



REGIONAL FISHERIES LIVELIHOODS PROGRAMME

FOR SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA (RFLP)

**Regional Workshop on Co-management
in Small-Scale Fisheries:
Lessons Learned and Best Practices**

12-13 December 2012, Bangkok, Thailand

December 2012

This publication has been made with the financial support of the Spanish Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AECID) through an FAO trust-fund project, the Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (RFLP) for South and Southeast Asia. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the opinion of FAO, AECID, or RFLP.

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 resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

Chief, Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
or by e-mail to: copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2012

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP	2
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES	2
WORKSHOP OUTPUTS	2
WORKSHOP FORMAT	2
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS.....	3
DAY ONE - CO-MANAGEMENT	3
Opening Ceremony	3
Session 1 - Co-management plans, structures and mechanisms reporting system.....	3
Session 2 - Traditional and local co-management structures	10
DAY TWO – CO-MANAGEMENT	15
Session 4 – MCS/Enforcement	15
Session 5 – Information for management.....	17
Session 6 – Small-scale fisheries improvement scheme	21
Session 7 – Gender equality and co-management	23
Session 8 – Reflections, discussions, recommendations and next steps	25
WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
Key co-management recommendations – Governance	26
Key co-management recommendations - Communities	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Key co-management recommendations – Resource management.....	26
Key co-management recommendations - Approach	27
WORKSHOP CLOSING.....	27
Annex 1 – Workshop Recommendations and Lessons Learned Table.....	28
Annex 2 - Workshop Agenda	43
Annex 3 - Workshop Participants.....	46

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AECID	Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation
CMB	Cambodia
FAD	Fish Aggregating Device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FAO RAP	FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
FiA	Fisheries administration (Cambodia)
GPS	Global positioning system
IC	International consultant
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
INS	Indonesia
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MCS	Monitoring control surveillance
MFI	Micro-finance Institutions
NC	National consultant
NDFA	National Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture (Timor-Leste)
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NPD	National project director
NTT	Nusa Tenggara Timur Province (Indonesia)
PHI	Philippines
PM	Project Manager
RFLP	Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme
SAR	Search and rescue
SatS	Safety at sea
SRL	Sri Lanka
TIM	Timor Leste
VIE	Viet Nam
VMS	Vessel monitoring system

INTRODUCTION

Fish and fishery products are very important in the Asia and the Pacific region, making enormous contributions to the nutrition and wellbeing of people, not only in the region, but also beyond. It is also of great importance to the livelihoods of the people involved in the sector, creating millions of employment in jobs at sea (fishing) and in land (processing, marketing, etc.). The Asia-Pacific region is still the world's largest producer of fish, having exceeded 50% of world production on capture fisheries since 2006, with the latest FAO figures in 2010 reaching 48.7 million tonnes¹.

Despite this important contribution, most fisheries in the Asia-Pacific are either overfished or fully fished, putting at risk the sustainability of the resources, and making necessary to take urgent action to improve the fishing sector.

Earlier efforts done by fisheries agencies to take full responsibility of managing the resources have been put into question, and there is an increasing consensus that for reaching sustainable and responsible fisheries, more attention should be given to fishers and fishing communities, and to enhance their full participation in the management of the fisheries resources.

Co-management in fisheries comes as the approach that allows fishers to fully participate in a shared decision-making process with fisheries agencies, for the sustainable management of fisheries resources². Despite the differences in the co-management approaches in different countries, they all share the fundamental need to improve dialogue through decentralized decision making mechanisms that promote partnership arrangements through the involvement, shared responsibility and authority of the main stakeholders (including fisheries agencies and fishers).

The four year, Spanish funded, FAO - Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme for South and Southeast Asia (RFLP) is working to strengthen the capacity among participating small-scale fishing communities and their supporting institutions in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam. By doing so the RFLP is seeking to improve the livelihoods of fisher folk and their families while fostering more sustainable fisheries resources management practices.

RFLP is seeking to put in place mechanisms and capacity for joint management of fisheries between the fishers and government authorities. National policies and legislation (local regulations) are being amended; registration of fishing boats have been either introduced and/or improved; stakeholder organizations have been formed and strengthened; officials and community members have been trained in co-management; fisheries management plans have been developed and implemented; there has been improvements in habitat management

¹ Funge-smith, S., Briggs, M., & Miao, W. (draft 2012.). Regional overview of fisheries and aquaculture in Asia and the Pacific 2012. *Asia Pacific Fisheries Commission*

² Pomeroy, R. S., & Guieb, R. R. (2006). A Practical Handbook. *International Development Research Centre*, 1–247.

practices; and there have been participatory enforcement mechanisms put in place, among other actions.

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

To facilitate regional sharing of information and experience (RFLP Output 6) with regards to RFLP co-management interventions (RFLP Output 1)

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

- To share and discuss experiences on co-management activities
- To highlight best practices and lessons learned
- To develop recommendations based on RFLP experiences
- To critically assess RFLP co-management actions with regards to impact, sustainability and replicability.

WORKSHOP OUTPUTS

The main output of the workshop is this report. The present report will be used as the basis to develop a regional “Lessons learned” note on fisheries co-management in RFLP countries. The report describes the main issues, and gives a set of recommendations, best practices and lessons learned for the following thematic areas:

- a. Co-management plans, structures and mechanisms;
- b. Traditional and local co-management structures;
- c. Capacity development and awareness raising;
- d. MCS and enforcement;
- e. Information for management;
- f. Small-scale fisheries improvers scheme;
- g. Gender equality and co-management; and,
- h. Reflections, discussions, recommendations and next steps.

WORKSHOP FORMAT

The workshop was structured in presentations done by countries, providing examples of their experience implementing the co-management approach. Due to time constraints, not all countries were able to present in each thematic session, but countries and observers were able to provide comments and feedback during every session.

All presentations from the workshop are available at http://www.rflp.org/comanagement_lessons_learned

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The regional workshop was attended by 31 participants, 9 of which were women. Participants included the RFLP National Project Directors (NDP), National Project Coordinators (NPC), Monitoring and Evaluation Officers (MEO) and the National Consultants (NC) for Co-management from Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, and Viet Nam, the RFLP regional staff team, and FAO Asia and the Pacific office staff members. Staff representatives from SEAFDEC and Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) and Wetlands Alliance attended as observers.

See Annex 2 for the full workshop agenda and Annex 3 for a list of participants.

DAY ONE - CO-MANAGEMENT

Opening Ceremony

Opening speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – Welcomed all the participants to the RFLP regional lessons learned workshop on co-management. He highlighted that the workshop was being used as a platform to draw out the lessons learned from RFLP pilot co-management and a discussion forum on how this could be taken forward and built upon.

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – Welcomed all the participants and the external observers from SEAFDEC and the Asian Institute of Technology and stated that the setting was meant to be informal to encourage interaction between participants.

A round of introductions was made.

Session 1 - Co-management plans, structures and mechanisms reporting system

Facilitating an ecosystem approach to fisheries management in Sri Lanka.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP Sri Lanka (SRL) National Consultant (NC) for Co-management

The presentation provided an overview of the situation previous to the arrival of the RFLP with regards to co-management measures in two Lagoons – the Chilaw and the Puttalam Lagoons. There was a clear need to integrate fisheries management with environment conservation, due to other non-fisheries issues (such as illegal encroachment, pollution of lagoon waters, destruction of mangrove, etc.). The presenter provided a summary on some of activities undertaken by the RFLP, which ultimately has led to the revision of the Fisheries Act to strengthen co-management by the government. Other relevant activities include the development of fisheries development and management plans for Negombo and Chilaw Lagoons. The RFLP also carried out other small-scale activities to improve the lagoon environment (e.g. removal of dangerous wrecks), which were necessary to maintain the interest of the fishers in the co-management process, so they would see immediate tangible benefits.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback from the floor

Mr. Bambang Sutejo, RFLP INS National Programme Coordinator (NPC) – this appears to be a top down approach, it needs greater involvement of fishers themselves and they need to express their needs and they should develop their own regulations.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – RFLP Sri Lanka provided a draft regulation to ensure that all aspects were covered, but the fishers themselves decided what gear restrictions, seasons etc., to apply and include in the regulation.

Mr. Suhendra, RFLP Indonesia (INS) Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (MEO) – What authorities does the fisheries committee have? What technical capacity does the fisheries committee have?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – The fisheries committees previously had no powers. They only advised the minister, but s/he did not have to follow the advice of the committees. The technical capacity of government staff in the districts is low, as 90% of the co-management activities in SRL have been driven by donor.

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP Viet Nam (VIE) NC for Co-management – When co-management areas are declared how do you decide what are the responsibilities of the different communities and different groups within communities?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Equal representation was given to each community on the fisheries committee. There was no area allocation

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP Cambodia (CMB) NC for Co-management – Why remove the boats from the lagoon?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – To improve navigation.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – Is all the funding from the project?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Currently all funding is from RFLP. However within the revised law the government has committed to fund regular meetings.

Mr. Pedro Rodrigues, RFLP Timor-Leste (TIM) NPC –Can you explain more about boundary demarcation?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Legally established boundaries are required so that people can be taken to court if they encroach. There are 3,000 fishers in the lagoon and they have open access to fish anywhere.

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP Cambodia (CMB) NPC – Does this fishery committee run as a federation?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – All fishers are obligated to become members of the fisheries committees. Negombo lagoon has 10 fisheries committees. There are a high proportion of fishers on the FC's and a smaller number of people from other agencies.

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – Previously there were some incidents of violence and a fisher was killed. What is the relationship with the government?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – The relationship with the government is now much improved. Following the riots and a death in Chilaw the government introduced a fuel subsidy scheme.

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – If government staff are spending all their time on the fuel subsidy scheme, will they have time to deal with co-management?

Dr. Damitha de Zoysa, RFLP SRL NPC and Secretary of the Ministry of Fisheries – This is the responsibility of the fisheries inspectors. The fuel scheme has become routine now, so the FI's have more time for their other responsibilities including co-management.

Ms. Angela Lentisco, RFLP International Consultant – What issues was the co-management meant to address?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – The environment and lagoon encroachment was the major problem which fishers wanted addressing.

