

7 The Bondo Stakeholders' workshop, February 26th – 27th, 2001.

R. O. ABILA, C. LWENYA, J. OUKO, J. ONYANGO, V. OMBWA and C. OYARO
Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute, P. O. Box 1881, Kisumu, Kenya

7.1. Introduction

The Workshop proper opened at Bondo with several introductory presentations. Richard Abila introduced the various presenters. The participants were welcomed by Dr Wakwabi, the Deputy Director (Inland Fisheries) from KMFRI. He outlined the duties of the researchers at KMFRI. This was followed by the opening address presented by the Mr Mutai the District Commissioner, Bondo. Who expressed his pleasure that the meeting was convened in Bondo, and the importance of bringing this workshop to the stakeholders. The DC stated that the local economy relies very much on local fish production, especially with the collapse of crop production. Description of the struggle against 'bad' fishing gears, piracy and trawling.

Kim Geheb then briefly introduced himself and then led quickly to the session hosted by Mercy Kyangwa. Mercy reviewed progress of the LVFRP and commented on some of the emerging results from the biological and socio-economic work. This presentation was then translated into *kiswahili*.

The facilitators introduced the ground rules for the workshop.

- (a) Unique leadership
- (b) People-centred development
- (c) Conservation of resources for future heritage
- (d) Guarding against sinking deeper into poverty
- (e) Sustaining fisheries revenues
- (f) Sustainable livelihoods
- (g) Making or breaking the future for the people
- (h) Knowledge is power
- (i) Translating words into actions.

The participants took coffee at 1015hrs and reconvened at 1100hrs. The facilitators introduced the questions that the various groups would have to work on to generate material for discussion. The groups then divided up to discuss the various questions and then report back.

7.2. Results

Is fisheries management necessary on Lake Victoria? Why? What should be managed?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors	Municipalities
<p>It is necessary, and its benefits are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Restoring the extinct fish species. Illegal fishing methods will disappear. Mature fish caught will fetch good prices, improving our economy. Pollution in the lake will be controlled. Employment will be created. Bans on fishing at certain times in certain places will allow fish to grow to the recommended sizes. 	<p>Yes, it is necessary, so as to maximise fish production, exploitation and conservation on a sustainable basis to achieve optimum economic benefits to the riparian fishing communities and the industry. The benefits of such action are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation and sustainability are established on Lake Victoria. Conservation of the environment on Lake Victoria. Sustained economic benefits accruing from the fishery. Improved quality of life amongst lakeside communities. Promoted economic development and growth, i.e. generated income and employment opportunities. Growth of tourism and recreational facilities (schools, fishing vessel construction etc.). Encouraged savings and innovative investment culture to reduce poverty amongst fishermen. Reduced rural-urban migration amongst fishermen. Strengthened food security to lakeside communities. Improved infrastructural facilities, e.g. roads to beaches, mobile phones etc. Reduced malpractice and general security within fishing communities. 	<p>Yes. The following are the benefits of such management.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Create awareness amongst stakeholders of the need for fisheries management. Fish in the lake will be protected, and so be able to increase in number and grow into fish big enough to benefit the fishers. Provide security in the lake to curb malpractice within the industry, such as using wrong gear, poisoning fish, piracy and protection of fish breeding areas. Protect the environment around the lake which are also good breeding grounds for fish, e.g. papyrus, reeds, water lilies, etc. Provide proper sanitation at the landings. Protection by the lake communities of the waters of the lake from pollution, i.e. chemicals from factories and human beings. Make byelaws to protect the lake from wrongful use. Assist the fishers to form and join co-operative societies and have banking facilities to enable them to save and borrow. Co-operatives to provide a voice for fishers, marketing, control of prices, and storage of fish. 	<p>1. Ensures the sustainability of resources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement of the economy, i.e. earning a living and foreign exchange. Creation o employment opportunities. Tourist attraction. Promotion of good national and international relationships. 	<p>Yes, because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The local authorities get cess from fish. It empowers the fisherfolk who in turn open businesses for self income. Improves peoples' economic conditions.

Is fisheries management necessary on Lake Victoria? Why? What should be managed? (Cont.)

Women traders/ processors	Researchers/NGOs	Co-operatives group
<p>Yes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The problem is that the small fish are being caught in small mesh-sizes. 6. Very many people have moved from other lakes, bringing with them bad fishing methods like mono-filaments and beach seines. 7. Management is still needed because we still need restrictions on what fish can be landed. 8. The government should provide proper sized nets on Lake Victoria. <p>What should be managed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Enforcement of laws. 7. Security. 8. Fish and human resources. 9. The government should introduce identity cards for fishermen on Lake Victoria. 10. Corrupt officers from the Fisheries Department and fishermen should be caught because they encourage bad fishing methods through bribery. 	<p>Yes, for the following benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable exploitation. 2. Order in the exploitation of fisheries resources. 3. Source of livelihood for those involved in the fishery in terms of employment, food and trade. 4. Increased revenue earnings. 5. Conservation biodiversity. 6. Monitoring of trends and levels of exploitation for the purposes of planning and policy formulation. 7. High quality fishery products, and high water quality. 8. Maintenance of a safe environment. 	<p>Yes, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure food security in the region. 2. Steady source of income for the communities on the lake. 3. Sustainability to ensure long-term food security.

Who are the stakeholders in fisheries management?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors	Municipalities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fisherfolk/fishers. 2. Fisheries Department. 3. Local authorities. 4. Marine researchers. 5. Local administration. 6. Fish processors (fish mongers). 7. Ministry of Health through the Public Health Department. 8. Donor community and NGOs. 	<p>Government departments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FD 2. KMFRI, and other research institutes, such as KARI. 3. Forestry Dept. 4. KWS 5. Water Department. 6. Provincial Administration. 7. National Environmental Secretariat. 8. Local authorities. 9. Co-operative societies. 10. Regional development authorities e.g. LBDA. <p>Non-governmental stakeholders</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fishers. 2. Fish traders and mongers. 3. Artisanal processors. 4. Industrial processors. 5. Consumers. 6. Gear manufacturers. 7. NGOs such as OSIENALA. 8. Fish transporters. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fishers. 2. Fish mongers. 3. Fish processors. 4. Co-operatives. 5. Local authorities. 6. Provincial administration. 7. Fisheries Department. 8. The researchers – LVFRP, KMFRI. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fisher's group. 2. Processors/traders. 3. Consumers (local and international). 4. Government e.g. FD, Health Dept. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fishers and fish mongers. 2. Local authorities. 3. Fisheries Department. 4. The community. 5. The Environmental Department.
<p>Women traders/ processors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fisherfolk. 2. Investors in fishing activities. 3. Processors and exporters. 4. Fisheries Department. 5. Importers. 	<p>Researchers/NGOs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Researchers. 2. Fishers. 3. FD 4. Local authorities. 5. Industrial fish processors. 6. Industries in the Lake Basin. 7. Co-operative societies. 8. NGOs and CBOs. 9. Consumers. 10. Development partners. 	<p>Co-operatives group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Riparian communities with their organisations. 2. Government agencies (ministries). 3. Local and international NGOs. 4. Processors and exporters. 5. Donors. 		

