbody level; “community-based”) District Community (Fishery) organizations District/level representatives of users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represent members at meetings with middle-level interface. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concepts of co-management Awareness of local issues Self-organization for representation of members Conflict resolution and mediation
Local level/ communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village level groups (“community-based”) Possibly with occupational or gender sub-groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dev of local mgt plans Implementation of community mgt plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NGO/co-management facilitating organization. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Users Local level association – needs training; same as that of district level <p>Note: Should be seen as LEARNING (learning by doing, exchange visits etc.)</p>

ASIA-PACIFIC FISHERY COMMISSION
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Phra Athit Road, Bangkok, Thailand
www.apfic.org