Development and implementation of Coastal Resource and Fisheries Management Plans in the Philippines

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP Philippines, National Project Coordinator

RFLP has made possible the approval of 11 Coastal Resource and Fishery Management plans. The process for their approval has been participatory, and was based on informed decision-making as well as best-practices. It also prioritized issues identified by the community and local authorities. Some of the of main achievements have been: increase of local government funds allocated for fisheries management, establishment of MPAs, reorganization of law enforcement teams, and improved awareness for fisheries protection. The presenter finalized by presenting some of the results and issues related to the closed season of sardine.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Suhendra, RFLP INS MEO – What key issues have been prioritized? What was purpose of the 3 bay clusters?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP Philippines (PHI) NPC – The clusters are municipalities which share the same bay area. Fishery Associations have been formed to give policy advice to local government on how to develop the fisheries. The consultation process was mainly with the FA's which represent the fishers.

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – How does the local government manage its 15 km of waters? Do they have technical staff to do this at the municipality?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – Municipal waters are managed in a decentralized manner and are controlled by municipal regulations and permits. Only small boats (< 3 GT) should operate in these waters. Plans and planning is done by the municipal council, but with technical advice from BFAR if needed.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – There was no licensing previously. Has there been any progress on this? Has this caused conflicts? Are there data collection systems for multi-species fisheries?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – the local government has no technical capacity on stock status and management. That is the role of the BFAR which is conducting stock assessments. BFAR has developed a licensing system, but local municipalities have not adopted the system.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – In many countries there is decentralized management to provincial governments etc. They make decisions based on lobbying. However the capacity and resources available to local government are insufficient for making informed and best management decisions. Measures are brought in to reduce conflict, setting up of MPA's. Measures like limiting and or reducing fishing effort are not imposed and fisheries are seldom closed. More effort is needed by the national agencies to address these issues and to better understand the resource. More effort has to be used to engage and incorporate fisher's knowledge in a systematic effort.

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP Viet Nam (VIE) NPC – It is impressive that an increase (x 10) in state funding has been achieved, but you state there are insufficient funds. Do the CRFM plans also cover land-based activities?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – There are hardly any fisheries technicians working for the municipal government. Dipolog City has increased its budget sufficiently to employ extra staff. Poorer municipalities do not have the financial resource to employ more technical staff. Land based activities covered by the CRFM plans only include things which could be addressed within RFLP like solid waste management. The CRFM documents are living documents which can be further developed over time.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – Information of informed decision making. Are any indicator species tracked at municipal level? 3-5 key species should be tracked over time – fish size and proportion of the catch from a few key gears. Fishers can be encouraged to do this, to provide a platform for discussion. More needs to be done to limit our own effort.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – the national stock assessment is looking at sardines, round scad and mackerel for the last 10-12 years.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – local fishers should look at reef fishes.

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – RFLP PHI worked on a fisheries improvement plan for grouper and reef fishes and sardine. As a result RFLP PHI supported the sardine management plan and the close season. What is the level of engagement of (sardines) processors and traders in the management plan process?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – Sardine bottlers were involved in the sardine management plan planning process including the ban on fine meshed nets and the banning of other destructive fishing gears. The commercial sardine fishing ban (3 months) is being respected by the processors.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, Deputy Director, Directorate of Fishing Business Development (DFBD), Directorate General of Capture Fisheries (DGCF), Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia – Can fishers be moved from one over-fished area to an under-fished area?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – The PHI does not have the resources to relocate fishers. Most small-scale fishers are fishing close to shore (< 7 km) as they cannot compete with purse seine fishing for pelagics.

Mr. Pham Trong Yen, RFLP VIE NPD – Degradation of habitat is a major problem in Viet Nam. Has any improvement been seen in ecosystems in RFLP areas? There are many MPAs in the PHI; has there been any MPA management activities in the PHI?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – No evidence of improvement as yet. RFLP PHI has been giving TOT training to BFAR staff so that they can continue to monitor changes in bio-diversity etc. RFLP PHI has provided maps for MPA's, organized MPA management councils, local habitat assessments

Dr. Theo Ebbers, Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) and Wetlands Alliance Coordinator – The Wetlands Alliance is working with live or web maps which are accessible by communities as well as technical groups.

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – The RFLP PHI is working with GIS based mapping.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – How close is the interaction between the municipalities and BFAR?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – BFAR is providing some guidance to municipalities. However there are only two technical BFAR staff covering 15 municipalities. As an exit strategy BFAR have agreed to provide more technical staff to provide technical support in the RFLP area. The relationship is good, but it is constrained by limited financial resources.

Mr. Bambang Sutejo, RFLP INS NPC – Have targets been set for habitat improvements?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – The economics and social targets are set into in municipal development plans. One MPA has been targeted per municipality.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Seasonal closure could impact on negatively on livelihoods, how did you resolve this?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – when the commercial closure of sardine fishing was announced there were public demonstrations on the streets in Zamboanga City. However the DG BFAR went through with the closure and now small-scale fishers are praising BFAR for their work, as the sardine catches have reportedly increased.

Development and implementation of Community Fisheries Area Management Plans

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC

The presenter provided an overview of the development and implementation of the Community Fisheries Area Management Plans (CfiAMP). The RFLP played an important role making sure that

these plans were finalized and approved by the Fisheries Administration. These plans included references to: Use of Fishing Gears, Improving the Fishing Grounds, Defining and Establishing the Conservation Area(s), Planting Mangrove Forest, Aquaculture and other considerations. The presenter referenced feedback given by the community members on the CFIAMP, as well as provided a list with the potential risks, and the recommendations for action.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – How do they decide the limits on the numbers of gears and fishers?

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – Surveys were initially conducted. The fishers themselves, guided by fisheries (FiA) staff, decided in meetings the number of gears and fishers. Fishers change gears with season. Each CFI knows how many fishers there are.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – It is good that the CFIAMP has been built into the commune development plan to ensure sustained delivery of government services and budgets. How have these commitments been institutionalized?

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – Congratulations to RFLP CMB and FiA for this work. While CFi's have had a lot of support in freshwater fisheries, RFLP CMB's activities with CFi's is a first. How will FiA take this forward beyond the RFLP implementation period?

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – A lot has been learned from the RFLP CMB experiences, plus that of the Wetlands Alliance and earlier Danida support. At the last national coordination meeting other partners agreed to continue support to co-management. RFLP CMB activities have been included in the Government of Cambodia budget. Funds are being sought from the EU. It is hoped that the WA will pick up some of the RFLP CMB activities.

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – Are the concrete anti-trawling devices cost-effective? Is the commune development plan funded only by the commune?

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – The commune development plan is integrated into the provincial development plan who allocate funds to the commune.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, DD, DFBD, DGCF, MMAF, Indonesia – what is the legal status of CFi members? What are the criteria required by the government for recognition of CFi's?

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – CFi members all have a voice. Anyone can be a member of the CFi committee. However not all fishers want to be members of the CFi. CFi committees have to have at 7-11 members. There are 9 steps to registration of CFi's.

Mr. Nishan Dissanayake, RFLP SRL Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (MEO) – In Sri Lanka, management plans were previously developed and approved for different specific high value species. However some plans were not implemented because the government did not provide commitment to implement the plans.

Ms. Sumitra Ruangsivakul, SEAFDEC – Social agreement among fishers is used to set gear targets but this should be supported by scientific data. Is landing data collected?

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – The government collects data, but it is not very scientific or regular. RFLP CMB has funded community data collection for 2 years and this data can be shared with SEAFDEC if required. This presentation will be given the next day.

The process of building fisheries co-management in Viet Nam

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management

The presenter provided an overview of the co-management activities carried out by the RFLP in Viet Nam. These activities included; establishment of the fisheries associations and co-management boards, development and implementation of co-management plans for fisheries management, development of co-management units, and the development of province regulations on decentralization of fishing boat management, among others. Fisheries associations exist in the country, but this was the first time that they were developed at the site. The presenter provided detail information of the process, as well as explanation on the rights allocation and definition of roles in the lagoon.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Pham Trong Yen, RFLP VIE NPD – The fisheries sector has developed very fast with exports of US\$ 6.5 billion in 2011. At the national level there is no regulation on co-management. The Fisheries Sector Programme Support piloted co-management in nine provinces. The minister has proposed that a government decree should be drafted for co-management.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – How did Viet Nam expand its fisheries sector even though there is no national regulation on fisheries co-management.

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – Under RFLP VIE and other development there has been input to policy development.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – In certain areas of lagoons in Sri Lanka only fixed gears are allowed; yet in Viet Nam you have mobile and fixed gears interspersed. How was this decided?

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – The fish protection area (FPA) was one of 8 established legally based on a stock assessment survey conducted by the sub-DECAFIREP. Thereafter the FA were given the rights to manage the area of water around the FPA. Much of the fisheries sector increase came from aquaculture and was based on centrally set production targets. There is a move now towards more sustainable targets.

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – Following surveys which identified spawning and nursing areas for the fixed and mobile gears areas.

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – What is the difference between the co-management board and the co-management unit? How do you prevent conflict between mobile and fixed fishing gear users?

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – The co-management unit is an area of water. The Co-management Board includes commune government and FA's. The fishing regulation is meant to limit fishing effort. By following the regulation, conflicts should be minimized.

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – Are the areas demarcated?

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – The FPA and sub-zones are demarcated by concrete poles in the lagoon. In the sea the method of demarcation is still under discussion, but it will probably be done by mapping and the use of GPS.

Session 2 - Traditional and local co-management structures

Traditional systems of co-management - Tara Bandu in Timor-Leste

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM National Consultant for Co-management

The presenter provided information of the Tara Bandu, a traditional system used in Timor-Leste to regulate interaction between people and environment. This system was already in use before any state legal framework was established to manage natural resources. It is widely well known at the community level among Timorese and it is highly respected by the community. There is also a lack of fisheries officers to monitor and enforce fisheries regulations. For all these reasons, the RFLP supported the recognition by the government of the Tara Bandu as traditional resource management measure.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – This is a primitive form of rule of law. Timor-Leste is a new country so there is possibly much to be done to develop the rule of law. Does someone accused under Tara Bandu have the right to appeal?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Before Tara Bandu are agreed and established, all community members are consulted and agree the Tara Bandu in advance.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – There are a few examples of traditional laws in the PHI. Are the Tara Bandu in danger of being broken by external people from the community.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – We recognize that things are changing and external people may be a threat to the Tara Bandu system.