What should be managed in fisheries management?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors	Municipalities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Security of people, items, piracy and breeding areas. 2. Pollution of the lake environment. 3. Illegal fishing methods e.g. bad gear and poisons. 4. Night fishing. 5. Control of fish nets sizes i.e. width of nets and pites. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fish species, amount and size. 2. Fishers, fish traders and processors. 3. Environment and protection of breeding areas. 4. Fish methods and gear. 5. Fish collection centres (landings). 6. Control of the introduction of fish and aquatic plants. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lake and rivers: fish and fish breeding areas. 2. The fishers: their resources, boats, fishing gear, and their welfare: pricing, savings and loans. 3. Beaches: bandas, shade and sanitation. 4. Finances: co-operatives – shares, dividends and bonuses. 5. Environment: removal of water hyacinth and any other harmful weed from the lake; lake poisoning by factories and communities; protect vegetation along the lake shores e.g. papyrus, trees, etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The aquatic environment, including the shoreline, breeding grounds and the whole water body. 2. Fish stocks by controlling fish catches. 3. The land surrounding the lake and water inlets. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fish breeding areas. 2. Where fish lay their eggs to hatch. 3. Fish methods. 4. Fishermen and fish dealers (licensing of them).

Women traders/ processors	Researchers/NGOs	Co-operatives group
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lake. 2. Fishing activities (employers and employees). 3. The environment: sewerage systems (e.g. towns and factories), river pollution and erosion, the benefits and profits from fishing and trading activities, the shoreline. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People and their attitudes to the resource, and over issues such as fishing activities (gear, where?), processing, handling and marketing) and industrial processing (fish sizes). 2. Attitudes and activities in relationship to environment, including industrial and agricultural effluent, wetland areas, sand mining and brick making, dams (hydro-electricity), dykes and the Mbita Causeway. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation measures to ensure the benefits noted above. 2. Fish breeding areas, which need deliberate protection. 3. Pollution control measures should be put in place.

What are the responsibilities of your group and those you have listed in fisheries management?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors and traders:	Municipalities
<p>Roles of fishers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protection of people, equipment, environment and illegal beaches. 2. Formation of vigilante groups to monitor theft, breeding areas, wrong equipment and items. 3. Formation of beach committees. 4. Formulation of byelaws governing the fishing industry. 5. Formation of a union to consolidate all fishers. <p>Roles of Fisheries Department</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protection of the lake. 2. Avail information relating to fishing grounds, procedures, periods and equipment. 3. Construction of fish bandas. 4. Educating the fishers on the laws governing the fishing industry. 5. Issuing of licenses. 6. Collection of data. 7. Scouts to monitor under-sized fishes being sold in markets. 8. Provision of patrol boats for rescue and surveillance. 9. Liaison with NGOs/GoK to provide fibreglass boats and an engineer at each beach to monitor their use. <p>Local authorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Control lake pollution. 2. Construction of sanitation facilities. <p>Marine/researchers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breeding areas surveillance. 2. Provision of life jackets. 3. Availing information on the good fishing areas. 	<p>Our group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To maximise fish production, exploitation and conservation on a sustainable basis to achieve optimum economic and social benefits to the riparian fishing communities. 2. The lake is a common property free for exploitation by all making it vulnerable to abuse and misuse. <p>Other stakeholders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Co-operatives: to organise fishers into workable groups. 2. Local authorities: to provide infrastructural facilities and trustees of the fish landings. 3. Kenya Wildlife Services: conservation of game reserves, form wetlands. 4. National Environmental Secretariat: to conserve the environment. 5. Provincial administration: dissemination of information and to provide security. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintenance and order. 2. Maintenance and provision of security. 3. Deliver and communicate government policies to our subjects. 4. We are role models: i.e. we should be the best fisherfolk in our localities. 5. Create awareness, initiate, supervise and monitor projects. 6. Ensure that the Chief's Authority Act is abided by all people in our jurisdiction as provided for under Cap. 128 (L.O.K). 	<p>Processors and traders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment of taxes through licenses and permits. 2. Provision of a link between fishers and consumers (buying and selling). 3. Adopt, develop and maintain quality standards acceptable to our customers. 4. To follow government's laid down regulations. <p>Fisher's group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using legal methods of fishing. 2. Adopt, develop and maintain the quality standards required by customers. <p>Consumers</p> <p>To provide information on quality specifications that should be in harmony with the government's requirements.</p> <p>Government</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Law enforcement. 2. Create public awareness e.g. extension services. 3. Harmonisation of the Fisheries Act with those of international regulations. 4. Construction and maintenance of infrastructural facilities. 5. Collection of revenue and taxes. 6. Provision of security. <p>Researchers</p> <p>Aquatic research and availing results to stakeholders.</p>	<p>My group's responsibilities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To protect the fisherman from exploitation. 2. To protect fish breeding grounds. 3. Enabling environment for the fishing industry and fishermen. 4. Sanitary and storage facilities. <p>Local authorities should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect the fisherman. 2. To provide an enabling environment for fishermen to do fishing. 3. To preserve fish breeding areas. 4. Provision of sanitation. 5. Water provision. 6. Cold storage provision. 7. Security on the lake in conjunction with the FD an the police. <p>FD:</p> <p>Enforce the fishing laws.</p> <p>Fishermen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should be responsible. 2. Should not destroy fish breeding areas and the environment. <p>Department of the Environment</p> <p>Should use harsher regulations.</p> <p>Fish groups:</p> <p>Provide education at the grass root level.</p>

What are the responsibilities of your group and those you have listed in fisheries management? (Cont.)

Fishers	Processors Co-operatives
<p>Local administration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of armed security along the borders. 2. Provision of security during meetings because fishers often fight. 3. Educating fishers through public barazas. 4. Ensure child labour is eradicated on the beaches. 5. Maintain law and order on the beaches. <p>Fish processors/fish dealers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marketing of the products. 2. Provision of gum boots, wheel barrows, overalls and gloves. <p>MoH – Public Health Department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure sanitation on beaches is up to standards. 2. Education on hygiene. 3. Provision of health certificates for fish handlers. <p>Donors/NGOs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building ice plants on every beach. 2. Provision of portable cold storage boxes to the fishers. 3. Provide grants to the fishers to help in the smooth change for new management. 4. Construction offish bandas to EU requirements. 5. Construction of roads to landing sites. 6. Organising workshops/seminars to educate the fisherfolk. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide savings and credit facilities to the fishers. 2. Develop and maintain sanitary conditions at the beaches.

What are the responsibilities of your group and those you have listed in fisheries management? (Cont.)

Women traders/ processors	Researchers/NGOs	Co-operatives group
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The creation and promotion of fish markets locally. 2. Good local sanitation. 3. Local security. 4. Employment opportunities. 5. Financing local activities. 6. Investment in fishing activities. 7. Co-ordination with other stakeholders. 8. Preservation of fish and their breeding areas. 9. Legislation of fishing rules and other regulations. 10. Creation of awareness through education and seminars amongst fishers. 	<p>Researchers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide recommendations and information on the status of the fishery. 2. Form linkages with the FD and other users. <p>NGOs:</p> <p>Through mobilisation, sensitisation, education and training to empower the communities.</p> <p>Fisheries Department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support relevant research activities, and identifying researchable areas (problem areas). 2. Formulation and implementation of laws. 3. Form linkages with researchers and other users of the fisheries resource. 4. Disseminate research findings to the fishing communities. 5. Collection of licensing and permit fees. <p>Fishers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct responsible harvesting of the resource (correct gear and FAO code of conduct). 2. They should be responsible and obey the fishing regulations, and they should stop other fishers from breaking the law. 3. To maintain the high quality of fish landed. 4. Provide information to researchers, and identify research areas. 5. Contribute to fisheries management through taxes to the FD. 6. Get involved in the formulation, implementation and reinforcement of regulations. <p>Local authorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Help in formulation and implementation of byelaws. 2. Set standards on pollution emissions. 3. Development of infrastructure at the beach level. 4. Multi-sectoral approaches to managing linkages to fisheries (NGOs and CBOs). 5. Local authorities could be used to define user rights in case they have a lakeshore boundary. 	<p>Co-operative group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide services such as marketing fish produce and assembling all fish in one place to ensure bargaining power. 2. Advocating to fishermen their duties and the fisheries regulations. 3. To ensure good sanitation and hygiene at the landings. 4. To ensure a maintained supply of quality fish through the provision of ice and ice containers. 5. To ensure that fish is properly handled. 6. To look after the welfare of fishermen. <p>The responsibilities of other stakeholders are to compliment the above.</p>

What are the responsibilities of your group and those you have listed in fisheries management? (Cont.)