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – This presentation shows the flexibility of the RFLP approach to co-management. Rather than impose legislation traditional beliefs are being used to protect natural resources and enforcement is likely to be higher because it is based on very strong beliefs.

Dr. Champa Amarasiri, RFLP SRL National Project Manager (NPM) – The penalties include cigarettes and alcohol but many countries are trying to discourage these.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – The penalty items vary from community to community.

Dr. Theo Ebbers, AIT and Wetlands Alliance Coordinator – Would the Tara Bandu help at all with fishers from outside TIM? How are cross-boundary issues dealt with? Has anyone ever looked at how much imposing management costs?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Parts of Atauro already have cross boundary traditional arrangements. This area is about 25 km from Indonesia, so foreigners may not be an issue.

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – We have no idea what the costs would be, but this would be worth investigating further.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – The Tara Bandu has probably cost (RFLP's inputs) less than US\$ 5,000.

Mr. Pedro Rodrigues, RFLP Timor-Leste (TIM) NPC – One falsely registered boat was recently caught as the local fishers knew there were only 15 registered boats in their community and this boat was number 16.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – One of the missing dimensions on community based or co-management is that there are no good valuations of a managed fishery. If a value was known then local government can better apply and are more likely to get funding to implement management measures. RFLP should try and put value on some of the positive outcomes of co-management. This will reinforce the resolve of governments to fund and support fishery management measures.

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – Previously government investment in funding for fishery management measures has been limited. The budget however will be increased in 2013.

Development of village regulations with incorporation of 'Lilifuk' in Indonesia

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management Indonesia

The presenter described the Lilifuk, a local term for type of pool that is known to be an important area for fishes, and has been traditionally managed by the village landlord, however, it lacked formal recognition as a management area. The presenter further provided information on the work done by the RFLP to introduce management of marine areas through Village Regulations in NTT province. Village Regulations are common in Indonesia but have rarely been used to manage marine resources.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – When you use the term 'landlord', how is it defined?

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – ‘Landlord’ refers to a clan which has had the fishing rights to a specific area of water for hundreds of years.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – Some of the most significant costs are for demarcation of boundaries. GPS can be used to mark locations. This would just need agreement between the relevant authorities and community members. Physical concrete blocks and buoys have significant costs and many different such blocks or buoys will be needed.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – The GPS coordinates have been included in the village regulation and will be included in the Savu Sea management plan.

Mr. Nishan Dissanayake, RFLP SRL MEO – How valid is it to use new technologies in co-management?

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – The government is giving legal recognition to the use of GPS points and the process is being done in collaboration with fisher community members.

Mr. Aminudin Salka, RFLP INS National Project Manager (NPM) – All village regulations have to be fully in line with all higher level legislation up to national level.

Dr. Champa Amarasiri, RFLP SRL NPM – Traditional management practices should be documented, but some traditional management methods are no longer appropriate and are not scientifically sound.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – Recommendations based on scientific best practices are also being included into the Lilifuk traditional management systems. It requires compromise however.

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – Co-management is a process which involves adaptation to specific local context. Where traditional methods are strongly believed that should be utilized. However the world is changing, and systems have to adapt too. The scientific communities should also work with fishers and to learn and benefit from traditional knowledge.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Tara Bandu work in TIM has been done in collaboration with the NDFA. As a new nation TIM needs to try and impose whatever fishery management measures are workable within the local context.

Mr. Suhendra, RFLP INS MEO – Social engineering is another reason why local traditional management measures should be given credence.

Session 3 - Capacity Development and Awareness Raising

Building the capacity of Fisheries Associations in Viet Nam

Dr. Tuyen, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management

The presenter described the process for the establishment and registration of the Fisheries Associations, including activities to build its capacity as a new community based organization,

such as awareness activities on co-management, community events, study tours, strengthening membership and leadership management, legal registration, etc.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – You gave some good activities like the beach clean up to kick start solidarity and community action. Activities like participatory stock assessment are however much more difficult to cover in very short training sessions. How much more follow-up technical support will be needed?

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – Continued technical support and learning by doing will be needed for the newly formed FAs in particular. Organizational structure has been improved. The FAs have achieved legal status. Fisheries management plans have been drafted and have been endorsed by the CCP.

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – The level of co-management development is different and more advanced in Thua Thien Hue as a result of the sister FAO IMOLA project. For Quang Nam and Quang Tri this is the first time that FAs have been formed, so they are beginning from scratch. NC's with experience from previous co-management projects have been used for training provision and mentoring. There is potential sustainability of the activities of the FA's and the possibility of replication.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – sometimes capacity development only produces results after projects end. It would be useful if this type of information on impacts can be gathered by the national agencies.

Mr. Bambang Sutejo, RFLP INS NPC – The FA's should give feedback to the government and the government can then adjust policy so that it is appropriate to fishers needs. Fishers may expect rewards for assisting the government.

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – The objective is to develop the FA's as bodies which represent fishers. In Quang Tri and Quang Nam the CCP (Commune peoples' committee) were distrustful of the FA and so most of the executive board were government members who were not fishers. As they had government jobs they were too busy to work on the Executive Board (EB). The FAs should be representative of fishers, and at the same time while they need support from the local government, the FA's need to be independent of the government. Later the number of government officers on the EB was limited.

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – Local government officers need training on what co-management is and what are the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the co-management process. Some local government officers may become insecure as the FA's and/or fisher groups become more empowered.

Building activity awareness amongst communities of fisheries resources and co-management in Indonesia

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management

The presenter provided an overview of the RFLP interventions in Indonesia directed to build the awareness amongst communities of fisheries resources and co-management in Indonesia. The strategy employed consisted in the use of what was already available in the field, build capacity of the partners, involve them in the process, networking and finding synergies with other RFLP components. The RFLP TOT Alumni were the main implementers of the strategy. The strategy also included the management of a pilot MPA, the development of village regulations and community control groups.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – Training should also be given to people in local government including legislators.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – RFLP INS hoped to do this, but only senior level government people can get law makers and legislators to attend such capacity building training.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – Study tours and one page fliers can also be arranged for legislators.

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – How can the local government be engaged to assist in this type of activity?

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – Representatives of each village were invited to RFLP INS training and follow-up activities in the field were arranged shortly after the training so that the local government staff could practice what they had learned. A process of trust has to be built with local government staff.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – The mangrove replanting has several ecosystem service benefits.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – There has been some very significant progress made in the RFLP countries. Some very impressive case studies are being produced and some very good PowerPoint presentations.

DAY TWO – CO-MANAGEMENT

Session 4 – MCS/Enforcement

Deployment of anti-trawling devices and community patrolling in Cambodia

Wiryu Khim, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (MEO) RFLP CMB

The presenter provided some background information on some of the issues of illegal fishing operations in Cambodia, by using illegal gear or fishing in restricted areas, catching restricted species, restricted sizes or not respecting the restricted season. As a result, fishers have been complaining of declining catches. As part of the development of the Community Fishing Area Management Plans, the community members proposed MCS tools, strengthened patrolling units and installed anti-trawling obstacles (cement poles and cement boxes), through a consultative and participatory process. The presenter finalized by recommending that a study would be needed to assess the impact of the anti-trawling devices and the management measures on the marine resources.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Lack of funding is an issue for patrolling. Are the fines imposed by the court of law and are the proportions of the CFI and FiA split fixed?

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – 40% of the fine will go to the CFI and 60% will go to FiA. This is not fixed.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – Will RFLP CMB advise the FiA to oversee MCS activities? In INS the equipment would be included onto the government list of assets and this would ensure maintenance of the equipment.

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – All the equipment is listed in the CFI inventory. Government staff will supervise the MCS activities if funds allow.

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – I would like to congratulate the FiA for their collaboration with the community which will improve conservation, patrolling etc. I would encourage the FiA to fund the continuation of the MCS activities.

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – FiA will try our best to continue to use local government and FiA staff to oversee MCS activities in collaboration with CFI's members.

Dr. Champa Amarasiri, RFLP SRL NPM – Use of fines to cover patrolling will only be a short term solution. Instead of concrete blocks, we are thinking of using sunken ships and old cars as artificial reefs.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, DD, DFBD, DGCF, MMAF, Indonesia – In Indonesia the artificial reefs and anti-trawling devices are called fish apartments.

Mr. Aminuddin Sarka, RFLP INS NPM – Fish apartments and artificial reefs are put into the sea by groups of fishers to provide artisanal fishing access.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Should RFLP recommend that the RFLP provided patrol boat be used for legal fishing? This could lead to future conflict?

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – We do not want to increase fishing effort.

Mr. Isara Chanrachkij, SEAFDEC – Is there communication with the trawl skippers? Can they be asked not to fish in specific areas? RBYCII can work collaboratively with RFLP.

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – Trawler skippers have been invited, but they continue to fish.

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – The Fish apartment could be a similar approach if it is used as an anti-trawling device, but you are using them as fish aggregating devices, which is increasing catchability of the fish stocks. This needs to be accompanied with strong management measures otherwise their could be over-fishing. Patrol boats should not be used for legal fishing, as it will put pressure back on the stocks. Perhaps they could be used for tourism instead.

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – The use of fish apartments, artificial reefs, artificial habitats do not necessarily increase the amount of fish in a fishery. They are probably only aggregating fish. To be sure that there are more fish, the fishers have to be involved in collecting data on the whole fishery and its sustainability.

Installation of a FAD in an inshore fishery stops trawling, so artisanal fishers are happy. However if a boat with powerful lights fishes over the FAD or fish apartment, all the grouper may be easily caught. Clear objectives should be set and strong management measurements are needed before any fish apartment, FAD, or artificial reef programme should be undertaken.

Enforcing the 3-month/3-night bans on sardine fishing in the Philippines

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC

The presenter provided information on the process lead by the RFLP to implement and enforce the 3 month / 3 night bans on sardine fishing in the Philippines, that included Bay cluster information and communication sessions to raise awareness on coastal resources and fisheries management. With regards to sardine management, there has been decreased production from 2008 to 2010. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to establish a closed season for the conservation of sardines. RFLP supported this process, as well as the enforcement measures to make it operative.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – Most countries have regulations for close seasons and undersized fish. However the market is not controlled. More effort should be made to be made ensure that juvenile fish species are not sold in the market.

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – BFAR is implementing ‘market denials’.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Small-fishers should also be regulated.

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – This is the responsibility of the municipality. They have to control the use of nets with very small mesh sizes.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – RFLP TIM is uses GPS to gather data. How can the NDFA control and limit fisheries as their fishery expands?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – If close seasons are imposed, alternative livelihoods options have to be provided.

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – The BFAR Director had to bite the bullet and decided to implement the closed season in the face of considerable opposition. Is there the same point in every country when such tough political decisions have to be made?

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – This is an extremely difficult political challenge.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP NPD PHI – The BFAR Director is an environmental lawyer. This is why he was so strong on this issue.

Mr. Pham Trong Yen, RFLP VIE NPD – A close season is a good measure to protect resources. However enforcement is not effective because of limited resources. VIE has 130,000 fishing boats and is unable to control them. Implementing this ban requires significant community support but I did not see this in the presentation. And did the government support the livelihoods of people who could not fish during the ban?

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – The target boats of the ban are the exporters of canned sardines, so discussions were only with the big canneries and industry, plus the mayors of the municipalities as the ban covers all waters for industrial gears like purse seines and ring net boats (7-15 gross tons). The government released a large amount of funds to support livelihoods diversification during the ban period.

Session 5 – Information for management

The National Statistical System: Filling the data vacuum in Timor-Leste

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP NC for Co-management

The presenter provided an overview of some of the previous data gathering issues within National Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture (NDFA) before the arrival of the RFLP. The RFLP supported the development of a database that has improved the management of data. It has a public interface through a website (www.peskador.org), which allows those interested to

access the data. The database contains information related to: fish price and fish volume per species, boat registration, fishing centers, bathymetric data, sea accident report, community based IUU reporting system, export import and entry permit, livelihoods and gender roles among others.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – Please provide more information on what data is currently being collected.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – The system includes IUU and bathymetric data provided by the SPOT GPS system in the live maps, also sea accidents, boat registration, fishing gear being used, livelihoods conducted, aquaculture areas etc. Price information, fish volume, weather information, etc. is all available.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, DD, DFBD, DGCF, MMAF, Indonesia – How many fishers have been licensed in Timor-Leste?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Virtually all the artisanal fishing boats have registered (over 4,000). And 1,029 fishing boats have been licensed.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – The sustainability of this pilot depends on the NDFA continuing to fund the staff after RFLP implementation period.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – 5 District Field Officers based at the fish landing centres are entering the data and several more staff in Dili analyze the data. The Secretary for the Ministry of Fisheries has agreed.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – Is the website connected to the central database? E.g. registration and fish price and volume?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – Yes they are connected and updated automatically.

Ms. Sumitra Ruangsivakul, SEAFDEC – In 2013 SEAFDEC is organizing a workshop on data collection. Can you please explain how the data is collected?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – A previous FAO project used a logbook system for fishers to record fish catch, but it failed. The fisheries staff collect the data directly on the fish catch daily at the fish landing centre (Lotas de Pescas) and send a picture of the fish, give the fish price and the quantity captured. This data is uploaded.

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – How long do you think this programme will operate? How can you get them to provide you with the data?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – RFLP TIM has already trained the 5 DFO's on how to collect

Don – RFLP TIM is promoting the LdPs as service centres which benefit both fishers and traders.

Mr. Suhendra, RFLP INS MEO – Are you training enumerators in addition to the DFOs who are entering the data?

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – To ensure the sustainability the system will be used to collect data. The government has agreed to fund the five DFO's. The management of the LdPs, with ice machines and distribution will be handed over to fisher groups. The SPOT GPS devices (used for reporting IUU fishing and summoning emergency assistance) have been included in the government budget and will be provided when fishing boat licenses are issued.

Mr. Pedro Rodrigues, RFLP Timor-Leste (TIM) NPC – Two mobile teams were also supported by RFLP TIM. Live maps on dangerous places have been produced where accidents occur. The system allows the NDFA to track how much work DFO's are doing entering data. The geo-referenced pictures also indicate when the DFO has travelled into the field. Over 4,000 fishing boats have been registered. Nearly 1,400 fishing boats have been licensed.

RFLP TIM has presented the system at the Regional Plan of Action to combat IUU fishing and they have been asked to present the system again at another future meeting.

The NDFA has produced a plan for the management of the LdPs, which will be operated by fisher groups and the ice will be sold to cover operational costs.

The government of Timor-Leste has allocated a budget to maintain the www.peskador.org website in the 2013 activity work plan and budget, which will ensure that the site is continued sustainably.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – This system builds upon a similar system which was developed in Aceh by Crispen Wilson and which he has since improved.

Catch monitoring pilot in Cambodia

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management

The presenter provided a brief overview of the catch monitoring process in Cambodia. No such catch monitoring was ever implemented in the Cambodian Coastal Zone before RFLP the started. During the consultation meeting on the development of Community Fishing Area Management Plan, CFI members expressed their desire to have accurate data on fish catch. This was done as a pilot to assess its utility as a management tool. Some of the initial results have been the recording of more than 100 different marine species. The species caught varied according to gear, and some fishing gears were highly selective (namely crab traps, gastropod long line, squid hook and line and hand collection of blood cockles). The findings from 2011 were approved by Director General of Fisheries Administration, and it is being used as baseline data for Fisheries Department of Planning to estimate total landing from small-scale coastal fishers.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – Over 100 species were recorded; did you record volume and for how long? Is there a mechanism to verify data collection? Why did the cost halve between 2011 and 2012?

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – Not all species were weighed. Only 11 key species were weighed. The pilot will continue for 2 years with RFLP CMB.

During the first month there were many mistakes in the data. This required technical back-stopping and the data has since improved. The costs went down as there was a lot of training provided and several people from the central level had to travel to provide the training and technical back-stopping.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – RFLP SRL is going to pilot fish catch data collection. RFLP SRL will follow FAO species codes.

Mr. Suhendra, RFLP INS MEO – Is this only economic species or all species and how does this relate to the government data collection system? What sort of incentives are provided?

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – All the catch items were counted. Only the main target 11 species were weighed and length measured. Transport costs were covered only as an incentive.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, DD, DFBD, DGCF, MMAF, Indonesia – What information is available on static fishing gear?

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – In the CFiAMP there is information on the numbers and types of fishing gears.

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – FiA collects data on fish catch data on freshwater species using the FAO fish code system. Data is not currently collected on marine catch. This piloting will help direct future government policy on marine data collection.

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – Are the incentives purely transport costs i.e. petrol/gasoline costs?

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – they are provided with US\$ 10 per month towards the fuel costs of their boats.

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – There are only small numbers of fishers are involved in this. How relevant are these fishers?

Mr. Yos Chanthana, RFLP CMB NC for Co-management – The sample size is very small compared to the total number of fishers. 5 samplers were chosen from 5 different Community Fisheries (CFi's). This is just a pilot.

Ms. Sumitra Ruangsivakul, SEAFDEC – SEAFDEC has conducted a similar activity in Cambodia to show the status of the resources. When SEAFDEC has done this it has been linked with other activities such as the crab bank system.

Session 6 – Small-scale fisheries improvement scheme

The Good Fish Code: A regional initiative

Don Griffiths, RFLP Chief Technical Advisor

The presenter explained the Good Fish Code that was initially developed and proposed by the RFLP regional team to encourage fishers and the authorities to take steps to improve co-management of inshore fisheries. He provided detailed information on the main principles and criteria, the color coding used, and the different steps that are to be taken to ultimately improve management and reduce risks. The process that was undertaken and the issues encountered were described to the participants. The presentation finalized with direct questions to the workshop participants, who were asked to give their comments, and feedback on three main questions: Does the GFC have merit? Why has GFC not taken off? How if at all can the GFC be taken forward?

1) Does the GFC have merit?

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – Yes because the MSC only looks at fisheries sustainability, while the GFC addresses other areas including social issues, equity, etc. and is more aligned to an EAFM. The EAFM, the CCRF and the GFC have many commonalities.

The GFC is a good idea but it may be ahead of its time. Recently an American blue crab importer – wanted to discuss with FAO about the national improvement plan for Thailand. Their minimum requirement is for the blue crab fishery to have a FIP. This is a bit like the MSC pre-assessment scheme, which is what the GFC promotes. Maybe can pull together 3-4 local FIPs and monitor them as a national programme. Certification is more about export products, which can be an opportunity to institutionalize the FIP process.

If we wanted to source snapper etc. this would require a FIP. GFC measures address this. It is more innovative and just than the MSC scheme. It is more culturally and rural development appropriate. Buyers need to be made more aware of this scheme.

Mr. Jose Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager – The GFC is not a certification scheme; it is a tool to show where a fishery is and is a guide for good management practice. The GFC is a tool that can be used on a national basis. Most certification schemes dictate what the fishers should do. The GFC is far more community based and community members set their own agenda for improvement. Each step taken is nearer to a sustainable fishery and equitable community benefits.

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO –The GFC could be an over-arching scheme for assessing the status of a fishery. The GFC framework could have been used to assess fisheries across a region. The GFC should have been used as a tool to assess RFLP progress.

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – The GFC would have been a good guidance document even before RFLP PHI started doing CRFM plans. Who is 3rd party certifier? Incentives, people see money. This should be agreed by BFAR before municipal governments.

Ms. Kaing Khim, RFLP CMB NPD – Cambodia sees the usefulness of the GFC. It would be good if FAO could find funds to pilot the GFC.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP PHI NPD – It has merit.

2) Why did the Good Fish Code fail?

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP PHI NPD – The GFC needs stronger links, support and buy-in from the national government. When MSC was first proposed in the PHI there was very little knowledge on it; this was similar. Like any other certification schemes, there has to be a good place to start.