<p>Researchers/NGOs</p> <p>Industrial processors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contribute finance to the research and management of the fishery. 2. Prevent marketing of undersized fish. 3. Responsibility towards the creation of fair and competitive markets (a social responsibility). 4. Development of infrastructure at landings (piers, roads and bandas) and landing bays and rafts so that EU standards can be met. 5. Enforcement of quality by paying good prices for high quality fish. 6. Giving true records of fish exported and their value. 7. Adherence to ISO standards and HACCP. 8. Obeying the laws. 9. Promotion of fish products in major world markets. 10. Identify an apex for marketing and quality control. <p>Other industries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gear manufacturers: production of legal gear, and monitoring and tracking who buys which gear and for what purpose. 2. Industries within the lake basin: to control effluent discharge, to develop the capacity to set pollution standards, and to obey laws on the pollution of aquatic systems. 3. Co-operatives: streamline fish marketing and the credit system for the fishers; contribute to beach development; promote good fishing practises and gear; develop collective bargaining power for fishers; fish traders should follow the rules by buying legally sized fish. <p>Development partners: help to fund development costs; help to fund the educational capacity of institutes; and provide equipment to institutions and the FD.</p> <p>Consumers: buy the right size of fish; buy good quality fish; offer good prices; assist in the development of a free and fair marketing system</p>

How should fisheries be managed (list a range of activities)? How can stakeholders co-operate together for the management of the fisheries?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors	Municipalities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Locally by the communities. 2. Formation of beach committees. 3. Formation of byelaws. 4. Security by vigilante groups. 5. Control of fishing activities. 6. Collection of levies to cater for management expenses. 7. Collaborate and define duties and roles each stakeholder should perform. 	<p>How? By involving all the stakeholders in managing Lake Victoria's resources.</p> <p>Activities: enforcing the Fisheries Act of Cap. 378, and obtaining consensus with stakeholders.</p> <p>How? Through co-management.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of awareness amongst stakeholders on the importance of fisheries management. 2. Initiate development for stakeholders. 3. The stakeholders should abide by and enact existing rules and regulations as provided in the Fisheries Act. 4. Every stakeholder to be accountable. 5. Co-operation amongst all stakeholders in fisheries management, and the sharing of responsibilities in the management of the lake. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By having a Fisheries Act, (a) creating public awareness on existing laws. (b) Law enforcement. (c) Through co-ordination between all stakeholders. 2. There should be room for interaction between all stakeholders, and creation of a unitary body (in all three countries) for all stakeholders. 4. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involvement of all the stakeholders. 2. Common objectives and responsibilities and efforts and team work.
<p>Women traders/ processors</p> <p>The fisheries laws should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An act of parliament. 2. Rules and regulations by the FD. 3. Byelaws drafted by the stakeholders should be given full legal backing. <p>Stakeholders can co-operate together when each and every one of them abides by the all the rules, regulations and byelaws governing LV.</p>	<p>Researchers/NGOs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All stakeholders should play their roles. 2. Harmonise and update the existing legislation in partnership with the local communities. 3. Provide latest information on stock density, and adjusting fishing effort when necessary. 4. Monitoring and enforcement. 5. Cease political interference in fisheries management. 6. Provision of research findings for public consumption. 7. Act on information available instead of delaying. <p>This can be enabled by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish linkages between stakeholders at national, regional and local levels. 2. Role identification of different groups and harmonise. 	<p>Co-operatives group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participatory management. 2. Research and information sharing. 3. Sanitation and environmental issues to be identified and addressed. 4. Theft and piracy on the lake need to be checked. 5. Use of proper and legal fishing gear. 6. Stakeholder co-operation to manage the fisheries. 7. A strong regional and national organisational framework for fishermen. 8. Organisation of regular consultative meetings or workshops. 		

What do you think are the costs of fisheries management and who do you think should pay for these?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors	Municipalities
1. Fuel. 2. Administration. 3. Maintenance of boats and engines, fish <i>bandas</i> and other equipment.	1. DSAs 2. Operations and maintenance. 3. Human resources development. To be paid by: 1. Government. 2. Development partners e.g. universities.	Costs: 1. Personnel. 2. Equipment/fuel. i.e. patrol boats and engines. 3. Security. 4. Rules and regulations from government and stakeholders. 5. Offices, stores, stationary and furniture. Who to pay? 1. The government: employ personnel, and provide security, build offices, stores, and provide equipment. 2. Fuel stationary and furniture should be cost-shared.	1. Human labour: skilled and unskilled. 2. Money – financial support. 3. Time. All stakeholders should finance these costs.	All stakeholders should contribute towards the cost of fisheries management as no single group can meet these costs on its own.
Women traders/ processors 1. Research costs. 2. Salaries and allowances for FD personnel. 3. Cost of equipment used by FD to carry out their activities. 4. Investment in fishing activities. 5. Cost of keeping the lake and its environment clean. All the stakeholders should pay for the management of the fisheries proportional to their profit and benefits from the lake.	Researchers/NGOs 1. Salaries for personnel, to be paid by the government and communities. 2. Treatment of discharge, to be paid by the polluter. 3. Equipment (boats etc.), to be paid by the government, processors, and local authorities. 4. Computers and facilities, to be paid by the government and development partners. 5. Training costs, to be paid by the government and development partners. 6. Research activities, to be paid by the government, development partners and processors. 7. Information generation, to be paid for by the government, communities, processors and NGOs. 8. Infrastructure, to be funded by the processors, the government and the communities. 9. Operational costs to be paid by local authorities, the government, communities and the processors.	Co-operatives group 1. Armed security personnel. 2. Patrol boats with engines. 3. Fuel and accommodation while out of station. 4. Proper fish <i>bandas</i> . 5. Bathing facilities. 6. Access roads. 7. Fencing materials. 8. Research: qualified personnel, proper equipment and instruments. 9. Community education and participation to ensure proper participation. 10. Use of correct gear.	Stakeholders should all share the costs of management.	

What are fisheries offences? How should the offences you identify be dealt with?