The GFC is too difficult to understand and needs to be supported by easily understood IEC for governments.

GFC promotion commenced too late; it should have been started much earlier.

Mr. Benjamin Francisco, RFLP PHI NPC – It was unclear what funds and benefits would be available under the GFC. The scheme should have been agreed with BFAR before the municipal governments.

Maybe the GFC is too advanced or ahead of its time; it may be more appropriate later. At a later date FIPs may become a requirement from buyers.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – The GFC is too soon now for Timor-Leste as the government of Timor-Leste has other more important priorities.

Insufficient needs assessment and consultation were conducted.

Some immediate benefits have to be made available to stimulate interest.

Mr. Don Griffiths, RFLP CTA – RFLP was hoping to find sponsors for the GFC who could provide funds and benefits. That was why the benefits were not spelled out. Unfortunately we were unable to do so.

Mr. Aminudin Salka, RFLP INS NPM – The GFC appears that it may be expensive as there are six principals which have to be assessed. RFLP should have given more details on the concept and on how the government should do it.

3) How can the Good Fish Code be taken forward?

Dr. Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fishery Officer, FAO RAP – FAO TCP funding could be applied for. However this would require strong ministerial support from the requesting countries. A regional

TCP could be done with 2-3 countries, but this would require endorsements from 2-3 countries. The GFC could also help to institutionalize Fishery Improvement Plan (FIP) process. APFIC and FAO will continue to support and champion the GFC.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for co-management – Governments should adopt the GFC first i.e. give the GFC their national government endorsement and then it could be used within an RFLP country.

Mr. Isara Chanrachkij, SEAFDEC, Fishing Gear Technology, Section Head – SEAFDEC has similar initiatives and has advised its countries, but it is voluntary; the idea promotes sustainability and has merit. The SEAFDEC Resolution and Plan of Action on Sustainable Fisheries for Food Security for the ASEAN Region toward 2020 (RES-POA 2020), under Human Resource Development activities related to RES-POA the SEAFDEC training department may be able to provide support for the GFC, where the RES-POA 2020 is consistent with GFC components.

Ms. Jessica Munoz, RFLP PHI NPD – The objectives and benefits of the GFC should be further clarified.

The GFC requires strong community commitment and buy-in.

Session 7 – Gender equality and co-management

Involving women in co-management in Sri Lanka

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management

The presenter provided an overview of RFLP efforts to bring women into the mainstream of co-management. Women make up 22 percent in fish processing and marketing in Negombo / 29 percent in Chilaw and 24 percent in Puttalam district. Some of the initiatives were the revision of the Fisheries Act to ensure gender equality (for example, replace the word fishermen for fishers), and the inclusion of women representatives into Fisheries Management Coordinating Committees.

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – How easy was the process to change the legislation?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – The Fisheries Act was drafted in 1996 and needs updating, so there was no opposition.

Mr. Thay Somony, RFLP CMB NPC – The same word in Khmer is used for fisherman and fisherwomen.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – In Sinhala it is the same too.

Dr. Damitha de Zoysa, RFLP SRL NPC and Secretary of the Ministry of Fisheries – The legislation will be in English, Sinhala and Tamil languages.

Mr. Marvel Ledo, RFLP INS NC for Co-management – What is the perception of women?

Dr. Damitha de Zoysa, RFLP SRL NPC and Secretary of the Ministry of Fisheries – Women want to be empowered and to have their work in the fishery sector recognized.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Women often represent their households in fishery meetings if their husbands are at sea.

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – Are women's groups specified within the law? Has any awareness raising been done on the role of women in the sector.

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – Inclusion of women in Coordinating Committees for fisheries will be included in the legislation. No awareness raising was done.

Ms. Angela Lentisco, RFLP IC – If no champions can be found, you should find some women's NGO groups to advocate for recognition of the role of women in the fishery sector.

Mr. Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer – Who are the women sitting on these committees?

Mr. Leslie Joseph, RFLP SRL NC for Co-management – They are presidents of CBO's.

Mr. Nishan Dissanayake, RFLP SRL MEO – The need for gender mainstreaming in Sri Lanka was not realized. As the gender focal point person I realized that women had to be involved in the implementation of co-management plans.

Enhancing women's participation in Fishery Associations in Viet Nam

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO

The presenter provided information on the process undertaken to enhance the participation of women in the fisheries associations (FA) in Viet Nam. Before the RFLP, there were only 36 women members in the fisheries associations – today, there are 243 women members. This has been achieved through awareness rising to the FA Executive Boards (EB) of the importance of women's participation as members, the improved collaboration between FA and Women's Union, and the development of incentives for women to join FA (for example, if a couple are members, they only have to pay one membership fee instead of one each, as well as the possibility to participate on alternative livelihoods models/training).

Comments, questions, answers and feedback

Mr. Isara Chanrachkij, SEAFDEC – What kind of training courses were provided and who were the trainers? What kind income and skills were provided?

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO – Except for the boat master training RFLP VIE has invited women to all training courses, including disaster preparedness, chicken and pig rearing, fish sauce production. Women benefit most from alternative livelihoods activities and post-harvest activities. Usually fishing villages get little support from agricultural extensionists, but with RFLP VIE support they were given training. Some women made more than US\$ 200 – 300 profit from chicken rearing.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, DD, DFBD, DGCF, MMAF, Indonesia – Have you assessed women’s access to markets?

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO – RFLP VIE supported women to market products in the interior mountainous markets who then sold 21 metric tons. Women have been supported to produce better quality fish sauce and which is better packaged.

Mr. Liliek Soeprijadi, DD, DFBD, DGCF, MMAF, Indonesia – Has any financial management training been given?

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO – Financial literacy training was given, but this is not a priority area as it is easy to access loans in Viet Nam.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – How can we ensure that the role of women within the household is recognized?

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO – The context is quite good in Viet Nam. Women often control the household money. The government is supporting gender equality too.

Dr. Tuyen Truong Van, RFLP VIE NC for Co-management – When RFLP VIE worked to stop illegal fishing within communes most illegal fishing was being done by internal commune members. The women were very much involved in convincing people who were fishing illegally to stop.

Mr. Mario Pereira, RFLP TIM NC for Co-management – How did you get so many women to join the FA?

Ms. Hoang Thi Phuong Thao, RFLP VIE MEO – Only women who were FA members were provided with RFLP VIE livelihoods training.

Mr. Nguyen Song Ha, RFLP VIE NPC – Several studies were conducted to identify feasible livelihoods options. Market chain studies for anchovy and scad were also conducted. Women headed households are encouraged to join RFLP VIE alternative livelihoods option training courses.

Ms. Angela Lentisco, RFLP IC – Previously women-headed households in Viet Nam were discriminated against. Viet Nam is ranked as 79 in gender discrimination of about 150 countries. Output 1 is a priority area for the empowerment of women and it should show positive results in the future.

Session 8 – Reflections, discussions, recommendations and next steps

Ms. Angela Lentisco, RFLP IC – Summarized some enabling features discussed, which would increase the likelihood of co-management initiatives being successful.

There was a plenary discussion to finalize the key findings and recommendations of the RFLP regional lessons learned workshop on co-management.

WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS

The workshop provided opportunities for the participants to share experience, learn new lessons and to reflect on their own experiences. Over the course of two days many constructive ideas were generated which through knowledge sharing can be used to improve the work done on co-management in coastal communities.

Below is a summary of the main recommendations. The full list of recommendations and lessons learned is in Annex 1.

Key co-management recommendations – Governance

- Government support/commitment to decentralization
- Co-management initiatives must be in-line with central and local government policy
- National government commitment to facilitate the rollout of co-management process
- Local government support of its own co-management units
- Positive and supportive policy/regulatory environment
- There is financial commitment
- There is adequate co-management capacity within counterparts
- Governments are open to and recognize the contribution other parties can bring to the co-management process
- Any co-management undertaken is ‘true’ co-management
- Transparency/fairness/trust are essential to keep stakeholders engaged
- *Gender discrimination is identified and acted upon*
- *Government support to positive inclusion/empowerment of women*

Key co-management recommendations - Communities

- Full support and cooperation of village governance structures is vital for effective management of marine resources.
- It is vital that fishers/communities do not feel that co-management is a process being forced on them
- Active leaders and communities will be far more likely to effectively put in place co-management.
- Community leader commitment
- Coastal communities usually care deeply about their livelihoods and environment
- Be open to the opportunities offered by women’s involvement and their empowerment

Key co-management recommendations – Resource management

- Resource recovery, limiting of fishing effort and other management measures may not appear to be immediate options in poor coastal communities
- Zoning and mapping support to define turfs or allocate rights to co-management groups
- The impacts of technological advances are understood in terms of their impacts on fishing effort and the fishery resource

- Fishery management measures are based on knowledge of the fishery, have a sound basis in either traditional ecological knowledge or are science-based.
- Building on traditional systems
- MCS/Enforcement
- Political patronage very important
- Relationships are built with communities through data gathering activities and discussion of the results
- There is a method to verify the data recorded/gathered
- Co-management / resource management planning takes funding/investment into account
- Market forces/demands are considered in the co-management approach

Key co-management recommendations – Approach

- *It is important that some immediate benefits become apparent*
- *Time and patience are essential to realize the fishery benefits*
- *Communication is key*
- *Keep it simple and understandable - A step by step approach should be taken*
- *Flexibility in planning / implementation increases the chance of success*
- *Clear definitions of roles of stakeholders will strengthen planning and accountability*
- *Build on existing experience and lessons previously learned*
- *Efforts should be made to enhance the social capacity building skills of government departments and staff.*
- *Capacity is best built through a process of “learning by doing”*
- *Capacity is best built through a process of “learning by doing”*
- *Creativity*
- *Giving people the chance to experience new approaches*
- *Give responsibility and some independence to explore the options for management*
- *Information for management*
- *Time and patience are needed*
- *Mentoring in data gathering and analysis*

WORKSHOP CLOSING

Mr. José Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager, thanked everyone for their contribution to the two day RFLP regional lessons learned workshop on Co-management. While the work on co-management has progressed, it is a longer term process. The first results and impacts are being seen. The path ahead is now clearer. The local authorities and fisher communities are now working better together and this process will continue beyond the RFLP period. A summary document will now be produced and shared with all. Thank you all for your efforts.

A copy of the presentations can be found on the RFLP website at www.rflp.org/comanagement_lessons_learned

Annex 1 – Workshop Recommendations and Lessons Learned Table

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>Governance - The enabling framework</p> <p>Policies, institutions, finance, gender, rights allocation, recognition, etc. that facilitate co-management.</p>	
<p><i>Government support/commitment to decentralization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation and support from central government at a high level must be ensured from the start of any co-management initiative if it is to succeed. • Likewise, cooperation and support is also needed from top-level local administrative officers to ensure the mobilization and active involvement of all key stakeholders. <p><i>Co-management initiatives must be in-line with central and local government policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any co-management/ resource management plan that is in line with government priorities/ planning has far more chance of success. 	<p><i>Government unwillingness to decentralize/ support co-management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless the government is truly willing to hand over certain management responsibilities and powers to communities/ local authorities' co-management actions will not be successful. • Legislators, key government appointees, or elected officials (e.g. provincial governors) lack understanding of the reasons for and the potential benefits of co-management.
<p><i>National government commitment to facilitate the rollout of co-management process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A senior level committee/task force may be used to drive the initial co-management process forward (or as part of a project) through regular meetings. • A dedicated government department should monitor and support the co-management implementation process. • Key government counterparts (at head office as well as field level) should be released full-time for the duration of any project/programme, with specific terms of reference. • An agreement is made detailing the roles, 	<p><i>Inconsistent commitment, supervision and support from local government</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of buy in or supervision from local government will greatly impact effectiveness of co-management measures. • Lack of support may result in actions not being integrated into annual work plans of relevant departments / districts. • If government counterparts are not committed to sustaining successful elements of co-management plans, any momentum generated will fade away. • Empowerment of fisher groups may

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>responsibilities and activities of all parties. These should be complementary, have a clear timeline, specify the role of each party in every activity as well as which party will finance what actions.</p> <p><i>Local government support of its own co-management units</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed co-management activities need to be included in the Ministry's / stakeholder's annual work plans from the very start to ensure government commitment. Local/district/provincial government must be willing to provide dedicated staff, budget and facilities at local/district/provincial level for co-management. Close collaboration is needed to discuss and identify the gaps and to raise government's willingness and motivation to implement any co-management measures in their plans. A training/capacity building programme needs to be developed and implemented for the counterpart agencies/officers from the commencement of any project/programme. 	<p>lead to insecurity amongst and non-cooperation from, government staff.</p> <p><i>Plans remain plans</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishery management plans, mangrove management plans etc. do not proceed to implementation. Insufficient political will and funding as well as long-term commitment exists to actually implement agreed plans.
<p><i>Positive and supportive policy/regulatory environment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy, especially at the provincial level, needs to be in place to support co-management and enhance community organization development. A policy framework for resource management planning (e.g. Community Fisheries Area Management Plans in Cambodia) facilitated by the government can act as a template and hence facilitate co-management efforts. However, these plans should be participatory and engage communities to gain their trust and ownership in the process, rather than be designated in a top-down manner. 	<p><i>Weak or uncertain policy environment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to policy at local or national levels may be slow and difficult to bring about. If the policy environment is not supportive and there is no political/institutional mandate or willingness for change then success/progress is unlikely. Changes of government or lack of a sustained policy directive can affect funding, designation of staff and long-term commitment to the process <p><i>Delays</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays from the government counterpart meeting its obligations may impact the co-management process.

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p><i>There is financial commitment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate financial commitment for co-management needs to be in place at the central, provincial, and district levels etc. 	<p><i>Inadequate financial resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient or irregular funding will result in difficulties implementing co-management activities. (Local) Government commitment must be backed up with allocation of resources (human and financial). <p><i>Sustainability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-management is not a short term process. Donor-supported initiatives often fail once donor support ends. Building in government support for co-management mechanisms (e.g. monthly meetings with fishers) should happen at an early stage, and it is important to sustain the process beyond any project.
<p><i>There is adequate co-management capacity within counterparts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient staff are allocated by the government at appropriate levels to ensure success. <p><i>Governments are open to and recognize the contribution other parties can bring to the co-management process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments open themselves to build collaboration with local NGOs. This could potentially help fill the capacity shortfall at local level and help drive the co-management process. <p><i>Any co-management undertaken is ‘true’ co-management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that government appointees/policies do not dominate decision-making and over-ride fisheries associations etc. Efforts should be made to advocate for and encourage true ‘co-management’ where fishers and their views are equally represented/empowered. 	<p><i>There is a lack of capacity at the necessary level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity and resources available to local government are insufficient for making informed and best management decisions. Lack of staff with technical expertise in coastal resource management. Government fisheries staff may be skilled in fishing technology issues, but often lack skills in building the social structures needed for co-management to work. Staff need to be continually trained to ensure the sustainability of any system.
<p><i>Transparency/fairness/trust are essential to keep stakeholders engaged</i></p>	<p><i>Lack of trust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishers/ community members may be

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process of trust between all parties has to be built for co-management to succeed. • Fair and effective allocation of fishing rights will stabilize resource access. • Exclusion of outsiders may generate conflicts if a powerful community “captures” the benefits. 	<p>concerned that the government will not deliver or support plans. Likewise government may not trust fishers and be unwilling to hand over management responsibility.</p> <p><i>Lack of transparency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers/ communities may suffer from a lack of transparency with regards to fine collection, granting of concessions, enforcement etc. <p><i>Competing concessions</i></p> <p>Concessions may be given to powerful private companies / individuals that compromise or threaten community rights.</p>
<p><i>Gender discrimination is identified and acted upon</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender analysis can reveal the participation of women in resource management. • The co-management process can improve women’s participation in decision-making. • Enhanced awareness and capacity building with regards to gender issues (for both government staff and communities) can facilitate the process. <p><i>Government support to positive inclusion/empowerment of women</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of regional governments actively support women playing a role in fisheries management. This sees reforms to membership of associations, and greater empowerment and involvement of women in decision making; thereby strengthening their interest and engagement. • There should be a gender focal point in concerned agencies. • A certain number of seats in co-management bodies should be set aside specifically for women. • Policy should be reviewed to become gender ‘neutral’ or non-exclusive. 	<p><i>Lack of awareness of need for gender equality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May result in a lack of interest among fishers and other stakeholders towards women’s participation. <p><i>Gender issues and women’s engagement are not given serious attention - Tokenism</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women are involved in co-management processes but only in a ‘token’ way without true or active participation. • Policy and legislation on co-management may specifically refer to ‘fishers’ or ‘fishermen’, thereby excluding women.
<p>Communities</p>	

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>Empowering communities, enhancing participation, increasing engagement, capacity building of leaders/facilitators,</p>	
<p><i>Full support and cooperation of village governance structures is vital for effective management of marine resources.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The involvement of dominant families or clan groups can help support the co-management process. • A functioning organization / effective communication and its maintenance within a village or community is vital. <p><i>It is vital that fishers/communities do not feel that co-management is a process being forced on them</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities need to understand the potential benefits of co-management. • A sense of ownership of any management body such as a Fisheries Association by its members / the community is vital if co-management is to take place effectively. • A major incentive is the ability to designate/allocate fishing rights. 	<p><i>Insufficient community buy in or involvement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate involvement of community members or poor communication with regard to co-management activities and their implementation limits the likelihood of success. • Where there are internal conflicts within a community co-management is highly unlikely to succeed. • Local power group(s), clan(s) or elites seek(s) to capture the benefits. • If the community is not behind its leaders, or if leaders or members have self-serving interests or if parts of the community are excluded effective management of marine resources is unlikely. <p><i>Lack of feedback or poor communication with stakeholders</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If results are not fed back to communities and local government stakeholders, then co-management will fail. • Community interest in helping gather data will also be seriously impacted. • If results are not communicated effectively to decision/policy makers an opportunity may be lost.
<p><i>Active leaders and communities will be far more likely to effectively put in place co-management.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities which have active leaders. • Communities which have experience in ‘self-help’ or empowerment. • Presence of capable community facilitators. <p><i>Community leader commitment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership is the key in the success of program 	<p><i>Changes in village leadership village or community leaders can undermine the co-management process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New leadership may be less aware/committed to the need for mechanisms pertaining to co-management. • Change of political/social alliances and other lobby group interests may be preferred.

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>implementation in a community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts should be made from the outset to ensure full buy in from village leaders. • If a village is not cooperating, then, do not force the implementation of the program. However, if time and resources allow, pilot activities could be put into place to enhance people’s understanding and interest in the co-management process. • Strong consideration should be made to switching efforts to another community, if the commitment is not there. • Community leaders should be trained more deeply on leadership and communication skills in order to reduce dependency on donors. 	
<p><i>Coastal communities usually care deeply about their livelihoods and environment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities will be more willing to participate and support the process of co-management when they themselves realize the need to seek solutions to rapid ecosystem/resource degradation. • The concerns of communities can provide a strong foundation for co-management to succeed. However communities will need consistent facilitation, support and assurance to be actively involved. 	<p><i>Lack of livelihood alternatives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lack of alternatives to fishing will hamper potential measures to reduce fishing effort.
<p><i>Be open to the opportunities offered by women’s involvement and their empowerment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts to increase women’s participation in co-management can improve women’s role in decision-making and therefore women’s empowerment. • The contribution and role of women in fisheries should be made more visible in order to make more apparent the need for women to play a role in management. • Women’s involvement in alternative livelihoods can play important roles in reducing pressure on fishing resources. 	<p><i>Selective membership and restricted scope of women’s groups and their activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing women’s groups may be affiliated to the church, and/or foundations of local politicians in narrower areas such for welfare schemes or to promote savings and credit. This may result in restricted membership and limit possibility/ interest to participate in fishery management. It may also reinforce stereotypic roles. • The opening up to broader engagement of women as stakeholders should be explored.
<p>Resources/ Management</p>	