Fishers	Managers	Chiefs' group	Processors	Municipalities
<p>1. Offence: Theft of nets, boat engines and property. To be handled by: Beach committee and court.</p> <p>2. Offence: Illegal fishing methods. To be handled by: Beach committee and court.</p> <p>3. Offence: Piracy. To be handled by:</p> <p>4. GoK – Provincial administration.</p> <p>5. Offence: Destruction of property. To be handled by: Beach committee and courts.</p> <p>6. Offence: Poison fishing. To be handled by: courts.</p> <p>7. Offence: trawling. To be handled by: courts.</p> <p>8. Offence: licence. To be handled by: FD and courts.</p>	<p>Documented offences on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Use of illegal gear. Use of illegal craft. Use of illegal methods. Landing illegal fish sizes. Fishing without a license. Fishing in spawning and breeding areas. Fishing with unregistered vessels. Fishing during closed seasons. Landing fish in undesignated areas. Trading fish without a license. Handling fish unfit for human consumption. <p>Undocumented offences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Use of drift nets (<i>yembea</i>). Use of harpoon fishing methods. Use of cast nets (<i>tupa tupa</i>). Beating the water (<i>ochuado</i>). Trading in fish below the required minimum length (NP 50 cm., tilapia 25 cm.) Manufacturing, stocking and/or selling illegal gear. Maximum length of fishing craft should be specified. Number of fishing craft per fisherman should be specified. Maximum speed for fishing craft should no exceed 25 HP. There should be a code of conduct amongst fishermen. <p>These should be dealt with by the judicial arm of government by FD prosecutors.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Having illegal landing areas on the lake. Use of wrong fishing gear. Fish poisoning. Pollution. Piracy. Stealing nets. Interfering with fish breeding areas. <p>These should be dealt with as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> People caught committing these offences should be arrested and charged in courts of law, and should not be bonded. We feel that penalties should be harsher than they are at present. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Illegal gear. Destruction of breeding areas and shorelines. Unsanitary handling and processing of fish. Theft. <p>Punishment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Illegal gear should be destroyed immediately, and the offender charged at least the cost of the illegal gear and banned for fishing for 5 or more years. Fishing in closed areas: gear should be confiscated and offenders banned from fishing for at least 5 years. Default on permits: offender charged and fined at least half the cost of the permit and obliged to pay for a permit. Theft: gear returned to owner and thief jailed. Unsanitary conditions – ban from processing until offender meets sanitary conditions. Shoreline destruction: stopped immediately and offenders fined. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Destruction of under-size fish. Destruction of fish breeding areas. Trawling. Destruction of fish hatching areas. Pollution of waters by industries close to the lake shores. <p>These offences should be dealt with harshly.</p>

What are fisheries offences? How should the offences you identify be dealt with? (Cont.)

Women traders/processors	Researchers/NGOs	Co-operatives group
<p>Offences and how they should be dealt with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poisoning: imprisonment without option of a fine. 2. Fishing with an undersized net: boats out of the water for six months, and nets confiscated. 3. Trawling: Prohibited without conditions, and offenders fined Kshs. 500,000/- 4. Uncooperative fishers: denied boat and fishing licenses. 5. Fishing in prohibited areas: fine and boat out of water for three months. 6. Thuggery: denied a fishing license. 7. Fishing without license: taken to court and fined. 	<p>Researchers/NGOs No response.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overfishing. 2. Theft on lake and land. 3. Trawling. 4. Dangerous fishing, such as <i>katuli, seke seke, ochuado</i>. 5. Concealing information about unlawful activities. <p>These should be dealt with as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Application of law by chiefs and local authorities. 2. The introduction of 'fisheries offences tribunals' as opposed to tribunal lawcourts.

7.3. Comments and discussion from the floor

1. There is a high expectation in the plan that others will provide towards the management of the fishery.
2. If there is to be a transition from many of the local (and illegal) gear to legal ones, the fishers will go through much discomfort and they should be financially assisted with this. The fishers are being charged with many managerial responsibilities, and should also be paid for this.
3. The government is already strapped for cash, and it seems unfair that the government should provide additional funding. Do you not think that the fishers cannot contribute towards those things that will be useful for you all? There are many traders who are very wealthy – can they not contribute?
4. We should understand the earning capacity of the fishery, and change our attitudes, and co-operate together to ensure that some of the billions that are made remain with us. It is embarrassing that we should go to the government or the donors to ask them to build a toilet on our beach.
5. Perhaps training in money management would help.
6. We have no bargaining powers. There should be a law governing the industry to give the fishers this power. We need a leadership framework to enable us to look after our problems.
7. The legal framework he's talking about already exists. All the fishers have to do is to create a co-operative society.
8. Do the fishers think that they are competent to assume responsibility for all the managerial tasks that they have identified?
9. It is the central government that should control the 100m line parallel to the shore. The local authorities are suggesting a duplication of activities with those of central government. The speaker is also suggesting to tax the FD.
10. The municipalities want to invest more in the regulation of the fishery because of the FD's failure. We are for the service of the *wananchi*, and we take a cess from them, and the municipalities take it to benefit the fisherman.
11. I think it is high time that the local authorities came in full force to participate in the proper management of the lake. If you promise services, and take cess for it, then that is okay. Our municipalities on this lake are potentially the richest in the country. But you will be exploiters if you do not return services. We should see the municipalities as a source of rules, which they can make under the Local Authorities Act. The Fisheries Act does not give fisheries officers the right to prosecute – an officer can bring an offender, and they ask who brought the offender, and it is the beach leader. Then the magistrate says there is no provision for the beach leader in The Act. The municipalities can sort this contradiction out.
12. A facilitator says that the municipalities say that they are supporting the fishers. If it is practical, and they are helping them, then they deserve a round of applause. But theory and practice differ. The local authorities should take note of their responsibilities now. All stakeholders should be in the sharing of costs – but the strategy for sorting out the modalities of this must be sorted out.
13. Stakeholders should contribute towards the cost of managing of the fisheries. Would the processors contribute some of their big profits? Reply: the government taxes us in any case. Retort: we know this, but we pay a little extra, like toilets or bandas. If we pay a little extra, can you not? Can you not pay a small rebate? Can they not negotiate with established groups at the landings? Processors' response: If the fishing communities feel that they need assistance from the fish processors, they can approach the fish processor's association. These issues can then be looked in to. We already negotiate with established groups. When you sell your fish to the processors, and you agree with the prices, then the contract ends there, and if they make profit on it, then it's their business. If you want money to be ploughed back, then you should talk about establishing an organisation that has a relationship with the processors like tea farmers have with their tea authority.
14. The fish processors have costs before they export their fish. Let us look at what the fish processors incur before that they sell their fish.
15. We the processors want to make a plea regarding the handling of fish before it reaches the factory. It should be handled like an egg, to avoid damage to its flesh and muscles. You cannot see this damage on the outside of the fish, but we see it when we open the fish up. We also ask that the fish not be contaminated with sand, either by putting the fish on the ground, or putting sand inside it to increase its weight. We also ask that the fish is removed from the water and iced within eight hours of capture. If it stays in the water too long, it gets damaged.

16. Non-indigenous people own most of the factories. Can we not come together and set up something similar. A lot of money is flowing into the local communities, and this could be used to set up such an industry.
17. The fishermen say that they are being oppressed, while the processors say that the fishermen are willing sellers. In my view, the fisherman is being oppressed because he cannot keep the fish longer, so he sells it at a throwaway price. If he keeps it longer, then the fisherman can bargain. The fish processors should help us with ice, so we have a stronger bargaining position.
18. When my father was a fisherman, his business was to fill his family. He never accounted for anything, and many fishermen continue in this way. I have seen at a beach an ice box, and they could store the fish for up to three days – I think that container is very cheap. All the processors have to do is to bring the ice.
19. You people cannot come together, be solid and come up with a concrete solution so you can sell the fish at the price you want. If you come together and no one comes to you and says willing seller, willing buyer. Without the fishers, the processors are no more. *Tuwatche maneno ya kupigana* ('Let is stop arguing'). We must plan how to come together.
20. Nyanza province is the poorest in Kenya, and in Kenya some 50% of people live below the poverty line. And yet we have many resources. To level the playing field between the fishers and the processors, we should provide every beach with a good road, so that the fishers can take their fish to market, rather than waiting for the processors to come to them.
21. The processors themselves are shying away from us. They are not even here in the workshop – these are their representatives. We see the *kokorros* being used, and the net is seized, and then we just see it coming back half an hour later – what is going on. The Fisheries Officers should excuse me, but this is what I see on the ground. This is why we say that offenders should not be bonded – the law is just not harsh enough.
22. Some of the license money should come back to help to maintain beaches at the standards required by the EU. If beaches are not gazetted, you cannot maintain those standards.
23. The co-operatives have failed because of the liberalisation – now everyone is a seller. The Fisheries Officers who return illegal gear to the landing sites should be arrested. The water hyacinth should be poisoned.
24. The illegal nets should be destroyed immediately, rather than going through the FD or the police, because they just come back to the beach then.
25. The people who are here are the boat owners and not the workers. Who is the group referring to when they say that fishermen are rich between 8 and 9 in the morning, and poor by 11 at night?
26. The facilitator comments: it sounds as if local level institutions have not the teeth to look after their interests, and this should be changed. The communities need to know about the laws, but, at the same time, the communities must let the chiefs know how they feel. The people should take part in the acts. The consultative process should be a strategy. There is a lack of a culture of saving. Capacity building and skills development programmes: there is no point acting from a position of ignorance – you pollute the lake because you do not understand. What do we mean by community empowerment in our own culture (response from the floor: community involvement in projects). How? (Response: joint problem and solution seeking identification).
27. Fish breeding areas should be delineated so everyone knows where these are.
28. We have not asked ourselves why it is that fishers use illegal nets? In many cases, it is more secure to use an illegal gear. The government should allow local guards to carry guns, and then the fishers could hire them to protect their nets.
29. In order to get some people using illegal gear, the government should provide some compensation – a *kokoro* costs some 100,000/-.
30. The facilitator comments: we talk about problems and we are not coming up with answers. We have all these stakeholders, all of which are humans, which are very hard to manage. Do you have the capacity to manage them? How will you co-manage with the other stakeholders? Are the skills of other stakeholders sufficiently developed to help the FD with their management? We cannot just say that the Act is inadequate. Who is going to look into the Act and fill the missing gaps? The question of security is important. What is the strategy around this?
31. Responses: the lake cannot be co-managed without a legal basis. The stakeholders are many. For discipline to exist amongst them, then there must be a legal basis. The Act must be amended to

accommodate the byelaws made by fishers. There has to be a structure in which the communities and other stakeholders are organised, which can be incorporated in the Act.

32. The revision of the Act has been addressed – a draft Act has been produced to harmonise an Act for the whole of LV.
33. The information in this Act must be disseminated to the stakeholders.
34. The stakeholders should be consulted at the planning stages of the Act. The government has good intention, but let us improve the consultative process.
35. A core group of ‘community mobilisers’ is needed to work amongst the communities to ensure that they are capable of managing the resource base.
36. The new act has been through a consultative process, albeit a fairly limited one.
37. The thieves on the lake are to be controlled, we need to sit down at the community level to make sure that all the thieves are exposed, and the government should use its diplomacy to ensure that transborder theft may be limited. We could have a small part of the Kenya Navy patrol the lake.
38. The workshop should not be influenced by the paternalistic attitude of government officers. Officers saying ‘that one has been taken care of’ are worrying. Who took care of it? Did they discuss it with me? If we are now amending the fisheries act, and he doesn’t know the situation along the lake, what act are we going to get?
39. I think that the creation of boundaries on the lake are quite wrong – I think that provided we use the right gears, then we should be allowed to fish anywhere on the lake.
40. If you want to control anything, you must have a boundary. That is why we have one with our neighbouring countries. Even the sub-chiefs have boundaries. In co-management, you need to know your area, where you start and where you end. The whole question of free access has not been dealt with here. Is licensing supposed to limit the number of fishermen allowed on the lake – there are some who say that this is so, and others who say that it is not, so we do not even know this?
41. The beach leaders should be empowered to say that only those fishermen of good character should be allowed to fish.
42. The Fisheries Act makes no provision for the demarcation of boundaries.
43. Many of those boats that carry out theft are not registered.
44. We have not come here to kill one another – the fish are not tamed, they move everywhere. If we cannot move around the lake, then we will start killing one another.
45. The fishermen should make known to the FD what nets that they are using and all of these must be registered, so that we can know if one it is stolen or not.
46. We could use the Ugandan system of painting boats to show what district they come from.
47. The facilitator comments: if there were contracts between boat owner and his crew, this might improve their relationship. Awareness raising in health, sanitation and hygiene. Development of byelaws, but there must be an involvement of the communities in their development. A consultative form, whereby there is a continuous dialogue between the communities and other development partners, so that we can be sure that what has been put in place is actually happening.
48. Now that we hear that catches have declined in certain areas, we want to work with the FD so that they can advise us on how to improve these catches again.
49. If there are 650,000 tonnes in the lake, and 130,000 fishermen, then the fish stock will last just a month. What will we do about this? Can we continue to allow fishermen into the fishery, and I feel there should be controls on entry.
50. The FD is being blamed to many things which you can blame on KMFRI. They are often restricted in giving out information by bureaucracy. For example, KMFRI says that the minimum mesh-size for NP should be 7 inches. If you are catching NP in 5” at 50 cm, this one has no bread. It needs to be 80 cm. It is true, if you move to 7 inches, then there will be little catch and you will say you will be killed. But after 6 months, then you will see the fruits.
51. This workshop has not addressed the issue of crew coming back to shore, where the boat owner then pays them. Then, when they have a problem, they come back to the boat owner, demanding more money. They never have money, and there are these women that come to the beaches. They are prostitutes, and many of the crew are just young men and cannot go home, and these women take the men, their money, and keep them captive.
52. The facilitator comments: it’s funny that when it comes to a woman’s sins, the debate becomes very hot. Its up to the workshop to work out the modalities of how to deal with this problem.

53. I would like you to withdraw the remark that fishermen will marry three wives if they get loans. Response: What we meant was that sometimes the loans are not used for what they were intended for. I withdraw it.
54. The gear should be licensed and not boats. This should help us to regulate illegal nets.
55. The Bureau of Standards should be introduced into the fishery. People have been arguing about the Mbita Causeway. It is good that this is mentioned. Is it true, then that it blocks the fish from coming into the Gulf?
56. The Causeway had an effect on currents into the Gulf. It is alleged that this has caused catches to decline, but because the NP arrived around the same time, then it is hard to know what impact it had. It could also be pollution.
57. The LBDA should develop ponds for culturing fish to be used as bait, because only small fish will do for long-lining. Such culture could also be used for re-stocking the lake. KMFRI asked to do more research on product development for the industries to help them improve added value on the fish, and would earn them more.
58. How do we deal with bribery? It involves both the giver and taker. Why can we not have a way to punish those who do it. It is affecting the industry a lot.
59. The fisherman should worry about corruption. They should be prepared to buy the right kind of gear, so as to avoid having to pay bribes.
60. Is it the duty of this house to identify the roles for each of the stakeholders. Corruption is with most of it. You can only reduce it if co-management comes into effect. If the fishers take some of the responsibilities, it might be reduced, but this is a long process. There is need for identifying stakeholders' roles. We were talking about costs back there, and it was not clear who would really bear the costs.
61. Much of the information generated by the KMFRI gets lost in bureaucracy, so what can we do to get around this?
62. We should radio for this. This was also recommended by the LVEMP Socio-economic stakeholder's workshop.
63. Yesterday, the processors said that there was room to negotiate between fishermen/co-operatives and the industries.
64. The facilitator comments: maybe we need to come back to the drawing board to identify roles and responsibilities. How do we streamline these responsibilities?

7.4. Summary of Kenyan deliberations⁴

1. Help call: (a) financial management; (b) information dissemination.
2. Local authorities critical partners for the fishers.
3. Review of policies, acts, regulations and byelaws.
4. All stakeholders to share costs.
5. Weak institutions.