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>The management measures, approaches to management, the resource focus, MCS, demarcation, building on traditional measures</p>	
<p><i>Resource recovery, limiting of fishing effort and other management measures may not appear to be immediate options in poor coastal communities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other considerations of people’s well-being (in addition to resource availability) must also be taken into account. Often this requires complementary activities to enhance livelihoods and support wealth creation. • Only when people’s basic needs are covered, are they prepared to start considering ecological well-being. • Hard decisions will sometimes need to be made concerning gear restrictions, closures etc. It will not be possible to please every party all of the time and on occasion ‘biting the bullet’ may be necessary. 	<p><i>Unwillingness to implement restrictions on fishing effort or gear measures</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While measures designed to reduce conflict or the establishment of MPAs etc., may take place, actions to reduce effort or close fisheries are far harder to implement and seldom take place. <p><i>Unwillingness to accept restrictions on fishing effort or gear measures</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers may be unwilling to accept gear or fishing restrictions developed under the co-management arrangement. Especially if this means short term loss of income. • This may be especially the case when illegal fishers are still entering community/protected waters or are using restricted gear.
<p><i>Zoning and mapping support to define turfs or allocate rights to co-management groups</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By giving more exclusive access to fishers, buy in to co-management processes may be enhanced. • Excluding outsiders offers immediate local benefits, but does not guarantee long term resource sustainability. • Affordable methods of marking marine zones need to be considered (e.g. marine buoys may be cheaper than concrete poles). • Use of GPS based mapping should be considered. • Communication and awareness raising with regards to zoned areas is vital. 	<p><i>High cost of physical demarcation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical demarcation of fishing areas (zoning of conservation areas etc.) is costly and hence may be unrealistic. As a result, management of resources may be difficult to implement as marine zones are not marked.
<p><i>The impacts of technological advances are understood in terms of their impacts on fishing</i></p>	<p><i>Fishery management plans over focus on excluding outside competition, reduction of</i></p>

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p><i>effort and the fishery resource</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising awareness of the potential negative effects of new technologies and fishing techniques should accompany every innovation action (e.g. introduction of fish finders). • Promote public information campaigns on best practices and the benefits of co-management. 	<p><i>conflict and equitable access</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans may not focus on managing fishing effort or restricting fishing activities of group members. • The result is that the resource may continue to be over-fished/ decline.
<p><i>Fishery management measures are based on knowledge of the fishery, have a sound basis in either traditional ecological knowledge or are science-based.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries administrations need to better understand fisheries resources. • MPAs established/based on known life stage characteristics and backed up by monitoring. • Mangrove conservation areas include associated seagrass and mud flat ecosystems that are equally and often more important for the juvenile stages of fishery and aquatic species. • Artificial reefs or benthic habitats deter trawling effort, but need to also have associated rules/regulation to prevent intensive artisanal fishing that might target broodstock or juveniles. • Traditional management systems are used to establish or reinforce meaningful refuge areas (protection of species, sacred spaces and forest areas including mangroves) and closed seasons. If undertaken effectively, this may contribute to improved recruitment or reduced fishing pressures; especially on juveniles or spawning stock. • This should be reinforced and backed up with local monitoring. 	<p><i>Conservation measures established without real fishery basis may not yield any benefit to the fishery resource</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPAs established for tourism potential may not benefit any fish species. • Mangrove conservation does not include associated seagrass and mud flat eco-systems that are equally and often more important for the juvenile stages of fishery and aquatic species. • Artificial reefs or benthic habitats may act as fish aggregators, making fishing more efficient and may actually result in higher fishing pressure (although they may reduce trawling pressure). • Local ecological knowledge is ignored; fishery stakeholders are not consulted over potential impacts on their livelihoods and particularly when no-take MPAs are established. <p><i>Protected areas developed without engagement with fishery stakeholders</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing of access. • Fishers refuse to comply. • Excessive water area/buffer area is closed. • Protected area benefits captured by other stakeholders (e.g. tourist operators, investors, etc.).
<p><i>Building on traditional systems</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional rules should be documented as much as possible and their formalization by the state and adoption by the communities should be encouraged as they show their usefulness to manage marine resources in coastal areas. 	<p><i>Traditional knowledge does not address increasing fishing effort and technological changes in the fishery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local knowledge may not be enough to address externalities in the fishery, or inform the establishment of

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional/local rules for the management of coastal and marine resources are respected by the resource users. Awareness of these rules should be raised. The recognition, use and incorporation of local/cultural traditions (e.g. Lilifuk and Tara Bandu) can play an important role in helping to facilitate effective management of marine resources and should be preferred over more 'artificial' and imposed mechanisms. 	<p>appropriate level of fishing effort or conservation measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid development (e.g. infrastructure) could lead to short term economic advantage, but will also weaken traditional systems such as Tara Bandu.
<p><i>MCS/Enforcement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration with authorities - Good collaboration with the Fisheries Administration is key to combating illegal activities effectively. Without involvement or rapid reaction of the relevant authorities illegal fishers cannot be 'arrested'. Patrolling may be insufficient to stop illegal fishing activities; installing anti-trawling devices may be needed to partially reduce these activities. Diversion of penalties to finance enforcement is a positive aspect that could be replicated. Ownership of resources helps enforcement. <p><i>Political patronage very important</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasize the police power to do the actual apprehension. 	<p><i>Cost of fuel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patrolling efficiency and regularity may be impacted by the cost of fuel. <p><i>Cost of anti-trawling devices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such devices are expensive and it may be prohibitively expensive to purchase sufficient numbers to effectively protect a fishing area. <p><i>Community not benefitting from fines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fines from illegal fishers may not feed back to communities which will negatively impact on their ability and incentive to patrol. <p><i>Violence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confronting illegal fishers may result in violence; they may also be heavily armed. Often conflict avoidance means that illegal acts which undermine management rules go unchallenged. Problem of retaliation from commercial fishers.
<p><i>Relationships are built with communities through data gathering activities and discussion of the results</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information gathering efforts should be tailored so that those gathering information are involved in the design (of forms etc.) and can easily understand what to do. Make sure the right people are involved and do not hesitate to switch those who are not doing 	<p><i>Incentives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment of financial incentives for data gatherers may result in active participation however it may indicate a failure to ensure data gathers really understand the need for the initiative. It may also compromise any future initiative should incentives not be available for example when a donor

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>what they are supposed to be doing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives may be necessary, but should be considered carefully. It should be built on <i>giving</i> and <i>taking</i> of all involved stakeholders, and agreed and signed in a written document. 	<p>funded project ends.</p>
<p><i>There is a method to verify the data recorded/gathered</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of technology such as SMS, email, digital photographs can facilitate gathering of information and can complement or in certain cases replace the use of traditional logbooks. Fish species identification is not easy. Training, mentoring and basic identification materials need to be provided. Photographic records of fish caught along with local names can help build up more accurate records. 	<p><i>Poor data quality limits application to decision making</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data quality may suffer if data gatherers are not sufficiently trained (e.g. identifying fish species incorrectly). Lack of trained staff - a lack of staff with data entry or analysis skills. Lack of commitment to perform best services. Lack of equipment availability – Basic equipment needed for gathering data may not be readily available.
<p><i>Co-management / resource management planning takes funding/investment into account</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts should be made to value well managed small-scale fisheries so that both potential donors (or investors) and government have a better picture of its worth. Efforts should be made to link resource management plans with investment plans. 	<p><i>Difficulties in valuing a fishery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate data is often unavailable.
<p><i>Market forces/demands are considered in the co-management approach</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If fisheries are supplying commercial concerns (e.g. the sardine bottling industry in the Philippines) then consultation should take place with private sector concerns regarding resource management planning. 	<p><i>Commercial interests overpower community concerns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small-scale fishing communities may find it very difficult to match the power, influence and ‘voice’ of commercial concerns should they have differing interests.
<p>Approach</p> <p>timing/approach/process</p>	
<p><i>It is important that some immediate benefits become apparent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-management is a lengthy process and it is important that fishers/community members can see tangible benefits quickly 	<p><i>Timing/resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amount of time and inputs needed to support co-management must be recognized and resources should not be spread too thinly from the outset.

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p>in order to maintain their interest and commitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to state up-front and clearly the incentives of the co-management process. • Often associated benefits may be the greatest incentives to sustaining interest/engagement (e.g. supplementary livelihoods, access to services like extension services and micro-finance, conflict reduction etc.) 	<p><i>Community expectations /results take time</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts should be made not to overly raise expectations amongst communities of the potential benefits from co-management. • Expectations are too high – fisher / community expectations from co-management mechanisms may be unrealistic. • With tangible benefits likely to take time, fisher interest may fall. <p><i>Going too fast</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trying to implement co-management in a hurry to a fixed time scale, and not recognizing the need to take things slowly. • Not delivering on promises – If the supporting agencies fail to deliver on promises, communities will lose trust and interest in the co-management process.
<p><i>Time and patience are essential to realize the fishery benefits</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries management requires considerable time and patience to develop and implement. • It cannot be seen as a quick 3-4 year initiative and needs to be approached as a long-term, on-going undertaking. • Other benefits of co-management usually become apparent earlier (e.g. greater community coherence, improved conflict resolution capacity, defense of resource against outsiders – all of these are side benefits, which will occur in the short term, well before any improvement in the fish stock as a result of management measures). 	<p><i>Co-management activities are too time consuming for fishers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings, planning processes and group activities take up too much time and can result in loss of earnings, with few immediate or obvious results for fishers. • Fishers or other data gatherers will be discouraged to participate in data gathering activities, if it becomes too time consuming. <p><i>Lack of motivation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those involved may lack motivation.
<p><i>Communication is key</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local governments need constant guidance and mentoring in crafting management plans and ordinances, as well as direct funding support. 	<p><i>Inappropriate communication tools are used</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of results to communities in an understandable form is vital. • Illiteracy/lack of education should not