The Management Scenario: Consensus on the crucial benefits of Lake Victoria

1. A source of livelihood for all citizens, management of the resource becomes a critical integrated function
2. Social: infrastructural and institutional development, community participation, service development, internal and external relations, consultative processes, transparency, empowerment through capacity building, sense of ownership
3. Economic: revenue earning, tourism development, enterprise development, investment and employment, opportunities and sanitation,
4. Environmental: conservation, health and sanitation, research and development
5. Technological: development, appropriate methods, information systems, technical support

⁴ The sections that follow are derived from the facilitators' notes.

Next steps

1. Strengthening of local institutions through development of legally recognised entities
2. Legal framework to enable co-management/cooperatives or village enterprises development.
3. Develop a culture of savings amongst the fishers and others
4. Exposure to training and enterprise

Transparency

1. Community organisational skills development programmes to be planned, organised and conducted
2. Provision of legal agreements between the contractor and contracted
3. Provision of basic management courses including simple book-keeping and marketing programmes which are designed to improve management of community finances
4. Awareness building through the design of skills development programmes in the areas of sanitation, hygiene and environmental education.

7.5. Additional comments

1. Capacity building of local fisheries groups: community mobilisation through training of trainers.
2. Community empowerment: e.g. involvement in joint problem identification and joint problem solving.
3. Legally constituted resource user's structures to develop byelaws to govern their activities on their beaches.
4. LVEMP harmonisation of a regional Act currently taking place – dissemination of information/Act will happen.
5. Involve the communities in the formulation/review of acts and policies that affect them: strengthen current methods used.
6. Security requires community mobilisation and collaboration with security companies and other stakeholders. Government patrols should continue. Communities taking responsibility backed by laws.
7. Capacity building and awareness raising for community security.
8. Develop an organisation framework or structures (co-managers to be picked from this framework).
9. Supporting infrastructure.
10. Development of byelaws proposed with the involvement of the community.
11. Research re: processors and fishers (pricing).
12. Establishment of a stakeholder forum to work out a plan of action for the implementation of proposals.
13. Generate ideas from the community on how to deal with offences for inclusion in the Act.
14. Develop mechanisms of eradicating prostitution around the beaches as this has a negative impact resulting in the spread of HIV/AIDS.
15. Develop poverty alleviation strategies that do not rely on fish income only.
16. Capacity building of local fisheries groups: community mobilisation through training of trainers.
17. Community empowerment: e.g. involvement in joint problem identification and joint problem saving.
18. Legally constituted resource user's structures to develop byelaws to govern their activities on their beaches.
19. LVEMP harmonisation of a regional Act currently taking place – dissemination of information/Act will happen.
20. Involve the communities in the formulation/review of acts and policies that affect them: strengthen current methods used.
21. Security requires community mobilisation and collaboration with security companies and other stakeholders. Government patrols should continue. Communities taking responsibility backed by laws.
22. Capacity building and awareness raising for community security.
23. Develop an organisation framework or structures (co-managers to be picked from this framework).
24. Supporting infrastructure.

25. Development of byelaws proposed with the involvement of the community.
26. Research re: processors and fishers (pricing).
27. Establishment of a stakeholder forum to work out a plan of action for the implementation of proposals.
28. Generate ideas from the community on how to deal with offences for inclusion in the Act.
29. Develop mechanisms of eradicating prostitution around the beaches as this has a negative impact resulting in the spread of HIV/AIDS.
30. Develop poverty alleviation strategies that do not rely on fish income only.

7.6 Intern's comments⁵

Fishers' presentation

Most comments and conflict surrounded resource allocation, money management and who should bear certain management costs. The first speaker said that the fishermen seemed to expect others to help out a lot, especially the government, to which a fisher responded that their community cannot change overnight and that they need support. Another man countered that fishers are always asking for limited resources. The next speaker agreed, saying that the Fisheries Department has financial problems and that KMFRI is a non-profit. If fishers want *bandas* for their own use, they should ask those making a profit from the lake - i.e. factories - instead of government agencies.

The next speaker received a lot of laughter, applause and support from the audience. He decried dependence on donors and the government, saying that the Meru people have found ways of keeping up their roads and infrastructure through their own initiative (on community coffee farms). Why should the government build you a toilet? Why should the EU build you a toilet? He is ashamed of the dependence attitude, and asked fishers if they could spare just a shilling per day to go towards toilets and other beach needs.

The next speaker said that fishers need training in money management. A fisher countered that fishers are oppressed and that they need parliamentary regulation in order to be more independent. The next speaker said that the legal framework was there, and that fishers just needed to form societies and organise--then they would get the prices they wanted and no longer be exploited. The next speaker felt that fishers needed an attitude adjustment. He said that they claimed that banks are too far away for them to save, but that is no excuse. What is wrong with the fishing community? How can you allow yourselves to be exploited? Where does the money go?

Local authorities

The presenter focused on the relationship between local authorities and fishers, emphasizing finances and services rendered. The presenter stated that fishing income in fact helps the whole community, not just fishers. He felt that fishers needed to be provided with an "enabling" environment: processing equipment so they can get good prices for their catch, latrines where they can put their "things". He claimed the Fisheries Department had let everyone down--they knew illegal things were going on--such as the capture of juvenile fish - and did nothing to stop it. This received a lot of clapping from the audience.

He then delineated what role the local authorities believe they can play in fisheries management. He said the local authorities benefit from fishing in the form of fish taxes, and therefore not only do they have a responsibility to help out, but they are both accessible and respected in the community and therefore are ideal to help manage. While fishers may complain about having to pay taxes, they must understand that they cannot get services unless and until they pay for them. He castigated fishers for poor money management, saying that they must be responsible and do the right thing. Saying he was just trying to advise them, he said that fishermen were funny men--they will eat all their money thinking more will come tomorrow. He also castigated fishers for continuing illegal and harmful fishing practices. He told them they

⁵ All proceedings notes have been derived from notes taken by an LVFRP intern, Sarah Kalloch.

should not be cutting reeds from fish breeding grounds in order to make mats--that it brings money in the short term but will mark the death of big income sources like fish. He said the same of juvenile fish catch. He encouraged the Fisheries Department to enforce laws and the community to decide on common goals. He ended by saying that no one group can bear all the costs of fisheries management.

Conflict arose over who actually controls the fishery and the delineation of responsibility between central government and local authorities. The first speaker said that the central government, as represented by the Fisheries Department, should monitor the 100 meters from shore, and that the local authorities were in fact trying to relieve the central government of their responsibilities by doing so much around the lake. He felt the central government had the power to bring out the bounty of the lake, and that the local authorities are now carrying out the same work so they have an excuse to tax fishers, a comment which was met with much laughter. The presenter responded, saying that local authorities have stepped in because there has been a failure in management. He said that they were only trying to use the tax to help the community, and apologized if fishers thought it was hurting instead of helping, which provoked laughter. He said the local authorities plough all the money back into the fisheries so that fishers can see results for their money.

Fish Processors

The presenter stayed on script for the most part. He did say that during past EU bans, there was no stakeholder co-operation, and that no one came together to try to find solutions. He also said processors supported very strict punishments for fisheries offences, including a 5-year ban on fishing for using illegal nets or fishing in closed areas.

The stakeholders in general had very negative comments for processors, many stating that processors were the oppressors on Lake Victoria, 'ripping off' fishers and putting little back into lake management. The first speaker said that all stakeholders should pay part of the cost of management, and that this payment should be in proportion to the profit each group takes from the fisheries. If you make more profit, you should pay more taxes. Local and national government tax the fishers, and they take care of sanitation along the beaches, while processors get up and go after purchasing fish. He challenged processors to accept proportional payment of fisheries management costs. The processor said it was a process of negotiation, and that if fishers needed assistance, the processors have an association that could be approached for funding. Fishers then wondered where they could find this association.

A female processor stood up and tried to defend processors in general, claiming that the workshop participants were not taking into account all of the processing overhead costs. Processors may buy at \$0.80 and sell at \$2.00, but there are costs involved in between those two transactions. She asked why she should give fishers money back after she buys their fish at an agreed upon and acceptable price. This comment caused a big stir among the workshop participants. The male processors continued, talking about the raw material they have to buy in order to process. He felt the contract between fisher and processor ends at the sale. Fishers sell their fish to processors at a profit - it is from this profit that fisheries management money should originate. Perhaps if one large company was buying all the fish--such as in the tea industry, then they should plough money back in, but, along Lake Victoria, processors are small private enterprises and do not have this responsibility.

These comments caused a lot of conflict, amongst fishers in particular. The next person who spoke was angry, claiming that processors spoke at length about offences perpetrated by the fishing community, but did not talk their own offences, which he claimed were the monopolistic exploitation of fishers. The female processor responded by saying that if fishers thought they were being oppressed, they shouldn't sell to the oppressors, but instead should discuss with processors a fair price. This angered everyone.

A man who works for the Lake Basin Development Authority supported the processors, claiming he was just presenting the other side of the coin. He said that the whole discussion of the \$0.80 to \$2.00 per kilo price differential cannot be seen as a single accounting process, but must take into account costs to processors, including bad roads and time. He asked that people not dwell on the exploiter angle, but instead to try to get fair play by taking into account each other expenses. The last speaker for the day encouraged

the group to find ways of coming together on this issue. While it may sound like processors are stealing from fishers, everyone must come back to reality and find out what needs to be done together to meet management requirements. At this point, the workshop closed for the day.

On day two, the workshop opened with a processor rebuttal. The presenter read a prepared speech. He said that fish are like eggs, and that they must be treated carefully. Processors do not know if fish have been bumped or bruised until they have purchased them. If bruised, the fish are worthless to them. Fish are also often contaminated by sand at beaches, which causes the quality to go down. He urged fishers to take care of their fish and use ice to preserve their catch. He then said that non-indigenous people own many factories, and that perhaps it is time for Kenyans to come together, follow suit, and reap the benefits. He claimed that money should not be a problem in this endeavour, as there is a lot of money "floating" in local communities.

The next speaker pointed out that fishers and processors seem to be saying very different things: the fishers say they are oppressed, while processors say willing buyer, willing seller. He felt that fishers were oppressed because they cannot preserve their fish and must sell it--if, for instance, it gets to 6 p.m., they will take any amount of money for their fish, even \$0.10 per kilo, because they have no choice. He suggested that processors provide the beaches with cold storage to preserve fish. The speaker encouraged fishers to come up with strategies on how to succeed without dependence. He asked how fishers could both be self-reliant and work together with other groups for common goals, adding that it is hard to harmonize actions when the scale is lopsided.

The next speaker continued on this topic, challenging the fishers to stop treating the fishing industry as a village kiosk and instead to look at it as a serious business. He castigated fishers for letting their wives take part of the catch, saying it costs them money, and in a business, every shilling must be accounted for (himself not taking into account subsistence needs for fishing families). He said he had visited a beach with a wooden icebox which kept cold for 2-3 days, and he felt that there was no reason why every beach could not get themselves a similar box.

The next person encouraged fishers to come together so they have more options and can get better prices for fish. He then said that if fishers stop fishing, the processors would be no more, which got everyone excited and clapping. The next speaker continued on the same tangent, saying that fishers must not take fishing for granted but see it as an income generating business. He encouraged all fishers to make a plan so they can get the prices they want, saying that fair prices will only come about if you join other stakeholders and work as a group. The next speaker felt that good roads, electricity and good water would solve many problems on the beaches. That infrastructure would make sure that fishers do not have to depend so entirely on processors, and that processors will get good value for their money in the form of good, fresh fish.

The session ended with a fisher commenting that processors are shying away from the fishing community, as evidenced by their relative absence at the workshop (only two showed up). He said that fishers wanted to hear their voices directly.

Local Chiefs

The presenter emphasized fishers' inability to manage money and support families, saying that fishers are rich between 8 a.m. and 1 p.m., but then they are broke. If they would learn to save, they would be the richest people in the country. He claimed fishers were out at 11 at night while their children went hungry, and that many fishers did not take any accountability for their wife and children. He claimed there is a lot of 'floating' money in fishing communities, the second such reference, and that savings, loans, co-ops and finance need to be a priority. In addition to accepting responsibility and accountability for their profits, he also said the fishers need to abide by and enact fisheries laws meant to help them. Finally, he said there needs to be more awareness in fishing communities. For example, he built a latrine at a landing site, but no one used it because it was the chief's latrine, a situation he felt would be rectified by education and awareness-building.

One man commented that co-operatives had failed in many places because of mismanagement, and that arrests did not always work and that illegal gear often made its way back to beaches. Another man commented on the "rich in the morning, poor at night" fisher phenomenon, asking who the chief was referring to when he spoke of such double-faced fishers. Did he mean crew or owners? Are there only owners present at the workshop? A woman spoke and asked how fishers obtained illegal nets. She felt that the shops should not be allowed to sell illegal nets. She also brought up livelihoods around the lake, saying that many children around the lake cannot afford to go to schools. She blamed the buyers for this, saying that fishers have to sell at throwaway prices, but that still, the community must organize and cannot wait for government to do everything. The last comment made was that the whole idea of willing buyer, willing seller was bad language, and that processors divide the community.

Fisheries Department

The presentation emphasised the connection between proper management and fisheries profit. The Fisheries Department officer said that if the lake is well managed, fishers will be receiving lots of money instead of feeling oppressed. If managed properly, people will not leave their villages for Kisumu or Nakuru to find work because they will be so busy. Good management will not only lead to higher profits, but should result in the cultivation of an innovative investment culture in fishing villages, a saving culture which will reduce poverty.

One man commented on security at the beaches, and mentioned the idea of beaches coming together to hire professional *askaris* with guns. Another spoke of the need for fishers to invest and not depend so much on processors and the lake. This conversation turned into a debate on institutions and power in fishing communities. The next speaker felt that fishers should spearhead co-management, but that they have no legal authority to do so. He felt fishers should be empowered, and that community-based structures should be legislated in order to give them power. At this point, someone stood up and said that all three riparian countries have different laws and regulations, and that they need harmonizing. This need has been recognized by the government, who are currently meeting to review and "take care of" this harmonization. People were not impressed. A facilitator summed up the reaction of the crowd when she said that the consultative, co-management process must start at the planning stages, and that community input must be part and parcel of whatever new fisheries act is developed. She asked rhetorically if stakeholders could really be defined as stakeholders if they did not participate in the process from the very beginning. A man asked if it would be possible to have some kind of grassroots, in-service capacity-building training. The next speaker spoke highly of the idea of a community based consultative process, angry that the community had not been consulted. He said that legal language is often hard to understand and attitudes hard to change, but that the process should be participatory in nature. The next speaker said that while the fishing community has problems - they cannot manage money and there are thieves living amongst them coming together will decrease dependency and help the community. The last speaker gained a lot of support from the workshop participants. He asked that the paternalistic attitudes of government officials not affect this workshop. He felt issues should be discussed exhaustively by the community because lawmakers just do not know, a comment that was met with much clapping. He wanted trainers and an organisational framework for community participation.