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government or communities working on co-management should be kept aware of the positive results they are achieving, to provide an incentive for their efforts. Reporting and communication mechanisms should be developed that link community members, village government, district government, law enforcement agencies, and other related stakeholders. 	<p>be a barrier to participation. Family members can also help.</p>
<p><i>Keep it simple and understandable - A step by step approach should be taken</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-management can be a complex process and therefore it is important to take a step by step approach with fishers, to ensure that they can understand what is being attempted. Learning by doing is essential; keep abstract theory to a minimum. Adapt implementation strategies to the local context. 	<p><i>Complexity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting complex management frameworks in local government's fisheries management plans and agenda confuses or overloads local capacity. Demands for scientific information (e.g. establishment of harvest reference points) may be overly complex and beyond the scope of available data and reference material. Setting up co-management systems in enclosed water bodies (lagoons, bays etc.) may be complex as it requires broader stakeholder participation, across various sectors, than may be the case for open marine waters.
<p><i>Flexibility in planning / implementation increases the chance of success</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-management should be inclusive and involve many people/stakeholders at a variety of levels. People often have their own agenda, commitments and targets. 	<p><i>Overly-prescriptive approaches deter stakeholders and fail to address the underlying problems</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A common problem of government or large-scale project-driven efforts to promote co-management is the establishment of associations and groups for co-management using a template approach. These groups are often not well organized and/or are insufficiently motivated and lack strong social cohesion <p><i>Information gathering efforts such as catch monitoring or a fisher census are not sustained by government and are seen as a one off activity.</i></p>

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p><i>Clear definitions of roles of stakeholders will strengthen planning and accountability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify roles and responsibilities (e.g. various activities to be conducted by each stakeholder within a specific time frame) of all stakeholders in the co-management process through participatory dialogue. • These should be reflected in the management plan and agreed by all. • Synergy among stakeholders – where stakeholders in any activity complement one another, training will be more effective. 	
<p><i>Build on existing experience and lessons previously learned</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing traditions often form the best basis for developing management measures that are socially and culturally acceptable. • Past co-management experiences and undertakings can be built upon more effectively than starting from scratch. • Traditional management systems are based on local beliefs, as well as social and cultural systems. As a result, community participation in management measures based on such beliefs may have more likelihood of being accepted, enforced and of being successful and sustainable. • Such traditional systems also offer an excellent entry point to engage communities and result in a greater sense of ownership. 	<p><i>Not building on what has gone before – seeking to build ‘one’s own’ co-management project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May impose external paradigms or cultural values. • May duplicate or even undermine embedded traditional measures. • Is “reinventing the wheel”. • There may be a reluctance by donor funded projects to carry on or building upon the work of other projects, provinces etc. <p><i>Be careful</i>, the reduction of fishing pressure or conservation of resources is often not built into traditional systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional systems have evolved under lower population conditions than now, and different economic and technological pressures, and were often intended to resolve conflicts between different user groups. • Their strength lies in communication, consensus building, buy-in and conflict reduction. They need to be supported with information on fishing impacts and ways to mitigate against over-fishing, in terms of both absolute numbers of fishers and fishing effort.
<p><i>Efforts should be made to enhance the social capacity building skills of government departments</i></p>	

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p><i>and staff.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building should be an on-going and gradual process. Attempting to ‘fast track’ capacity building in intensive sessions will reduce effective learning. • Appropriate community facilitators or change agents and champions for co-management should be defined and deployed. • The capacity of any management body such as a Fisheries Association must be enhanced before co-management can take place effectively. <p><i>Capacity is best built through a process of “learning by doing”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom learning about co-management / resource management is only effective in certain instances. Learning by doing/performing or on-the-job training is likely a more effective approach. • When training is related to implementation in the field so that knowledge and skills can be quickly practiced in the field, it has more chance of being effective. <p><i>Training is participatory</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When trainees are fully involved and not ‘lectured to’ training will be more effective. <p><i>Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When participants are creative and engaged, the output of awareness raising actions will be more effective. <p><i>Giving people the chance to experience new approaches</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most government staff have a sound basic understanding on marine and fishery topics, but when working with the community, their approach is usually strongly top-down. Meaning, they come and give directions to the people. However by involving them as trainers or resource persons in co-management activities, they can experience the bottom-up approach which involves listening to the people, discussing and clarifying ideas, and letting the people decide their own priorities. 	

Enabling features, opportunities	Risks, constraints
<p><i>Give responsibility and some independence to explore the options for management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing small seed funds to newly formed fisheries associations to manage by themselves raises their sense of responsibility to manage and monitor funds, and can be used to put training into effect. • Local study tours – Bringing fishers or officials from other provinces or nearby areas to visit activities, helps share experiences and build networks and drive replication at a relatively low cost. 	
<p><i>Information for management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of communities – the full involvement of communities in planning and gathering data will help create a sense of ownership and interest in data gathering activities. <p><i>Time and patience are needed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient time is needed for the entire process of planning, community discussions, developing tools, training, data collection, analysis etc. It cannot be rushed. <p><i>Mentoring in data gathering and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training is not sufficient. Those taking part need to be mentored over a longer period. A “learning by doing” approach is also required. 	<p><i>Lack of commitment to sustained information gathering to inform management and co-management dialogue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information gathering efforts such as catch monitoring or fisher census are not sustained by government and are seen as one off activities.

Annex 2 - Workshop Agenda



Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme for South and Southeast Asia (RFLP)

Day 1 – Wednesday December 12th

08.30 – 08.35	Opening remarks Simon Funge-Smith, Senior Fisheries Officer, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
08.35 – 08.40	Opening remarks Jose Parajua, RFLP Regional Programme Manager
08.40 – 09.00	Introduction to the workshop and definition of workshop outcomes Steve Needham, RFLP Information Officer
Session 1	Co-management plans, structures and mechanisms
09.00 – 09.30	Sri Lanka – Facilitating an ecosystem approach to fisheries management
09.30 – 10.00	Philippines – Development and implementation of Coastal Resource and Fisheries Management Plans
10.00 – 10.30	<i>Discussion</i>
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee Break
11.00 – 11.30	Cambodia – Development and implementation of Community Fisheries Area Management Plans
11.30 – 12.00	Viet Nam – The process of building fisheries co-management
12.00 – 12.30	<i>Discussion</i>

12.30 – 13.30	Lunch
Session 2	Traditional and local co-management structures
13.30 – 14.00	Timor-Leste –Traditional systems of co-management - Tara Bandu
14.00 – 14.30	Indonesia – Development of Village regulations with incorporation of Lilifuk
14.30 – 15.00	<i>Discussion</i>
15.00 – 15.30	Coffee break
Session 3	Capacity Development and Awareness Raising
15.30 – 16.00	Viet Nam –Building the capacity of Fisheries Associations
16.00 – 16.30	Indonesia – Building awareness amongst communities of resource and co-management
16.30 – 17.00	<i>Discussion</i>
17.00 – 17.30	Wrap up of recommendations from day 1
17.30	End

Day 2 –Thursday December 13th

08.30 - 09.00	Review of Day 1 and Introduction to Day 2
Session 4	MCS/Enforcement
09.00 – 09.30	Cambodia – Deployment of anti-trawling devices and community patrolling
09.30 – 10.00	Philippines – Enforcing the 3-month/3-night bans on sardine fishing
10.00 – 10.30	<i>Discussion</i>
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee break
Session 5	Information for management
11.00 – 11.30	Timor-Leste – The National Statistical System: Filling the data vacuum
11.30 – 12.00	Cambodia – Catch monitoring pilot

12.00 – 12.30	<i>Discussion</i>
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch
Session 6	Small-scale fisheries improvers scheme
13.30 – 13.45	Regional initiative – The Good Fish Code
13.45 – 14.30	<i>Discussion</i>
Session 7	Gender equality and co-management
14.30 – 15.00	Sri Lanka – Involving women in co-management
15.00 – 15.30	Viet Nam – Enhancing women’s involvement in FAs
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee break
16.00 – 16.30	<i>Discussion on gender</i>
Session 8	Reflections, Discussions, Recommendations and Next Steps
16.30 – 17.30	Discussion to finalise key findings and recommendations of the workshop
17.30	End

Annex 3 - Workshop Participants

#	Country	Name	Notes
1	Cambodia	Ms. Kaing Khim	RFLP CMB NPD
2		Mr. Somony Thay	RFLP CMB NPC
3		Ms. Wirya Khim	RFLP CMB MEO
4		Mr. Yos Chanthana	RFLP CMB NC Co-management
5	Indonesia	Mr. Bambang Sutejo	RFLP INS NPD
6		Mr. Liliék Soeprijadi	
7		Mr. Aminudin Salka	RFLP INS NPM
8		Mr. Suhendra	RFLP INS MEO
9		Mr. Marvel Ledo	RFLP INS NC Co-management
10	Philippines	Ms. Jessica Munoz	RFLP PHI NPD
11		Mr. Benjamin Francisco	RFLP PHI NPC
12		Mr. Glenn Labrado	RFLP PHI MEO
13	Sri Lanka	Dr. Damitha de Zoysa	RFLP SRL NPD
14		Ms. Champa Amarasiri	RFLP SRL NPC
15		Mr. Nishan Dissanayake	RFLP SRL MEO
16		Mr. Leslie Joseph	RFLP SRL NPD
17	Timor-Leste	Mr. Pedro Rodrigues	RFLP TIM NPC
18		Mr. Mario Pereira	RFLP TIM NC Co-management
19	Viet Nam	Mr. Pham Trong Yen	RFLP VIE NPD
20		Mr. Nguyen Song Ha	RFLP VIE NPC
21		Ms. Hoang Thao Thi Phuong	RFLP VIE MEO
22		Dr. Tuyen Truong Van	RFLP VIE NC Co-management
23	Regional	Dr. Simon Funge-Smith	FAO RAP Senior Fishery Officer
24		Mr. Jose Parajua	RFLP Regional Programme Manager
25		Mr. Don Griffiths	RFLP Chief Technical Advisor
26		Mr. Steve Needham	RFLP Information Officer
27		Ms. Angela Lentisco	RFLP International Consultant
28	Observer	Mr. Theo Ebberts	AIT/Wetlands Alliance
29		Ms. Sumitra Ruangsivakul	SEAFDEC
30		Mr. Isara Chanrachkij	SEAFDEC
31		Ms. Pattaratjit K.	SEAFDEC