Women's fishing groups and traders

The presentation was punctuated with "I" statements from the male presenter. He emphasized employer/employee relationships and the need for contracts to be negotiated. He also touched on money mismanagement in the fishing community, which resulted in environmental degradation. He said that fishers would have two good days, drink heavily, and then not catch anything for 15 days, forcing them to do illegal fishing to make any income. He suggested seminars be organized to teach money management.

Co-operatives

The presenter asked how the group could say co-ops have failed when the co-op group is here. He said that co-ops need infrastructure support and qualified personnel in order to succeed.

There was much commentary focused on the regulatory bodies, Fisheries Department and KMFRI. One person commented that the Fisheries Department works in some places, does not in others, helps in certain locales and is absent elsewhere. The next person commented that the fishery seemed ready to collapse, with too few fish for so many fishers. Someone else felt that the workshop participants were wrongly blaming the Fisheries Department for things that are KMFRI's responsibility. Since it is the researchers who provide vital information like correct mesh sizes, they have a lot of influence over fish stock levels. He reminded everyone that reductions in mesh sized would mean slow catches at first, but that within 6 month, catches would go up.

A second major issue was raised by a female workshop participant. She said that boat owners often hire young men as crew members, and then have a lot of problems to deal with. These young men get to the beaches after work and there are prostitutes waiting for them, ready to take their money. She asked if this kind of behaviour could be restricted on beaches, as these young men are taken by these women and "held captive", a comment that generated a lot of clapping and laughter. A facilitator asked if participants felt that something needed to happen on the legal side to curb prostitution. Two people commented that freedoms needed to be protected, but that people must be taught self-discipline, and that the attitude of young men needs to change.

NGO's and Researchers

The presenter elaborated the relationship between researchers, the Fisheries Department and donors, saying that the Fisheries Department identifies areas to be researched, researchers collect data, and the Fisheries Department disseminates this information. Donors - development partners - should provide staff and equipment for researchers and the Fisheries Department. He also emphasized which regulatory measures his group found most important. He said that political interference needed to stop, and that trawlers must leave the lake. He placed a lot of emphasis on limiting entry to the fishery. He said that people living along the shoreline should be the only people allowed to fish the lake. Those who live on the lake and interact with the lake see the resource as both a money making venture and a resource to be conserved, while those who live far from the lake think only in terms of profit.

He also made a comment about fishers and money management. He said that if fishers were given loans for their business, they would just turn around and buy another wife, and that this kind of fiscal irresponsibility needed to be addressed. This was met with laughter. Fishers were angry about the loan comment. A fisher complained about the comment and asked the presenter to take it back. The presenter said that while not every fisher is like this, it seems to be a cultural pattern, at which point the fisher said that the presenter was humiliating an entire community, and the presenter withdrew his comment. Another point of contention was whether or not there should be mention made of fish poisoning in the presentation. The fisher was concerned that if fish poisoning was mentioned, the EU or another governing body would think that it was still taking place and that this would cause major problems in the fishery. The last few comments were a call to end bribery and corruption around the lake.

7.7. Workshop Summary

Conflict

There were several prominent conflicts between stakeholders groups at this workshop.

1. Fishers and Processors: fishers claimed that processors were oppressing them, offering low prices, making a large profit and then not contributing to lake management. Processors said, 'Willing buyer, Willing seller', and did not feel any obligation to give back to the lake, believing money for beach construction, etc. should come from the margin of profit fishers obtain when they sell processors their fish. Others felt that the proportion of money paid towards lake management should be proportional to the money each stakeholder group makes from the lake, meaning industrial processors would have a heavy burden. No compromises were reached and tension between these groups was high.
2. Fishers and officials: officials felt that fishers needed to police themselves and be aware of what goes on at their beaches. Fishers felt that the Fisheries Department helped in some places and not others, often knowing illegal acts were being carried out but doing nothing to stop them. They felt that officials could be very patronising and had no idea what was really going on around the lake. Fishers asked to be included in the rule making process from the beginning, rather than being handed fisheries laws by the government.
3. Fishers and everyone else: people had some harsh comments on fisher's money management skills, dependency on government/donors and morality at the beaches. There were several references to floating money in the fishing community, and where this money might go - to drink, leisure and women. One person commented that if fishers would only save their money, they would be the richest people in the country. Many people felt that fishers needed to take a more business-like attitude towards their trade; to count every shilling and not allow their wives to take their profit by taking their fish. This idea, however, put the fishing industry in conflict with the subsistence needs of households. In addition, people decried the dependency attitude of fishers, and felt that instead of asking government and donors for help in beach infrastructure, they should be able to do it themselves.
4. Local authorities and fishers: there was some conflict over the taxation rights of local authorities and whether the fishing community truly felt they were benefiting from this taxation. See below.
5. Local authorities/Fisheries Department/Government: there was conflict between these groups over who had which responsibilities in the realm of fisheries management, who had the right to tax and make laws and who had the responsibility to build roads, etc. Some insisted that the Fisheries Department should handle most of the management responsibility, but the local authorities claimed that they had to step in because the department failed to do anything. What needs to be addressed is the delineation of responsibilities between local government and central government: who can tax, who must build, who can enforce, who will take on an active role in new co-management initiatives, etc.

Holes in lake management

Several holes in management were highlighted.

1. Fishers felt that there were legal obstacles that prevented them from taking a more active role in management of the lake. There were requests for a legal framework that would empower fishers to take a more active role in management. However, the capacity of fishermen to undertake co-management, even within a legal framework, was questioned. The facilitators suggested community mobilization training for selected participants from each fishing community in order to build capacity from within.
2. Many participants referred to floating money in the fishing community, and a lack of money management skills amongst fishers. Money management - both for family livelihoods and for investment into lake management - appears to be a major problem in communities. People felt that co-operatives were not effective in money management because of corruption, and perhaps banks are too far away, leaving a hole in the money management of fishing communities. The lack of a saving

culture contributes to a lack of development on beaches, which may contribute to the feeling of oppression fishers have when dealing with processors on an uneven playing field. It may also contribute to poverty in fishing households, and should be addressed in any fisheries management model. Any management plan must acknowledge that while making the artisanal fishing industry more "professional" and business-like is a noble goal, the importance of fishing for subsistence as well as cash should not be down-played.

3. In a related note, infrastructure at beaches is clearly a concern. Fishers feel they need fish bandas and refrigeration in order to be more competitive with processors. However, who should provide this infrastructure is up for debate and was contentious at the workshop. While fishers asked for help from government and donors, many others felt that fishers themselves should show some initiative and save money for their own amenities. The creation of community institutions at beaches that can facilitate savings and re-investment may need to be part of a management plan.
4. There was debate about which local and governmental authorities were responsible for what fisheries management activities around the lake. Conflicts between government agencies need to be addressed and overlapping responsibilities must be rectified. Currently, it seems unclear which government body is responsible for what activities, which could undermine community co-management efforts if government officials start infighting and wanting to control the same parts of the process.
5. The role of processors in lake management needs to be addressed. Processors said that there were processor organizations that fishers could speak to about management assistance, but fishers did not know what these were. If processors are to be engaged in management, discussion needs to take place about how this will transpire. The fact that only two processors came to the workshop was upsetting to some participants, indicating a lack of effort and interest in management on their part.
6. Access issues were not a major concern, but they did come up and may need to be addressed in a management plan.

Other observations

Women had very little voice at this workshop. The women's group was represented by a man, who insisted on using "I" statements to describe how the group responded to each question. Out of about 70 comments made by participants, only about five were made by women. Within the conversation, women and family were not often mentioned as stakeholders on the lake. Women surfaced as prostitutes, as items to be purchased with fishing loans, and as disruptive influences on the serious business of fishing. A co-management plan which takes into account all lake stakeholders and all multiple uses of the lake may need to include more women's thoughts and ideas.